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Theology, philosophy and science: is there a meeting point? Can these forms of knowledge come together in the Post-industrial era, the age of the computer? Is a critical unification of knowledge feasible?

Man poses these questions when he gains self-knowledge. He raises these or similar questions when he realises that he constitutes a carrier of many various forms of knowledge.

Man has been trying to unify his knowledge about cosmos, Man, God and society since ancient times. By means of his mental and critical abilities, Man has been trying to solve general, particular and existential problems unifying the forms of knowledge.

This effort made by Man, the unification of the forms of knowledge, is the starting point of the present study.

This study tries to unify two forms of knowledge: the Theological and the Philosophical form and content of knowledge. It constitutes a reference to the work of two personalities, St. Maximus the Confessor and Max Scheler, which attempts to answer the question of "what is Man?". In particular, this study attempts, by means of a critical unification of forms of knowledge, to support that Man, each and every person as well as all persons, is Personality and Love. It aims at contributing to the preservation of Man as a particular, unique and unparalleled Personality who develops the authenticity of human nature by means of the agapetic expression of existing. More specifically, it is maintained that Man, the human person, reaches his true and ontological fulfilment by relating to human persons, to the Personal God and to the cosmos on the basis of love.
PREFACE

The instigator of this subject is Dr. David Drown, Professor of the University of Durham.

The title of the present study was given during a conversation in Dr. Brown's office in December 1990. Ever since, starting with the draft of this study, its actual writing in parts, the despatch of each part and finally reaching the final stage, the corrections, the comments, the expansion suggestions have inspired more thirst for research, for in depth participation in the work of St. Maximus and M. Scheler. In addition, Dr. Drown pointed towards the research into other ways and forms of thinking related either to the work of St. Maximus or to that of M. Scheler.

It is to Dr. Drown that I owe, to a large extent, the consummation of my knowledge, the thirst for more knowledge and, mainly, the fulfillment of the way of thinking about knowledge and human beings on the basis of love.

The occasion of meeting Dr. Drown and of my passage to Great Britain was my acquaintance with Rev. Dr. George Dragas. Fr. G. Dragas, as a Greek Priest and as a Patristic writer has been on my side during the whole course of my study, with constructive discussions, always stressing the importance of Orthodoxy.

It is to Fr. George that I owe the stressing of the Orthodox Patristic views of my study.

This study is based on two axes: a. the Man-oriented nature of Orthodoxy and b. the philosophical-theological analysis. It is based on the way of thinking of two professors of Theology in Greece, namely Dr. N. Bratsiotis and Dr. N. Matsoukas.

Dr. N. Bratsiotis leads the mind of the student of the Theology in the University of Athens to Man. The student of Theology in Athens learns to think about Man, he sees the Man-orientated nature of Orthodoxy. The teaching of the Theology of the Old Testament by N. Bratsiotis, his written work as well as his personality are in harmony with Man as the subject of theological research.

Dr. N. Matsoukas expresses perfectly the effort to harmonize the theological with the philosophical way of thinking. He leads the
the student or the reader of his studies to the selective harmonisation of theology and philosophy. Dr. N. Matsoukas has attained a scientific synthesis of the theological and the philosophical way of thinking aiming at harmonising the human mind.

It is to the two Professors of the Greek University (in Athens and in Salonica) that I owe, to a large extent, the God-Man-oriented nature of my thinking, as well as the endeavour to harmonize Man with God and, consequently, with cosmos.

Concluding this brief preface, I hope that I have correctly analyzed, used and developed all these elements that I received from the afore-mentioned persons. It is this development of the special elements of my personality, a development due to my studies under the particular professors, that I try to express in the present study entitled "Personality and Love according to St. Maximus the Confessor and to Max Scheler".
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Having a spiritual course of four thousand years, Man in the twentieth century has not been able yet to reach an answer to the question of "what is Man", what is his own self. The question of Man about Man becomes always more puzzling and more pressing.

It becomes ever more puzzling because Man constantly reposes his hope for the solution of the problem upon various particular aspects of the human spirit and human civilization, and thus fails not to obtain a particular and final answer. Moreover, the problem becomes ever more pressing because Man feels alienated from his own self, from the essence and the reality of who he is.

This question stresses his existential agony in the face of loneliness from two points of view. Firstly, Man feels agony before the general nature of the problem of his loneliness and alienation because of the many, various and puzzling concepts of himself. Secondly, Man feels constantly alienated from his own self because he constantly chooses a particular and absolute direction of the human spirit in order to answer the question about the essence of Man, that is his own essence, and this generally fails to satisfy.

In particular, Man, especially nowadays, turns either to the metaphysical solution and basis of the problem, or to the various social, scientific and epistemological answers currently available. But by turning to one kind of solution to the problem, he regards it as absolute, and this effectively reduces the other possible solutions or answers to the same kind of problem. The consequences of this reduction (or of the ostensible contrast between the answers to the particular problem) are isolation and alienation.

For instance, saying that the problem of what Man is can accept only a theological or only a philosophical or only a scientific answer would mean that we consider one of these concepts as absolute. This consideration however reduces or rejects the nature of the other concepts and confines the mind of Man to the one regarded as absolute. By regarding one concept as unique and ideal,
Man is alienated from the other concepts and is led to a feeling of insecurity. Because Man regards his own concept about life and Man as absolute and considers it a general and final theory, consequently the ontological level is occupied by a limited individual concept. According to this, whatever the particular thinking existence regards as real and final, and thus absolute, is ontological, final and real for Man, for his life in the cosmos, for both microcosm and macrocosm and for Metaphysics. By extension, Man, the particular existence who thinks in this individualistic way, opposes and reduces the significance of the other ways of thinking, of the other concepts of life, in order to prove the perfection of his own concept.

According to such unilateral absolute answers, Man is presented in constant isolation and disruption, in a state of constant competition with the cosmos, since understanding of Man is now based on the sophistical concept according to which "μανῶν χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος". By regarding as absolute only part of the human reality and life, Man stands in sharp contrast to the integrity aim of ontological truth.

He is led into opposition to his own self since every human existence lying in the cosmos comes into contact with contrasting absolute aspects of reality. He co-exists with them, "εἶναι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ", but at the same time he must reject this co-existence (what he is) in the name of one absolute concept of the cosmos. Finally, he is led to being opposed to his own existential struggle, to the struggle of "ὑπάρχειν" as "οὐνομάζειν" with the cosmos, with Man, with the truth and with God.

As far as existential struggle is concerned, Man lies in contrast to the following: his own quality of thinking (as a basic element of "ὑπάρχειν"), the creation of the cosmos by God as "very good", the purpose of this creation by God as an expression of the love of God for Man, the purpose of the Humanization of God (that is the aesthetic unity of Man with the cosmos and God) and, finally, the
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struggle of "ομοφωνία" eternally, the eternal co-existence of the
human existence with the eternal trinitarian existence and the
eternal truth of the cosmos which is, according to St. Maximus,
Ἄθων ὅντων (parts of the Mind of God), or, according to
M.Scheler, the Values (eternal and immutable truths).

Contrary to this dominating general disruption, Man constitutes
the unity of the cosmic, the divine and the human. He is a unity of
all the unilateral absolute dimensions of reality, since he is
directed to, and by extension regards as absolute, only one
dimension of reality even though he knows and experiences that he
belongs to all dimensions of reality. Insofar as Man determines and
partakes, in all the dimensions of reality, then reality is what it
is as a whole. But in order to feel that he has revealed the
supreme character of reality, Man regards one of its aspects as
absolute even if he has to come with contrast to reality itself,
which is very good.

The present study, "Personality and Love according to St.Maximus
the Confessor and M. Scheler", is in stark opposition to the
general concept of regarding any concept as absolute. Not accepting
the disruption of the unity between the theological and the
philosophical ways of thinking or referring to a particular subject
quite separately from patristic and philosophical points of view,
this study aims at an integration a unity of the two as in
appearance only opposite concepts about the same subject. Initially
it aims at presenting certain common points between the two
different ways of thinking, and two different ages.

Nevertheless, the initial aim cannot be final, as every age, every
moment in time and every way of thinking is based on previous ages
and ways of thinking.

For instance, six centuries of Patristic thought and two and a
half thousands years of philosophical thought precede the thought
of St.Maximus. Similarly, a philosophical period of four and a half
thousands years precedes the thought of M.Scheler. Both writers
seem to have in mind, in some cases general and in others specific,
knowledge of certain concepts. In addition, they accept certain
concepts and reject others, that is they critically accept or reject previous concepts or, better still, parts of the human spirit.

As a consequence, the present study must refer not only to the thought of the two particular writers. It must include parts of the whole human spirit in order to comprehend deeply the reasons for which the two writers accept or reject their particular theories. But naturally this study cannot make reference to the whole of the human spirit. This would lead to too much generalization. Furthermore, the multitude of theological and philosophical texts would make the task impossible. This study will therefore simply focus on certain points of the human spirit which relate to the subject of research, namely the philosophical-theological concepts of personality and love.

On this basis, the present study will attempt to present Man as Personality and Love according to the concepts of St. Maximus and Scheler and in relation or in opposition to certain theories with which the two writers either agree or disagree, my aim always highlight an alternative complex way of thinking.

From one point of view, this study is limited to the thought of the two particular writers referring and their relevant intellectual backgrounds. But it also seeks to set the two concepts of personality and love in a wider context.

In particular, Man, in his daily existence, can be characterized as a Person and a Personality who relates with the cosmos and other persons on the basis of Love. All Men, as well as each and every Man, constitute a singularity, a Personality from the theological, philosophical, sociological and epistemological points of view. Furthermore, every particular Personality, as well as all other Personalities, are in relation with the cosmos, with other human beings, with Man in general and with God on the basis of love. Every Man, every personality, as well as all Men, possess a particular and a general concept of their own reality as Personality and as Love and of the reality of the other persons.
other human beings.

This empirical daily reality constitutes the principal starting point and subject of research of the present study. It does not only intend to present a philosophical or philosophical-theological comparison of the theories of the two writers. Nor does it only aim at scientifically presenting a particular subject on the basis of two or more concepts. Its intention is also to endorse a view of Man as Personality and Love according to the views of the two writers, in order to deal with the daily problem of Man as Personality and Love.

In accordance with that aim this study will refer to the problem of "Personality and Love according to St. Maximus and to M. Scheler" by using the Phenomenological (person-oriented, intuitive and inductive) method, in order to provide an answer to the question of "Philosophical Anthropology", "What is Man?". The reason behind this study is that Man, at a daily existential level, feels a longing that he constitutes a Personality (a singularity of the Human Eνατ) and that he relates with Man and the cosmos (the general Eνατ) as well as with God on the basis of his singularity and on the basis of Love.

First, the biography of the two writers will be briefly presented simply because they are two particular persons who lived in a particular moment in time, in a social reality which influenced their way of thinking in both negative and positive ways. We will refer to the life and the work of the two persons in order to understand them not only as objects of study but as simple Men, to understand their simple human struggle and the forms of expression of their love in their particular social environment.

The life and work of St. Maximus the Confessor.

St. Maximus was born in 580 in Constantinople to an aristocratic family. His education was theological and philosophical in accordance with his social status and age. In 610 he became the first secretary of the Emperor Heracleitus. Later, in 613 or 614 he
resigned from the imperial court and became a monk in a monastery in Chrysoupolis in Bosporos. At this monastery in 610 he met Anastasius, a monk who remained loyal to him throughout his life and who was with him in his martyred. It seems that St. Maximus resigned from the imperial court and became a monk simply because he desired peace of mind. He remained a simple monk throughout his life because of this desire. His life in Chrysoupolis, as we can see from his work, was mainly connected with asceticism and the contemplative life.

Two years later, in 624 or 625, St. Maximus left Chrysoupolis and went to the monastery of St. George of Gyzikos where he stayed until the Persian invasion in 626. He wrote his first works referring to John Rubikularios. It was then that he also wrote "Ἀντίος Ἀσκητικός" and "Κεφάλαια εἰς Ἠρῴας" referring to Elpidios. Other works of the same period are "Ἡσαύρεις, Ἑρωθεῖς καὶ Ἀσκηταῖς" and "Ἐρμηνεία εἰς τὸν 59ον Ψαλμόν". Earlier he had written "Τὰ ψυχικὰ κεφάλαια".

These works, being ascetical, reveal a person who is interested more in the practical spiritual life than in the philosophical-theological.

The works, which are of a particular ascetical nature, are the ones which refer to love as purification from vice and as attainment of virtue. However, love is not only the starting point of purification from vice (asceticism). According to St. Maximus, love and the purification from individualistic and egotistical vice aim at unity with the cosmos, with the whole of reality. On the one hand, love is the cause of purification from the individualistic concept of life and the cosmos, and on the other, the only way towards, unity with the true aspect of the cosmos. Consequently, love and its self-generating asceticism constitute an event and an action of unity with the cosmos and with life. St. Maximus experienced in an agonized and intuitive way not only love but also the truth about Man and the cosmos. This was the reason for his turn to the theoretical and ascetical aspect of love. The
experience of the absence of agapetical unity with God, Man and the cosmos, even in the Monastery of Chrysoupolis, led St. Maximus to express and formulate, in the form of an epistle, the intuitive concept of agapetical unity. The dominance of envy, of the egotistical will even in the Monastery of Chrysoupolis, as well as the deep, internal, and intuitive experience of love as a way of unity with the cosmos and the ontological reality, led St. Maximus to write those ascetical works which are based on love 1.

On Pentecost 623 he was in Carthage where he spent some years in the Monastery of Eukriaté. The abbot of this Monastery was Sophronios, who became Patriarch of Jerusalem in 634 and who was the first to react against Monoenergeticism. His stay in this particular monastery as well as the association with Sophronios had a profound impact on St. Maximus both from the point of view of writing and from the point of view of his social activity.

In the next ten years (626-634) St. Maximus wrote the second group of his works. In this period, as we can see from them, he was a monk in Crete where he had several arguments with Severian bishops. His correspondence with priest Marinos shows that he must have spent some time in Cyprus.

In these years St. Maximus wrote the second group of his works

---

1. At this point we cite an excerpt from the introduction of D. Staniloae to "Muaxama" which expresses the point of view of Hans urs von Balthasar. Our purpose in doing so is dual: to prove that St. Maximus refers to love as an expression of the struggle for υμόρχειν and that this way of existence and unity with the cosmos is absent from the Monastery of Chrysoupolis.

In addition, love expresses the reality of any age.

"Ό Hans Urs von Balthasar βλέπει μια άντιγυμNOP ευτύ γεμάτης ἁγάνης συμπεριφορὰς στὰ "Κεφάλαια περὶ ἁγάνης". Μέχρι στὰ συνάνωμα μοναστήρια ὧν ζα, απεικόνισε γι' αυτὴ τὰ κήματα τῆς ζωῆς καί τῆς συνοίκωσιας, καθώς βλέπει ἁμέρως, ὅπως ἔχει μάθη, στὰ "Κεφάλαια περὶ ἁγάνης", ο ἐνός ἡμέρας ἀποκρίνεται πάντα με ἁγάνη, που εξαρχεῖ στὴν σκέψι τῶν πατῶν καὶ ὑψώνεται στὴν έξωθερα ἔνος οἰκονομικοῦ ἐναγκαλίσμου που μιμεῖται τὸ θεό. Θα δούμε πόσο αὐτὴ ἡ ευαγγελικὴ ἁγάνη, που ἀρνεῖται κάθε πρόθεση γιὰ προσωπικὴ δύναμις, εἶναι ἡ τελικὴ δύναμις που συνθέτει τὴν σκέψη καὶ τὶ ἡμῖν του." p.15.

---
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which constitute the theoretical foundation of his spiritual teaching already to be found in the works of the first period.

At this time St. Maximus wrote *Ambigua*, the preparation for which had started during his stay in Cyzikos. In this epistle, St. Maximus initially attempts to refute the theory of the pre-existence of the souls, that is the theory of the initial spiritual unity of creatures within God, the heresy of the disruption of the personal unity between God and Man and the theory of the confinement of the soul to the body. This particular text, in addition to being a refutation of the myth of Origen, is also an ontological foundation of the spiritual life, of asceticism, of love, of the unity and unification of Man with the cosmos and God. In certain cases, this text corrects the concept of Evagrios according to which asceticism and spiritual life constitute a form of opposition to body and matter. In *Ambigua*, the fight against the egotistical motive in the relation of Man with the cosmos, (the spiritual expression of asceticism), is based more on the ability of the human λόγος and logic to conceive and experience the virtues as a form of spiritual elevation of Man from his own self towards the truth of beings and, by extension, towards the Logos of God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, Who is the creator of λόγοι τῶν δύον. Such participation in the virtues by means of human reason constitutes participation in the ontological, authentic reality of the cosmos and the creation as well as the participation in the Logos of God, in his soteriological work, in his way as existing of Theanthropos. *Ambigua* aims at the ontological unity of Man with the cosmos and with God-Logos. It aims at the transcendence of the egotistical will and relationship and, by extension, at the event of the community of the love of God with Man and the cosmos. Its ultimate intention is the logical, agapetical unity. In addition, this work highlights the unity of love and of human logic on the model of the Logos of God. Love reveals to Man the righteous human λόγος, the ontological λόγος of existence which, in turn, reveals the desire and "pothos" of Man for the Logos of God, for the liberation from
egotistical vice and for participation in the virtues.

*Ambigua* expresses the unity of Man with God and the cosmos, participation in the work of the Theanthropos and His way of existence, as well as the theosis of Man by means of the ontological reality.

According to this first presentation, *Ambigua* is a text of love, λόγος and life in all their forms. It is a text which consists of the totality of the views of St. Maximus, in comparison to his other texts which deal more with specific subjects.

By 630 St. Maximus must have written the works *Εκ της προσευχής του Πατερ Υπών*, *πρὸς Ἑναν ψαλοχριστὸν Ερμηνεία Συντομος* and *Ἀμβίγους*. The ideas expressed in these works have a lot in common with what he says in *Ambigua*. His next work was *Πρὸς Θεολογίαν περὶ δυναμών Ἀνδρὸν τοῦ θεία γραφής*, followed, in all probability by *Κεφάλαια Σ περὶ θεολογίας καὶ τῆς ἕναρχος Οἰκουμενίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ* which must be contemporary with the work *Πρὸς Θεολογίαν Σχολάσικον*.

The dominant characteristics in the second group of St. Maximus' works are his opposition to monothelitism, the negation of divine determinism, the negation of the deprivation of freedom and the perspective of authentic spiritual love.

St. Maximus stayed in Carthage until 646. In 630 he started defending the concept of the two wills of Jesus Christ, which brought him into conflict with the "Εξάρχια" of the Emperor Heraclitus which, for political reasons, forced everybody to agree that there is only one will in the person of Jesus Christ. In 642 or 645 he became the leader of a movement originating in Africa that sought to defend true faith. His first written manifestations against monothelitism can be found in the first part of *Ambigua* (the second part according to its true layout) in 633 or 634 and in his epistle to the priest Pyros, who later, in all probability, became Patriarch of Constantinople.

In 641 or 643 he started his fight against Severian monothelitism based on the concept that the two wills of Jesus Christ do not mean disruption (two separate things) but numerical unity in the one
26 Max Scheler.

particular person. According to St. Maximus' theory of numbers, the latter does not signify the disruption of a multitude but the unity of the many. Freedom, as a choice of one state among many other states, also means the participation in the nature (divine and human in the Person of Jesus Christ), the intercompletion of the personal choices on the basis of the authenticity of this nature. From this point of view, freedom is related to λόγος as a way of revealing the θεόν τῶν ὄντων or the virtues. It is logical freedom and, by extension, a logical and natural relationship with Man, the cosmos and God. This kind of freedom, which is expressed as love and as an agapetic relationship of Man with God, the cosmos and Man, is logical freedom because it is based on the model of Jesus Christ who acts freely, according to his divine and human nature, and logically because, being the Logos of God, He creates and He knows λόγον τῶν ὄντων and relates them on the basis of love with his creations, Man and the cosmos. The freedom of Man, in proportion to the Theanthropos Jesus Christ, is the freedom of existence, of perpetuation, of love and of the struggle of existing. The struggle for existence, according to this concept, is the vertigo of freedom, a vertigo of agapetic and ontological unity.

The most important work of St. Maximus against monothelitism was the epistle to Marino which was written in 640.

After 641, when Constas became emperor, St. Maximus found himself in a difficult position. He helped to organize the (Lateran) Synod which condemned the heresy of monothelitism. The emperor sent exarch Olympius to Rome with orders to arrest St. Maximus and Pope Martin and to quash the decisions of the Synod. Nevertheless, Olympius accepted the views of the synod and became a defender of St. Maximus and Pope Martin. In 635, after the death of exarch Olympus, Pope Martin and St. Maximus were arrested and taken to Constantinople. In 645, Pope Martin was found guilty of conspiring with the usurper Olympus and was exiled to Cherson where he died in 655. The same year St. Maximus was brought to trial charged with
yielding Egypt and Africa to the Saracens 22 years earlier, because of his hatred for the emperor. In 656 he was tortured because he refused to accept Monothelitism and was exiled to Thrace where he stayed for six years.

In 662, St. Maximus, Anastasius and another Anastasius who was ἰσοκριτοφόρος of Rome were brought to trial in Constantinople. At a special synod they were excommunicated. Their tongues and right arms were cut. St. Maximus was exiled to Laziki on the coast of the Black Sea where he died on 13 August 662 at the age of 82.

The Life and work of Max Scheler.

M. Scheler was born in Munich on 22 August 1874 and died in Frankfurt on 19 May 1928. His father was a Protestant and his mother a Jew. When he was a high school student he converted to Roman Catholicism. He married three times and he fell in love several times.

He studied medicine in Berlin and Sociology and Philosophy at the University of Jena where he was influenced by the "noological method" of Rudolf Eucken. In 1900 he became an assistant professor of Philosophy with his study Die tranzendentale und die psychologische Method. This was the year when E.Husserl's Logische Untersuchungen was published. This work had a great impact on Scheler's way of thinking. Later he became one of the leaders of the circle of the Phenomenologists by teaching in Jena in 1907 and in Munich from 1907 to 1910. From 1910 to 1918 he worked as a writer in Gottingen, Berlin, Tubingen, Geneva and the Hague. He worked as professor of Philosophy and Sociology in Cologne from 1919 to 1928. In 1928 he worked as a professor of Philosophy in Frankfurt Main where he died later that year.

Scheler is influenced by the teaching of St. Augustine, Blaise Pascal, Henri Bergson, and Wilhelm Dilthey as well as by the phenomenological teaching of E.Husserl. According to the latter, it is possible to conceive the essence of objects by means of
intuition and rather than by means of an a priori philosophical schema. Man is able to conceive the truth of his own and of general reality by means of intuition and induction, thus reaching the ideal objectivity. The essence and the truth of the object is revealed by means of intuition and induction as a personal act. According to the phenomenological method, it is the person who reveals the truth. The essence or the a priori essences do not reveal themselves to the person. The person reaches the truth according to his experiences and relation with reality.

The human person must shake off individualistic, psychological, phylogenetic and ontogenetic states. In this way the truth revealed by means of intuition and induction will not be merely an individualistic personal expression of the truth.

From this point of view, Phenomenology is the philosophy of the essence, the way of presenting the truth of the object, the event of personal participation in the essence; it is a form of asceticism, of purification from personal, individualistic pursuit. This form of revelation of the truth connects the person with the essence, with ontological truth. Consideration of the individual egotistical element is left behind. By means of Phenomenology as intuitive conception of the truth and as purification from individualistic pursuit, the human person reveals the truth as experience, or better still, he reveals the experienced ontological truth free from the egotistical tendencies which can be characterised as general ideas and which would lead to the occupation of the metaphysical level by an egotistical concept.

Scheler took the phenomenological method beyond the limited philosophical area of ontology to philosophy as a whole. In particular, he used the phenomenological method in his quest for the truth in Ethics, in the Philosophy of Religion, in the Sociology of Knowledge and so on.

In the work Der Formalismus in der Ethic und die materiale Wertethik-Neur Versuch der Grundlegung des ethischen Personalismus he turns against the formalism of the ethics of Kant. He is opposed
to the a priori forms of reality, stressing the content of the values of the moral act and relationship. The right act, the moral way of existing as a human person, is not based on the logically revealed general principles of reality. The moral act is not determined by the general final reality. Rather according to Scheler, the moral act is based on the experienced value of the act, on the emotional identification of the act. From this point of view, ethics is more "τάξις τῆς καρδιᾶς" and not "τάξις τοῦ λόγου". It is mainly based on the feeling and the will and not so much on logic. According to this concept, phenomenological ethics is based on the intuitive conception of values more than on logical proof of the causes of reality. Ethics is not founded on the principles of reality but on the experienced values of the human person. The person does not act morally because he is a part of the human reality but because he experiences the values of the human reality at a personal level.

This phenomenological aspect of ethics highlights mainly the experienced values as the content of the moral act. These experienced values are the foundation of Scheler's thought.

The values are scaled as superior and inferior:

a. The values that last longer are characterized as superior. The ephemeral ones are characterized as inferior.

b. According to this concept, a certain value is considered as superior to other superior values insofar as it is less disrupted.

c. A fundamental value, a value on which other values are founded, is regarded as superior. For instance, the value of an infinite personal God on which other values are founded is superior to the values founded on it.

d. Moreover, a value is superior depending on the satisfaction it brings to the person.

e. Finally, a value can be characterized as superior depending on its absolute nature.

According to this presentation, inferior values are the material, financial and biological ones. The rational, aesthetic, social, political and moral values are superior to the afore mentioned. The
religious values are considered supreme values.

As far as the Philosophy of Religion is concerned, M. Scheler in his work *Vom Ewigen im Menschen. Erster Band: Religiose Erneuerung* of 1921 draws the following distinction between Religion and Metaphysics: Religion is based on the impulse of the soul for the **Hol**, and the desire for salvation. Metaphysics on the other hand is based on the impulse for knowledge, on the desire to know the inner cause and the final cause. This distinction is also founded on logical knowledge and the desire for salvation. The distinction between Metaphysics and Religion is a distinction between knowledge and experience.

The writer's concept of God is based on the fact that God is revealed as Personal God. According to this concept, knowledge about God is knowledge by means of God. Natural revelation constitutes another way of revealing God, who is the fundamental meaning of the cosmos, its ontological foundation.

This concept of natural revelation is connected to the Patristic way of thinking. In particular, it relates to the way of "Δουθρής ἀρνή" (Justin) God by means of the cosmos. In addition, it is related to the "ὡς ἐν κάτωτρω" (St. Athanasius) revelation of God by means of the cosmos. This concept reminds of the revelation of God by means of the cosmos as "καθορέν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖο ὡς ἐν κατωτρώ τοῦ Θεοῦ" (Basil the Great). It also brings to mind "μετά τῆς ἀναλογίας πρὸς τὴν Θεον τοῦ ἀναγάφαμεν τοῦ Ἴλου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰδίου Θεοῦ Θαν τοῦ Θεοῦ" (Gregory Nazianzen) as well as "μετά τῆς ἀναλογίας τοῦ Θεοῦ κάλλους" (Gregory of Nyssa).  

From the point of view of sociology, the following works are of particular interest: *Schriften zur Soziologie und Weltanschaungslehre* 1923, 1924, *Die Wissensformen und die Gesellschaft* 1926, *Problem einer Soziologie des Wissens und Erkenntnis und Arbeit*.
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2. See. Κ. Θεοδώρου "Τὸ Φιλοσοφικόν έργον τού Max Scheler" (Θεολογία τ. 59 issue 1. pp. 145-146 ‘Αθήνα 1980)

In particular *The Nature of Sympathy*, which is the object of the second part of this study, was initially titled *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie* 1923. In this work, the writer attempts to solve certain problems of Psychology but he also expands to problems of ethics, of sociology and of philosophical anthropology. In our opinion, it constitutes a form of Ethics or Deontology which is based on the theories of any emerging philosophical anthropology that is derived from the phenomenological method. In this work, Scheler, as a philosopher who deals with the problems of ethics, takes the phenomenological method beyond gnoseology to ethics. This gives the researcher a clue as to what Scheler attempts to create later in the form of philosophical anthropology. In particular, it leads the researcher to the desire to answer such questions as "what is man" and "what is the essence of his internal life" by means of intuition to emotional states, as well as by means of personal, interpersonal and social relationships.

Upon completing the first introductory part of the present study, we should say that initially the life and works of the two writers with whom we are going to deal in this study do not seem to have any relation. St. Maximus is an ascetic Father of the Church whereas M. Scheler is a philosopher whose life, in certain aspects, could not at all be characterized as ascetical or Patristic. The former aim at the right foundation of the faith, while the latter aims at elevating values to a metaphysical and dominant level.

Nevertheless, the dominant concept in both writers is love at a personal level. Both of them experience love as the emotional

---
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content of the relationship of persons. Persons exist, relate and act according to love when turning either to the cosmos, or to truth or even to God (as we shall see later). The love of God constitutes the model of personal love. On the one hand the love of God, who is Trinitarian and Personal, constitutes the model of personal love since it is the cause of Humanization. On the other, the love of God as the Creator of the cosmos constitutes the supreme model of personal love.

The basic common ground of these two different thinkers who live in different ages is the concept of Personality as Love, the concept of the truth according to which Man is a Person and relates with Man, the cosmos and God by means of love. Even though this truth emerges from completely different personal motives (theological or philosophical), it coincides. It coincides in the fact that it is personal unifying struggle and longing. It coincides in the fact that every person struggles to exist by loving and by being loved.

Nevertheless, since it coincides simply on account of the different motives, it brings forward certain questions. First of all, why do two writers with a different angle of view reach the same conclusion? Is there such a vast difference between the motives, between the theological and the philosophical way of thinking?

The answer to those questions can be summarised in one phrase: In both cases Man is the centre. Man is being theological on the basis of Holy Revelation and Holy Tradition; Man is being philosophical on the basis of reflection upon what is given in the world. The centre in both cases is Man, the one who asks about the ordinary as well as about the extra-ordinary.

It is with this being who asks that we would like to deal when referring to the two writers. We wish to deal with man at a general and particular level from many and different angles of view. We want to deal with the human person in various different situations of his existence, with the intention of discovering certain of
these situations in ourselves.

Nevertheless, while having this aim we should not in any way ignore the systematization of our thought. We should discipline ourselves to the thought and the way it is presented in the particular texts of the two particular writers. First of all, there must be a very systematic reference to the contents of the two texts, to see if Love as a Personal Act is of primary importance in these texts. Next, there must be an analysis of the terms or words whose content is love. At the end of this course we shall deal with the reality of Man as Personality and Love according to each text. Finally, in the third part we shall refer to the more general modern view of the Philosophy of Religion and the similarities and differences of the two writers on particular subjects.

In short, the aim or rather the motive behind this study is to offer a philosophical-theological answer to the question "What is Man" on the basis of two texts, one philosophical-theological from the patristic period and the other a working Moral Phenomenology or of Phenomenological Ethics from the modern period.
PART I.
PERSONALITY AND LOVE IN SAINT MAXIMUS' "AMBIGUA"
Chapter 1

A General discussion of "Several Ambigua of Saint Dionysios the Areopagite and Gregory the Nazianzen" by Saint Maximus the Confessor.

The "Ambigua" contains explanations of several texts by St. Gregory the Nazianzen and of one text by the Pseudo Dionysius. In that text St. Maximus explains certain excerpts taken from texts by St. Gregory, based on the thoughts of Pseudo Dionysius, which, if misinterpreted, could possibly mean that St. Gregory had been influenced by the theory of the pre-existence of the souls.

The reason behind composing this study is, in all probability, the conversations held between St. Maximus and the recipients of the epistles which brought about the disputations in question. St. Maximus sends these two epistles to Thomas the Sanctified and John the Archbishop of Cyzicus, in which he clarifies the ambiguous parts of St. Gregory's thoughts as well as parts of the thoughts of Pseudo Dionysius.

Consequently the present text, as two epistles, consists of two parts: One addressed to Thomas the Sanctified, P.G. vol.91 1032 A–1060 D, and another to John the Archbishop of Cyzicus, P.G. vol.91 1061 A–1417 D.

The second part-epistle, which is the lengthier of the two, according to the layout of the Patrologia Graeca, was in fact composed first, while the first was put together later on. This

---


viewpoint, supported by P. Sherwood, is reasonably acceptable, since the second part, (1032 A-1060 D), (the first according to the layout of *Patrologia Graeca*), is more articulate than the first one, (1061 A-1417 D), (the second according to the layout of *Patrologia Graeca*). It is also argued that the first part was written in 630 (1061 A-1417 D) while the second between 634-638 (1032 A-1060 D).

According to the distinction above, we are now going to divide the text into two parts. The first part (second epistle) consists of 4 (four) paragraphs and the second (first epistle) of 52 (fifty two). The reason behind this division can be traced to the content of each one or, better, to many references made by St. Maximus. St. Maximus variously explains texts by Pseudo-Dionysius, St. Gregory the Theologian, or the Bible. Also several references to the Trinitarian God, Jesus Christ, Salvation, Man, Cosmos and the Necessity are made by St. Maximus. St. Maximus' style is very varied. It is theological, philosophical and ascetical.

**1. Part 2nd. Epistle Amb.1032 A-1060 D.**

As *Patrologia Graeca* suggests, besides the usual preamble (Amb.1b. 1032 A-1033 C), the first part (1032 A-1060 D) also contains four
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5. The part of *Ambigua* 1032 A-1060 D contains answers on four aporias by St. Gregory (1033 D-1045 C) and one on a text by Ps. Dionysius (1045 C-1060 D). One of the four aporias is of Triadological content (1033 D-1036 C) and the other three are of Christological content (1036 D-1045 C). Also, the aporia on Ps. Dionysius is of Christological content. In comparison to the second part which contains a multitude of aporias, this one is articulate because it is limited to strictly theological subjects.

---

5. About the composing of the first epistle in 630 and the second epistle between 634-638 see Introduction in "Μυστικώτα" by G. Staniloae p.36.
answers to texts of aporia by St. Gregory the Theologian and another one by the author of Areopagitica. Out of those four references, one is of Triadological content, (Amb.2b.1033 D-1036 C) and three are of Christological content (Amb.3b.1036 D-1045 C).

Amb.2b.1033 D-1036 C. The Trinitarian God as Singularity and One Divinity.

In the reference of Triadological content, the unity of the Three Personages of the Holy Trinity is put forward, their singularity (1036 A-C) and unity (1036 C), their monarchy (1036 A), unification (1036 A) and equality (1036 A-C). It is also stressed that the Trinity does not necessarily mean that deity is depleted of its wealth, nor does it mean polytheism (1036 B). By being Trinity, the Deity cannot be accused of being devoid of any inner sociability, and through the principle of Monarchy the Deity does not involve polytheism as it is headed by the Father (1036 A6).

Amb.3b.1036-1045 C. Jesus Christ as a model of Singularity.

In these references, St. Maximus places much weight on the Christological parts, facing the heresy of Monothelitism7 which initially appeared as Monophysitism and Monoenergetism8. In the

6. Regarding St. Maximus's viewpoint on the Holy Triad as a repudiation of polytheism see P.G.91 1036 C. The reason behind this conclusion is the comment on a text by St. Gregory P.G. 36 76 B and PG.35 1160 C. Also see N. Matsoukas "Κύριος "Ανθρωπος Κοινωνία". p.58

7. About the idea that St. Maximus is a Christological writer because he is opposed to Monothelitism which originally appeared as Monophysitism and Monoenergetism see.
   A. Radosavlievits "Το Μυστήριο τής Σωματικής". p.29.
   V. Lēsiki "Η θέση του θεού". p.169.
   D. Staniloae "Φιλοσοφικά και Θεολογικά Ερωτήματα κατά τόν "Αγίο Μάρτυρο τόν 'Ομολογηθή". pp.16-19.
   L. Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator". pp.2-7.
   G. Dragas Introduction on "Patrologia Graeca". p.κα.

8. A. Radosavlievits in "Το Μυστήριο τής Σωματικής". p.30 wrote: According to P.Sherwood, St. Maximus keeps in mind the Origenists
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Christological references the unity of Jesus Christ's Holy and Human nature is supported (1037 A-C). The immaculate (1037 A) conception the unity of material and immaterial nature, the fact that the spiritual existence of the Lord was encased in human flesh are also supported.

God the Logos as a concept is transformed into the perfect man acting naturally on the strength of flesh, spirit and reason, quite independently, working away at Your Salvation (1037 C). The intangible (1040 AB), perfect God become material man, a down-to-earth God (1040 B), without his two natures coexisting. I wish to become God as much as He wishes to become a man.

God-Logos as the perfect man, unblemished by sin, disobedience and incoordination (1041 B) takes on the guise of servant in order to help man rise above the confines of disobedience and his nihilistic attitude.

God-Logos become man in order to assist man to turn his tendency toward non-being (1044 A) into a unity of φύσικόν καὶ γυμνικόν θέλημα (natural and judgmental will).

Although the Lord went into labour, hunger, thirst, anguish and weeping... manifested by bodily functions (1041 C-1044 A), he dominantly transcended passion and decay by preaching harmony and of his age not Origen himself.

9. P.G.91 1040 C.
Also see A. Radostinov in "Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Σωτηρίας" "Ο άγιος Μάτθαιος παράλληλα με τὴν Χριστολογία άναπτύσσει καὶ τὴν διαδίκασιν περὶ θέσεως ὡς άλλη ὄψιν τῆς Χριστολογίας" pp.37, 181 κ.ξ.τοσ.
Also see and L. Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator" pp.33.

10. God becomes Man so that Man can transform his tendency towards μὴ ὄν into a unity of φυσικό καὶ γυμνικό θέλημα. It is here supported that the cause of God's Humanization is the fall of man εἰμπροστιστέον (precondition). God become man in order to transform the nihilistic tendencies of man towards μὴ ὄν into an evolutionary and perichorematic movement of unification with God. God-Man Jesus Christ is a perfect man, a model of unification as He becomes a model for man to look up to P.G.91 1040 D.
Jesus Christ is, in the very words of St. Maximus, the most singular and effective (1044 D-1045 C) means of salvation whereby Man is deified.

Amb.4b.1045 C-1060 D. The Pothos of God for Man as the Cause for Humanization.

In the same way, the reference-comment of a text written by the Pseudo Dionysius is of Christological or —better still— anthropological content (Amb.4b.1045 C-1060 D).

At this point, St. Maximus regards the infinite love of God for man (1048 C) as the supreme cause for Humanization. It is on account of this passion that God becomes man, a substantive unity of the Divine and the Human, while this unity remains a mystery.

Although the Logos of God remains unidentified and inconceivable as to the way the Holy and Human elements have blended together, He is the perfect personal and substantive unity through which man can be deified. Man can be deified by existing and acting as a unity similarly to the Logos of God who acted in a common perichoresic and Theanthropic way.

Also, in that comment on mystic Pseudo Dionysius, the elements of ignorance, mystery, negative Theology and the limits of human knowledge come out (1048 D-1049 A). St. Maximus, as a mystic

---

11We understand that Dionysios is Mystical by recognizing cataphatic and apophatic knowledge in the text PG.91 1241 AB. In general, a basic characteristic of Mystical Theology and Mysticism is knowledge and its limitations. Orthodox Mysticism, in particular, is imbued with the fact of the knowledge by means of which Man reaches God and with the experience of the limitations of knowledge compared to the essence of God.

Also L. Thunberg in "Microcosm and Mediator" refers to the Mystical, Apophatic and Negative Theology of Ps. Denis characterizing it as an ascending movement towards higher and higher attributes p.434. Also he writes: "Both types of apophatic theology—that of extreme purification and that of extreme negation—result in an immanentism which, in a way, eliminates the proper concern of negative theology: to stress the difference between empirical man and God Himself". p.436.

PART I.
author, referring to the unknown of God, to the limits, to the unity), as an existence lying between heaven and earth, the known and the unknown, the stated and the silent, has a desire for meeting God, for reaching theosis and does not merely intend to comprehend the way in which God becomes man. St. Maximus longs for theosis, experiences the limits of knowledge and transcends them in his pothos to participate in the saving event, the unity and unification.

The comment on the author of Areopagitica ends with a request for intervention (1060 B-C) (in favour of Maximus) thus signifying the completion of the epistle.

1st. Epistle Amb. 1061 A-1417 C.

The second part (1061 A-1417 C) also contains an introductory part addressed to John the Archbishop of ευζικος (Amb.1a.1061 A-1065 B).

Amb.2a.1065 B-1112 A. The Erotic Perichorematic movement as opposition to the theory of the pre-existence of the souls.

Right afterwards there are comments on certain texts by St. Gregory the Theologian, which are mainly of philosophical-theological and moral nature (Amb.2a.1065 B-1112 A).

Those comments are clarifications on ambiguous texts by St. Gregory which could be considered influenced by the theories of

12. St. Maximus is at the same time a Christological and a Mystical writer because he experiences the limits of knowledge compared to the Mystery of Incarnation.

St. Maximus writes:

"Τις γὰρ ἐγνώ πώς σαρκωταὶ Θεός, καὶ μὲνεὶ Θεός; πώς Θεός μὲνων ἀλήθης, ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶν ἀλήθης ὁμως δεικνύει ἐαυτὸν ἀλήθης ὑπάρχει φυσικῆ, καὶ δι' ἑκατέρου ἑκατέρου, καὶ μηδετέρω τρεπόμενος". P.G.91 1057 A.

The theory of the pre-existence of the souls originates in the Orphic Theology. The soul, according to the Orphics, is the "sweet child of Zeus." This gave birth to Theology as it lay between the Man of God and the world. Zeus places the mind in the soul, and the soul in the lazy body.

According to this first Greek theory about soul, the soul is created by the divine before the psycho-somatic birth of Man. It is also an independent and pre-existing part of Man's psychosomatic birth and unity. It lies in between sky and earth, God and Man. The soul's basic tool is the Mind, which also mediates between the divine and the human. The soul is imprisoned in the body, in the matter and, in general, in the world.

It seems that this theory is the starting point for the philosopher Plato. The soul, created by the Divine, pre-exists autonomously but because it disobeyed the divine will, it is left in suspense until the moment when it enters a particular body. The soul is in a perpetual state of μηδεηζης of the ideas, of the perfection, after its unification with the body. The human being reaches psychosomatic perfection by participating in the eternal ideas which he experienced before his psychosomatic birth.

According to Plato, the soul exists prior to the body in an autonomous way and it is in such a way that it can perfect man, by means of memory and auto-memory. The soul is in the state of a cyclical and reversive movement towards perfection-autoperfection by means of logical analysis and critique of the situations.

In this case, logic is directed more towards the analysis of the world, the reaching for truth and the kinds of the ideal reality, since the world (as in the Orphic theory as well) is the prison of the soul. According to this concept, the world is a kind of punishment for the soul. However, by means of this world, Man can discover the truth and reach the idea.

According to this theory, the soul lies in an autonomous territory between the divine and the human. The tool of the soul is the Mind. It is through the Mind that Man reaches the νοολημενη idea, always struggling towards the Divine and the unity with the Divine. According to this theory, the soul is not related to the Divine in a personal and active way but through the idea of νόμοις. Perfection mainly consists in the understanding of the ideal objectivity and in the μηδεηζης, in proportion.

Aristotle, Plato's student, seems to support the pre-existence of the soul. By replacing the term μηδεηζης with the term ἐνεκείσθαι, the movement becomes less reversible and more evolutionary. According to this theory, Man does not return to the pre-existing perfection, but moves towards perfection. This movement is imbued
with the logical analysis of the world and Man, even to the point of rationalism.

Although Aristotle, the scientific philosopher, stresses logic, analysis and knowledge, he indirectly supports the pre-existence of the soul because he believes in ἐπιφύσωσις (the entrance of the soul in the body).

The Neoplatonic philosopher Plotinus supports the theory that the soul is dependent on the Mind, since the soul pre-exists autonomously, and that it is imprisoned in the body always desiring perfection however. His theory is based on the concept of the triad: Ἐν (One), Θεός, Νοῦς (Mind). The Mind, according to its potential, is capable of uniting with the "One, the' God, of becoming godly and, by extension, of making the soul godly as well. The soul can do two things: it can either remain stuck in the Mind or it can turn to the outside world.

According to Plotinus, the soul in general exists prior to the birth of Man autonomously. It is not matter, it is not a kind of material, but it is eternal essence. The soul enters the body by means of love and it is by the same means that it can be self-perfected according to its participation in the mental ideas.

According to Plotinus concept, the matter, the tangible and the world is a kind of prison for the soul and for the truth in general. Plotinus primary concern is the separation of the soul from the body since this means unity with the divine.

The Origenist theory about the pre-existence of the souls is similar to the afore-mentioned. According to this theory, the souls and their fall are directly connected with the fall of the spirits, of the angels. In this way this theory takes on a hagiographical dimension. The Origenist theory of the pre-existence of the soul makes the effort of the beings to become god without God more apparent. This theory brings forward the tendency of the beings, and especially of Man, to become God in an autonomous way.

The main concern of this theory is the separation from the body by means of ἀκατάστασις to the point of exhaustion. This is also made evident by the way of life of Origen.

All the theories of the pre-existence of the soul stress the dualism between body and soul, Man, the world and God. They also stress Man's effort to become God without a personal relationship with the Divine. According to these theories the following are stressed: Man's reversion, autonomous, mental and logical movement, that is disruption; the independence of Man from God, selftheosis and selteros for selfperfection.

Bibliography: Plato "Meno", Aristotle "Περὶ Ψυχῆς, Μετὰ τὰ Φυσικὰ", Plotinus "Ἐννέαδες", Origen "Ἐργα" (Β.Ε.Π.Ε.Σ), Λεξικό "Μέλος "Ὀρφικά", Ι.Ν. Θεοδωρακάπου Λου "Εισαγωγή στόν Πλάτωνα", "Εισαγωγή στήν Φιλοσοφία τ.Α.Β.Γ.Δ". Ταξέρερ Νεστέλ "Η ιστορία τῆς
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Besides, this part is filled with moral, dogmatic content. It could be regarded as a set of rules toward theosis offering pieces of ascetic advice as well as prompts.\footnote{At this point, the concept of the way of theosis as participation in the natural movement is expressed. St. Maximus starts from the ontological truth of the movement of beings and highlights the participation in the movement from $E_{\text{I\nu}}$ towards $'A\eta E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}$ as a way towards theosis. (1084 BC). V. Lossky characterises this movement as participation in the reality of the body of Jesus Christ ($E_{\text{I\nu}}$), as participation in the knowledge of the essences of the beings, the ideas and the divine models ($E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}$) and, finally, as participation in Theology ($'A\eta E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}$). According to Lossky $E_{\text{I\nu}}$ and $E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}$ are constant $\mu\varepsilon\theta\varepsilon\varepsilon\varsigma$, which are in accordance with the essence of the logical beings. $E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}$, that is kindness and wisdom, are offered to the free will of Man. (See V. Lossky "H $\Theta\varepsilon\alpha$ tou $\Theta\vareou$" pp.170,174) About this movement, also see L. Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator" pp.391-392,396: "This movement $E_{\text{I\nu}}$, $E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}, 'A\eta E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}$ as chronological triad of being and as movement of being to God. He related this movement with Aristotelian Thesis of $\zeta\upsilon$ and $E_{\text{O}} \zeta\upsilon$. The Humanization including the logos of $E_{\text{I\nu}}$ and $E_{\text{O}} E_{\text{I\nu}}$. (Microcosm and Mediator. pg.391.392.396). P. Sherwood writes on this movement: "The reference here to being and ever-well-being leads us to a passage in Amb.42 where the Triad of being, well or ill-being is developed at length. I quote it in full: Of all things that do or will substantially exist...the logoi, firmly fixed, preexist in God, in accordance with which all things are and have become and abide, ever drawing near through natural motion to their purpose logoi. They (the things) are rather constrained to being and receive, according to the kind and degree of their elective movement and motion, either well-being because of virtue and direct process in regard to the logos by which they are, or ill-being because of the opposite motion out of harmony with the logos by which they are. ("Earlier Ambigua"pp.170-171.) Sluniloae in his comment sees this movement as participation in the logos of being which preexist in God, as participation in the logos of well-being, as participation in the holy virtue and as participation in the eternal well-being. The constant use of the term $E_{\text{I\nu}}$ in all three successive phases of the movement (which consists in a $k\alpha\lambda\hbar$, $d\varepsilon\alpha\hbar$ alternation of the existence) signifies the movement from the exploitation of the natural reality of Man, $E_{\text{I\nu}}$, towards the participation in the Holy PART 1.}
Those guidelines are closely connected with the refutation of the Platonic and Origenic Myth, since they are based on the sense of movement as evolution, as relation and as perichoresis. This

Actions (which transform, in a theotic way, the basic existential states), $\varepsilon\theta\tau\iota\nu\varsigma$, $\varepsilon\tau\nu\varsigma$. The final destination of this movement is the participation in Eternity, which is described by the term $\varepsilon\tau\iota\nu\varsigma$ or the theotic transformation of the basic existential states ($\varepsilon\tau\iota\nu\varsigma$). In our opinion, St. Maximus uses the term $\varepsilon\tau\iota\nu\varsigma$ in its philosophical sense, that is, to signify the ontological truth and the reasons of beings in which the existence (as a member of the human kind and as in the Image) partakes according to its natural reality. By exploiting its reality, by means of the states of the conscious (will, willingness, opinion, power and glory, 91 13 B-23, mind understanding, logic) and the states of the sentiment (sorrow, lust, desire, fear, anxiety, agony 1196 C-1197 D), and by participating in the Divine actions, the existence is able to transform its basic existential states (passion, lust, space, time, independence) towards eternity. The use of the term $\varepsilon\tau\iota\nu\varsigma$ in all the three successive and at the same time simultaneous phases of the existential movement highlights the philosophical-theological, the ontological-humanitarian, the Theanthropologic and the Triadologic nature of the movement. This existential movement is of all these natures because the Theanthropologic revelation of God and Man and the participation in the Holy Triad's creative, preserving and theotic energy merge in it. Also, in the term $\varepsilon\tau\iota\nu\varsigma$, the human desire merges with the theanthropologic redemption and the Holy Triadic Energy. This philosophical-theological analysis of the movement emerges from St. Maximus's philosophical-theological refutation of Monothelitism and, in general, from his philosophical-theological way of dealing with dogmatic, anthropological and ascetic subjects.

St. Maximus does not consider movement as repressive and autonomous, but as perichorematic and evolutionary, as opposed to the Origenic repressive movement. "Movement does not involve a vicious circle, but a dynamic fulfilment. "See. N.Matsouka "Cosmos Man and Community" p.50 and 198. For the use of perichoresis in St.Maximus's cosmology see, L.Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator", the opinion of Von Balthasar according to how St. Maximus uses the term perichoresis as linked to Stoic physics.pp.29-30. About the movement as evolutionary according to St.Maximus, and as opposed to the Origenic repressive movement see. P.Sherwood "The Earlier Ambigua".pp.29,92.

L.Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator".p.94.
movement is neither reversible (1069 AB) nor autonomous (1072 BC, 1073 BC) 17. That movement, conceived as co-movement (1072 C)18 rather than selfmovement 19, aims at the unification with The Holy, the Perfect, the moving immovable 20 κινοῦν ἀκίνητο. St. Maximus founds this viewpoint on the pothos 21 for perfection and the perichoresis of the beings. This philosophic-theological author22 (St. Maximus) reverses the

17. About the movement as not being autonomous, see. P.G.91 1072 ABCD.
D.Staniloae Scholia in "Φιλοσοφικά κατ Θεολογικά Ἐρωτήματα".pp.130-139.
P.Sherwood "Earlier Ambigua".p.185.

18. As long as the movement aims at theosis, it is also an active co-movement of God and Man. Theosis is God's energy and man's passion. About the natural movement of man towards theosis as an active perichoresis of God and Man, also see and K. Papapetrou "Ἡ οὐσία τῶν Θεολόγων".p.135.

19. Term used by St. Maximus to express his opposition to the theory about man's self-existence. P.G.91 1073 B.

20. See Aristotle "Metaphysics" 1071 B 1072 B.

21. St. Maximus supports the concept of movement-relationship in the pothos for perfection and perichoresis (PG.90 1053 B)
St. Maximus, unlike the other earlier Fathers, uses the term perichoresis not only when he refers to Triadology, but also when he refers to Christology, Anthropology and Cosmology. Another expression of this innovation is the concept of the movement as a relationship of the beings towards perfection, and as perichoresis of the beings.
See L.Thunberg "Micrcosm and Mediator" pp.23-47.
Also about the movement as "natural power,passion or operative energy,driving to an end" see P.Sherwood "Earlier Ambigua".p.25.

22. According to Ch. Giannaras St. Maximus is more philosophical. He states the truth by philosophical predicates. "Επαφώς στὴν Φιλοσοφία" vol.B p.64.
Also about the fact that the Fathers use Philosophy in order to
philosophical individualistic and autonomous attitudes by adopting a philosophical Orthodox Biblical and patristic method. Against common sense, he places the unity of Holy Revelation by human reason and observation. He does not accept the disruption of the unity between the philosophical and theological way of thinking and he believes in the unity between some elements of Greek Philosophy and the Bible; being an Orthodox Father, he always does that selectively.

St. Maximus brings forward this unity by referring to movement as an "volutionary process instead of as a movement in compliance with the Law. The world does not only move due to necessity, but express the divine truth in the right way in order to create a "Religious Philosophy" see:

23. According to Plotinus, Man reaches theosis because of the memory of the earlier form of his existence. See B. Russell "The Philosophy after Aristotle" pg.118-119.

24. About the method of the Fathers as selective see. N. Nisiotis "Φιλοσοφία τῆς Θρησκείας καὶ Φιλοσοφική Θεολογία". According to Nisiotis, the Fathers use Philosophy selectively in order to offer a contemporary and comprehensible interpretation of the Orthodox Theological truth. Also see

25. According to V. Lossky the limitation and the movement create the idea of space and time. The driving force is Agape and Eros."Η Θεολογία τῆς 'Ανατολικῆς 'Εκκλησίας" p.110.

This concept is in the opposition to the movement in compliance with the law, which leads to the absolute destination. By extension, it is apparent that the movement is based on the agapetic and perichorematism relationship of the beings, according to the particularity of their species, as well as according to the free choice of the loving and the loved persons.
also because through moving it evolves in its wish to identify with the Holy Creative existence.\footnote{About the evolutionary movement of the beings also see O.Clement "Μετὰ τὸν Θάνατον τοῦ Θεοῦ" p.126: "The movement is a continuous transition from μηδέν (zero) to Ἐίναι (Being). It lies in the magnetism of ἄνευρον (the infinite). Its base and starting point is not within it". This concept supports the moving evoloutionarity of the beings towards the unification with the divine creative existence. All the Orthodox Theologians agree that Creation, in its natural movement evolves towards unity with the divine. In general, the natural mobility of those who are and those who exist signifies the perichorematic, energetic, unifying movement of the ὄντα and the ὑπαρκτά towards the divine creative energy which συγκρατεῖ, προνοεῖ καὶ συνέχει τὰ ὄντα.

The concept of the energetic unity between the ὄντα and the ὑπαρκτά coincides also with theories of the contemporary theoretical physics according to which, the existence of the beings is due to the dynamic ἀλληλοπεριβάλλοντος of the beings, to the energetic relationship.

See F.Capra "Ἡ Κρίσιμη κυμή", "Τὸ Τάο καὶ ἡ Φυσική".}

\footnote{In PG.91 1073 B, 1073 C, St. Maximus presents movement as a passion for the unity of "those who are" (ὄντα) and of "those who exist" (ὑπαρκτά). This passion exists because neither ὄντα nor ὑπαρκτά are self movement or self force. Consequently, they move towards unity and the perichoresis of beings.

See D.Stanićsa "Φιλοσοφία καὶ Θεολογία ἐρωτήματα" p.140 com.24

The end of the passion for movement, according to St.Maximus is God Himself, the Ἐντόκος, the perfection. (1073 C).}
By moving and by being filled with the passion for unity with God, the reasonable man deifies the world while reaching theosis himself. That Theosis, in the perspective of movement, follows the unity with God in an erotic sense, as well as the reasonable analysis and mental conception. It is a kinetic theosis, evolutionary in what concerns both existent and mental creatures (νοοτροπνα δύνα). (1073 C-1074 A)

This cosmological and moral reference to kinesis-motion is founded on God The Father's Creative force, on the reasonable order governing the universe, on the Holy-Human revelation of the Logos of God, on the saving Ecclesiastic unity headed by Jesus Christ and the Grace of the Holy Spirit.

At this point St. Maximus unites the human analysis of the world (philosophy), the Holy Bible, Triadology, Soteriology and Ecclesiology, in the movement of Man toward theosis. St. Maximus builds up a connection between movement and the Orthodox truth and authenticity to express his opposition to the theory on the pre-existence of the souls which involves a reverse movement, (the return to a perfect pre-existing state), man's self-sufficiency and independence from God (denying any connection to God) and, (ultimately) the ruling out of man's aesthetic aspect, which has provided part of the grounds for denying Jesus Christ's human nature.

In the eyes of those supporting the theory of the pre-existence of the souls, the fact that God-Logos assumes a human face, a human body, which is the prison of the soul, and that he raises it to the Godly status by Resurrection and Ascension is inconceivable.

28. See O. Clement "Μετά τον Θάνατο του Θεού" p. 138.
30. See A. Radosavlievits A. "Τὸ Μνημήτρῳ τῆς Σωτηρίας" p. 83.
According to that theory, (to the 'Ελληνικὸς νουσόντες\(^3^1\), since it sounds preposterous that God could take on a bodily appearance, it necessarily follows that the Holy Nature absorbs the human one (mono-physicism), the Holy Energy absorbs the human one too, (mono-energeticism), and finally the Holy Will assimilates the human one (mono-theliticism)\(^3^2\).

To the supporters of those theories anything human, which could be received by the senses, takes away man's ability to achieve theosis\(^3^3\). Man finds himself fallen, degraded and imprisoned, inside his own carnal status and that is a form of punishment, expressing itself through alienating man from God. That punishment

\(^3^1\)The term "Ελληνικὸς νουσόντες" is used by St.Maximus when he refers to the Origenistics of his age, who supported the theory of the pre-existence of the souls and, by extension, Monoenergeticism, Monophysitism and Monothelitism. St.Maximus uses the term "Ελληνικὸς νουσόντες" when referring to the persistence in the mental conceptions of everything, even of the Mysteries of God and Humanization.

St.Maximus is opposed to Anomians as they try to understand the essence of God.

P. Sherwood "Earlier Ambigua"p.44.

L. Thunberg when referring to "οὐσία" writes that: "according to St.Maximus God, though being, is above οὐσία, and created οὐσία is not eternal as "the Greeks" presume. "Microcosm and Mediator"p.89.

\(^3^2\)Monophysitism is the heresy which supports the belief that Holy nature absorbed the human nature in Jesus Christ's person. This heresy underestimates the participation of human nature in Soteriology. It underestimates the absolute love of God for Man and the salvation by subject (ἐξ ὑποκειμένου).

According to Monothelitism, God asks Man to reach καθ ὁμολογία through the transcendent and the remote. Monothelitism, as well as Monoenergeticism and Monophysitism, are based on the theory of the pre-existence of the souls according to which, everything tangible and human is devoid of theosis because it is a prison of the soul and the truth. These heresies were condemned at the forth Ἐν Χαλκηδόνι Σύνοδο.

\(^3^3\)See P.G.1069 A.

D. Stănilescu D. "Φιλοσοφικά καὶ Θεολογικά Ερωτήματα"pp.19,126-129.

and hell cannot be transcended by the persistent philosophical perception (νομία)\textsuperscript{34}. Restricted as the human brain finds itself by the confines of punishment and self-castigation, it is incapable of comprehending the infinite love and eros of God for Man.

On the basis of that concept, the absolute eros of God for Man is diminished, since this eros is regarded as a result of the mental (νοτική) philosophical perception\textsuperscript{35}.

The humanist\textsuperscript{36} St. Maximus righteously supports the evolutionary kiaesis, the relationship with God, the perfect human nature of Jesus Christ, living through and experiencing the "in the image of God" nature of Man, the personal unity and harmony with the world, the body and God.

St. Maximus is also a Mystical Father, as he believes in the loving, erotic unity with God and the world as it really is, in the reason of beings, Λόγους τῶν δυνάμεων\textsuperscript{37}.

\textsuperscript{34} The term έμπνευσις (persistence) is used by S. Kierkegaard to state his opposition to Hegel. According to this concept only what is conceived by the Mind can be existing, perfect and authentic.

\textsuperscript{35} See Ι.Ν. Theodorakopoulos Ι.Ν. "Ελεγχω την Πλάτωνα" p. 139, 197.

\textsuperscript{36} St. Maximus is a humanist Father because in all his studies he defends the human nature of Jesus Christ, and because he is anthropocentric by being in agony for the Redemption of Man. The term Humanitarian does not only apply to the ones that defend materialistic humanism but also to the ones who strive to project the authenticity of nature in Jesus Christ, the primary model. St. Maximus is a humanitarian Father and writer because he continuously stresses the unity of the Divine and the human in Jesus Christ.

\textsuperscript{37} About the concept of "reasons of beings" according to St. Maximus the confessor see.

I. Thunberg writes "We hear, on the one hand, that the one Logos is many logos, 1077 C, but on the other that all the logoi subsist eternally in God's good counsel, 1080 A, and pre-exist monadically in God. p. 79... Many logos are one Logos and one Logos is many logos. p. 80. (Also Thunberg asks Sherwood if the logoi are situated in the divine essence or only in the divine energy. 80)."
It is also remarkable that the Areopagitic writer's interpretative reference to St. Gregory the Theologian is of an erotic nature.

Amb.3a.1112 A-1116 D. The participation in the Holy Energy following the personal mental and Logical analysis.

Subsequently, St. Maximus refers to three subjects: The flesh, the lust and the three movements of Soul. (Amb.3a.1112 A-1116D).

All three existential references are of analytical, philosophical and theological nature. Here, certain existential states are examined invariably in relation to the Bible, as the mystic

At this point we should clarify this: λόγοι τῶν δύναμεων do not relate with the divine essence (this would mean pantheism) but they relate to the divine will, as they eternally pre-exist in God. In addition, λόγοι are related to the Mind of God in which Man partakes by preserving "λόγοι". Of course this does not mean that Man partakes in the Divinity. λόγοι τῶν δύναμεων do not relate, in any case, with the essence but with the divine will which is realised by the divine energy. The products of this energy, the actions (Man and World) are carriers of the divine will but not of the divine essence. In this way λόγοι pre-exist eternally in the Mind and the will of God (see also "Microcosm and Mediator" p.169) with the purpose of the reinstatement of Jesus Christ, that is, of the Humanized Logos. (see also "Microcosm and Mediator"p.165).

According to St. Maximus λόγοι are identified with the divine virtues and they mean the divine purpose (see "Microcosm and Mediator" p.175). In this sense they have an energetical and not an essential meaning ("Microcosm and Mediator" p.171,173.).

N.Matsoukas also expresses the view that λόγοι pre-exist eternally in God ("Δομινική και Συμβολή Θεολογία"p.175) and that they are invisible and united in the uncreated divinity-without, of course, being related to the essence of God ("Κόσμος άνθρωπος, κοινωνία"p.84).According to the writer, Man must find the λόγοι τῶν δύναμεων within himself and become Μοίρα Θεού in order to reach Salvation ("Κόσμος άνθρωπος κοινωνία"p.100).

In M.Dobrivojje "Το Μυστήριο τῶν 'Εκκαθαρίας" p.72 we read that St. Maximus identifies the λόγοι τῶν δύναμεων with the divine will.

Also P.Sherwood supports that λόγοι τῶν δύναμεων relate to the divine will and pre-exist eternally in God ("The Earlier Ambigua"p.169). He also supports that the fact that aeonic logoi are pre-existing is the foundation of the apophatic concept of the world (ibid.p.172).

PART I.
writer's main concern is man's theosis with and from God, and not the theosis without God, (the deification only through his mind, as theory of the pre-existence of the souls supports).

St. Maximus is the ascetic philosopher the interpreter of existential states, the existence which rationalizes the causes alienating Man from God, also the existence which experiences its holy origin, its participation in the Holy Energy as the only way of reaching existential authenticity.

In line with that concept, Man is being original-authentic by experiencing the Holy Energy, by being a part of the reasons why he exists, conceiving (νοέωντας) the Holy Presence at all times and places by means of reason.

Amb.4a.1117 A-1128 D Comments on Biblical excerpts—theories using the allegorical method. A reference to the substantial character of theoretical understanding.

In Ambigua 4a. 1117 A-1128 D St. Maximus refer to Biblical excerpts. Those subjects which are dear to St. Maximus, are bound

38. About theosis as the main concern of St. Maximus see. P.G.91 1088 C. (Theosis is the most lovable of anything else).

P. Sherwood "Earlier Ambigua". pp.132.136.


V. Losky "Ι. Μυστική Θεολογία τῆς 'Ανατολικῆς 'Εκκλησίας". p.76.96.

N. Matsoukas. "Κόσμος 'Ανθρώπου Κοινωνία". p.212

39. It, is supported by H. Balthasar that St. Maximus is influenced by Isaak the Syrian, by Evagrios and by the Mysticism of Origen. (A. Radosavljevits "Τὸ Μυστήριο τῆς Σωτηρίας"). St. Maximus sounds more ascetical on the "Four centuries on Charity" see. P.G.90.

Thokløtos Dionysiatis "Τὸ 400 κεφάλαια περὶ 'Αγάπης".

40. See. P.G.91 1076 BC.

to be found in his\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ambigua}.

In that text, too, the author makes reference to Biblical excerpts, situations and people. (Amb.4a 1117 A-1128 D).

As always, here the method of \textit{allegoric} \textsuperscript{42} interpretation of Biblical instances is followed. These are closely associated with model persons (sanctified people), with the purpose of setting authentic examples for man to get to know the truth, in reference to the Bible.

This part is principally of a moral, advisory nature. It is worth pointing out here that St. Maximus regards these parts as \textit{theories}, thus wishing to point out the substantial character of theoretical understanding\textsuperscript{43}.

The term \textit{theory} according to St. Maximus is the foundation of every existential condition and action. According to him, every authentic action is preceded by an original-authentic concept.

\textit{Amb.5a.1128 D-1133 A.} The Gospel as "\textit{Δόγμα}" and the Nature in its "\textit{Δόξα}" reveal the human authenticity and God.

Later on the areas of \textit{natural and written law, φυσικόν καί γραπτού νόμου} are analyzed. (Amb.5a 1128 D-1133 A).

St. Maximus mentions the Gospel as well as nature as the sources of human authenticity and the ways by means of which God is revealed to us (1129 ABCD). The Bible, the source of every original-authentic contemplation and action, is, according to

\textsuperscript{41}St. Maximus analyzes \textit{biblical} excerpts in Ambigua. Some of these are interpreted by St. Gregory the Theologian and others are simply analyzed by St. Maximus. His main \textit{biblical} work is "To Thalassion, about several ambiguas of Holy Bible". P.G.90

\textsuperscript{42}St. Maximus also uses the allegoric method in his interpretation of \textit{patristic} texts. See P.G.91 1357 A.

A. Berthold "Patrology" p.630.

\textsuperscript{43}See also P. Sherwood "The Earlier Ambigua". p.21,36,132.
St. Maximus, the source of every existential condition. The Bible is also a model of orderly lines, syllables (visible signs). It contains the Holy Mystic works, by signifying the alignment between reason and sense, earth and Heaven, the visible and invisible, the built and the unbuilt, the material and the immaterial, the expressed and the implied.

By means of its phenomena, Nature reveals God, who is concealed behind them. St. Maximus longs for the Creator rather than the creation, unlike the *Ἐλαφνικὸς νοοῦντες*. He is opposed to the deification of nature and natural phenomena, experiencing them as godly actions. According to St. Maximus, the natural world and its phenomena do not lead to *φανομενικότης* (the attitude towards the phenomena) but to *φανομενολογικότης* (the experience of God as the acting force in the world by means of reaching the truth through reason).

Amb.6a.1133 A-1137 C. The cosmos in its Philosophical division and its "ὁγον" reveal God; it is a school of Theology and Theognosis.

St. Maximus then refers to the visible world which is the school of Theology (1134 C) as well as Theognosis (1137 A) of both the visible and the invisible. (Amb.6a.1133 A-1137 C).

The way in which the invisible God manifests Himself in terms of the visible world is based on the world's philosophic division into *οὐσία* (substance), *κίνησις* (movement), *διαφορά* (difference), *κράτος* and *θέσις* (position) (1133 AB). Those divisions present God as the cause, the foreseer, the wise distributor and the authentic way to

"At this point the terms "φανομενικότης" and "φανομενολογικότης" are used to signify adherence to the surface and experience of the depth of the experienced respectively. *Φανομενικότης* is the adherence to *φανοσθαί* and to the literal meaning of things, whereas *φανομενολογικότης* is the adherence to the experience, the revelation of the concealed truth.

See N.Madden "Ἄλωθαι Νοερὰ" on "Studia Patristica" vol.xxiii pp.53-59

Also see A.Camus "'Ὁ Μύθος τοῦ Συστημού" p.53.
exist, the theotic way of existence (1133 BCD). St. Maximus presents the world as the means by which God's will, truth, creation and human authenticity are taught. True creation gets united to true existence. The world in its true existence reveals the unity between God, man and world, the unity between the Creator and His Creation as well as the role of man as a mediator.

The human truth is set as a unity of ἡθὸς (morality), γνώμη (opinion), ἐργαζόμενη (act) and θεωρία (theory), ἀρετὴ (virtue) and γνῶσις (knowledge) (1136 ABCD). The world teaches the unity, which leads to theosis, after a process of ἔννοια (inner contemplation) after the existential experience of the universal truth.

Amb.7a.1137 C-1153 C. Biblical comments according to the point of view of St. Maximus.

Subsequently persons and facts of the Holy Bible are once again mentioned through the medium of allegoric interpretation. (Amb.7a.1137 C-1153 C).

In particular, perfect and sanctified persons come into the picture. There is a particular reference to Melchizedek and to the fact that μέτει ἱερεύς εἶς τῶν αἰώνων. According to St. Maximus, the first, the one and only fatherless (as Human person) and motherless (as God) priest was Jesus Christ Himself and, subsequently, the persons-priests-eternal creatures live on by adopting the Logos of God, the way of living of the Lord.

It is worth our paying particular attention to the theory allowing us to imitate those Law-abiding, sanctified personages who lived prior to the coming of the Lord. Before the Humanization, the way in which the Holy Truth, the revelation of God, and theosis could be arrived at was by means of natural revelation, by participating in the virtues which are synonymous, according to St. Maximus, to the reasons of beings, τοὺς λόγους τῶν ἐννέων

St. Maximus believes and experiences that λόγοι τῶν ἑνίων, the truth of the world, means the same as the holy virtues, the authenticity of man, as this truth stems from God. At this point,
St. Maximus, believes that the way to theosis is channelled through naturality, the preservation of truth, the transcendence of the disruption of unity between man, the world and God caused by sin. Man and the world deify each other since both signify the unity of beings with God, at the level of "reasons of beings".

Amb.8a.1153 D-1157 A. Asceticism as transcendence of egoism and participation in the Light. Ignorance as the cause of the Prior to the Fall disobedience.

That unity, unification and harmonization subsequently emerges through the study of excerpts from the Bible, which signify and illustrate the transcendence of the individualistic nature, of the egotistical desire. (Amb.8a.1153 D-1157 A).

Here St. Maximus appears to be ascetic in the sense of leaving

45. The preservation of "in the image" and, by extension, of the divine will (αὐτῶν ἐν ὑμῖν) in Man lead to theosis by means of the preservation of the human element, the ideal. In this way the authenticity of nature is at the same time a philosophical-theological way of theosis.

See N. Matsoukas Κόσμος "Ανθρώπος Κοινωνία" pp. 59, 83, 89.

46. At this point, two things must be stressed.

Firstly, the theosis of Man by means of the world and the theosis of the world by Man do not mean pantheism. There is no materialistic pantheism since Man does not become God "by essence" and since the world does not include elements of the essence of God. Man can reach theosis by means of the world by discovering in it the reasons of beings which mean the holy virtues (and not the essence) of God.

Secondly, St. Maximus does not support the theory of the reinstatement of everything but he supports the reinstatement of the world in its prior-to-the-fall state. This reinstatement does not mean the total reinstatement of everything but the reinstatement of the relationship between the being who has reached theosis and the world. The existence that has reached theosis is able to experience the world in the prior-to-the-fall state and to relate to it in the same way as he did before the fall.

The second point of view highlights two things: St. Maximus does not agree with the theory of the reinstatement of everything according to Origen; the mainly personal nature of the concept of reinstatement is stressed.
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behind the confines of individuality. The transcendence of individuality aims at Man's theosis, his participation in the light of Metamorphosis, the illumination and by, extension, into the truth.

Making specific reference to Jesus Christ's disciples during the event of Metamorphosis St. Maximus points out the resignation from cosmic matters, the participation in the light and the presence of the original light outshining all cosmic objects.

On analyzing the reasons why the original Sin-Disobedience took place, St. Maximus pinpoints the darkness of ignorance, the burden of the matter shouldered upon us as well as the worldly nature of

47 St. Maximus appears to be an ascetical writer in this text, as he transcends both the cosmic and the ontic. St. Maximus is an ascetic Father because he transcends the individual will through ascetic life.

48 The Fathers of the Church use reality as well as the concept of light to present two things: the Trinitarian God and the truth. The use of light in this way is based on John 8,12 where Jesus Christ is presented as the light of the world and the light of life.

Dionysios of Alexandria uses the term light to signify the eternal God. ("Ἐξεγέρσεις καὶ ἀποκάλυψις, p.243 B.E.P.E.S. vol 17).

Origen characterizes God as the inaccessible light (Ἐλκ τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν p.573), he refers to John 8,12 ("Ἐρμηνευτὰς τὸν Παλαιό Ἐξ., p.11) and he considers virtue as light ("Ἐρμηνευτας τῶν Παρουσίων) (B.E.P.E.S. vol.16)

St. Gregory of Nyssa refers to light to express the relationship of God the Father with the Son. (‘Αγίου Γεροφορίου Νισσαίου Ἰεραμά ντ.1 Published by Περιγραφαὶ Παλαιαῖς p.247.)

St. Maximus uses the term light to refer to the truth and to the participation in the Divine theotic energy. (PG.91 1077 AB).

Today in "Εἴρων καὶ Χρόνος" (pp.39-54) M. Heidegger analyzes the term Phenomenology in relation to the Greek word Φῶς. He relates φῶς (light) with the truth and the radiance.

49 Argument supported by St. Maximus see PG.91 1077 A. D. Stanilooae "Φιλοσοφική καὶ θεολογική ἐρωτήματα" p.154 comment 33.
the effort toward theosis as the main culprits. By denying the natural process to theosis via personal contact with God, Adam opted for the route of materialistic delights in his wish to become a cosmic God, thus suffering decay and death.

The only way to avoid repeating the Original Sin can be achieved, according to St. Maximus, through Holy Communion of the Flesh and the Blood of Jesus Christ. This is the only way towards Man's theosis, the only unity and harmony.

Amb.9a.1157 B-1160 B. The transcendence of cosmic theosis and death by means of the pothos for theosis with God.

The Saints succeeded in ascending from the present life into the next by transcending the form of theosis through matter. The Saints fought a winning battle against the material world and beat death in their search of God and theosis. (Amb.9a.1157 B-1160 B)

The saints escaped the permanent death and time-nihilism by their pothos for eternity, by relating to God through ascetism. By transcending the cosmic lures and the individualistic tendency-will of Man, the Saints achieve unity and harmony with God, with the world, with the truth and the Holy Energy.

Amb.10a.1160 B-1169 B. The theories of Metamorphosis. The unity of material and spiritual.

The theories on Metamorphosis (Amb.10a.1160 B-1169 B) signify the unity, the harmonization between the material and immaterial, the visible and the invisible, God and the world. Metamorphosis is the unity of God with the world, of the things said (πνεύμα) and the things unsaid (ἀνεξανθρώπως).

At a daily level, St. Maximus keeps exemplifying the two Prophets Elijah and Moses in his effort to reveal that everyone is capable of reaching God and experiencing the Holy Eros, in spite of all.

50 See M. Dubrovlie "Τὸ Μυστήριο τῆς Εκκλησίας" p. 90, where the writer supports the form of the cosmic theosis by Adam, its repetition and its transcendence according to St. Maximus the confessor.
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cosmic social differentiations.

Amb.11a.1169 B-1173 D. The transcending of cosmos by means of the cosmological philosophy.

In the process, he refers to the world from an ascetic point of view. (Amb.11a.1169 B-1173 D).

According to the cosmological philosophy⁵¹, after analyzing the world and internalizing the truth, Man goes beyond the limits of the world and reaches the stage of Holy Image. By experiencing virtues and the presence of God, man outruns the worldly revelation. He has reached the stage of Metamorphosis, of transforming his basic existential conditions, transforming, at the same time, the world. He is a part of the loving-agapetic union existing between God, Man and the World. He has got rid of his egotism, his worldly concern and cares, as he is in a state of loving perichoresis. The individualistic attitude, the ontic⁵² has transformed into the ontologic (the attitude of unity and perichoresis)⁵³.

Amb.12a.1176 A-1193 C. Theosis as unity with God and with the true "Aγούλα". Theosis as catharsis from malice. The untenable nature of "Ανουξία" on the basis of the philosophy of "Μονάς”.

St.Maximus returns to commenting on texts by St.Gregory. (Amb.12a.1176 A-1193 C).

In this part, theosis is again conceived as unity with God. The

---

⁵¹ About cosmos as a reductional concept according to St.Maximus, see N.Matsouka "Κόσμος Ἀνθρώπως Κοινωνία" pp.67,70, 75,77,79.

⁵² About cosmos as "ontic" see M.Heidegger M."Εἶναι καὶ Ἐχόντος" p.83

⁵³ Cosmos turns into an Ontological entity when Man through it and through "Time" arrives at the Truth, See C.Giannaras "Η Μονή στὴν Φιλοσοφία" p.92
purification from malice and from the tendency towards μὴ δύναται 54 plays a very important part since it aims at γνώρισμα (revelation), at inner experience and at the pothos for indestructibility.

At this point the writer mentions the natural worldly revelation by specifically stressing that Dualism (God and Matter) 55 is impossible. Instead, Monarchy is feasible. It is inconceivable for the world to be governed by two powers: one movable and evolving (the world) and another which is immovable (God).

The moving, the evolving, the chronizon 56 and the limited element (in time and space), as long as it is gradually developing on the basis of lawfulness, is also directed towards an all-powerful and thus creative source. On top of all stands the Μοναδική as Unity, the monadic, not subordinate to any other idea or principle, which explains why it is whole, self-contained and

54. "Μὴ δύναται" is presented as a manifestation of the imperfection of beings as well as a nihilistic movement. "Μὴ δύναται" has a dual nature: it is both ontologic and nihilistic. "Μὴ δύναται" initially stands for the ordinary beings' inability to reach the state of perfection, which, in turn, causes perichoresis and the movement of beings. Creatures are not self-contained and that is the reason why they need to co-exist in an active perichorematic way as they move towards perfection. Seen from another viewpoint, "Μὴ δύναται" signifies a tendency towards extermination and sin. To St. Maximus' mind, "Μὴ δύναται" either provides the divine force or Man's self-destructive tendency. In both forms it is of a negative nature. In its first form it tends to disappear and in its second it causes the self-destruction of Man. According to St. Maximus "Μὴ δύναται" can be transcended, in both its forms, by means of relationship and unity.

55. Dualism is based on the concept that there are two principles, God and the world. St. Maximus refutes Dualism by highlighting God as a Creator and by supporting the Monarchy of the Father. Any other concept leads to dualism and to the disruption of the human nature and existence. The Mystical Father continuously refutes the existence of two principles in order to unify and balance Man with himself and with whatever Man is related to.

56. See, Aristotle "Meta ta Physica".1068 B.
indivisible. Mováda, being something unique and ideal⁵⁷, is capable of creating and uniting beings and creatures.

St. Maximus philosophizes on Movác, by singling out the unity and unification formed around it by those begun and finished which are many, imperfect and consequently tending towards integration, (loving perichoresis), by participating in the unifying and évich (singular) Holy energy emitted by the One and Only God⁵⁸. The many and imperfect creatures, the world, come to perfection only by participating in the sole energy which is holy and conferred upon them according to the capability and need of each⁵⁹. Every being or existence becomes perfect according to its condition, to its subjective capability of taking part in the one and only energy.

St. Maximus stresses the way of unity, without depriving every ontological creature⁶⁰ of its singularity as a form of species. This unifying theory is based on the idea of Monarchy, the One God (One substance) who is also Three Dimensional.

Amb.13a.1193 C-1196 C. The existential significance and interpretation of the Trinitarian Dogma.

By commenting on St. Gregory, St. Maximus interprets the Trinitarian God as a unity. (Amb.13a.1193 C-1196 C).

The message which the Personal Trinitarian God (the base for

⁵⁷. Mováda is an indivisible unity. St. Maximus supports this concept and stresses the importance of the unity and the unification of God, Man and the World in their initial and ontologic cause. (PG.91 1184 B-1188 C).

⁵⁸. About the concept of the "Father" being the foundation of the Triadic and Pateristic Theology, see N. Matsouka N. "Χώρος, Ανθρώπος, Κοινωνία" pp.57,325.

⁵⁹. According to S. Kierkegaard individual perfection consists in the participation in "Δόξης". Η Εννοια του Δόξων. pg.38. "Adam and the Human generation" pg.37.

⁶⁰. Ontology is the perfect uniting force holding the human species together. According to this point of view, it follows that the Ontological person is the united being.
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every Mystical Orthodox father) conveys to every Man is the loving unification with God and the participation in virtues as a way of reaching theosis. Unification and theosis presuppose personal experience, (intuition) and mystical way of contemplation (ζητείσια).

Amb.14a.1196 C-1197 C.Philosophical and psychological analysis of the soul.

There follows an intervention and deviation from the whole spirit of the epistle, as a philosophical and psychological analysis of the soul takes place. (Amb.14a 1196 C-1197 D).

This analysis brings out the following psychic conditions: "logic, alogic, affect, sorrow, pleasure, envy, laziness decency, shame, amazement, surprise, anguish...". This analysis is aiming at becoming Holy Ενθουπτα. Any existence can achieve control upon itself by means of analyzing the soul, knowing its states and actions.

Amb.15a.1200 A-1208 A. Reference to Biblical excerpts using the allegorical method.

The part between Amb. 15a. 1200 A and 1208 A contains analytical reports on Biblical comments, in an allegorical way, in which model persons are suggested.

61."The supreme cause lies not only in uniting with the Holy Trinity, but also in expressing its Wish". This opinion is supported by P. Evdokimov "Φοροδοστα" p.31,443.

62. The term "Mediation-Deviation" is used here, as this part of the text is not in perfect tune with the whole work of St. Maximus.

63. St. Maximus believes that the foundation of the balance of the Man as a psycho-somatic unity, lies in the gnosiologic analysis of the soul. The theoretical inspection of the soul causes the being to dominate or be sovereign upon itself. Modern Psychology and Psychotherapy are based on this concept.
Apart from these model persons, reference is also made to miracles and incidents closely connected to the Lord’s presence in the world. These references and incidents are of an existential nature. They all signify man’s release from the bounds of passion and selfishness. They also reveal God’s identity as a Provider of being and a Donor of well being, Ἐρήμων.

Amb. 16a. 1208 D-1212 B. Reference to Ἀγγέλος and Heresy

Continuing his comments on texts by St. Gregory the theologian, St. Maximus reports on the latter’s antiheretical attitude (Amb. 16a. 1208 D-1212 B).

St. Maximus chiefly refers to Ἀγγέλος as the human reason and human logic, as a means of fulfilling the ἐρως for Holy Beauty, as the means of purification, as opposed to logic, interpreted in the strict sense, which leads to vanity and emptiness. At this point it becomes apparent that in St. Maximus’s opinion, heresy is equal to the disruption of unity. A further conclusion is that heresy is based on the external, superficial logic.

As opposed to Orthodoxy, heresy reflects the surface, τὸ φαίνεσθαι (the appearance), of things. On the contrary,

---

64. St. Maximus refers to "Moses, PG,91 1200 C, Phinees PG.91 1201 BCD, and Job PG.91.1205 D01208 A.

65. A reference to "Ἡράκλειον, "Ἡρίτων τοῦ Ἑλληνιστήρος".

66. P.G.91 1209 A

67. According to St. Maximus, heresy as a disruptive force is based on the external, superficial logos. see P.G.91 1209 C.

68. Heresy, being based on human understanding, is closely related to "φαίνεσθαι (the appearance). It seems to be connected to the Sophistic viewpoint according to which "Πάντων Χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος". God comes to be regarded as nothing more than a common being susceptible to man’s understanding, and thus
Orthodoxy, as the expression of authentic personal reason, (the phenomenology) responds to the depth, and its basis is the unifying reason. Orthodoxy as a form of authenticity comes from the experience of eros and of the Holy Beauty and its target is unity and harmony.

Amb.17a.1212 C-1221 B The Eudoxia of the Cosmos.

On the contrary, the heresy and superficial reason sets itself the task of studying lies and this is why this kind of reason is devoid of the human capacity for ecstasis. The prevailing eutaxia in the world is also in contrast to the non-authentic, disrupting reason.

The world is in perfect harmony and geometric consistency. This harmony and consistency allows us to perceive God as the Creator the Sapient Distributor and Provider. God presents Himself as harmony and unification by reason of nature. On the basis of limiting power. Φανομενικότητα and the logical description of the divine, the adherence to the surface, to the known and the understandable determine heresy as the "Φανομενικότητα" description of the true and the divine, based on human logic. The attempt to understand the Triadologic and Christologic Mystery is one of the manifestations of heresy, since it tries to understand either the Way in which the Son was born, or the Emanation of the Holy Spirit, or the unity of the divine and the human in Jesus Christ. Heresy identifies with Φανομενικότητα because it attempts to introduce logic in Divinity and because it tries to reduce the human nature in Jesus Christ.

69. As opposed to heresy, Orthodoxy is phenomenological as it experiences the limits of the gnosioic capacity of Man and it reaches God by means of ένδοτον or by means of phenomena. Orthodoxy is of phenomenological nature because, after reaching the limits of knowledge, it reaches experience and belief even in the Paradox or the Irrational.

70. We call the movement of beings a causative figure in the sense that beings stem from an original source and, as a result, they keep moving according to specific laws. Causation is prevalent in the world but it means neither an absolute destination nor a limitation of each constituent. The result can be united to the cause by reason of its own choice. The causative movement is not
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this, St. Maximus regards the world as the reflection of God by analogy.

This cosmological viewpoint, which also assumes theological dimensions, could possibly be regarded as a main philosophic realization, since it belongs to the realm of cosmological philosophy. However, St. Maximus's personal experiences, adopting a universal Orthodox viewpoint and being a member of the world as well as of creation, by constant reference to both energy and activity, turn every philosophic generalization and vagueness into existential experience and energy. The cosmologic analytical philosophy is directly connected with the theological experience, the energetic unity and harmony between God and world.

St. Maximus's way of thinking is based on God, the Triadic God Ἐν μιᾷ οὐσίᾳ καὶ ἐν τριοί δύοσίασι.

Amb.18a.1221 B-1233 C. The Apophatic concept.

Next St. Maximus extols God's supremacy in his reference to Ἀνθρωπιά μὴλίον ἢ Ματρί τὸν Ὠμὸν κατοθρήσς εἰκάζοντις (Amb.18a.1221 B-1233 C).

It is supported that God is an Existence beyond beings, beyond the understanding (νόησε) of substance, and that the Trinitarian nature of God does not mean Polytheism as νοοτροπος άλλην veoov of ἑλληνικός νόσονίεσ. The words ἄνεμος (unborn), immortal and indestructible signify that he is not the God, that he is beyond any mental concept. Compared to the creature which is a Being (ἐν), God is a non-being, (μη δν).

The term non-being, is used at this point by the writer not to necessarily revesive. The result can harmoniously co-exist with the cause in an affirmative sense but the latter does not depend on the former.

71 An axiom of apophaticism is that the only thing that we know about God is that "He is" but not "What He is". See. P. Evdokimov Ὀρθοδοξία p.70.
K. Jaspers Ἔναρξη σχετικ Φιλοσοφία p.133.
signify the sense of zero-nothing or an ontological category but to stress God's supremacy over the world. God is as inconceivable as non-existence is, seen from the viewpoint of human actuality and perception. The existing man, based on logic and naturality, according to the rules of direct reality, is incapable of conceiving either the perfect nothing because he exists) or the absolute perfect existence, that is God, because he is not a holy creature himself. However, the existence is able to become God, in a state of Grace, without getting hold of the Holy essence, and it can also move towards zero, without coming to an end itself.

Amb.19a.1233 C-1236 D. The participation in the Holy energy as participation in the truth and in the ways of the truth.

According to St. Maximus, man can participate in the existence, the Holy Energy, by taking part in the process of truth. (Amb.19a.1233 C-1236 D).

Practical philosophy suggests that man can be purified from the infections of human flesh. He is part of the energy and the Grace of the Holy Spirit, the Mystagogy. By experiencing the Holy Mystagogy in an inspirational way, Man sees and experiences his own existence and can also sense the Holy Truth. Man is a constituent element of the harmonizing unity between the Holy and the Human. The Practical philosophy indicates that, in the process of being purified from the infections inflicted by human nature, man is being directed to the state of apathy and Holy Energy through ἔγρηγόρη, ἁπαθίᾳ καὶ βλασφημίᾳ.

Amb.20a.1236 D-1241 C. The Ascension as Co-operation of God and Man.

Next, St. Maximus refers to Apostle Paul's ἀνάλημα and ἀναβασις.

72 About Non-Being as an Ontological category see. Aristotle "Meta ta Physica" 1030, 1067, 1089.

73 The term ἔγρηγόρη is mainly ascetic and indicative of constant self control. see Isaac the Syrian "Καλματ".
as an exemplary of ἀνωτέρα and βασιλεία. (Amb.20a.1236 D-1241 C).

This is not something that solely happened to Apostle Paul. This is a natural event as long as, in his authenticity, man is anxious to meet God. Analepsis is a φύσεως ἐργον-nature’s product, since the same rule applies to the relationship between God and Man. Man can participate in the analepsis through transcendence, his quest for the truth, by means of practical philosophy and theologic mystagogy. Man takes part in his analepsis through the kataphatic and the apophatic way, by means of knowledge and by resigning from knowledge when this has been exhausted.

St. Maximus suggests that analepsis is the meeting between God and Man according to Apostle Paul’s pattern. Man can take part in his analepsis via purification, practical philosophy, the ὑπερλαύν τῶν ὄντων etc., and this analepsis is also the creative force behind the perfect practical life. The creature, by going through the process of analepsis, participates in the divine actions, becomes a deified being but it preserves its cosmic identity.

Amb.21a.1241 D-1256 C. St. John the Baptist as a model of deified existence in relation to the Ἀγίος of the Gospel and to the Ἀγίος τῶν ὄντων.

John the Baptist is considered the epitomy of this combination (Amb.21a.1241 D-1256 C).

St. Maximus projects on John the Baptist the unity of the deified existence with the world by correlating him with the Bible, with practical philosophy, apathy and the love for ultimate virtue.

74. See also P. Sherwood "The Earlier Ambigua", p.45.

75. About the Kataphatic and Apohatic way see. V. Logi "Ἡ Μυστικὴ Θεολογία τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Εκκλησίας" p.25. Aristotle "Meta ta Physica"1207 B.

76. The authenticity of existence is looked into from both the Orthodox and Existentialist viewpoint. The Orthodox belief supports that the perfect practical lifestyle is contingent upon one’s personal attitude, while Existentialism (Dasein) regards personal insight as the answer to the question of "Being".

PART I.
St. Maximus establishes a correspondence between what John the Baptist says and what the Gospel says. According to him, there is a correspondence between the element αἰθήρ, and the existential condition of ψυχή, as έξις φωτισμοί and πνευματικών λόγων ἀποδεείκτης, the element of όθρ and the existential condition of εἴσις κυριελής, τάς καὶ πνεύμα τῶρς συνεκτική, the element of θώρα and the existential condition of αμφροσοθην as έξις θειική ἐρωτική πρὸς θεόν and, finally, the element of δεικασθή and the existential condition of γεννητική as τῆς ἐκκατον διαδοχως ἀπονειματική.

St. Maximus also establishes a common ground between the aforementioned and the four Gospels. Matthew's Gospel is the symbol of Faith, Mark's is the one of Practice, Luke's is the one of the Physical condition and John's is the one of Theology. St. Maximus experiences and presents the unity of holy revelation, virtues and existential conditions on the model of John the Baptist.

St. Maximus now analyzes and describes a model existence by comparing it to the revealed rule of God. Thus he implements a revealing theological and existential analysis. Moreover, he places particular emphasis on the existential conditions paving the way towards theosis invariably in relation to the revealed truth, the Gospel and the truth that is revealed by the world, that is, the participation in λόγοι τῶν σων.

Amb.22a.1256 C-1257 C.Reason, Knowledge and their limits.

Next St. Maximus refers to reason which, perfect though it may be, can never reach the absolute knowledge of God. (Amb.22a.1256 C-1257 C).

In St. Maximus's opinion there is plenty of evidence manifesting God. However the human mind can simply conceive a multitude of actions, and differences among Holy Actions. Every simple one of those actions however manifests the One God and the One, united and unifying energy which simply gets identifiable through its ἐκπαρθείς (demonstrations).

In keeping with the distinction between the multiplicity of the divine actions and the singularity of the Holy Energy, God applies
His force to all beings, but in proportion to each particular one of them without confusion. Through this realization only one thing is stressed: God simply exists. In conclusion, the perfect knowledge can be nothing more than failure.77.

Amb.23a.1257 C-1261 A. The movement of the cosmos and the erotic movement of God towards Man by means of Ελαφάμις.

The Aristotelian knowledge and realization is then employed by St. Maximus while referring to the κίνον άκλοντο (the deterministic movement) in order to transform it into causal relation, causality79 by illustrating the loving way of God as a drawing movement. (Amb.23b.1257 C-1261 A).

The Holy energy is no longer regarded as a distant one. Instead, God appears as an appealing and compassionate force attracting human beings around him in a unifying way80, in line with the Areopagitic point of view81. This Holy Tradition can only be identifiable by the human beings by means of Ελαφάμις, and inner experience 82. God does not act according to the patterns of

77. About the perfect knowledge as being limited, see K. Jaspers K. "Ειςαγωγή οινθ Φιλοσοφία" p.164.
S. Kierkegaard "Η Εννοια της Άγνωστης" p.16

78. About the Aristotelian Knowledge, see J.N. Theodorakopoulos "Ειςαγωγή οινθ Φιλοσοφία" vol D. p.164.

79. About causality, see.
O. Clement "Μετά τον Θώμα του Θεού" p.138.
K. Jaspers "Ειςαγωγή οινθ Φιλοσοφία" p.164
A. Einstein "Η Θεωρία της Σχετικότητας".

80. St. Maximus visualizes God's image as being a unifying force, rather than just a distant Creator. This mystic Orthodox theory regards God as approachable by Man.

81. See P.G.3 712 C.

82. The way of learning the way in which God exists is Εναντίον, the internal experience and radiance. At this point, the meeting with God at a personal internal level is highlighted as a means of knowing God. According to both Kierkegaard and Berdyaev,
movement, in an evolutionary way, but He is experienced as an evolutionary movement by the beings who have seen the light. St. Maximus appears more existential-oriented in his concept of God. He is supportive of existentialism in stressing the erotic nature of God's existence, the erotic co-existence of God and Man and he considers the existential Eλαχισμός as the way of experiencing this erotic movement. This Orthodox experience is based in the Trinitarian nature of God and on the Trinitarian way of the existence of God as a form of harmonious co-existence.


In putting forward the relationship between the Father and the Son, St. Maximus eliminates the distinction between superiority and inferiority, a distinction apparently arising from the fact that the Father, (Amb.24a 1261 A-1272 C) was unborn while the Son was born. This fact however signifies relationship, unity and harmony rather than disruption.

St. Maximus is vehemently opposed to the Arian theory of the Father's superiority, which disrupts their unity and harmonization.

Amb.25a.1273 A-1280 C. Jesus Christ as a model of unity and harmonization.

That unification and harmonization is also stressed by St. Maximus when referring to Theanthropos Jesus Christ. (Amb. 25a. 1273 A-1280 C)

On the basis of Theanthropos Jesus, St. Maximus speaks of both God reveals Himself only to the Person, and the Genius experiences the divine in the inner part of his existence.

83. St. Maximus can be characterized as an "existentialist" in the sense that he refers to existence, the way of existing and its energetic unity. However he is not influenced by the contemporary Existentialism as a philosophy of existence. He can be considered as a founder of Existentialism as he lived prior to it and a he is the basis of the contemporary existentialistic Orthodox Theologians.

PART I.
unity and unification between the Holy and the Human, practical philosophy and mystic theory. Apathy, the release from the movement towards non-being, from sin, is considered as a means towards unity and unification. On the model of Jesus Christ, the limits between the two natures (built and unbuilt) are transcended, and the unity between Holy and human truth becomes a fact in an extraordinary and incomprehensible way. This unifying actuality surrounding Jesus Christ is the model of unity of every human existence.

Amb.26a.1280 C-1281 B. Jesus Christ as a model of spiritual rebirth.

In Jesus Christ the principle of spiritual renaissance (Amb. 26a. 1280 C-1281 B) takes flesh and bones. The moral philosophy is experienced i.e. the unique and authentic way in which every existence aims towards union, which is repeated by every human according to their capabilities.

Amb.27a.1281 B-1285 B.Crucifixion as a way of Theosis.

Crucifixion provides the moral philosophy of the christoid condition (Amb.27a.1281 B-1285 B).

The shape of the crucifix illustrates the moral philosophical unity as well as the unity of the following elements: substance, providence, judgment, sapience, knowledge of virtues.

Through those elements which lead up to Holy Wisdom, man repudiates himself (his egotistical wish) and experiences the state of apathy. Every individual is capable of experiencing apathy, the mystic truth of substance, providence, judgment, sapience and knowledge of virtues, according to their personal potential. Apathy can be arrived at either by purification, or by action, or by

---

84. About God’s Humanization as a Paradox and a Paralog see. I.N. Theodorakopoulos "Εκσυγχώρηση στην Φιλοσοφία" vol D p.58.

85. We use here the term apathy in an ascetic way of thinking. Apathy in this sense means the exceeding of the passion, the freedom of the flesh and of egoism.

---

PART 1.
disposing of passions or by philosophy. The Christoid condition is the product of transcending anything individualistic.

Amb. 28a. 1285 C-1288 A. The reason towards the truth and the unity.

"Reason" comes back to the structure of the text as νευρατικός λόγος, (spiritual reason), leading to truth and unity. (Amb. 28a. 1285 C-1288 A).

It is simultaneously the ενοποιός δύναμις, (unifying force), and the condition of ῥητόν-δεξίομενον, (expressed) and the ὄρατον, the (implied), of ὄρατον, the (visible) and ἄφρατον, the (invisible). Reason becomes more of a unifying nature when it participates in "Νεύμα" (Spirit).

Amb. 29a. 1288-1289 B. The limits of reason

St. Maximus establishes λόγος, (reason) in Mystical Theology (Amb. 29a. 1288-1289 B).

Although reason could be both spiritualistic and unifying, in comparison to the Holy Substance it is rendered powerless. The infinite supremacy of God, His remote concealed essence sets the limitation of every logic. Once again, St. Maximus refers to man's inability to comprehend God's essence and magnificence.

Amb. 30a. 1289 B-D. Humanization as a Paradox.

In spite of His inconceivability, God, by means of Humanization communicates with Man, in an Παραδοξοστίον, (Exceptional) way. (Amb. 30a. 1289 B-D).

Despite God being unidentifiable as well as inaccessible, He is in constant and direct communication with man by grace and by energy. Through Humanization, a new and even more extraordinary

86 About the incomprehensible Essence of God See. N. Nisiotis "Προελεύθερα στὴν Θεολογικὴ Γνωσιολογία" Athens 1986
communication between God and Man, is established\textsuperscript{87}. Humanization is the \textit{paradoxon}, (extraordinary act), being greater than the communication between God and Man in the beginning of creation, in the sense that God Himself becomes the creature.

\textit{Amb.31a.1289 D–1297 B. Reference to St. John the Baptist and to David.}

St. Maximus compares the model of John the Baptist to the model of David. This sets the borderline between the Old and New Testament. (\textit{Amb.31a.1289 D–1297 B}).

The former (John) has reached theosis from the very beginning while the latter (David) through repentance. Both of them have experienced the \textit{practical, natural and theological philosophy}\textsuperscript{88} because they are \textit{epautal} (lovers) of the spiritual reason.

\textit{Amb.32a.1297 C–1301 A. Biblical comments.}

Subsequently St. Maximus refers to Biblical persons by means of allegoric interpretation. (\textit{Amb.32b.1297 C–1301 A}).

Herod, according to the allegorical interpretation, is the flesh, the sin, the unknown. Man transcends this nihilist movement by apathy, by \textit{Christoid (the Christype-\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\omicron\epsilon\omicron\iota\delta\omicron)} state and by practical philosophy.

\textit{Amb.33a.1301 B–C. Critique of idols.}

St. Gregory Nazianzen has always exerted a major influence on St. Maximus's judgment of idols\textsuperscript{89}, the worship of the created

\textsuperscript{87}\textsuperscript{87}.See.\textit{P.G.91 1289 BCD}.

\textsuperscript{88}\textsuperscript{88}.The term "Practical, natural and theological philosophy" is often used by St. Maximus to signify the gnosiologic unity of Nature, Man, God and the way of existing. \textit{P.G.1265 D,1275 B,1293 B}.

\textit{See P.Sherwood "The Earlier Ambigua".p.36.}

\textsuperscript{89}\textsuperscript{89}.St. Maximus refutes idols and the man-created God by experiencing, as a Mystical Father, God in His unknown and simple nature and by experiencing, as an Orthodox Father, the Magnitude of
God™. (Amb.33a.1301 B-C).

Amb.34a.1301 D-1304 C. Catharsis and ἀγαπή.

St. Gregory is also the inspiratorial force behind the theory of the soul's purification in connection to the truth which comes out of the analysis of beings. (Amb.34a.1301 D-1304 C).

Amb.35a.1304 D-1316 A. The cosmos and its unifying divisions.

Then the world is analyzed into five units. (Amb. 35a.1304 D-1316 A)

These units stress the significance of unity instead of suggesting disruption and dissolution; at the centre of all this lies Man, following the distinction between male and female. The principle joining force between the Holy and the Human finds its expression in the person of Jesus Christ, the model of unity between the divine and the human, the built and unbuilt. This does not give rise to an apparent dualism but points out the unity between logic, the ἀγαπή ἰηνός ὀντόν (the truth) and God-Logos.

Amb.36a.1316 A-1317 C. The triple birth of Man.

This unity is also stressed by St. Maximus when referring to the triple birth of Man. Man is subject to the three evolutionary stages: the first one is marked by his physical birth. The second one is his birth by Christening and the final one is his birth through Resurrection. (Amb.36a.1316 A-1317 C).

From the very moment of his physical birth, man follows a standard evolutionary process which, reinforced by christening (his

God's love that led Him to reveal Himself to man in the form of a Man. By this concept he transcends the worship of the created, the deification of beings and objects and he experiences the energetic, existential and personal relationship of God and Man.

90. See P.G.36 344 A.

91. Also see L. Thumberg "Microcosm and Mediator" p.147,151,406, 418,419,424.
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rebirth), leads on to his perfect birth by means of resurrection. According to this concept, Man is physically born and then reborn by 'Ὑποκείμενος-Προσωπον (the original sin is cancelled out by christening) and by Holy Grace. The whole existential movement-process of Man constitutes a loving birth and rebirth of human nature, Holy Salvation and Holy Grace.

Amb.37a.1317 D-1321 D. Incarnation as Divine Providence.

After that, St. Maximus refers to Incarnation as unification. (Amb.37a.1317 D-1321 D)

God's Humanization was planned by God and aimed at saving Man and restoring unity. That plan was labelled by St. Maximus as Holy Providence or, better still, God's principle concern for man, implemented in a most reasonable, though paradoxical, way: God resolves to become man in his perfect effort to approach him in his daily life. As a result, the perfect God and man, untainted by sin, shows man the way to perfect himself while being in his natural condition. In this sense, Humanization is God's providence, a unity of the divine and the Human, harmonization of the human nature and the Holy Energy and restoration of the authenticity of human nature. Man is in harmony with himself, he does not feel imprisoned within the flesh, the sin, within relativity-mediocrity but, based on his human nature and reality, is able to perfect himself or to reach Orthodox theosis, according to the model of Jesus Christ.

Amb.38a.1321 D-1341 C. The opposition to the theories of the pre-existence of the souls.

The Orthodox concept of God's Humanization seems to be beyond the

---

92 The only way towards Man's salvation is through his approach of God. In his first, abortive attempt, Man was given the chance to reach God by Grace in Genesis. Therefore, this time God becomes a man Himself in order to help Man reach theosis. God Himself becomes the object of desire. He becomes Man in order to show Man how he can become God by Grace in both a human and a divine way.
grasp of the followers of the theory of the pre-existence of the souls, to which St. Maximus, in his specific references, is always opposed. (Amb.38a.1321 D-1341 C).

The simultaneous creation of the soul and the body, without the soul predating that process, is supported here. The soul takes on Being-Elvai, existence, during physical conception. St. Maximus supports the co-existence of the soul and the body at the time of the physical conception. At the beginning of creation Man is a soul-body unit (without the pre-existence of an autonomous soul). God has created man as a Ψωτὴ Ζωα, (Living soul), who is purified and sanctified at the time of christening and who is resurrected, soul and body, at the time of resurrection.

St. Maximus deals with the second foundation stone of the theory of the pre-existence of the soul without making any personal evaluations. Only logoi pre-exist in God.

Man participates in the logoi of beings, not in his autonomous pre-existing soul, but after logical analysis of the world and of his existence, and, last but not least, after his choice between Well being-Ev Elvai-virtue and wicked being-Φευ Elvai-malice. The participation in logoi and Holy Energy is man's choice and not an absolute end deriving from the pre-existing selfperfection of his soul.

Man's freedom to take part in either has a catalytical effect on

93. See N. Matsouka "Δογματικὴ καὶ Συμβολὴ Θεολογία" p.192 and "Κύριος "Ἀνθρωπος Κοιμωνία" p.81

94. At this point we refer to the creation of man by God according to the Old Testament "Genesis".

95. See also P. Sherwood "The Earlier Ambigua" p.172,176.

96. The transition from "Being" through "Well-Virtuous Being" to "Eternal Virtuous Being" is also used by V. Losky "Ἡ Θεία τοῦ Θεοῦ" p.169,170. Also see V. Losky "Ἡ Μυσικὴ Θεολογία τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας" p.178.

L. Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator" p.78,91, 394
his participation in selfperfection. Man, being free and opting for the wicked cannot have possibly pre-existed in his perfect form of existence and this cannot mean his absolute destination. The idea of pre-existence is directly involved with the lack of freedom which means absolute, infallible and autonomous destination. Experience, however, suggests that this evaluation is erroneous. St. Maximus believes that every human being is free, in the sense that he has freedom of choice and, by extension, a relationship with the chosen object. Because this kind of freedom does not mean selfconnection, selfperfection or selfselection of the pre-existing situation, it refutes selfdestination and selforigin.

Through his relationship with the chosen person, object or situation, man is related not only to his autoperfection, his existence and individuality, but also to the other part on his way towards perfection. The other part, in this situation, could equally be the world (natural philosophy), man (ontology) but, on top of all, God (metaphysics, theology and even ontology, since logoi pre-exist in God).

97. The concept of "Absolute destination" originates in the theories of St. Augustine and signifies every being's predetermination of movement by the Holy Element. This concept is both defective and incomplete in the sense that it deprives man of his choice to salvation, since it is predetermined by God from the beginning of the movement. This interpretation of Holy Providence in relation to the Aristotelic pattern of movement (forming the foundation of the theory of "absolute destination") is not supported by Mystical Fathers and, in particular, by St. Maximus, since they experience the agapetic and erotic drawing energy of God in the world.

98. At this point we refer to the effort of Man to reach the truth in all its aspects: the truth of value, the truth about Man, the truth about God, the truth of the relationship of Man with the world and of Man with God. In general, we recall the whole journey of the human spirit by referring to: the Presocratic Philosophy, the Philosophy of being, the revelation of God, the Medieval Philosophy, the Idealistic Philosophy, the subjective Philosophy.
"Pothos, Eros and Agape"


The following paragraph refers to Jesus Christ. (Amb. 39a.1341 D-1349 A).

There is much talk about innovation, the new concept governing the relationship between God and Man, matter and spirit. This paragraph is a comment on innovation and the paradox, a comment on the idea of rising above corruption and the confines of both flesh and passion. This part is of christological, ascetical and transcendent (when it comes to worldly matters) nature.

Amb.40a.1349 B-1356 C. Comment on asceticism.

St. Maximus' comments on St. Gregory's text are of the same nature. (Amb.40a.1349 B-1356 C).

The transcendence of the worldly concerns through scientific analysis leads to apathy and the experience of the loving unity with God.

In these texts St. Maximus is ascetical and theoretical. He is ascetical in the sense that he refers to the individualistic materialistic life which is in a position to transcend Man (1349 BCD, 1352 B, 1353 CD, 1356 AB) by means of theoretical knowledge (1352 B, 1353 BC, 1356 AB). The reason for original sin is the absence of personal insight, the absence of apathy (1353 CD, 1352 BC), and the absence of the reasons of species (1356 A).

Amb.41a.1356 C-1357 D. The allegorical interpretation of time.

Right afterwards there is an allegoric interpretation of time in connection with Jesus Christ. (Amb.41a.1356 C-1357 D).

The allegorical meaning of Time is the Lord Himself. It is προαναγωγή του Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Time, conceived in terms of logic, in terms of its harmonious division and evolution means Logos;

and finally the Existential Philosophy as well as the philosophy which originates in contemporary physics.

99. See P.G.36 405 B.
Logos brings the beings from non-existence to existence. It is the Providence of God that preserves the world. Time also means the Logos of God, who is the Creator of time, the beginning and the end.

Amb.42a.1357 D-1361 A. Crucifixion as Co-crucifixion.

Next, St. Maximus presents crucifixion as co-crucifixion with Jesus Christ. (Amb.42a.1357 D-1361 A).

The way of crucifixion - co-crucifixion is through the purification of the mind (practical philosophy), the mental natural theory and death of sin, the negation of the symbolic theory of the beings and the unity with God through mystagogy, the unity with Theology through the mystical unity.

Amb.43a.1361 A-1365 C. The donated by God Pothos and the Holy Communion as way of theosis.

Man's pothos for God is interpreted by St. Maximus as a gift of God to Man to spare him inexorable struggle. (Amb.43a.1361 A-1365 C).

That holy pothos and eros, offered to Man by God, actually suggest the authentic way of living. This eros leads Man to his authenticity, to the unity and unification with the truth as well as to the active erotic and loving unity with God. This eros

100 What is also obvious at this point is the common ground found between St. Maximus and Heidegger, as they have both been able to identify the original way of existence. This also illustrates the non-forgetfulness (δ-ƛηθεω) of man's authenticity, the preservation of the "the reason of beings" and ultimately the transfiguration of the existing beings as it is related with the truth, be it an active relationship with God or with "Εινα" from a Philosophical Existential viewpoint.

About the relationship between Man and Truth, also about man's transfiguration according to Existentialism, see M. Heidegger "Εινα κατ Χρονος". p.298.
is connected to the power of logic and provides man with a meaningful existence. Man, being in agony and fighting for existence, co-exists with God, forming an active perichoresis. The authentic eros can be arrived at by means of purification of the mind and man's liberation from his individualistic passions. (God and Man form a perichorematic energy). Jesus Christ stands out as the chief model through the Holy Mystery of Communion (involving the Flesh and Blood of Jesus).

The human body is sanctified in its entirety but also each and every limb, according to its physical function, sanctifies the being. The Holy Mystery of Communion, according to St. Maximus is ἄλτα αὐνωνατα (divine intercourse), the soul and body erotic participation in theosis.

Amb.44a.1365 CD. St. John the Baptist as a model of repentance.

The next paragraph also refers to John the Baptist as the model of genuine repentance and τὸς μεσοτος γνώσεως πρόδρομον (prophecy). (Amb.44a.1365 CD)

Amb.45a.1368 AB. The student of the Gospel as transcendence of the double ("Σανάντη") ethics.

There is also a relevant reference to the Student of Gospel who, quite like the hermit Baptist, is a model of alienation from society, a model of transcendence of the dual morality.

(Amb.45a.1368 AB)

Amb.46a.1368 B-1384 D. Biblical comments.

101. About the relationship of Eros, Logos and the logic way of existence see N. Matsouka "Κώσμος "Ανθρώπος Κοινωνία" pp. 130, 134.

102. About the agony of human beings to be in unity with the Absolute, see S. Kierkegaard "Ἡ Ἑννοια τὸς Ἀγώντος" p. 197, M. Heidegger "Ἐννοια καὶ Ἐρώς" p. 259.

103. See P.G. 91 1369 B.
Then, a series of comments on the Holy Bible, on Biblical instances follows (Amb.46a.1368 B-1384 D).

They are full of theological, philosophical and ascetic content since St. Maximus always interprets them allegorically. St. Gregory Nazianzen's hagiographical comments, duly interpreted by St. Maximus, combine Triadology and Christology with facts, persons and symbols of the Holy Scriptures. They are also connected with the truth of being and with cosmology.

Amb.47a.1384 D-1396 A. Comments on St. Gregory Nazianzen.

St. Maximus exalts the unity of God, Man and the world through the medium of Holy Bible and Holy tradition, in the sense that they are comments on St. Gregory. (Amb.47a.1384 D-1396 A).

By comparing Biblical passages, St. Maximus points out the importance of the number seven and, taking issue from the miracle of feeding five thousand people in the desert, he seems to be getting involved with numbers, which, to him, carry a special significance in connection with either the world, or the Trinitarian God, the present and future, or the Unity (number 1), morality, nature and theological philosophy.

Amb.48a.1386 A-1404 A. A comment of numbers.

Numbers assume a theological and philosophical importance, according to St. Maximus as they manifest εὐαγγελία, harmonization and, by extension, the search of human continuation on earth. (Amb.48a.1386 A-1404 A).

Μονάς (Unit) plays a very important part in the analysis of the numbers since it is from Μονάς that everything starts and gets unified in a loving and evolutionary way.

Amb.49a.1404 BC. "Μονάς" as a Symbol.

104 See P.G.36 405 B

105 About the Theologic and Philosopher significance of Numbers see Ν.Νικολακάκου Ν."Θείματα Φιλοσοφίας" pp.94-100
Póthos, Eros and Agape

Póthos as Unity stands out as a symbol of mystical theology, of Holy Economy as well as of virtue and knowledge. (Amb.49a.1404 BC).

Amb.50a.1404—1405 C. A comment on charisma.

The two charismsas, Ἀγάπη and Αληθινή γνώση are both on St. Maximus's mind (Amb.50a.1404 D—1405 C).

Amb.51a.1405—1408 C. A comment on Basil the Great.

Basil the Great also is, by St. Maximus's standards, a model of existence. (Amb.51a.1405 D—1408 C).

At this point the Holy figure is praised as an example of virtue.

Amb.52a.1408 C—1417 C. A critique of the reason.

Ambigua ends with a critique of reason. (Amb.52a.1408 C—1417 C).

St. Maximus stresses the importance of reason leading man to God, but, on the other hand, it confines him as to the comprehension of Mystery. The Mysteries (Trinitarianism, Holy Substance, Humanization) are ύπαρξις of reason.

Reason is rendered powerless when compared to Paradox. The only way to rise above the obstruction of ύπαρξις is by establishing an erotic and loving relationship between God and Man. At this point where reason stops, the eros (or love) for God starts. However, reason precedes eros and love since it is purification and apathy. Eros is of a reasonable nature, the epitomy of logic.

St. Maximus ends "Ambigua" by pleading to God for his intervention during the Ritual conducted by John the Archbishop of Cyzikos.

In "Ambigua", St. Maximus gives prominence to Orthodox facts and views on "Trinitarian Divinity", "Humanization", "World and Man", by interpreting the works of the two writers.

Triadological "Ambigua".

In the reports—comments of Triadological content, the truth about
Divinity comes out. The Holy Substance is regarded as One, the unity of the three Persons. The Monarchy of the Father is stressed so as for Divinity not to be accused of being a multitude of Gods and for authentic faith not to be accused of being destitute, which involves denying God's sociability. So Dualism is inevitably avoided.

St. Maximus gets round Polytheism which is based on human conceivability.

As an Orthodox Father he leaves behind the idealistic concept of deity according to which the Holy is simply a creative force devoid of any internal way of existence, impersonal and unrelated. There is no longer Dualism and disruption of unity (good-evil, God-world, Man-world, soul-body), since the Father constitutes the only beginning. The unity and sociability of the Tritarian God is also expressed through the "One Common Holy Energy" which is experienced by Man through analyzing rationally the "acting" and the "acted". The unity of the One Holy Energy, which οὐντεῖ θεός the beings, is experienced by Man only after the stage of θόνθε, (understanding), of analyzing "νοοθέτειων" (those understood), a process which ends up in harmony, in the unity and unification of "δύνα" (those who are) and "ὑπαρκεία" (those who exist). The Trinitarian God, the corner-stone of every Theology, Metaphysics and Ontology, is experienced and presented by St. Maximus as both a united and unitifying existence, as a loving and erotic way of existence and co-existence.

Christological "Ambigua".

106. P.G. 91 1036 AD

107. Polytheism is founded upon human comprehensibility, as the Greek group of twelve gods suggests: every single god or deity represents, and thus deifies, a distinct and separate human particularity or impulse. The presence of the deification of "νοοθέτειων" (those understood) is strong in the ancient cult of Orphics. In this ancient Theology there is a merger of Mythos, logos "θόνθε" and "νοοθέτειων".
The image of a perfect God and Man is expressed successfully in
the person of Jesus Christ. He is the embodiment of the Holy and
the human nature. Jesus Christ is free of sin and also represents
the model of unity, of the qualities to be adopted by man based on
his ability to make a free choice. In these references as well,
unity, unification and harmony are stressed as a model of
existence and of co-existence between the divine and the human in
an absolute and "Μονοδικός" (Singular) way.

St. Maximus regards the co-existence of the Holy and Human
elements in the person of Jesus Christ as an extraordinary event a
"Paradox". The term "Paradox" stresses the absolutely unique way of
unity and unification and signifies, at the same time, the mystical
nature of unity with God, the theosis "κατὰ χάριν" (by grace)
through Humanization. The Crucified and Resurrected love and eros
of God for Man, transcends the incomprehensible and inconceivable
fact of the Humanization and the "μνημεία" of Human beings. The
absolute love and eros of God for Man re-establishes the unity and
the community of God and Man at a personal level. Jesus Christ, as
God-Man Himself, constitutes the direct and Unique (that can not
happen again in the same way) reality of unification through the
Church. Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church and every Man can
partake of his by means of Holy Communion.

Jesus Christ, the pre-eternal Logos, becomes eternal (the whole
human species), temporal and "αἰωνικός" (the particular human
being). Jesus Christ is the link between the man who lived
prior to the Original sin and the one who lived after, simply by
erasing the burden of sin through the miracle of his Resurrection.

Cosmological "Ambigua".
The Unity with the Logos of God is also stressed by St. Maximus
in his cosmological references.

---

108. About the Eternal and the Aeonic see.
D. Staniloae "Φιλοσοφικὰ καὶ Θεολογικὰ ἔρωτιμα" p.44.
S. Kierkegaard "Π Ξνοοί τῆς "Ἀγωνίας" p.103.
N. Nisiotis "Ὑπαρξισμός καὶ Χριστιανικὴ Πλοτις" p.48.
The image of a perfect God and Man is expressed successfully in the person of Jesus Christ. He is the embodiment of the Holy and the human nature. Jesus Christ is free of sin and also represents the model of unity, of the qualities to be adopted by man based on his ability to make a free choice. In these references as well, unity, unification and harmony are stressed as a model of existence and of co-existence between the divine and the human in an absolute and "Mοναδικός" (Singular) way.

St. Maximus regards the co-existence of the Holy and Human elements in the person of Jesus Christ as an extraordinary event a "Paradox". The term "Paradox" stresses the absolutely unique way of unity and unification and signifies, at the same time, the mystical nature of unity with God, the theosis "κατά χάριν" (by grace) through Humanization. The Crucified and Resurrected love and eros of God for man, transcends the incomprehensible and inconceivable fact of the Humanization and the "μορφή" of Human beings. The absolute love and eros of God for man re-establishes the unity and the community of God and man at a personal level. Jesus Christ, as God-Man Himself, constitutes the direct and Unique (that can not happen again in the same way) reality of unification through the Church. Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church and every man can partake of his by means of Holy Communion.

Jesus Christ, the pre-eternal Logos, becomes eternal (the whole human species), temporal and "αἰωνικός" (the particular human being). Jesus Christ is the link between the man who lived prior to the Original sin and the one who lived after, simply by erasing the burden of sin through the miracle of his Resurrection.

Cosmological "Ambigua".
The Unity with the Logos of God is also stressed by St. Maximus in his cosmological references.

---

108 About the Eternal and the Aeonic see.
D. Staniloae "Φιλοσοφικά καὶ Θεολογικά Ερωτήματα" p. 44.
S. Kierkegaard "Η Έννοια τῆς 'Αγωνίας" p. 103.
N. Nisiotis "Ὑπαρξισμός καὶ Χριστιανική Πλοήγησις" p. 48.
Cosmos, the world, according to St. Maximus, is analyzed by means of oral and written speech and by means of logic, in logoi-truth. "Δόγμα τῶν δόγμων", the truth, or rather the parts of the whole truth (essence, kinesis, difference, position species...) mean "perichoresis", and lead up to the One Creator, the common origin. By extension, "Δόγμα τῶν δόγμων" lead up to the "Ένα Λόγος". This unity also signifies the unity of the "Creative Cause", the "Ἔνας" (One)\(^{109}\), as well as the "Many", since "logoi", the aspects of the truth, are many.

Every being is a part of the truth of its species, without being confused with other species, because it is a part of the common divine and creative energy and, at the same time, it is a part-member of its species, that is, it has a particular nature.

In his cosmological references, St. Maximus sounds more philosophical, or better still, Metaphysical, as he is led, through natural philosophy, to the Holy Cause, the "Ὅμοιος ὁν".

If Metaphysics is to be defined as the quest for the Holy Creative Cause based on nature, then St. Maximus could be called a metaphysical thinker since he believes that natural revelation is equivalent to the Gospel, the direct revelation of God to Man.

He is metaphysical in another sense as well: he believes that natural theory helped the saints who lived prior to God's Humanization to reach "theosis". Not only does natural philosophy refer to the creative cause, but it also sanctifies those participating in the creative force. In this sense natural philosophy is metaphysical. The references to model persons of the Old Testament serve to stress Theosis, the metaphysical meeting with God.

The comparisons between model persons of the Old Testament and persons and situations of the New Testament, the references to the human nature of Jesus Christ and his antiheresy and ascetic point of view constitute St. Maximus's teaching, which is always in

\(^{109}\) About the Plotinian term "Ἔνας" see. B. Russel "The Philosophy after Aristotle". pg. 119
agreement with the "Εἰκόν" concept, the Trinitarian theory.

Anthropological "Ambigua".

In his references to Man, St. Maximus points out the unity between soul and body, reason and sentiment. The soul-body unity signifies, by extension, the unity between spirit and matter, between the divine and the human, leaving behind, at the same time, the theory of the pre-existence of the souls which regards the world as the house of evil and the body as the prison of the soul. This soul-body unit also supports, by extension, the erotic, active relationship of God, man and the world. Evidently, there is no dualism, no division, no alienation from God. By means of the reason-sentiment unity, the reasonable way of being is unified with the experiences of the existence which come from the world and raise the sentiments. Reason and sentiment in Man are united by means of "apathy" and the transcendence of individualism. "Apathy" is the harmony of reason and sentiment, the harmony of the divine, the human and the worldly ("Διόνυσιος των θυσιών"), will and truth. By means of this kind of "apathy", this resignation from individualism, this unity of reason and sentiment, Man frees himself from sin, transcends the limits between God and Man (that he himself has set) and experiences eros. Eros, in this sense is the product of the Mind, of the Understanding and the understood which Man senses (ἐνιασάγησεν), through reason. Man reaches (ἀνηγγεία) the divine through reason, he reaches the creative divine energy through the reasonable beings, through logic, according to practical philosophy. Thus he transcends the individualistic will and finally, he resigns from freedom for the sake of God (ἐκκαθητεὶ τῷ αὐτοκοσμικῷ σῶμα τοῦ Θεό). Eros is a personal meeting of God and Man, a kind of renunciation to the "Holy Energy" and Will by means of reason. This eros is of rational nature, it is a personal participation in the truth and in the Trinitarian Personal energy. It is, like Man, a mediator between God and Man. It is the transition towards the unfulfilled desire for unity (of God and Man), towards Love.
In the beginning, Man feels the desire for the unity of God, Man and the world (λόγοι τῶν θειών). By means of reason and logic he experiences the unity between God and Man according to the logical erotic will and reality. He reaches the perfect unity between God and Man through loving "perichoresis", he experiences love as unity of God, Man and the world. According to this transitional unity, unification and harmony (pothos, eros, agape), Man acts as a mediator between God and the world. He is (in the ecclesiastic dialect) "ἐπταργός, χρημάδ, διαγγελέας" of the Holy Grace in the world towards the divine, by grace, unity. Man, being a mediator, functions, in a unifying way, between God and the world, either by mental conception, or by logical analysis, or by direct communication (practical philosophy, every day way of being).

According to St. Maximus, man is a "Genius" being in his erotic, logical and mental unification, since he transcends individual will, since he finds himself in the truth of the beings, in his authenticity, in his participation in the divine actions. The nature of the genious and intelligent being, the being towards theosis, is based on continuous inner experience, "ἐνθρώποι", on "ἐναντίον" and on "ἀναγώγηκ". By means of this inner experience a continuous Metamorphosis takes place in Man, a continuous transition from the part to the total, from the ontic to the ontologic.

In his references to Man, St. Maximus, always aims at Man's salvation.

This happens because the writer is, above all, unifying, partaking and "perichorematic". He stresses the unification of Man, of each and every one, (subject-being), the participation in the common origin of creation, and the "perichoresis" of the divine and the human will. St. Maximus's main concern is Man. It is in Man that he stresses the unity, the unification and the harmony, the evolutionary movement from "κατ' ἐκκόνα" towards "καθ' ἀνθρώπαν", by means of logic, sentiment and especially by means of our

---

110. About the "Genius" see P.G.91 1172. S.Kierkegaard S.'Η Ἐννοια τῆς ἀνθρώπινος'.pp.37,105,119,121.
relationship with God.

Anti-heresy "Ambigua".
The concept of unity-unification is also pointed out in St. Maximus' references opposing heresy. His anti-heresy point of view stresses the opposition to disruption and, by extension, it points out unity, harmony and perichoresis.

In particular, St. Maximus is opposed to the theory of Arius which disrupts the harmonious relationship between God the Father and God-Logos. He is opposed to the concept that one of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity is superior to the others. The word "Son" does not imply the inferiority of Logos compared to the Father, but the way in which God the Father relates to God-Logos.

These beliefs, connected with inferiority and superiority in Triadology, stress the disruption of the Divine, of the ontological corner-stone and, by extension, they stress the disruption of Man, of the world and of the relationship between them. These disruptive tendencies are a result of the human will to comprehend the Divine. By being opposed to them, St. Maximus transcends the logical analysis that the theologic reason creates and uses the term "perichoresis" in his references to the Trinity, to Jesus Christ, to Man as well as to the World. The points of view

1. The term "Ontological Foundation" marks the starting point of every writer's ontological mental reflection, be he a Father or a Philosopher. By St. Maximus's standards, the Ontological Foundation is God, who firstly created and ever since has been holding the world together. Besides Plato, Plotinus and Origen hold the belief that God has created the world of Eternal ideas. This term manifests the creative force behind the world and the truth. We believe that the concept of the "Ontological Foundation" by each writer is in accordance with the concept of the world, Man and their relationship.

2. St. Maximus uses the term "perichoresis" in all his theories of God, Jesus Christ, world and man, stressing their interaction. Being, as a Mystical Father himself, able to experience the unity among God, Man and the world, he uses the term "perichoresis" to stress the active unifying relationship of beings
and the terms which refer to the harmonious and unifying relationship, are used by St. Maximus in connection to all levels of reference. In this way he aims at showing the relationship, as well as the reflection (according to the way of being) of God upon Man and the World.

St. Maximus points out the unity and harmony also by being opposed to Monophysitism, Monoenergetism and Monothelitism.

St. Maximus stresses the harmonious unity between the divine and the human nature, the divine and the human energy and will as opposed to the theories supporting the absorption of the human nature, energy and will by the divine ones.

In Jesus Christ, the unique Model of unification, the divine and the human elements co-exist in harmony. It is by means of this co-existence that Man is able to reach theosis by grace and through participation in the divine will and energy.

The concept of the authenticity of human nature is re-established by this, Orthodox point of view and reality. In the person of Jesus Christ the perfect human nature, devoid of sin, is to be found. In the same way, those who fight against sin experience the authenticity of their nature and through this authenticity they reach theosis.

In "Ambigua", St. Maximus mainly tries to refute the theory of the pre-existence of the souls. By doing so, he deprives Monothelitism of its foundation, since this theory is based on the belief that the human body, and every human action in general, is the prison of the more authentic element, the soul. This point as well stresses the opposition to disruption and dualism and consequently, unity, unification and harmony are considered as the only theoretical and practical experience, as the only starting point towards theosis.

Having in mind St. Maximus's opposition to heresy, disruption and
dualism are considered its corner stones and prerequisites.

According to St. Maximus, the term heresy refers to anything that involves "superiority", anything that disrupts the harmonious relationship, anything that involves dualism. As opposed to this, anything that is real and leads to theosis is unifying, harmonious and "perichorematic" according to St. Maximus's Orthodox experience.

In St. Maximus's point of view, Orthodoxy does not consider as heretical only the theories that do not accept the reality of the Holy Trinity or the reality of the Humanization. Anything that accepts the disruption of man even, is also considered as heretical, since this affects the truth of God and Humanization as well.

There is a kind of interaction between these heresies beliefs, whether they refer to the Holy Trinity or to Humanization. Even heresy is of perichorematic nature. The one misinterpretation interacts with the other and consequently there is a distortion of the truth, an alienation from salvation, from theosis and, by extension, the relationship between God, Man and the world is disturbed.

The concept of Trinitarian God in Orthodoxy influences all the other concepts of man and the world. The concept of God in heresy has the same impact. The theory of the remote God is the corner stone of the division of Man into body and soul, matter and spirit. The body (or the matter) is inferior to the soul (or the spirit) as God is not near the world and the world functions as a form of punishment. The corner stones of the disruptive, heretic beliefs are, in general, the concepts of God which predetermine Him according to the mistaken philosphical concept of God. Since God was motivated by the urge of punishment in creating the world as we know it, then, it is impossible that He should have transformed into a human being, and if so, certainly not a perfect one. In no case should He be regarded as the embodiment of a balanced proportion between the Holy and human nature. This philosophic theory has had a profound influence upon man's interpretation of how God reveals Himself to man. Perhaps that accounts for man's persistence in coming up with logical conclusions, even when God reveals Himself to him.

PART I.
Heresy is based on the products of logical one. The quest for the truth based only on human logic and devoid of the relationship with the holy revelation, the persistence in the literal, and not the metaphorical, meaning of things, as well as the lack of participation in the human experiences, constitute the motive and the starting point of the heretical, disruptive theories.

Personalistic "Ambigua"

The truth, on the other hand, consists of the harmony between holy revelation, human experience and logic. It is this kind of harmony and unification that St. Maximus, as an Orthodox Father and, in particular, as a Mystical Father, stresses.

St. Maximus, as a Mystical Father, experiences this unity and harmony in an active erotic way of being and of relating, as a Man, to God and to the world. He experiences and he presents the unity and the harmony of the human logic, the truth (λόγος τῶν δινῶν) and God Logos. He presents the harmony between theory and action, between dogmatic teaching and human authenticity.

He continuously refers to natural, moral and practical philosophy in order to point out the humanizing unity of the divine, the natural and the human truth. St. Maximus cares about Man in general, but also about man in particular, since he refers to the particular aporias of St. Dionysios and St. Gregorius, thus referring to particular beings. St. Maximus' work is personal for many reasons. Firstly, it has a personal foundation as it is based on a personal theory (Personal God, personal salvation, personal relationship

---

114 Heretical doctrines, chiefly relying upon the verdicts of the strict logical and philosophical way of contemplation, tend to come as a result of an individualistic, self-contained mental concept. What accurately provides the measure of God is the human rationalization alone. By same token, Lord is either the Father's creation or only God with nothing human inside Him.

115 About Mysticism as a larger unity and harmonization see. E. From "Ψηφανάλυση κατ' Ἐρημάχαση" p.106.
between God and Man and personal relationship between Man and world). Secondly, it is personal because it refers to the personal participation in the personal holy energy, in which the writer himself partook (according to the orthodox point of view).

The personal and mystical nature of the work is particularly stressed by the references to the experience of "Pothos", "Eros" and "Agape".

The Person-Man longs for unification with God and the World. He exists in active perichoresis with God when he resigns from the individualistic will in his erotic relationship with God and, by extension, he reaches love and experiences the active unity of God, Man and the World. Man, the human person, who is St. Maximus's main concern, is at the same time, the main ontologic state, authenticity itself and the realisation of the truth of Nature.
Chapter II.

The Personal nature of Pothos, Eros and Agape according to St. Maximus the Confessor.

The Aporias by St. Maximus consists of 2 epistles addressed to two specific persons. It refers to the Personal Trinitarian relationship and existence, to the Holy Energy, to the perichoresis and to the personal and substantial unity of the two natures incorporated in Jesus Christ's person.

Man's authenticity lies in the realization of his personal union with God, with the Reasons of beings and with the world in general.

Man takes on and preserves his form as a person by maintaining his originality and getting actively related to God and the Holy Existence on the way to theosis.

That personal character emerges from the nature of the text (epistles) as well as its contents (Triadology, Christology) including the teachings (on experiencing the truth, the relationship to God).

Ambigua is a text of a personal nature because it is deeply rooted in the trinitarian personal relationship and hinged on the personal revelation and unity between the holy and human truth found in Jesus Christ's Personality. It brims with the exclusive, unique and loving relationship among God, man and world. This personal relationship, unity and co-existence, is particularly stressed by the unifying experiences (states, possibilities, movements-actions) of pothos, eros and agape referring either to Trinitarian existence, or to Christ's Divine figure or to Man. No matter whether they refer to a holy or a human existence, none of the others is excluded. God's Pothos and Eros are always associated with the Holy Trinity, the Three Persons. They are a form of energy aimed at both Man and World. In the same way, Man's Pothos and Eros bear a close association with God, Man and the world.

It is in this sense, in the sense of unity and active unification, that we will present the viewpoint of St. Maximus about "Pothos", "Eros" and "Agape". We will present these three personal
existential experiences-actions of unity in the sense of the personal unity between God, Man and the world, always seeking to reveal, to bring to the light\textsuperscript{116} the essential nature of these relational actions.

Our first aim will be to identify the self consciousness of the human "Pothos" for unity with and towards perfection and, in particular, for unity with God, for theosis.

Our second aim will be to try to highlight St. Maximus' teaching on "Eros", aiming at revealing the godly nature of the personal erotic relationship and unity between God, Man, and the world.

As far as the third aspect of the personal unity, that is "Agape", is concerned, we will highlight the ontological, energetic and agapetic unity between God, Man and the world, always according to St. Maximus.

On this basis, we will arrive at the main part of our discussion reference that is, the personal nature of the agapetic energetic unity of God, Man and the world, making a specific reference to St. Maximus the confessor and in particular to "Ambigua".

\textsuperscript{116}About the view that Phenomenology has to do with the light and that the term means "bring to the light-reveal the truth" see. M. Heidegger "E\v{e}va k\v{e}l Xp\v{e}vos" pp.38-54.
"Personality and Love in Maximus Ambigua"

a. Pothos as defined by St. Maximus the Confessor.

1. Pothos as the Cause of Humanization.

In the first (second) part of St. Maximus’ work, the word Pothos is used in the sense of Eros.

By analyzing the concept of the Pseudo Dionysius according to which Jesus Christ is not merely an ordinary man but the human kind, race in its entirety, St. Maximus projects the Pothos of the Son of God for Man. Christocentric St. Maximus considers the Pothos of the Son of God as the cause of Humanization.

More specifically, St. Maximus is opposed to Gaius the Healer’s erroneous belief according to which Jesus Christ appears as an identifiable man, by countering that the Lord represents the human kind in its entirety. St. Maximus has experienced the true meaning of Humanization, the authentic unity between the Holy and the Human elements in the person of Jesus Christ.

117 About the “Θεομετέωτες” as a singular Judaic ascetic community see.

"Βαπτικά Μελετήματα" issue Β Θεσσαλονίκη 1971 pp.53–58.
S.Agouridis "Ιστορία των Χρόνων τῆς Κατάθλιψης" pp.436 447.

PART I.
Jesus Christ is both perfect God and a perfect Man, untouched by sin. Therefore through that unique unity, the burden of sin and death is removed from Man. It is this very unity and not only the obedience to Holy commandments that leads Man to his redemption. As opposed to Man's first abortive attempt to reach the divine status, God Himself is transformed into a creature in His wish to set a tangible example of the original form of unification. Through suffering as a Man, God is capable of redeeming Man and restoring the unity, between God and Man. Only God Himself, who feels pothos for Man in his human suffering, can save Man by directly communicating with him. Only Jesus Christ as an entire Man (and not as a particular Man) can redeem Man eternally.

About Jesus Christ, as a "Μοναδική" (singular) unity of the divine and the human, see. V.Losky "Η Μοναδική Θεολογία τύχης 'Ανατολικής 'Εκκλησίας".p.171.

At this point we refer to the salvation of Man not only by means of the divine orders, as was the case at the beginning of creation with Adam and Eve, but we also refer to the transcendence of the orders as a means of Salvation according to Jesus Christ. In the person of Jesus Christ, the way to authenticity by upholding the divine orders (as in the Old Testament) is left behind, but it is not totally abolished. In Jesus Christ, the personification of pothos and eros, the formalistic nature of theosis, as a journey towards perfection in the strict sense, is left behind. The absolute nature of love and eros transcends the form and the limited ways of movement towards Perfection. This transcendence takes places according to the participation of each and every Man in the absolute nature of the erotic pothos of God for Man. This participation is the realization of the human pothos for God, a pothos whose model is the pothos of God by means of which He becomes Man.
Man's salvation can only be achieved by Jesus Christ acting above and beyond every limited human comprehension. Jesus is, by definition, quite unlike "every other being"\textsuperscript{120}, so He falls far beyond Man's grasping powers and cannot be appraised in terms of human logic. He cannot be limited to the confines of a mental shape. Far from being a philosophical substance\textsuperscript{121} or a

\textsuperscript{120} The characterization of Jesus Christ as "a being that is not the same with the other beings" does not have the same philosophical meaning with the characterization of "Ec\nu\nu" by Heidegger. Jesus Christ is not the same as the philosophical "Ec\nu\nu", that is "a being of larger significance", something absolutely transcendental, because He is not a product of human thought which can be directly limited and defined by it. Contrary to the philosophical analyses and formulations, Jesus Christ is indeed "of a larger significance", because He is, at the same time, "\textit{M\nu\pi\lambda\alpha}" and "\textit{\textpi\kappa\nu\sigma\varepsilon\alpha\lambda\nu}\" for the limited philosophical reality. He is indeed "of a larger significance" because He cannot be understood but, at the same, He includes every human authenticity and truth. He is "of a larger significance" than any other being and than any notion of "Ec\nu\nu" for two reasons: Firstly, because the way of God's transition to the human form is unknown and secondly because Man can experience and become "Christoid" by imitating His way of existence. Consequently, Jesus Christ remains unknown when it comes to the reality of His essence, but constitutes a Model for Man when it comes to His way of existence. According to this dual significance, Jesus Christ is "of a larger significance" since He comprises the unknown and the known, the knowledge and the limitations of knowledge, the ontologic as well as the inconceivable element.

\textsuperscript{121} Jesus Christ is not a philosophical principle or a rational conclusion in His reality. He is above logic because he is not only one thing (a God) or another (a Man). From the philosophical point of view, according to which there is a difference and a distinction between the divine and the human, the "\textit{\kappa\i\nu\o\nu\i\nu} \textit{\acute{\alpha}k\i\nu\eta\i\i\nu}o\nu\i\nu\nu" and the "\textit{\kappa\i\nu\o\nu\i\nu} \textit{\acute{\alpha}k\i\nu\eta\i\i\nu}o\nu\i\nu\nu", Jesus Christ is indeed "\textit{\om\u{e}\rho\o\pi\o\nu\o\u{t}o}\u{c}\" (the transcendence of every condition referring to essence). The philosophical predeterminations and presuppositions of the essences of God and Man, according to the rational conclusions about essence, affirm that Jesus Christ is "\textit{\om\u{e}\rho\o\pi\o\nu\o\u{t}o}\u{c}\" (above essence).

The Fathers used the rational aspect of the philosophical duality (God and Man) in order to formulate the apophatic aspect of Christology. The point of view according to which there is a big gap between God and Man (as a philosophical outcome) at a

\textsuperscript{12}
definable species, Jesus stands out as a complete God and Man at the same time.

That outstanding form of unification which is based on God's pothos for man is a mystery to Man, an eccentric paradox. The human mind, can neither conceive nor limit that reality. Man can merely believe in it.

The reason of this redeeming paradox lies, according to St. Maximus, in God's infinite pothos and eros for man. What comes as a result of this pothos is the incarnation of God's Logos as God veritably turns into the desirable 122 without His Divine Status being diminished. The Logos of God turns into Man, His very gnoseologic level, seems to be one of the foundations of Christological agnosticism.

This point of view is dominant in St. Maximus. This is made obvious by the questions in which the incapability of understanding how it is possible to understand "how" God becomes Man, that is how the divine is united with human, is stressed.P.G.91. 1052 C-1060 C.

122.P.G. 91 1048 C.
creation, by taking on its human nature in an implied, untold way\textsuperscript{123}.

\textsuperscript{1049} D "thy úpér ἡμῶν οἰκονομίαν πεπληρώκεν ".

\textsuperscript{1053} B "καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου ἐνέργει τῷ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἀκραν ἔνωσιν δῖχα τροπῆς συμφεύσαις δεικνύσ τῇ θείᾳ ὁμάθει ἡν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν. ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡ φύσις ὄσον ἑννείσα τῷ φύσει δι' ὀλού περικεχώρηκε, μηδὲν ἁπλίτου ἑντιάπασαι ἔχουσα, καὶ τῆς ἁνθρωπίνης αὐτῇ καθ ὑποδοταίνεν κεχωρισµένον θεότητος. Ἰπερ ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἄληθῶς τὴν ἡμῶν οὐσίαν οὐσιωθεῖς ὁ ὑπερούσιος λόγος συνήψε τῷ καταφαί τῆς φύσεως καὶ τῶν αὐτὰς φυσικῶν καθ ὑπεροχὴν τὴν ἁπλίταν, καὶ γέγονεν ἁνθρώπως, τὸν ὑπὲρ φύσιν τοῦ πῶς εἶναι τρόπον ἔχον συνηµένον τῷ τοῦ εἶναι λόγῳ τῆς φύσεως, "

What is highlighted by St. Maximus is the unknown, mysterious and paradoxical fact of the Incarnation (Man is incapable of understanding how God becomes a man), as well as the indisputable certainty that, in doing so, God wished to redeem Man from sin.

In that sense, pothos is a form of energy channelled by God towards man. It stands for the linking bond which unites God and Man at an ontological and personal level. God moves erotically towards man by assuming both the Holy and human natures to help man rise to the Godly status by grace and energy\textsuperscript{124}.

As a form of Holy Energy and re-instatement of the Human race through The Lord, pothos contains both elements of incarnation:the

\textsuperscript{123} P.G. 91 1048 D-1049 B.

\textsuperscript{124} P.G. 91 1004 D-D
non-requisite (ἀνποὺνθέτων) and the pre-requisite (ἐμποὺνθέτων)\textsuperscript{125}. In other words, incarnation consists of both self-eros (non-requisite) and God's wish to redeem Man of sin (pre-requisite), to prevent Man from moving towards non-being \textsuperscript{126}. This clarification also highlights the fact that pothos is a form of pre-existing energy, a form of unfulfilled, fulfilling and fulfilled energy which signifies the unity between God and Man or the quest for this unity. In this sense, pothos is "self-pothos" on the part of God but also pothos for Man.

Pothos is the pre-existing cause of incarnation which, in its turn, can be traced to God's self-pothos and His wish to redeem Man of sin. From the human viewpoint it could be argued that, by experiencing pothos, man wishes to get united with God. Looking into God's pothos for Man in reversed order, the human pothos is the cause of Man's ontological theosis.

2. The Pothos of Man for theosis. A Anthropocentric reference to Pothos based on the models of Jesus Christ and Apostle Paul.

St. Maximus's subsequent reference to pothos is of an anthropological nature. The human pothos for theosis is analyzed in the second part of his work (1061 A-1417).

St. Maximus regards man's pothos for unification with God as the cause of the resignation of Man from self determination. By reaching his authentic status, being "in the image of God" after a mental and rational process of contemplation, Man rejects the idea

\textsuperscript{125}About the "Ἐμποὺνθέτων " and " Ἀνποὺνθέτων " qualities of the "Ἐναρπακώμες" see.
A.Radôsavlievitch "Γο Μυστήριο τῆς Σωτηρίας".

\textsuperscript{126}G. Florovsky identifies the redemption from moving towards "μη-δύν" (non being) with "γεγένονται" (becoming): "The built is in a continuous "γεγένονται" (becoming) and transcendence of individualism. The cause of this transcendence is the purpose-aim of this movement, that is, theosis"."Ἀνατομικα Προβλημάτων Πλοιεως" p.46 (Comment on PG 91 1093)
of self-determination as he falls in love with Holy Existence, with which he wishes to unite (1076 BC), with God, the supplier of being, of existence, of the movement towards perfection and the way of the movement. God represents the source of existence and the way of moving towards perfection, the archetype. Man reaches theosis because he wishes to exist and move resigned to the Holy Will, to the archetype 1076 B.

According to St. Maximus, pothos is the pothos for existence, for the transcendence of "non-being", of the movement towards "non-being". It is pothos for relationship with God, pothos for theosis, pothos for eternal existence because it signifies the agony of meeting with the Divine, which created both existence and movement.

The Pothos for existence, co-existence and theosis reaches its highest level when Man resigns from his freedom, when he deprives himself of the right of choice because he wants to reach his original status.
According to St. Maximus, this resignation from freedom does not imply that Man will be deprived of one part of his essence. This resignation is the product of γνωτική ἐκχώρησις 127 (1076 B). Man

127. By connecting freedom with the natural movement of Man, St. Maximus suggests the resignation from freedom if this freedom is connected with a nihilistic choice. By "γνωτική ἐκχώρησις", Man disclaims the nihilistic choice, the nihilistic freedom, by partaking in "Εἶναι", in "ἀγαθόν". This happens freely as the resignation is Man's choice, as opposed to the nihilistic concept of freedom (see J.P. Sartre "Εἶναι κατ Μηδέν" p.61).

Freedom in the sense of concession-resignation from the nihilistic freedom is essential according to St. Maximus, because through it Man re-establishes his authenticity and, at the same time, he partakes, by analogy, in the Soteriologic event. Jesus Christ is the Model of natural freedom and participation in the ontologic, since He does not have an individualistic (egotistical will) "γνωτικόν ἔλεγμα" but only a natural will. He resigned during His fast in the desert and in the garden of Gethsemane.

(About freedom as a state of movement and as a possibility of choice between good and evil according to St. Maximus see. D. Staniloae "Φιλοσοφικά κατ Θεολογικά ἐρωτήματα" comment on p.148-149.
cedes the choice of his actions, of his authenticity, to God, in his pothis to be authentic, real. (1076 CD).

In his authentic human pothis for unity between Man and God, Man experiences the divine will, he transcends the individual will and he becomes a true ontological existence.

This attitude encapsulates the embedded meaning lying under the apostolic doctrine Ἰν ζοῆ ἐν θεοτικη ζεϊ ἐν ἐν θεοτικὴ ἡμερήσιος as well as the mystical meaning of the Lord's agonizing resignation to His Father's commandment during His prayer in Gesthsemane garden, as summarized in the phrase Let thy will be done; not mine.

Those two models of theosis and originality are employed by St. Maximi to proclaim the turn in the beginning of creation (God Creator) and eternal movement towards the truth as the avenues leading man to the state of theosis.

In this sense of pothis, according to the two models, Man longs

---

128. About the view that by means of "γνωσικὴ ἐκφώρησιν" perfect knowledge, God the Creator and the truth of beings can be experienced see. V. Lozky "Ἡ Μυστικὴ Θεολογία τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας" p.122. where the following can be found :"By deserting everything the Saints accept perfect knowledge of the creatures".

129. Here we can see the relationship between Mystic Theology and Existentialism at two levels: the level of the truth and that of existence.

The experience of the truth, of the ontologic, by Jesus Christ and by Apostle Paul create the proportionate way of existence, the concession to the Divine will and the love of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ and Apostle Paul exist in accordance to the purpose of existence, in accordance to the experienced truth.

The Existentialist, with the term Dasein, experiences the truth and exists in proportion to the experienced truth. The existence-Dasein cares for and is in agony for "Εξείλυ"; it exists in proportion to the revealed truth.

Even though there is a big gap among Jesus Christ, Apostle Paul and Dasein, there seems to be a relationship as well, when it comes to the fact of the relationship of the being with the truth during the predetermination of the way of being. In all three cases, the last stage, the truth of existence, predetermines the way of existing.
for eternal existence (fear of death)\textsuperscript{130} and he is in agony to exist in "co-existence" with God in an agapetic and perichorematic way.\textsuperscript{(1076 C)}. Because of this agony and pothos, Man experiences the creative divine existence and energy. He experiences the fall to sin, the disruption of the unity between God and Man because of γνωσικόν θέλημα and he reaches divine energy, authenticity and the "reasons of the beings" \textsuperscript{(1080 AB)} and the "Holy virtues" \textsuperscript{(1081 D,1084 D)}, by means of Jesus Christ and by means of resigning from individual.

\textsuperscript{130}The shocking experience of death is, from the point of Philosophy, the cause of the ascension of the person to the level of its essence. There is some interrelation between philosophy and theology as far as the quest for the essence, the eternal and the eternity are concerned: they are both based on the transcendence of Death. See. I.N. Theodorakopoulos "Ελευθερία στην Φιλοσοφία". Vol.B.p.85
According to this concept of pothos, Man partakes in both "El\vai" (the truth) and "Pluyev\vdat" towards theosis, by partaking in the virtues. This happens when Man resigns from the individual choice by means of the two quests and revelations: one which reveals God the Creator and one which refers to rebirth in the person of Jesus Christ.

The pothos of Man, the meeting and the co-existence with God, the unifying agony of Man, constitute the beginning of his course towards theosis. This course is based on the preservation of the reasons of the beings, of the truth of Man, since it is a turn towards "El\vai" and "Pluyev\vdat".

In its anthropological form, pothos is a pothos for unity with God, with the divine creative and preservative energy and with the divine, by grace, theotic energy. Human pothos is at the same time agony for unity with truth-authenticity (which constitutes an expression of the divine energy) and with the "\vde\vke\vpos \vdi\vso\vme\vna" theosis by grace (which constitutes another expression of the divine energy).

It could therefore be argued that the wish for theosis, as well as Pothos (the sought after and the pursuit itself) do converge in Maximus's mind. There is a philosophical concurrence between El\vai (Being) and Pluyev\vdat (Becoming) which marks the process.\footnote{The two general principles of Philosophy, "El\vai" and "Pluyev\vdat" come together in the fact and the experience of "pothos" for unity. "El\vai", as a more general truth of the beings according to the idealistic philosophy which originates from Parmenides and Plato, constitutes the essential content of "pothos", because it includes the meanings or the ideas. Through the pothos for authenticity, the human person partakes in the "\vvo\vth\vme\vna" truth, in the ideas as a means towards the realisation of authenticity. "Pluyev\vdat", as an eternal movement (in its philosophical sense) towards perfection, is included in the experience of pothos, since pothos is not the realization but the action towards the realisation of unity. The fact that, in the experience of pothos, the idea mingles with the evolution, that is "\vke\vnu\vno" (the immovable) mingles with "\vke\vnu\vlos" (movement), is paradoxical, according to the philosophical point of view.}
By means of Pothos, Man unifies the human "Εἶναι" and "Προέσωσαί" with their Creator. He unifies the Creator with His creation.

In Man's pothos, the divine personal energy is united with the truth as the creation, the beings, is a product of the one Divine Trinitarian energy. It is this energy that Man experiences by feeling pothos for God and theosis.

By longing for theosis, Man becomes a Person, that is an ontological existence. He is, at the same time, a person and the whole mankind. Man reaches the theological-Orthodox authenticity, that is theosis, as well as the philosophical authenticity, that is, ontological existence by means of personal pothos and resignation from the materialistic will.

It is this ontological and theotic unity that St. Maximus highlights in his interpretation of the human being as "ΜοιραPARTMENTESO" and as Ἐδώ δέλθημα of God. (1080 C, 1084 BC, 1085 C).

1080 C "καὶ μὴ δεινὸς ἄλλος πρὸ τῷ ἔδιας ἀρχῶς κατὰ πόδαν ἐπιθεμένως ἔλεγον, οὐκ ἀπορρέει θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῷ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνατάσει θεοῦ γίνεται καὶ μοῖρα θεοῦ λέγεται τῷ μετέχειν προσπονίως θεοῦ.

Orthodox Theology is the realisation of the authenticity of existence. In this sense, the philosophical ideas are included in it (in active perichoresis) as ways of participating in perfection and not simply as general principles according to which the world is analyzed. Mystical theology could be described more as an existential experience and reality and less as a revelation of the truth of the world. The realizations of what is true, the truths and the principles, the meanings and the ideas are of a redemptive, existential, unifying and deontological nature. The principles of "Εἶναι" (being) and "Προέσωσαί" (becoming) are not merely "ἀποτελεῖσθαι" about the truth of the world but suggestions and revelations of the existential authenticity, that is, they are experiences. Mystical Theology reveals "Εἶναι" and "Προέσωσαί" as facts (Man partakes in a more general truth, the reasons of beings, he moves and he becomes). Consequently, by means of this revelation "Εἶναι" (Being) and "Προέσωσαί" (becoming) are transformed into experiences of unity, into experienced unifying actions.

PART I.
"Personality and Love in Maximus Ambigua"

"καὶ ἐστὶ μοίρα Θεοῦ, ὡς ὢν, διὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτοῦ λόγον, καὶ ὡς υγιής, διὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ εῦ εἶναι αὐτοῦ λόγον, καὶ ώς θεός, διὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ τοῦ ἄει εἶναι αὐτοῦ λόγον, ώς τοῦτος ἴμμας καὶ κατ' αὐτοῦς ἐνεργήσας, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ἐαυτῶν μὲν τῷ Θεῷ μόνῳ δι' ὄλου ἐνθέμενος, τὸν δὲ Θεόν μόνον ἐαυτῷ δι' ὄλου ἐντυπώσαντος καὶ καὶ μορφώσας."

"Εἰ γὰρ εἶναι δυνατόν τὸν ὑπὲρ τὰ ὁντα τὰ ὁντα τῶν ὄντων ἀνιλαμβάνεσθαι. ἄλλ' ὡς ἔδοξε θελήματα γινώσκειν αὐτὸν τὰ ὁντα φαμεν, προοδέντες καὶ τοῦ λόγου τὸ εὐθυγραμμόν. Εἰ γὰρ θελήματι τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε, καὶ οὖν ἰδίας ἀντερεῖς λόγος, γινώσκειν δὲ τὸ ἔδοξε θελήμα τὸν Θεόν εὐθυγραμμόν, τε λέγειν ἀεί καὶ διακόνιον ἐστίν, ἐκατον δὲ τῶν γενομένων θέλων πεποίηκεν, ὅρα ὡς ἔδοξε θελήματα ὁ Θεός τὰ ὁντα γινώσκει, ἐπειδὴ καὶ θέλων τὰ ὁντα πεποίηκεν."

Man is "Μοῖρα Μέλος" of God both by grace and by relationship. He is a member of God, he is identified by God, not by means of the mind or of the senses, but as ἔδοξε θελήμα (God's will)\textsuperscript{132}.

God identifies his creatures as His own members when the human creature is purified from sin and turns to Him. The human creature identifies God by remaining in his original natural state. At this point, St. Maximus mainly refers to the preservation of the reasons of beings of the truth and, at the same time, he implies the ascetic effort of every Man.

The unity between the human logic and mind and the Mind of God constitutes the main ascetical effort in the search for the truth. Ascesis is not of an external, space-time nature but of a personal existential nature. In his pothos to be united with God, Man does not fight against matter or the world but against his own logic and

\textsuperscript{132}About the theory that God knows Man as ""Ιδίον Θελήμα"" see. PG 91 1085. D.Staniloae "Φιλοσοφίκη καὶ Θεολογική ἔρωτήματα" pp.182-183
understanding.

At this point, St. Maximus highlights the pothos of Man to become "Ποιήμα Μελος" of God by means of his effort towards unity with the logic and the Mind of God. This human pothos becomes a mental and logical unity by means of ascetic effort. The human mind and logic are united with the Mind and logic of God by accession. The projection of pothos on the mind and the logic does not constitute an external imposition but an internal emergence. The pothos for unity-theosis and meeting with God as "Ἐνίον µελος" is originated by the person himself as well as in the person himself.

At this point, pothos functions at a unifying level in two ways:

Pothos initially unites Man to God and, subsequently, it unites human logic and comprehensibility.

The second way is secondary and primary at the same time. It is primary in the sense that by feeling his pothos for unity, Man rationalizes his existence and detaches it from non-being-sin, searching, at the same time, for the reasons of beings. Man experiences his unification with God by letting his pothos emerge. By leaving the movement towards non-being (μὴ-δύν) behind him and by preserving the reasons of beings, Man is truly and actively united with the reason and mind of God on a permanent basis.

The permanent association secures him a participation in "The reasons of beings" and a keen approach of the archetype, the Image.

Humans are in agony to be part of Ἐλεύθερος (Being) and to join the Divine Force which created Ἐλεύθερος, the truth. By means of his pothos, Man is in agony to exist truly-ontologically and according to the way of existence of God. In this sense, human pothos, as pothos for the Image, constitutes a transcendence even of philosophy (in the sense of ontology). Man does not long to exist

According to St. Maximus, asceticism is more of a spiritual than of a material nature. About this see B.Tatakis "Ἡ Βουκαβρικὴ Φιλοσοφία" p.91: "According to St. Maximus, asceticism is not the torture of the flesh, which by many, is thought to be impure, but the purification of the spirit and the soul that leads to union with God, who is spirit and truth".
in his truth, in "in His own Image" but he longs to reach the archetype, God, the Image, as well. Pothos, in this sense, constitutes the reaching of "καθ ὁμοιωματίαν".

In this sense, pothos, according to St. Maximus, is of an existential-personal nature. It is pothos for unity with God at an existential and energetical level. It is a unity of logic and understanding. In particular, according to St. Maximus, it is pothos for unity with the "archetype", with perfection.

According to St. Maximus's terminology, Man struggles to perfect himself to the point that his image fits the Holy archetype, by preserving the reasons, the truth.

By extension, pothos stands for Man's endeavour to rise above sin and to thrust himself forward leaving behind the finite and imperfect conditions ruling his ordinary life. In order for Man to establish himself as a functional member of perfection and theosis, he must be based on his created naturalness by God.

Theosis means the successful accomplishment of his mission. This is due to the fact that pothos marks a pre-existing moving condition intrinsic to the human nature which is governed by Holy Laws, devised by God Himself and evidenced by Holy Energies. These Laws are experienced by Man and can deify Man as they merge with the experienced divine energy in an evolutionary, relative and perichorematic way. This concept is far from giving rise to a reversive movement or supporting the theory of the pre-existence of the souls. On the contrary, with the use of such terms as reasons of beings, Archetype and, in particular, Destiny and Member, the autonomous reversive order, selfpothos and selfperfection are transcended. By the term Reason of beings implies the ontological unification of all beings into one truth.

The term Image demonstrates the depiction of an archetype rather than the selfdepiction of perfection. Both the reversive movement

---

1134 About perfection as preservation of the reasons of beings, see Comment on D.Staniloae "Φιλοσοφικά κατ Θεολογικά 'Ερωτήματα" pp.186-187.

PART I.
and the self-revealed pothos for perfection are totally discredited.

By means of Pothos, St. Maximus seems to draw together such concepts as authenticity, reasons of beings, individual ascetic effort, experiencing the agony for theosis, active personal unity between Holy and human energy towards perfection and theosis.

3. The Pothos of God by means of Holy Beauty ("Θελόν κάλος")

According to St. Maximus, the prophet Elijah constitutes a model of the existence which experiences the pothos of God in its authenticity. (1121 C-1124 B).

Astonished by the Glory of God, after internalizing Holy Beauty, the prophet Elijah is inwardly traumatized. By relating to God, Elijah is overwhelmed with astonishment at God's Glory which also results in his trauma.

This arouses the pothos for God in him. The prophet is in search of the truth for which he fights unrelenting battles. He finds
nothing opposing God at a personal level. Having experienced the amazement of God’s Glory, he is unable to experience anything opposing, any real or personal disruption in the relationship of God with Man. He experiences the Divine Beauty and Glory in all beings, he is a guard of the divine virtues and he transcends the external oppositions at a personal level. He transcends matter, the materialistic, individualistic will. Finally, by transcending the carnal will, by experiencing the truth, according to the pothos for God, he becomes a participant of the desired goods.

According to St. Maximus, in the case of the model Elijah, pothos constitutes the consequence of the meeting with the Glory and the Beauty of God. It is a consequence of the amazement and the trauma. Pothos precedes the fight for freedom, the struggle against matter and flesh, the strife against the contradictions and the oppositions of individualism and egotism. Every being is in a state of unity with God in terms of the reasons of beings. Having defined this, it could be argued that pothos lies amidst the traumatic condition, the astonishment and the sharing of immaterial goods.

At this point, pothos is the experience that lies between

135. The prophete Elijah, due to his view of the Glory of God, does not experience anything objecting (ανι-κελμένον), contrasting or threatening. According to this concept, beings transcend the gap between the subject and the object by experiencing the Holy Presence while partaking in the absolute unity.

This view of God, according to this concept, is the transcendence of "ανι-κελμελίκην" (objection), of contrast. The person is in the state of "περιέχει", in the content of the relationship (Jaspers) and in a state of reconciliation (see S. Kierkegaard "Η Εννοούμενη τος διώνυς" p.17). By means of this reconciliation, the being is in harmony with the environment, solving the problems of every day life.

At this point as well, we can see the ενδοκοσμική (wordly) radiance of the relationship with God. We can see the significance of the view and the theoretical experience of God at a daily level. By means of this view and theory, contrast is left behind and the harmony and unification of Man with the other beings (persons and objects) is stressed.
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amazement-trauma and the participation in the holy goods. Pothos originates in the amazement of the Glory of God, it becomes internal trauma and it leads to the transcendence of the opposites, of the individual will.

At this point pothos acts as a mediator: At the beginning Man experiences perfection and Holy Magnitude and then he transcends the oppositions.

By means of pothos, the world and the relationship with the world are transformed at a personal level. At this point, pothos constitutes a way of transition of the holy truth in the worldly reality, always at a personal level.\textsuperscript{136}

The prophet Elijah experiences this pothos and it is by means of this pothos that the nature of the relationship, of the co-existence is transformed from individualistic to ontologic. This pothos, the result of the inner experience of the divine Glory and Beauty, transforms individuals into persons-ontological beings of worldly radiance. Methexis, the participation in the truth, is not a product of memory, of auto-memory or of the inner emergence of truth, but a product of the relationship with the Divine Personal Beauty and the Divine Personal Glory. Man is attracted to truth because the latter merges with the Divine Personal Energy.

In other words, methexis-participation is the product of the close personal relationship between God and Man.

\textbf{4. Logical Pothos.}

\textsuperscript{136} By prophesy we mean the conveyance of God's logos and will to the world. St. Maximus highlighted the personal nature of Prophecy by projecting pothos in the person of the Prophet Elijah. The prophet becomes a mediator of the divine will in the world because he himself desired the divine will, the "εὐα γηράμων" (divine likeness). In this sense, prophesy presupposes the personal desire, for the divine truth as well; it does not only constitute the divine application on Man. Prophecy, in this sense, is the meeting of the human pothos for perfection with the divine will for the perfection of the world.
As opposed to the heretical reason, the righteous reason can be labelled as the Pious Reason leading to Salvation, turning, as it does, against ignorance and lust.

Heresy is mainly an effort on the part of Man to understand the mystery of God and Humanization. Man tries to understand and to define God in the same way as philosophy defines "Elwv", that is by means of logical categories. Heresy has been based, mainly since the age of Gnostics, on philosophical concepts. Consequently, it alienates Man from the inner-pious understanding. The rationalistic foundation of heresy alienates Man from God. This alienation lies at the existential level of the relationship of the divine energy with the human one through understanding. Heresy is not pious because it is based on the "understanding" of God by means of logic, thus confining Him. Logical understanding and confinement also mean domination on what is understood. In this sense, they degrade God to the level of an object, like all the others, that can be understood by Man. Consequently, Heresy identifies with the abolition of the Divine, since Divinity is no longer something transcendental, unknown and desired by Man. Heresy tries to determine God up to the point that Heresy comprehends as Divinity. Heresy denies the ontological truth of Divinity and Its absolute and infinite nature.
In its initial sense, logos is transcendence of ignorance as it familiarizes Man with the Personal God by means of knowledge and truth. By getting to know the truth through reason, man sets his pothos in tune with God, unable as he is to secede from him. The true knowledge, the original reason intensifies Man's pothos for God, by advancing the reasonable elements of pothos.

By liberating man from the suffocating restraints of common passions and lust, which act as a disruptive force against the unity between God and Man, logos restores that unity. Also, by purifying the human soul from the corruptive smudges lying obscurely behind the individualistic pursuits, logos rekindles the pothos for God in Man's soul.

Logical pothos carries a dual meaning, both ontological and deontological (governed by the rules of propriety). Firstly, it leads Man to the truth, the ontological reality. Secondly, by extricating himself from the bounds of ignorance by means of purification, Man is led to the deontological reality.

Following the dictates of deontological pothos, man gets rid of malice and becomes a veritable student of virtue, displaying self-restraint and disposing of lust, fear and cowardice.

The ontological pothos removes the burden of ignorance from Man's shoulders, thus sparing him a distorted and deviant relationship to God (heresy).
St. Maximus sounds Ontological in interpreting logical pothos as a measure of adherence to the truth and the virtues, as the sense of the whole. By being opposed to the heresy view regarding Reason as a means of delving into the depths of Holy Essence, which ultimately leads to isolation, St. Maximus conceives of logos as the avenue towards pothos for God. As an orthodox ontological Father he stresses the Reason which leads to the relationship with the personal divine truth and the personal pothos of Man for God.

He displays an ascetic attitude, in regarding logos as a means of transcending hedonism and individualistic tendencies. That allows pothos for God to rekindle in Man.

Both the ontological and the deontological elements converge with the pothos for truth and the purification from hedonism by means of ascetical struggle. In both senses man, by means of logic, yearns to reach the authenticity of his pothos. According to St. Maximus, the ontological and deontological pothos of Man transcends, by means of logic, heresy which regards reason as a form of super-comprehension, as autonomous comprehension, because this pothos is a "Donation" of God to Man. Man does not yearn for the truth, the divine truth, theosis because it is a product of logic. Logical pothos, being the logical pothos of God, is not a logical product but a personal meeting of the divine and the human person. By extension, it is human agony, human pothos and divine Donation to Man.

5. Pothos as Donation of God to Man.

Pothos, in this part of St. Maximus study, forms a part of rational substances. By reason of its supreme status, pothos comes first in terms of both serialization and evaluation.

1361 A-D "Ό πάσαν μετὰ σοφίας φύσιν ὑποστήσας θεός, καὶ πρώτην ἐκκαθὲ τῶν λογικῶν οὐδὲν δύναμιν τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώσιν
This donation, pothos and eros, is also united to the power of
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reason through which pothos is fulfilled and accomplished. The first Donation of God is connected with the power of logic, so than Man is not in unorthodox, non-authentic agony. The logical pothos for God constitutes the intense existential agony for meeting with the Divine, with the truth of existence, with the reasons of beings in an authentic way.

By experiencing this kind of logical pothos, the human existence is in agony to meet God. It feels pothos for God because of its natural agony and naturalness and because it is led to God by the ontological-authentic logic, which emerges from the unity of naturality and truth. Pothos encompasses the meanings behind those pairs of words: God and Man, Creator and Creature, Dominator and beneficiary. God the Creator as the Bearer of substance, well before man attempted at rationalizing His Existence, finds Himself identical to God the Donator of Human logic. The two concepts are internal. By sowing the seeds of Pothos, God attracts man towards Him while at the same time Man finds himself being attracted by God.

By experiencing the nature of pothos, the honest Lovers of Truth go to every pain in their search of the truth. Reinforced by the teachings of Jesus Christ, Our Lord, they seem to be left in no doubt by obscurity and bewilderment. Those ontological persons are entitled to future eternal goods, the state of theosis.

Natural pothos is both a Divine Donation and a logical pothos restituting man, to his prior-to-the-original-sin state.

In this interpretation by St. Maximus St. Gregory the Theologian is quoted to suggest that Man should eat The carved Holy meat, thus giving prominence to divine harmony and the disruption of heresy.

At this point, St. Maximus refers to pothos as a pre-understanding donation of God to Man, as an innate logical essence, as a reality understood by means of logic, which leads to the participation in the Logos of God.

(1364 B) "Τὸν τοῖνυν προηγεῖται περὶ θεοῦ φυσικὸν πόθον ἑξοντας ἡμῶς εἰδῶς οὕτως ὁ μεγας διδασκαλος προτρέπει τε πάντας
b. "Eros" as defined by St. Maximus the Confessor.

1. Eros as a personal act and as the cause of the transformation of the human person.

The significance of "Eros" in "Ambigua" by St. Maximus comes out of the fact that its recipient is called "A most prudent Lover" (1032 A). Eros stands out as the most important existential form of energy playing a very important part in St. Maximus's mind.

More specifically, in his preamble, St. Maximus addresses the person in question as "A most prudent lover" in order to shape "eros" into a personal energy by means of which the functioning individual goes through a transformation. That individual experiences eros by disposing of "incoherent theories" and "έξ έμμελούς περί τα θεία οπουδάς έξιν λαβών άναλλοιωτιν, ούχ άπλώς σοφίας, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κάλλους αὐτᾶς, θεῷ λίταν ἡγαπημένε, γέγονας ἔρασις αὐθεντικός.

That personal eros and active unity is preceded by the authentic knowledge effected, in its turn, by concentrated studying. On the one hand, the real personal eros comes as a result of authentic knowledge, while authentic knowledge comes as a result of a painful study, on the other. That form of personal attraction-eros is stable, concrete and "unaltered".

That first phase suggests that eros, far from being a momentary fact, presupposes a more in-depth look into matters. That eros, requiring both study and stability, is not of theoretical nature only. It involves the transcendence of bare theoretical patterns as it enters the field of daily, direct experience.
The erotic glamour of theory\textsuperscript{139} lies in "applied knowledge" and "wise application". The love of theoretical beauty does not seem content with his mere abstract knowledge but he makes it part of his practical daily encounters.

Both "applied knowledge" and "wise application" converge on a common focus point: the Logos of God who is providential and judgemental.

The erotic glamour of theory is a "logical eros". The person correlates—unifies the practical knowledge with God's providence. The erotically acting person practically experiences Divine Providence for the world by reference to the theory of beings as a composite unit. He manages to do so by reaching the ontological reality. (1133 CD).

The person also closely watches each and every creature and thus gets associated with the loving unity of Divine Judgement and the prudent way of acting. Therefore, the person is in an erotic relation with the beauty of Divine Sapience.

By way of drawing those two states, possibilities and movements

\textsuperscript{139}At this point, the existential nature of theory and 
\'\text{\textalpha}παθε\textipa{\textalpha}ις is stressed. Even though both of them seem to be of a theoretical-ideal nature, they are transformed, by means of eros, into states of an existential nature, states which create the perfect action, the perfect practical life \'\text{\textalpha}παθε\textipa{\textalpha}ις as harmony of shapes, colours etc, in connection with theory, means harmonization and unity at a daily level. They mean the perfect practical life of the existence which experiences the beauty of theory and the harmonization of the idea and the ideal with daily life.

Theory, the foundation of the perfect practical life, and its beauty are stressed by means of eros, at this point as well. Theory, through the experience of beauty, acquires an existential nature both at a daily and at an ontological level. By experiencing the beauty of theory, beings form an ontological unity of theory and action, of space-time and eternity, of the divine and the human.

In this unifying erotic reference, St. Maximus highlights the existential nature of the theoretical understanding of the truth, that is of theory. The existential nature of theory and of the experience of Beauty, is highlighted by its extensions, that is "\textipa{\textalpha}ςφισμα πρ\̣̂\textipa{\textalpha}ις" and "\textipa{\textalpha}μπρακτος γν\̣̂\textipa{\textalpha}ις".
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towards Man's authentic destiny, existence lies in the unity of the 
truth of the total and the truth of each separate part. Logical eros involves unity with Divine Truth which lies in both 
the total (ontological) and the partial (ontic). This unity secures 
the consolidation between man's mental and sensory statuses.

Direct experience (senses provide a partial understanding) is 
induced to the whole (which is the domain of mental energy). Unity 
allows the individual, who is in love with the beauty of sapience, 
to be part of the truth that Man was made in the Image of God. At 
this point, St. Maximus presents the eros for the beauty of 
sapience as the experience of the unity between beings and 
creatures.

This beauty of sapience, which leads to the harmonious synthesis 
of the opposites, transforms the existence into a person, that is 
into a being which is, at the same time, a part of the whole while 
it keeps its personal hypostatic difference when compared to the 
other beings of the same essence.

The transcendence of contradictions ultimately leads to 
experiencing "virtues".

At this point of Ambigua, eros constitutes a personal action of 
unity. It unites the truth with the theory, the truth with the way 
of existing.

2. The Personal Eros for truth.

In the preamble of the second part of "Ambigua" (1061 A) St. 
Maximus again refers to eros as a form of existential energy.

At this point, the mainly personal and ontological nature 
of eros is stressed, in the sense that it refers to the ontological 
and to the particular. Eros is personal and ontological, since the 
person is defined as a being which belongs to a more general truth 
but which, at the same time, has its own personal peculiarity. The 
eros of the person is, in this case, both an extension of its 
ontological reality and an action of unity in proportion to the 

essence. The unifying, ontological action of eros, which 
constitutes its main nature, is pointed out by the eros of the 
general and the particular.
He calls "προθιμιτέρους τῶν καλῶν ἐραστῶσ" those who come to the preachers of the truth and he underlines that the knowledge of truth-authenticity emanates from the human eros.

The knowledge of truth and its transition from the transcendental is due to the person's eros for this knowledge. This knowledge constitutes an action of the existence towards the truth and the authenticity.

"Question" constitutes the way of this transition of the truth and the way of formulating eros. By being formulated into a question, the eros for the good transcends the shame of the person, which is caused by ignorance. Motivated by eros, the "lover of the good" asks questions and thus he transcends his individuality and the fear that he will be considered ignorant. The person is freed from ignorance by means of the question caused by the eros of truth.

In this second preamble to Ambigua, St. Maximus qualifies eros as the pothos for the original knowledge and the truth acquired through the seeker's relationship to the teachers. The eros of knowledge and truth is a form of existential energy in consolidated unity with authenticity and can be appropriated by means of contact with the other true person.

The lover of truth is in a state of possibility and movement...
towards the eros of truth\textsuperscript{141}.

Eros can be formulated into a question—the quest for the ontological truth and perfection of the person.

By extension, eros is also a form of existential energy—a wish of man to be united with the whole in the form of truth.

3. Eros as a way of movement towards perfection.

However, eros is not simply a unilateral action directed towards truth and authenticity; in other words towards theosis. Eros also includes the imperfect moving world "1069 CD".

Amb. 2a. 1065 B-1112 A.

1069 C-

1069 D. \textit{Ei de σύνασθαι μέν φαίειν, μή βούλεσθαι δὲ, διὰ τὴν γενομένην πείραν τοῦ ἐναντίου, καὶ ὦτως οὐ δι' ἑαυτό, ὡς καλὸν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἐναντίον τὸ καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἐσται εἰς ἀνάγκης στεργόμενον, ὡς οὐ φύσει ἢ κυρίως ὁν ἑρασίον. Πάν γὰρ ο μή δι' ἑαυτό ἁγάδον ἐστὶ καὶ ἑρασίον καὶ πᾶσι ἐλκτικοὶ κινήσεως οὐ κυρίως καλὸν.}

Being opposed to both the Platonic and the Origenic theories regarding Man as pre-existing and moving towards his previous state of self-perfection\textsuperscript{142}, St. Maximus raises the argument that no

\textsuperscript{141} At this point St. Maximus reminds us of the Aristotelian principle of philosophy, that is the question (Metaphysics 1078 B). He transcends this principle however, by relating the word question (ἐρώτησις) to eros. Consequently "ἐρώτησις" takes on an existential meaning.

\textsuperscript{142} St. Maximus believes that eros, as the desire of Man to be filled with the transcendent, is in contrast with the Platonic and the Plotinian theory of the pre-existence of the souls. Eros abolishes any previous self perfection because it is an action towards unity with the absolute, towards relation with the "other". In particular, St. Maximus uses the philosophical aspect of eros (as a means to self perfection, as a relation with the perfect) in
being perfect in its self falls in love and erotically moves towards another so as to attain perfection. The realisation and the reality of the movement of the world towards evil is employed at this point.

The theory of the movement of the beings towards the evil forces has it that neither beings nor creatures could have possibly pre-existed in a perfect form (they would not move towards the evil if they had existed before), and that is the reason why they move towards perfection by means of eros as perichoresis. 

St. Maximus invokes the imperfection of each person's individuality to demonstrate the need for pothos in the form of unity.

Having established the nature of existence as erotic and moving towards perfection (and not self-perfection), St. Maximus is opposed to the theory of the pre-existence of the souls.

At a daily, social level, eros involves the release of Man from his bounds of individuality, his involvement with his fellow-being and his induction towards the whole, the ontological element. St. Maximus sets himself against the theory of self-relationship, of self-perfection and of the eros of truth stemming from "reminiscences". He outlines eros in an evolutionary and perichorematic, rather than an individualistic, sense.

The personal eros as a form of relationship helps in the cause of order to refute the self perfection of the being even in a perfect previous form. The erotic impetus of Man signifies the acquisition of perfection and completeness. Because of this impetus, Man is proved to be neither self sufficient nor self perfect. He is an experienced proof of the non-preexisting perfection.

143 D. Staniloae supports that, according to St. Maximus, movement signifies the indisputable refutation of the theory of the pre-existence of the souls. See D. Staniloae "Ο Θεός, ὁ Κόσμος καὶ ὁ Ἀνθρώπος" p.154: St. Maximus supports the movement of the human spirit as an argument against the supporters of Origen who see movement as the result of Fall from the primary unity".
discrediting "µή δὲν" 144 (the non being) and the movement towards zero, so that the human being can become a "virtuous existence". That involves Man's transition from absence to presence and, consequently, to inspiration145.

The personal evolutionary eros as relationship of the existenses is, in that sense, phenomenological146, being opposed to self-sufficiency as a form of perfection. Eros as a relationship, and not as self-relationship, as community and not as self-projection on the other, the ideal, the individualistic views, is of an inducing nature, while eros as a form of projection of the existence on the other and on perfection is nihilistic and egocentric. The human person transcends this nihilistic and egocentric phenomenic eros by relating with the other persons and forming a community. The human person transcends the ontic (the egocentric interpretation of the truth and the egocentric erotic point of view, the self-eros) and becomes an ontological person who acts in relation and in active perichoiresis, thus becoming αὐτή ὑποκθέν.

In that way, at a daily-worldly level, the person transcends its ontic, nihilistic self-perfection, it transcends µὴ δὲν by acting in an erotic-sociable (and not in an individualistic) way. The human

144 About the transcendence of "µηδέν" (zero) by means of pothos and eros during the movement see D.Staniloae "Φιλοσοφικά και Θεολογικά Ερώτημα" p.128.

145 At this point, eros for ἄγαθον (the good) constitutes the transition from non-authenticity to authenticity. Eros here signifies the transition from the absence of ἄγαθον to the presence of ἄγαθον, from ἀθέα (oblivion) to ἀ-ἀθέα (truth), according to the Existential meaning of ἀ-ἀθέα (truth).

At this point also we can see the existentialistic nature of Orthodox Mysticism as well as its relation to Existentialism.

146 Eros is of phenomenological nature, in the sense that it constitutes a transition of the subject to the objective truth and not the pre-existing truth. Eros, as a personal community with the good (ἄγαθον) and the perfect, is, according to phenomenology, Εἰδική γνώση (Eidetic knowledge), authentic experienced knowledge, and not self-knowledge.

person constantly transcends the individualistic absence by means of transition to the social presence, to the revelation of authenticity during and by means of relating\(^1\).

At this point, eros is highlighted as a relationship of persons towards perfection and as transcendence of self-relationship and self-perfection. By means of eros, Man constantly transcends the non-being of individuality and becomes a person, a communion of truth.

That eros is moving passion towards perfection, felt by both beings and creatures. The self-perfect element neither moves nor is reinforced by passion towards perfection, because it fails to give shape to its wish for perfection within kinematic eros and passion, since it is independent and self-sufficient.

God only is self-sufficient and self-perfect. He is the centre of gravity towards Whom every imperfect being longing for perfection is drawn. Passion, not merely entailing decay and corruption but also the natural movement typical of beings-creatures, can be regarded as an intensified erotic movement towards the Divine, towards perfection.

'\(\text{'AeL E\(\delta\) E\(\iota\nu\)\), the eternal perfect existence}\(^2\), constitutes the aim of the movement of "those who exist" towards perfection, in their relationship with the perfect Divine element.

Eros is identified with the elimination of both imperfection and self-determination, (the elimination of the idea of non-being by means of natural movement, passion) and with the transcendence of individuality. Man's participation in the Divine Energy, which gives birth to "E\(\iota\nu\)", donates "E\(\iota\) E\(\iota\nu\)" and "'\(\text{'AeL E\(\delta\) E\(\iota\nu\)}\)". In this sense, eros constitutes an action of transcendence of

\(^{1}\) About the continuous transition from the absence to the presence and the truth, as a personal event see K. Papapetrou "Η Οδός τῆς Θεολογίας".

\(^{2}\) About the movement from E\(\iota\nu\) to '\(\text{'AeL E\(\delta\) E\(\iota\nu\) via E\(\iota\) E\(\iota\nu\)}\) as the content of the work of Salvation see V. Lojko "Η Μυστική Θεολογία τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας", p.178.
individuality, of self-perfection, an action of relationship with God. It is a natural movement towards perfection which is offered by the "Perfect nature", by God. At the same time, eros constitutes a form of transition from individuality to sociability, from the ontic to the ontologic, from appearance to phenomenological authenticity.

4. Eros as the outcome of the natural mental possibilities of the human person and as passion for the "νοερὰ ἐρωμένα".

The person acquires this phenomenological authenticity through eros and by means of the realisation of his natural states, possibilities and movements.

St. Maximus sounds quite clear on that:

"If the mental element (state) moves mentally (movement and possibility), it cannot fail to contemplate. Again, if it is capable of contemplating then it falls in love with the object of its mental perception (it actualizes its naturality and is erotically involved with the object of its meditation). If, subsequently, it falls in love that way, then it feels strongly attracted to that object of love (it denies itself in favour of its
natural trend, it is identified mentally with the loved object). Being in a state of passion, it is naturally directed towards that mental point. On the strength of an impetuous dynamism, the person moves towards Divine perfection. This situation does not stop the strength of movement, does not stop anywhere. It intensifies this strength until the whole person is included in God, the object of the existence's eros.\(^1\)

Eros emerges from the person's natural existence. Man falls in love with that supreme form of perfection as he moves towards it.

In an evolutionary process, man falls initially in love with beings and therefore experiences his natural erotic fibre. As long as that experience joins forces with Man's mental capability on his way to perfection, then Man manages to look upon Divinity. In terms of that eros of perfection, man is capable of fulfilling all his natural states, possibilities and movements. He reaches the limits of his authenticity and gets united with God.

Eros stands for Man's ultimate point in his effort to make the best of his natural capabilities and to be assimilated to the Divine Force. Eros is, at the same time, a natural state, a relationship with \(\psi\omega\omega\chi\epsilon\tau\omega\nu\) (the understood), an impetuous movement and finally the concession of Man to God. Eros, as relationship-movement towards perfection, leads to the authentic and perichorematic authenticity; it transcends any kind of limiting naturality because this transcendence is authenticity itself. The erotic nature of Man, his authenticity, consists in the transcendence (by means of eros) of any kind of individuality, even of the human essence (which is a philosophical limitation).

The transcendence of the philosophical limitation of "\(\varepsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\)" as a form of stable and motionless substance\(^2\) can only come true by

\(^1\) D. Staniloae "Φιλοσοφικά και Θεολογικά Έρωτιμα" pp.143-145.

\(^2\) About \(\varepsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\) (Being) as a constant and unchangeable essence see M. Heidegger "'Ενσωσθή για τὸν 'Ανθρώπινο" pp.93,95.
means of the erotic union between God and Man. This presupposes Man's self-resignation from his right to freedom and his dedication to Divine Ordinances (reasons of beings). Eros as a form of resignation leads to the divine truth of what Man is, to the human naturality which is created by God. Personal love is a double resignation: a. resignation from the individualistic will and b. resignation to the human naturality, the reasons of beings.

To set a striking example of erotic condition, St. Maximus draws on two characters.

The first one is Jesus Christ reported as saying while in the Gesthimani garden "ναΐν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλ' ὡς Σὺ". The second one is Apostle Paul in his self-effacing dictum "ὤ γὰρ οὐκ ἔτι ἐγὼ, τῷ γὰρ ἐν ἑμοί Χριστός". Eros helps reinstate Man into his natural relationship with God. Man becomes a natural citizen of two worlds: the Divine and the Human. Upon his self-denial, Man becomes ἡγίασμα-Μέλος "destiny-member" of God.

That Divine status is gained as soon as human reason and rationale "merge" with Divine reason and the "image" rises to its "archetypical" pattern. 1088 C.

Man grows into God's "destiny" by virtue of his bond with Divine Logic. During that "merger", man is allowed to witness the luminosity of the Trinitarian Light stapling both angels and man together in terms of a logical structure. That includes God's sensible creatures which managed to escape "corruption" by "carelessness", which did not defile the "reasons of beings" and maintained themselves as "prudent" instruments of Holy Nature.

In terms of that merger, Man is filled with the Glory of Serenity and at the same time is extricated from any corruptive influence. Thus, by Grace of God, Man participates in Divine Energy both mentally and physically. Most evidently, eros for Theosis stands out as the principal driving force. Theosis is the most erotic
existential evidence, the supreme form of eros man has ever been part of.\textsuperscript{152}

Divine eros, in terms of which man is appreciated as a "destined member", is capable of encompassing mind and reason, soul and body, man and God all at the same time.

It also involves a double movement: It is a drive towards unity on account of eros, that is towards theosis, besides being a force setting out from theosis and leading towards eros since, by being filled with eros, Man gets Divinized.

Man reaches theosis by unifying (in his erotic movement) his logic and mind with the divine logic and mind. He reaches unity by moving towards theosis in a psychosomatic way.

The eros for theosis, in every sense, is of a moving, attracting and unifying nature. The term perichoresis is more suitable (since the eros for theosis is a product of the energetic unity between the divine and the human) than the term unity-unification, when referring to the reality of theosis.

During the erotic divine movement, there is a perichoresis of that movement towards the sought-after with the object of the pursuit of the movement (eros for theosis). That form of eros is reinforced by double force and direction. It is a meeting point between the object of the pursuit and the pursuit itself. It constitutes movement towards theosis and theosis itself, since theosis is the origin of the eros for it.

By getting erotically involved with theosis, Man feels a yearning for it besides sensing it and setting out on a course to fall in love with it. The pursuit and its object, as well as the wish and the reality behind the wished for, fulfil each other.

By falling in love with theosis, Man is divinized and is also filled with an urge for absorbing a constant influx of theosis.

The erotic divine movement is both intractable and unceasing. Since theosis means constantly participating in Holy Energy, that

\textsuperscript{152} Theosis is presented as a cause of transcendence also in G. Florovsky "Anatomy of the Mind" p. 46.

\textsuperscript{152}
form of eros helps Man to preserve his existence. Divine eros totally eliminates the nihilistic movement since "existing" is inextricably connected to the Holy creative force which erases every form of emptiness153.

By means of his erotic participation in theosis, man succeeds in eliminating the upsurging movement towards inexistence, as he experiences the erotic relationship in an existential way. The person also finds itself involved in an erotic existential community consisting of God and Man and in a state of rebirth by Holy Energy eradicating emptiness and non-existence.

5. The Eros for μηδεν and the pedagogical death.

St. Maximus considers Man's movement towards non-being as running contrary to that erotic movement.

153. The point of view that, through the eros for theosis, the nihilistic movement is effaced is the resultant of two concepts by St. Maximus: firstly, the one referring to the creation of cosmos ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος and secondly, the one referring to the eros of persons at a daily level. This eros is a tendency towards completeness because of the knowledge that self-completeness is impossible. Consequently the eros for theosis signifies the continuous participation in the Holy creative energy, which eliminates μὴ ὄν, and the participation in the existential agony for completeness by the self-complete divine element.
Man, being a descendant of Adam, always moves towards the worst. He is free to choose between the adherence to God (thus becoming Spirit) and the adherence to the body (thus being alienated from the divine and creating heresy). Man can choose between reaching theosis with or without God's help. He can choose between unity, if "spirit" involves the unity between beings and creatures, and disruption, supposing that heresy entails the dissolution of the unity of the spirit.

That is the reason why God "wisely" and compassionately, by virtue of His benevolent providence for man, takes action and punishes the absurd nihilistic eros by death. Death apparently carries emptiness and lifelessness with it, only to actually restore man to his loving and unifying state.

St. Maximus here refers to the nihilistic eros which acts as a disruptive force between truth and authenticity, the ontological unity. Man falls into the trap of falling in love with the disruptive zero in his futile attempt to reach theosis, quite like his ancestor Adam, counting solely on his own power without God's assistance. At this point it seems quite evident that eros itself is man's inheritance.

Man inherits eros from the reasons of beings, from God, if he is virtuous unifying and existential. Man inherits the nihilistic, disruptive eros from Adam, when he attempts to reach theosis in an autonomous way.

Death, which has a catalytical effect on eros, represents God's humanitarian and at the same time, sapient spirit. Death means either nihilism or re-induction in the state of existence, renaissance and resurrection.

Eros and death or-better still- erotic movement (either nihilistic or deifying) and death are two terms paradoxically related. They signify both the unifying relationship between God
and Man and the educational lesson God teaches Man: By punishing Man, God helps him to be re-instated into his original erotic movement-action and attraction.

The nihilistic eros is punished by an apparent form of nihilism (death); also the movement towards inexistence is punished by an apparent disruption of the existence, so that man will be able to recover his authenticity which lies in his "existing" rather that in "being zeroed" 155.

That, by extension, means "falling in love with existence", what it already is (state) what it can be (possibility) and what it is capable of constantly being (movement).

6. The double course of the human personal Eros. The Eros for temporal beings and the natural Eros.

St. Maximus’s following comment is of a similar content. St. Maximus displays personal eros in two forms: a. As a form of connection with the surroundings, b. As a natural love. 1104 BC.

1104 BC., "Συγχωρεί γὰρ ὁ πάνοσοφος τὰς ἡμετέρας ζωὰς προνήτης φυσικώς χρύσαι πολλάκις τὰ πράγματα ταῖς οἰκείαις ὑμαιζ ψάσσαι σωφρονισμὸν ἦμων, ἕσθ’ δὴ τῶν ἐρμανῶν αὐτά μεταξειρισθέντος διὰ τὰς περὶ αὐτὰ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν συγχωρεῖς τε καὶ ταραγῆς, πρὸς τὸ κατὰ φυσιν ἔρασιν ἐπανάγων τὸν ἑως ἄλληςτον ἥμων πρὸς τὰ παρόντα ἔρωτα".

More specifically, the shape which eros of "surroundings" assumes can be related to the presumed infallibility of bodily qualities and the disorder of the matter. Man falls in love with what comes within the scope of the senses, he opts for the "obscenity" of material nature and is also in a state of forgetfulness regarding mental beauty. Man is evidently in favour of the body, the carnal corruption and decay, death. Man prefers the lures of passion, the

155. See J.P.Sartre "Εἴκων καὶ Μηθέν" pp.67,69.
disorderly, abnormal and distortive movement as he becomes alienated from Holiness and the economy of nature. The adoption of infallibility and dogmatization of eros connected to the surroundings paves the way for evil passion and corruption. This form of eros is disorderly, non harmonical and subsequently non-unifying. It ultimately leads human existence to inequality and abnormality.

The other form of eros is the natural eros to which Man returns following God’s Holy Providence. God’s providence is evidenced by means of the confusion and the turbulence brought about by things and people. According to St. Maximus, this confusion and turbulence consist an evidence of God’s Providence, aiming at restoring Man in the authentic eros, the eros of truth.

7. The Eros for those present and the reinstatement in the authenticity of Eros by means of the "Moral, Natural, and Theological Philosophy".

The unity-unification, the transcendence of the erotic movement towards the "present" and the restoration of Man in the level of a person, that is in the erotic movement towards God, are highlighted by the "Theory of the interchange of the natural and the written speech" (1128 D-1133 A).
That theory encompasses the harmonization between spirit and matter, letter and syllable, the part and the whole. That harmonization comes to Man's notice by means of the Bible as well as by means of nature. By means of the written and the natural law, the person can discern the speechless speech. The person can experience the truth in an "Ενορασικός" way by means of moral, natural and theological philosophy. God is concealed behind matter and words. The words and the material objects cover the concepts that Man can reveal by means of moral, natural and theological philosophy, that is by means of induction, Ενορασις and the participation in the truth.

That unifying philosophy (moral, natural and theological) employs the instrument of vision to bring man up to the level of reaching the veritable eros, the eros of the reasons of beings and ultimately the Divine Eros which is active, creative and providential.

The (natural and written) speech, originating in "natural, moral and theological philosophy", functions as a catalyst for eros. Between the eros of present life, which is "appealing", the "adherence to the letter of the law" and eros of God as manifested by Biblical speech and natural speech the philosophic-theological mind chooses the latter as it yearns for Divine eros. By analyzing both himself and the world in terms of a rational and visionary process, Man falls in love with God, who eliminates the lie and releases man from cowardice.

The logical eros is a product of logical analysis, mental perception and Ενορασις. Both the Biblical and the natural speeches reveal to Man his way to erotic authenticicity.

According to this concept, eros as a relationship and as a form of energy, constitutes the product of the genuine inner
relationship of Man with the revelation of God: (by means of the Holy Bible and of nature). It is the product of ενθρασις, of the inner knowledge and penetration in the certainty of the truth.

St. Maximus adds the term ενθρασις to the personal eros. Ενθρασις signifies the inner certainty that what was understood by the analysis of the Holy Bible and of nature is true. That eros is prominently personal because, besides the contribution of external and objective signs, there is also the factor of man's internal experience at work. Ενθρασις assists man not only in reaching the level of objectivity but also in merging the whole truth with his very existence. The truth does not remain as a form of "distant" objectivity. Ενθρασις turns it into a personal experience with which man falls in love.

The kind of philosophy St. Maximus seems to adopt is of personal, unifying nature rather than of externally revealing nature. It extends far beyond studying the "ἀνθρωπολογία" and takes on the character of personal participation. Man stays away from the remote and unapproachable facade and, instead he falls, in love with the ontological reality, an active member of which is he himself.

157 Philosophy in its primitive form, the Presocratics, is defined as objective and analytical. It seeks the truth of beings as a transition from Mythos to logos. The quest for objectivity on the part of philosophy is also supported by the Platonic concept of ideas. Aristotle, being the most scientific Philosopher, supports implicitly the objectivity of philosophy. The idealistic philosophy also, by the quest for the ideal and its full understanding, supports the objectivity of philosophy.

Husserl's phenomenological school also supports the strictly scientific nature of philosophy as a means of understanding the completeness of the truth. Existentialism defends the objectivity of philosophy by defining Είσα ων as a being of larger significance, although this school supports the existentialistic understanding as a criterion of truth.

The outer nature of truth is pointed out by the objectivity of this kind. This participation in the ideal, the remote and inaccessible truth of Είσάων is stressed. The concept that truth is the ulterior state in which a being can partake, not through the absolute personal relationship and interaction but through the revelation of objectivity, is founded and supported.
As opposed to this ancient Greek thought person fails to take an insight into the internal unity of the truth, because it keeps adhering to the letter of the law and the potential of human comprehensibility. By the standards of the Hellenic concept, eros involves the denial of unity and perichoresis and the reliance upon the ontic and the visually comprehensible.

8. The Eros of Sapience. Man as a Lover of Sapience.

Man arrives at theosis by managing to push away distracting individualistic ontic wishes. (1153 D-1156).

1153 D-

1156 A. "Ο τῆς σοφίας έαυτίν έρωσιν καταστίχασ μόνω θεῷ συνετίνα καταξιούται, τήν εὐαγγελικής ύποθετείναν ύποθειαν δεξάμενος, καὶ τοῦς θέρους καὶ μακαρίους ἀποστόλους, οί τὸ πᾶν έαυτίνς ὀλοκληρων περιεθέμενοι καὶ μόνω δι' ὅλου τῶ θεώ καὶ λόγῳ προσφύγετε. .

Man becomes a person, "a lover of sapience", by resigning from his daily, worldly pursuits. This resignation leads him to the experience of the truth, of the authentic form of eros. He transcends the law of nature and acquires the unique truth. He finds himself lying in truth, light, transparency by, relying on Jesus Christ, as the Apostles did, because the truth exists in the light of Transfiguration.

St. Maximus, the mystical enlightened father, presents the lover of sapience as having overcome worldly symbols since he has been in unity with the veritable light of Transfiguration. By experiencing the truth as a form of inspiration, St. Maximus sounds phenomenological. Beings are visible in their actual

158. PG. 91 1153 D.

159. At this point St. Maximus is characterised as a phenomenological writer because, according to the interpretation of the term phenomenology by Heidegger, this term has to do with the
condition through our Lord. The phenomenological eros for wisdom reflects the prominently personal fibre of the relationship between the divine and the human or, better still, between God-human and human elements. Beings are not simply put in their veritable state by logical analysis (philosophical phenomenology). Instead, they "co-appear" in terms of an association among the Sun, (Our Lord) and Man.


That phenomenological love of wisdom, showing the way to the truth of beings and human existance, is highlighted by St. Maximus in his reference to the kind of model pioneered by the Apostles.

Also, Moses and Elijah, as participants in Transfiguration are two further models of illuminated eros.

1161 D. Ὁ πάλιν τά κατὰ τὸν γάμον καὶ τὴν άγαμίαν μυστήρια παρὰ τῷ λόγῳ εἶναι μανθάνοντες διὰ Μωυσέως, τοῦ διὰ γάμον τὰς θείας ἑρωτών γενέσαι δόξης μὴ καλλιδέντιος, καὶ διὰ Ἡλίου, τοῦ παντελῶς καθιστῆς συναφείας καθαροῦ δειμείναντος, οἱ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ θεοῦ τοῦ λόγῳ ταῦτα εἴδονον, κατὰ τοὺς θεωτικῶς περὶ πάντων κειμένων νόμους, ἐαυτῷ μυστικῶς εἰσαπείδαθα καρποττοντος.

They both display the merits of unity between legal and prophetical speech, sapience and piety, Knowledge and education, theory and practice, marriage and celibacy, life and death, beings and time, the tangible and the mental. Everybody contains the erotical element in themselves by Grace of God, the truth of beings significance and the reality of light (see M. Heidegger "Ἑνώ καὶ Χρόνος". pp. 48-54). St. Maximus, as a mystical father of θείου καὶ ἁκτίτου φωτός (the divine and the unbuilt light) of the Metamorphosis, as a father who makes constant references to the brilliance of Man and the World, can be characterized as a phenomenological writer.

160. PG 91 1073 D-1076 A
and by means of their participation in the truth according to each one's personal capabilities.

The Human person can be a lover of the Holy beauty and be attracted by the Holy Pothos as long as the pious speech and purificational labour turn against ignorance and lust. §1. 1209 AB.

Affected by the eros of Divine Beauty, Man becomes capable of surpassing every nihilistic movement. Divine Beauty transports man from the partial to the whole, the harmony and harmonization, if one is to assume that beauty is a harmonious synthesis of states, possibilities and movements. At this point St. Maximus can be characterised as an "ascetic writer" since he refers to the Holy Beauty and Man's eros for it.

However, St. Maximus's aesthetic reference does not merely rely on his personal interpretation of Beauty or on his sense of admiration. There is plenty of evidence of his personal attraction to Holy Beauty. This concept regards aesthetics in terms of a principally erotic relationship with beauty.

Far from being a sole memory of beauty, this relationship stands out as a dynamic inter-penetration into beauty, an eros of Beauty. By experiencing this sort of eros, the human existence gets "attached" to Holy Beauty, to the extent that it no longer recognizes something else as beautiful.

Assuming that the sense of beauty originates in the harmony of shapes, colours, in harmonization, then, by experiencing the Holy Beauty, the human person finds himself in the harmonization of existential experiences, truth, logic, virtue and benevolence. The beauty of the Holy Beauty is not only of an aesthetic nature (view of the divine light of Transfiguration) but it also constitutes an ontological unity, a unity of truth, reason, meaning, virtues etc.

The sense of beauty does not simply exhaust itself in the objective visual image of aesthetically co-ordinated objects but,

\[161\] About Aesthetics as a part of philosophy see.
I.N. Theodorakopoulos "Ελπίδα και Φιλοσοφία", vol.Γ,pp.395-636
M. Heidegger "Η Προεξοφλομένη του Εργου τέχνης".
far beyond that, it extends to achieving a personal harmonious relation to God and the world. (Reasons of Beings).

The personal admiration for what is conceived as beautiful and eminently aesthetic, secures harmonization, resistance against the fall into non-being and ultimately the adherence to the harmonical unity.

10. John the Baptist as model of Natural Eros of God.

That harmonious co-ordination subsequently appears again in St. Maximus's reference to John The Baptist. 1214 D-1256 C.

1245 BC. Καὶ διὰ τοῦ τῆς διανοίας κόσμου ἐστὶν αὐθεντική, ἐξ ἕπαρξεως τῆς ἐν ἀνεμόματι, ὄντος γονιμότητος πολιτείας, καὶ τῆς ἁμελημένου κατὰ τὴν ἰσχειαν περὶ τὸ θεοῦ έρωτικὸς δέλεως γεννητικῆς.

That reference brings out a comparison-harmonization between John the Baptist and the Gospel, the Gospel and Nature, Natural elements and virtues. In terms of the correlation between natural elements and virtues in particular, the following four pairs come to the picture:

a. Ether and prudence. Ether in the world is translated into the spiritual enlightenment qualifying every being, as well as, the attraction towards God.

b. Air and gallantry. Air in the world responds to the, connective and invigorated movement to God.

c. Water and wisdom. Water in the world finds its match in wisdom as taken to mean the yearning for vitality and fertility as well as the erotic attraction to God.

d. Justice and awarding virtues. Justice in the world of senses entails the Spiritual award of virtues to every being.

There is a reference here to eros as a source of fertility and of spiritual vitality, as an incessant attraction to God. Eros is as vital as the water in the world. It represents a perpetual
fertility, a constant affinity between man and truth and man's unceasing attraction by God through a continuous movement.

According to St. Maximus, there is a kind of unification between personal eros and natural elements. The Human eros towards God, signifies the realisation of naturality and not its refusal.

Authenticity lies in the realization of the divinely directed erotic movement. It also aims at divine fertility-spiritual fertilization, revitalization and vitality.

11. Eros as Man's personal attraction by God.

In his analysis of movement, St. Maximus presents Man’s personal attraction by God (1257 A-1261 A).

1260 BC. Τι δήποτε τὸ θείον οἱ θεολόγοι πότε μὲν ἐρωτα, πότε δὲ ἁγάπην, πότε δὲ ἐραστόν καὶ ἁγαπητόν ἀποκαλοῦσιν; Συμμεραίνει τὸν λόγον οὕτως φάσκων. "Ωσπερ τῷ μὲν κινεῖται, τῷ δὲ κινεῖται καὶ συμφαστερον εἶπεν. 'Ὡς μὲν ἐρως ὑπάρχον τὸ θείον καὶ ἁγάπη κινεῖται, ως δὲ ἐραστόν καὶ ἁγαπητόν κινεῖ πρὸς ἑαυτό πάντα τὰ ἐρωτικά καὶ ἁγάπης δεκτικά, καὶ τρανότερον αὖθις φάναι. Κινεῖται μὲν ως σχέσαι ἐμπλούσιν ἐνδιαθέτον ἐρωτικό καὶ ἁγάπης τοῖς τούτων δεκτικοῖς, κινεῖ δὲ ως ἑλκικόν φῶς καὶ τῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ κινουμένων ἐφέσως, καὶ πάλιν κινεῖ καὶ κινεῖται, ως διηγῶν τὸ διψάδατι, καὶ ἐρως τὸ ἐράσαται, καὶ ἁγάπης τὸ ἀγαπᾶσαται.

Initially St. Maximus refers to the deterministic movement, the movement of the result towards the cause. Then, he proceeds to the realization that there is only one initial and final principle governing the moving. The divine element is immovable and ἀναλήμμα (un-caused), because it is caused by nothing and its movement is not affected by transcendence or by the laws of causality.
Quoting Pseudo-Dionysius, St. Maximus defines God as immovable as He does not move towards perfection. However, since He exists in the form of eros and love, He moves-attracts to Him anything that can feel eros and love. God, being διάφων το διψάθαι, ἀγαπών το ἀγαπάθαι and ἔρων το ἔρπάθαι, moves in an erotic and agapetic way. This movement can only be perceived by Man by means of Holy Inspiration (1260 D).

That theory regards eros as a form of co-existence between God and Man. Eros functions as the special linking chain between God and Man, functioning on a personal level. It staples together Cause and result, Creator and creation, ontological foundation and ontological existence.

As an Orthodox father, St. Maximus internalizes God as an erotic way of existence. The Lord as an energetic erotic unity and finally Man as an erotic person. God and Man co-exist erotically and relate to each other on a personal erotic understanding. What holds the key of man’s entrance to the erotic Divine Realm is "ἐλλαμψις" or Divine Inspiration. Even at the very point of his experiencing authenticity, Man is still closely related to God. This erotic inclination does not only come as a result of man’s rationalistic interpretation but, additionally, as a result of God’s revelation to Man, by means of his attraction to Him. The eros of God and for God signifies the attraction by God, the personal wish, the meeting, the inter-personal incident by means of "ἐλλαμψις"(Inspiration).

According to St. Maximus, eros is experienced in the form of personal attraction; it is the way in which God exists and the way in which God and Man co-exist.

12. Eros as Relationship of Man and God.

This point of view is also reinforced by the following statement:

1413 AB "Τολμητέον δὲ καὶ τούτο ὑπὲρ ἄλληλας εἰπεῖν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶς ὁ πάντων αἷτος ἰῷ καὶ ἀγαθὸν τῶν πάντων ἔρωτι δι’ ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἐρωτικῆς ἀγαθότητος ἐξώ αὐτῶν"
Even in this pseudo-dionysiac quotation eros constitutes the way in which God exists and magnanimously looks after His beings and Creatures. According to this theory, God exerts an erotic unifying force over species. Eros does not involve Man alone; instead, God is the centrepiece. God's purpose lies in energetically uniting all beings to Him. The loving way of existence suggests the meeting place between God and man on the understanding that there is a mutual form of attraction transcending any attempt of alienation. Being a form of erotic Trinitarian existence, God divinizes man who, by himself, keeps struggling to be erotically united to God. Eros constitutes a personal perichorematic unity identifiable at an existential and inter-subjective level. Man is unified as a person by means of experiencing eros in a logical, sentimental, psycho-somatic, sensory, social and worldly way. The person who feels eros finds himself in absolute harmonization and unification (of logic, mind etc) when he experiences the erotic attraction, when he is erotically attracted to God.

The eros which consists in the relationship with God is the main eros of the ontological person. The meeting of the ways of God's existence with those of Man's, the realationship between the erotic way of God's existence and that of Man's, constitute the authentic form of unification. They also justify Man's assuming Holy Status by grace of God.

Finally, St. Maximus qualifies eros as unifying and perichorematic. In his text titled "Five hundredth Several Chapters"
on Theology and Economy", St. Maximus seems to make the following unifying reference to eros:

"Τὸν ἐρωτικὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγγέλικων, ἐπὶ τοῦν ἐπὶ σωματικῶν, ἐπὶ σωματικῶν ἐννοιμέν, ἑωτικὴν τινὶ καὶ συγκρατικὴν ἑννοημέν ὀνομασὶν. " vol. 90 1398 A.
c. "Agape" as defined by St. Maximus the confessor.

1. Love as unity of beings.

Referring to the "movement" and coming in stark opposition to the Platonic and Origenist theories of the pre-existence of the soul, St. Maximus introduces "love" as the "natural reality of beings whereby they are regarded as "permanent" and "indivertible" (1072 A).

1072 A. "ις ὀρθής λέγω, γεννητικήν, καὶ ἣν πέφυκε πάντα τὰ ἐκ θεοῦ γενόμενα εἰς θεόν συνάγεονδαί μονήμος ὑπὲρ ἀπαρατίτης."

He arrives at this conclusion through experiencing that nothing is authentically good and virtuous by nature alone. The induction to the ontological reality, to God, is a product of the agapetic relationship between the creatures (ὑπαρκτία) and the beings. All those born, existing and movable, move towards an agapetic unity among themselves and mainly with God.

According to this concept, love is an ontological unity.

According to St. Maximus, this ontological unity includes all the creatures of God which are united with God, by means of love, without moving or experiencing the wish to move.

This also abolishes their tendency towards transcendence, since the pursuit of reaching the truth has come to an end.

The evolutionary character of that movement directs it towards perfection, while the immovability of love signifies the accomplishment of perfection. Love, in its unity, also signifies the "permanent". Thus it is both an ontological and a personal unity with God the Creator.

Although the ontological significance of love apparently involves the absence of its personal element, if one takes St. Maximus's mentality into account as a whole, then one cannot possibly disregard the personal influence on the entire unity. The person
however, enabling him to fully comprehend the Divine Essence. The logical approach provides the ontological foundation for Man in his quest for the connective link between God as the cause and the world as the result. Finally, the aesthetic approach, which best responds to man's nature, is expressed by means of man's permanent contact with the world through experiencing "the reasons of beings". (1112 D-1113 D).

More specifically, the divinely inspired persons managed to overcome the individualistic wishes and subsequently to experience the authentic personal and ontological unity among God, man and the world. (1113 B-C).

While it is in the process of fulfilling the states, the possibilities and the movements of the soul by means of personal participation in the Divine Energy (illumination by grace), the ontological person experiences love as the utmost unity between beings (the world) and creatures (God and Man). That experience and rational realization has led the divinely inspired creatures into the firm belief that God and Man are "depictions" of each other. The ontological person-existence experiences love as the unifying event in which God is humanized and Man, by means of love, is deified.

The person experiences this unity-unification, that is love, by fully activating his psychic states, possibilities and actions-movements. By activating his philosophical potential to its extent (mind, logic and observation), Man reaches the state of loving ontological reality as expressed by the loving unifying content of the reasons of beings, which are, according to St. Maximus, identical to the Divine virtues. (1113 D). As soon as the divine energy becomes part of his own self, Man rises to the level of becoming a person.

The Reasons of Beings do not only form principles-manifestations of a philosophical existence, but they also suggest the content of love. They are a divine declaration of love and a way of participating in the Divine energy, the loving ontological reality.

By fulfilling his natural states, possibilities and movements, Man
becomes a person, a saint, or better still, a deified, existence.

(1113 Ὁ). Man becomes God by grace. He reaches "καθ' ἐμφάνεσιν" by fulfilling his naturality and by being led to the agapetical unification.

According to this concept, love is the ontological content (in which everything is included) since it is a product, of the fulfillment of the human potential (mind, logic, aesthetic) which leads to unity. Love is of an ontological nature (in every sense of the term) since it presupposes the mental perception of the ὄνως ὄν, the logical realisation of the cause and the direct daily experience and observation. The ontological nature of love is even more stressed when it reaches theosis. In the ontological unity of love, the person does not only find himself in "truth", but he transcends even the ontological objectivity since he partakes in the Divine Energy. The human person is not only authentic nature but also action. Not only does he participate in the truth by means of love, but he also acts in a loving, unifying way. He stands on the border line between God and the world.164.

3. Love as transcendence of egoism. Love based on ascetism.

Melchisedek is, according to St. Maximus, an ontological existence standing on this border line. (1144 Ὁ).

1144 Ὁ. Ἡς ἑτοιμασία τὸ μέλη νεκρώσας τὰ ἐπὶ τὰς γύς, καὶ ἃλλον ἑαυτοῦ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀποσβέσαι τὸ φρονήμα, καὶ τῆς ἡράς αὐτῆς δι' ἄλλον σχέσιν ἀποσειαδόμενος, δι' ἑς ἡ τῶ θεό ῥόνων χρεωστουμένη παρ' ἑρών ἄγαν μεριζεται, καὶ ἀρνησάμενος πάντα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τοῦ κόσμου γνωριματα, τῆς θείας ἐνεκεν χάριτος, ὡστε καὶ ἴσειν δυνασθαι μείν τοῦ

164. About the role of Man as Mediator, according to St. Maximus see:
A.Раддов аляев "То Мистηριο της Σωτηριας" p.51
V.Лозин "ΠΙ Μιστηρια Θεολογία της Ανατολικης Εκκλησιας"p.121
L.Тhemperg "Microcosm and Mediator"p.150.
Melchisedek "denigrates" the usefulness of human limbs by "eliminating" carnal lust. He distances himself from the individualistic relationship with beings, through which "Divine Love is shared". By Grace of God, he keeps denying every carnal and worldly "quality". By keeping to this division, Melchisedek is identified (by St. Maximus) with Apostle Paul, because he does not experience anything capable of alienating the person-Man from the love of God. By being alienated from the individualistic will and by experiencing love, he becomes ἀπαθωρ, ἀρητωρ ἀγενεαιδοντιος.

Melchisedek transcends the individualistic and egotistical desire and the disruption of the existence by means of love and for the love of God. The individualistic and the ontic elements are transcended at a personal level and by means of this transcendence the human existence reaches the ontological state.

The induction to the ontological unity relies on the "existing connection and interaction" between the human person and the spirit165. By participating in the "spiritual community", Man leaves the ontic existentialistic entanglements behind him.

The term-reality "spirit" gives love an ontological nature, since this term includes both the natural and the true reasons. Melchisedek becomes an authentic existence by partaking in the truth of the reasons of beings since personal love is not

---

165 Here we can see a relation between St. Maximus and S. Kierkegaard referring to the fact that the authenticity of the person consists in the participation to the spirit. Melchisedek (a model person according to St. Maximus) becomes spirit by partaking in it, the same way as the Genius of Kierkegaard. In both cases the spiritual nature, or rather the spiritualization of the human person, is stressed.
disrupted. The indivisibility of love, the transcendence of both individualistic desires and carnal lusts as well as the connection to the spirit signify the prominently ontological and unifying force of love and the human desire for the ontological unity.

At this point St. Maximus sounds ascetic and ontological at the same time: Man overcomes his individualistic desires in order to enter the ontological unity. Man transcends the division of love between beings and creatures from both of which love emerges, so he is directed towards spiritual unity and unified loving energy. Man acts in a "spiritually" unifying way through love and he reaches the ontological level, eternity and inconvertibility. That ontological love grants Melchisedek the status of a "perennial priest", a permanent "half-space" between heaven and earth, God and Man.

According to St. Maximus, the nature of love at this point is ascetic-deontological, ontological and aeonic-eternal at the same time. By experiencing love and by means of the unifying loving action, the human person becomes eternal; it acts in a unifying way as a mediator. By transcending the expression of love for the "temporal", the person is also highlighted as transition from the temporal to the eternal.

According to that ascetic, philosophical and theological reference at a personal level, love, by St. Maximus, is of an ascetic, ontological and aeonic nature. At this point, agape is mainly synonymous to the direction of the human existence. It is a personal choice of the direction-destination of the human love.

Modern terminology suggests that love conceived as a form of energy, can be associated with the "energetic moving ontological unity.

166. About the term "αιωνικός" see D.Staniloae Introduction of "Φιλοσοφικά καὶ Θεολογικά Ερωτήματα" pp.43-44.

167. See M. Heidegger "Είναι κατ' Χρόνον" p.197.

PART I.
4. Love as Ontological unity.

Abraham, also by St. Maximus, is a model of love and ontological unity. (1145 C-1148 A)\(^{168}\).

1145 C-1148 A. Ἄρα ὁ πατὴρ παθηματικός γίνεται τῶν γὰρ καὶ τῶν συγγενεῖας καὶ τοῦ οίκου του πατρὸς ἐξερχόμενος καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ θεοῦ δεικνυμένην ἐρχόμενον γὰρ, ὁ τῶν σαρκῶν καὶ τῶν διάθεσιν απορρήτους, καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἀπολυμένων, καὶ μικρῶν ὁ αὐτῶν ἄμαρτος έτι παραδεχόμενος ὁμάνην, καὶ τὰ αἰσθήματα πάντα παρελθὼν, εἰς ὃν ἐν ψυχῇ διὰ τῶν αἰσθάνεσθαι τὸ ἀπατοῦντα καὶ παλαιοῖν προσγίνεται, καὶ μόνον τῷ νῦν παντὸς ἕλευθρῳ δειμμῷ εἰς τὴν θείαν καὶ μακραίαν τῶν γνωσεως ἐρχόμενον γὰρ, καὶ εἰς μίκρος καὶ πλάτους αὐτῶν μυστικῶς διδοθῶν, ἐν ὑπὸ τῶν φθορομένων αὐτῶν κληρονομιὰν, εἰς μήκος μὲν ἀνεκαστὸν διὰ τοῦ ἠγαθοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων κατὰ τὸ ἐφικτὸν ἀνθρώπων θεολογομενον, διὰ τὸ ἤμις δὲ εἰς πλάτους δοξολογομένων, διὰ τῶν συνεκτικῶς τοῦ παντὸς σοφωτάτης αὐτοῦ προνοίας, καὶ τῶν ἑκτὸς ἡμῶν μάλιστα δαμαστικῆς καὶ ἀπερρήτητος οἰκονομιᾶς, καὶ μέτοχος τῶν σίς γεφαίρειν τὸν κύριον ἐξεπαιδεύθη τρόπων κατὰ πράξιν τῶν καὶ διερρύον γενόμενος, διὰ τῶν θεοῦ βεβαιως κυριοκατα πέφυκε φιλία καὶ ἀφροδίσιας. καὶ ὑποτυχώς περὶ τοιῶν εἰπεὶν, ὁ θάρκα καὶ αἰσθαναν καὶ κόσμον, καὶ ὁ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ πρὸς τὰ νοτά κατὰ τὴν ὁχέσιν διαλίθως γίνεται, πρακτικῶς καταπαλάτος, καὶ μόνη διανοία διὰ ἀγάπης θεώ

\(^{168}\) St. Maximus refers to the person of Abraham in PG 91 1200 AB as well, where there is reference to the transcendence of the flesh, of the carnal will because of the divine knowledge.
Abraham acquires the "spiritual status" by "leaving his father's residence" and coming to the land suggested by God. He repudiates carnal lust, switches off sensations and detaches himself from sins which delude the human soul. Abraham is in a state of mental freedom, having repudiated material attractions; therefore he comes to share Divine knowledge. He experiences Divine Economy and Providence, setting himself in an harmonious relationship to God. He partakes in the divine and unsaid truth, he lies in friendship with God, in a harmonious relationship with the beings, the creatures and God.

Abraham exercised all his natural capabilities, his theoretical and practical background serving as a tool towards the end of Divine love.

Man can activate and subsequently fulfill all his natural qualities (relationship with the world, theory, practice, mental perception, knowledge) thus being led to the "ideal" objectivity and reality of the world. By that induction, God is

169. According to the model person Abraham, the transcendence of relativity and mediocrity is a prerequisite for the relationship with God and the participation in the truth. St. Maximus interprets the model person's ἔξοδος ὑπὸ τοῦ οἴκου (the departure from his home) as a form of transcendence of the carnal-nihilistic will, as asceticism. At this point St. Maximus offers an allegorical interpretation of ascetic nature.

170. The model person Abraham, by leaving his home because of the divine exhortation and by fulfilling the natural states, possibilities and movements, is considered to be, allegorically interpreted, as a form of transition towards "ideal objectivity". The person Abraham attains, allegorically, the phenomenological destination after his personal aspiration for unity with God and after his meeting with the Personal Divine. In the Mystical view,
conceived and experienced as the Creator of beings, "the reasons of beings".

An extension of that ontological reality and realization is the "intellectual loving accession to God".

According to the model of Abraham, love is ontological, a complete energetic unity with God. It is a complete unity because all the beings and the creatures lie in energetic unity (reasons of beings) as the existence-person fulfills all its states, possibilities and movements, thus reaching ontological reality. By means of this activation the friendship with God, the gnostic loving accession takes place.

Love, "gnostic love" in particular, at a personal level, constitutes the product of the fulfillment of the energetic unifying potential of the existence which leads to the interpersonal harmonious relationship between God and Man. The human person, "the result of the action" (Evéryma) lies in a friendly interpersonal relationship with God, the "acting force", the Creative cause, the ontological foundation. According to this concept, love is, at the same time, the realization of the ontological reality and a relationship with the Creator of that ontological reality.

Love and the "νοοθετημένη" Trinitarian unity as the basis of asceticism and the ontological unity.

St. Maximus also refers to love at a personal, ontological as well as at an indefinite level. More specifically, he mentions love as a form of ontological unity (1193 C-1196 C).

1196 AB. Ἡν εὖ ἡς κατακτεῖε καὶ ἐφ' ὦ δεῖ προδότως ψευδαὶ πελεῖε, δούλικως ὑπεξευμένας τῷ δυνατεῖα τοῦ λόγου, ἢ καὶ παντέλως αὐτῶς ἀπολιπὼν ἀποίληθον, καὶ μόνῳ ἦς

The phenomenological transition to the ideal objectivity is a result of the personal desire as well as of the relationship with God.
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The loving unity also includes "saints". The term "saints" is at the same time, indicative of the personal nature of love and struggle and of a generalization, since there is no reference to a specific saint.

The "Trinitarian unity" reinforces saints with the will-power to disregard matter and carnal lusts. On the strength of Divine light, they seem to have put individualistic wishes behind them absorbed as they are by their tendency to get closer to God.

The saints learnt that between God and matter lies the soul and the mind, the uniting source. They reached God in an unknown and unsaid way by resigning from matter. It was by means of this resignation from the material and individualistic will that the persons-ontological existences were united with the "archetype". This unity included: the mind, the logic and the spirit. By means of these uniting actions (mind, logic, spirit) and by being illuminated by the Trinitarian unity, the persons-saints overcome the "muteneering" psychic actions (anger and desire) which cause turbulence and anxiety to the existence.

When fully activated, the persons experience the ontological unity in the Ontological Foundation, in the Trinitarian Divinity and they overcome turbulence and anxiety. They acquire "gnostic

111. At this point, sanctity is ontological because the prerequisites for it are the experience of the ψυχικόν (menta) Trinitarian unity and the transcendence of the individualistic will. Sanctity is ontological since Man υοιτε (understands) the unity of the Ontological foundation, God, and because of this Man transcends the individualistic aspiration. The term Sanctity includes the meaning of the unity of the Ontological foundation, by means of which Man can transcend individuality, disruption and isolation; the "in the image" is in harmony with the Image the person is in harmony with the Personal Divine Foundation of the beings.
love" by means of reasons and theory. The ontological persons, at the same time, make full use of their natural potential, they experience the Meaning of the Trinitarian Divinity and they lie in harmony with themselves and with the world. They transcend the individualistic mood and movement, the ontic and the disruptive. Love here appears to be personal, ontological, unifying as well as deontological and existential: not only does the person experience the loving unity on a theoretical basis, but it also balances itself against the world. That God-bound "gnostic love", besides its theoretical merits, is also conceived as a form existential transformation\footnote{By using the phrase ἔργον ἔνδομας (1196 H), St. Maximus projects the existential transformation as a result of "gnostic love", that comes also after a scientific logical analysis of the world. The human person ὑπολείτω (is attracted by) the meanings of the scientific analysis. This results in a profound existential experience of the pothos for the loving unity with God and with Ἑλού.}.

That reference by St. Maximus also implies the truthfulness of the Orthodox applied theory, whereby there is an immediacy between Dogmatic, verbalism and existential experience\footnote{Here it is supported that Dogmatic teaching does not only refer to the correct expression devoid of any anthropocentric meaning. The correct expression of the Dogma is directly related to the redemption of Man, it is of anthropocentric nature. For instance, the absorption of the human Nature, energy or will by the divine (in the person of Jesus Christ) diminishes the human possibility for theosis as well as the human freedom. In this case, the Salvation in the person of Jesus Christ would be Salvation ἐξ ἀνάκεισμένου and not Salvation ἐξ ὑποκειμένου and by the personal unity of the divine and the human.}. Man's salvation and authenticity are inextricably connected to the correct concept of the Triadological Dogma as found in terms of the mystical Orthodox writs. The original teachings on Man being made

\footnote{St. Maximus could be considered as a humanitarian Father because he supports the human nature of Jesus Christ. He is a humanitarian Father, not in the sense of the materialistic humanism, but because he supports the perfection of human nature in the person of Jesus Christ.}
in the Image of God converge with those teachings on Trinitarian Divinity, since Man constitutes the reflection of the Holy Image. The Trinitarian unity, according to St. Maximus's deontological and anthropological teachings, signifies and highlights the unification and the harmonization of Man. The Trinitarian unity signifies the overcoming of "anxiety", "individualism", disruption and imbalance.

Man's transformation by the implied Trinitarian unity in terms of "gnostic love" is not merely confined to the levels of knowledge and essence. Unity becomes an existential fact by means of love as a personal existential action and a direct inter-personal relationship. The love of the Trinitarian Unity is synonymous to the directness of the unity and the unification. It is the utmost unifying, personal and ontological action, the utmost personal as well as ontological unifying experience.

The distinction between ἀγωγός (anxiety) and ἠγωγος (agony) is quite clear. The source of anxiety is the effort of the being to exist with persons and things, while the source of agony is the effort of the being to exist eternally by relating to the absolute. Anxiety leads to the acquisition of the ephemeral, while agony leads to the acquisition of the eternal. Although nowadays there is no clear distinction between anxiety and agony in their expressions, the former is related to the ephemeral and the latter to the eternal. Anxiety relates to the individualistic, social status, while agony relates to the realization of the ontological, of the person, as a relation with the eternal. Sometimes anxiety covers agony, temporarily, but most of the times it leads to isolation. Anxiety is a mask of agony, a seeming redemption from agony, but it is never a realization of the agonized deadlock, of the eternity of existence through place-time persons and things.

Here it is supported that Man tends to be united with Μονήν Τριάδης at a νοησικός (mental) level. It is supported that the correlation of the divine and the human way of existence is achieved by means of νοησις. This mentally experienced unity (as far as the way of existence is concerned) also results in the fact that Man does not only reach the level of his essence but also he partakes in the common way of existence. Man does not only understand what his essence is but he also partakes in the divine way of existing.
6. The "Ἐνατείνιασ" of Logoi : "Ἀγάπη" and of "Ἀγάπη".

Commenting on the miracle of the "epileptic Man" by our Lord, St. Maximus refers to saints and ontological existences (1204 C-1205 C).

1204 D-1205 A. Ἡρῴς γὰρ τοὺς ἄκρους των ἀνθρώπων ἐφικτῶν περὶ θεοῦ λόγους, τις ἀγαθότητι φημι καὶ τὰς ἁγάμας, μᾶλλον γε εἰκότως ἐνατείνιαστι, οἷς κινήθηκα τὸν θεόν τῷ εἶναι τε δούναι τοῖς οὖσι καὶ τῷ εἶναι χρήσασθαι ἐπανειδηθησαν (ἐνερ κινήσει ἐπὶ θεοῦ τοῦ μονού ἁγιάσματος δόμησε εἰπεὶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ μᾶλλον βούλησαν, τὴν πάντα κινοῦσαν τε καὶ εἰς τὸ εἶναι καὶ παράγουσαν καὶ σωνέχοσαν, κινούμενας δὲ σώματος σωματοειδεῖς), τοιούτοις καὶ αὐτοὶ σωφρόνες ἐαυτοὺς ἀνείστισαν, τοῦ ἁμαρτοῦ καὶ ἀλλήλους καθάς τὰς μεγαλοπρεπείς ἐνεργήθησας πειρασμοῖς παιδεμένης διὰ των ἁρετῶν τὴν ἠδονίτητα. Διά τούτο ἄγαθοι καὶ φιλάθλοι καὶ φιλανδρομοὶ, ευνοϊκάχνοι τε καὶ οὐκήρυμοις γεγόνασι, καὶ μπαν ἡρῴς ἀπαν τὸ γένος διάθεσιν ἐχοντες ἁγάμας ἐδειχθησαν...

Those "τοῦ δελοῦ καὶ ἀπλανοῦς λόγου ἐπίθεμένοι (1204 D)saints are not bount by the limits of relativity and moderation imposed by time and temporariness, "τῶν αἰώνα τούτων", as they are in agony to exist as forms of an ontological entity.

Man's agony to exist as a form of ontological reality is

176 At this point, the agonized form of existence is expressed as participation in the Divine virtues and, in particular, in "agape". Man's agony for existence, which also constitutes a relationship with the absolute and the divine, is expressed at this point as participation in the Divine virtue and Agape, which is experienced by means of ἐνατείνια and of the reasons of beings. The agapetic agony of this kind includes the unity with truth, with the ontological (reason of beings) and also with the relationship with the active expression of God, that is agape.
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characterized by St. Maximus as a form of ἐνατενίοις and movement towards "ἐμπληκόντος περί θεοῦ ἄγνους... love and virtue". The saints are regarded as accomplished ontological existences in terms of their "ἐνατενίοις", (internal existential vision and experience)177 of God by means of "love and virtue". God is also regarded as the donator of "εἶναι" of beings, "τοις ὀνο" and as offering "εὖ εἶναι". The saints incorporate in themselves "τὸ ὑμνεῖς κατ' ἄρα πάντα ἥν θέλεις μεγαλοπρεπείας ἐφαρμίῃς φέτοντες φιλομενήν διὰ ἄρετων τὴν ἰδιόπιαν". Struggling for their personal perfection, the saints are transformed into virtuous, God-loving, humanistic and compassionate persons who experience "ὑν μν ἀν διὰν τὸ μένος διάδεουν ἔχονες ἅμαν". In doing this, they rise above "disruption, confrontation, malice and envy".

Love becomes the means by which existences are led to the ontological level, the truth, the reasons of beings and God-Creator and, at the same time, to the invisible beauty. In the quest for the Divine Element as a creative power, it is the Driving Force towards unity since it struggles to maintain its ontological character. Love is at the same time a presupposition and a result.

That love is phenomenological, existential and personal, as the

177. When St. Maximus refers to the agapetic ontological unity at this point, he uses the term ἐνατενίοις instead of the usual (phenomenological) term ἐνφανισι. Contrary to the term ἐνφανισι (which also means, up to a certain point, inwardsness, inner understanding and experience), the term ἐνατενίοις means inwardsness as well as unity with ὅλον. That is, instead of ἐνφανισι, of the inner way of experiencing the truth on the basis of personality, the term ἐνατενίοις is used, meaning the inner way of understanding the truth on the basis of the objective truth, the truth of ὅλον. By means of ἐνατενίοις the person experiences the truth in relation to the other beings, in relation to the reasons of beings. He is in a state of inner personal understanding and experience by means of the whole truth and by being incorporated into it.

Ἐνατενίοις is more of an ontological essential nature than ἐνφανισι because it covers a larger spectre. ἐνφανισι could be interpreted also as subjective understanding whereas ἐνατενίοις can be understood only as ontological personal understanding.
person experiences love (presupposition), reaches the level of its essence (it experiences the existential truth as a form of yearning for loving unity), experiences God as the Creator of the reasons of beings (of love) and ultimately it lies in Divine beauty. This reference indicates that love is predominantly ontological as it simultaneously unites the existence with its true origin, God and continuously maintains the loving unity. Love is also ontological because it connects the person with the reasons of beings, the truth, and creates the authentic-human and true relationship. Love is both the "περιέχων" (that which includes) and the content of the relationship of the person with the truth, God and the other persons.

The unifying and the deifying love of "ὁρθαίευτα" and "Ἀληθινα" St. Maximus highlights the unifying nature of love also in his presentation of the world which always bears relation to the world of the intellect and the virtues (1248 A-1249 C).

1249 B Τάς δὲ πάλιν εἰς τὴν τῶν πασῶν γενικοιτίαν ὁρείναι, φημὶ δὲ τὴν ἀγίαν, συνάγει, ἐκοιτικῆν ὀνύμαν τῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ προσαγωγικῆν τῶν δι' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐνοποιητικῆν τῶν εἰς αὐτὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ Ἀληθινὰν, καὶ διαφερόντις εἰς πᾶσι δεοποιητικῆν.

178. The agapetic transition form "presupposition and pre-understanding" to the participation in the divine beauty and meaningfulness by means of truth and the reasons of beings, is related, by analogy, to the Existential interpretation of R. Bultman. About the method of Bultman see P. Andriopoulos "Τὸ πρόβλημα τού Ἰστορικοῦ Ἰδεών" pp.88-107.

179. The term περιέχων (that which includes) is used by analogy from the work of K. Jaspers. See "Ηθικογλωσσή σύστημα Φιλοσοφία" pp.116 ete. By saying that "the Mystic sinks into περιέχων" the writer makes us reach the ascertainment that Orthodox Mysticism is of existential nature and that Existentialism is more of a mystic nature than the other Philosophical schools.
St. Maximus indirectly opposed to the theory of the pre-existing souls by supporting the unity between the sensory and the psychic functions of the existence. Every sensory power is united to a psychic function. In particular, the mind is directly related to the power of vision, logic is related to the power of hearing, the thymic to the power of smell, the desire to the power of touch. Thus, the mind is united with the image, the sight and the eye, logic with the sense of hearing and the ear, the thymic with the sense of smell and the nose, the desire with the sense of taste and life with the sense of touch.

The "proper use" of the senses reveals God's presence to Man. The concealed God can be experienced, by induction, by means of the seen and felt existential states. God reveals Himself as the Creator of unity and harmonization according to the experienced psychosomatic unity on the part of the existence-person-Man.

The "proper use" of the senses reveals God's presence to man.

The mystical internalization of the psychosomatic unity helps to "merge" and "consolidate" the four virtues. The unity of mental and logical power with the visual and acoustic senses (through the medium of gnostic and scientific power) leads to the experience of prudence. The thymic and smell, when combined, produce gallantry, desire and taste beget sobriety and, finally, touch and the vital power give shape to justice.

At this point, St. Maximus highlights the supreme existential-personal unity, the psychosomatic unity which is indissolubly related to the virtues. The unity of the psychic and the bodily functions leads the human person to its unity of experience with the virtues, the supreme truth of the existence and of "Ωλον".

Love is the supreme unifying and deifying virtue. The human existence reaches love after the experience of the other four virtues and of the unity of the psychosomatic states, possibilities and actions. The human existence-person reaches the level of his/her own essence, that is the agapetic and deifying unity, after experiencing a total psychosomatic unifying activation and
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harmonization. Man reaches love, the ontologic, after fulfilling his mental, logical, gnostic-scientific, desiring and vital states, possibilities and movements.

According to this agapetical and unifying reference by st. Maximus, the ontological nature of love is once more stressed. Love is ontological because it is a product of the existential psychosomatic unity, because it constitutes the accomplishment of the unity between existence and the virtues and because it is supreme virtue.

8. Jesus Christ as the Perichorematic Love of the Built and the Unbuilt.

The ontological character of love is also highlighted in St. Maximus' quotation "Καὶ νοτομοντικαί φιλοτείς καὶ Θεὸς ἄνθρωπος γίνεται" (1304 D-1308 C).

1308 C καὶ τέλος ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις, καὶ κατατην φθανα τῇ ἁρματοῖς δι' ἁμας ἐνδός (ὁ τοῦ ἁματοῦ τὰς περὶ ἁμάς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας) ἐν καὶ ταυτὰν δεξίες καὶ τὴν ἐξίν τς χωρίτις, δόλος δόλῳ περιφωρικὸς διάκως τὸν Θεό, καὶ γενώμενος ἡν εἰ τὲ πέρ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς, χωρίς τᾶς καὶ ὡσιαν ταυτότητας.

St. Maximus applies the Christian Orthodox teachings to God, Man and the world in order to promote the unity among the three of them in the person of Jesus Christ. The Christological and Soteriological unity presupposes the division of the world into five units.

Those five units are experienced by those in the know of holy Mysteries and in the true knowledge of beings. With the aim of disclosing to themselves as well as to others the truth about Jesus Christ, the saints trace the world's roots back to the very
Creation, ἡ ἐκχώρα. Subsequently, they proceed to divide the world into "created and uncreated", "mental and sensory", "sky and earth", "paradise and human society", "male and female". Those divinely created divisions have been improvised not to intonate the disruption, but, the dynamic unity of opposites and the unifying hypostatic potential in every human being.

Man stands out as the prominently unifying being who is the connective bond among other creatures and ἱεροσειτεινικὸν τοῖς ἄρχοντες. Man drives both beings and creatures towards unity and unification with God since he constitutes the means through which the aforementioned divisions are diagnosed. This should by no means, of course, lead us to the unreasonable conclusion that the powers of God and Man are identical.

The saints reach unity and unification in a gnosio-logico-scientific way, by analysing the world and Man, since they lie in the sole unifying energy, the Divine Energy. The perfection of the unity, the unification and the harmonization is "love". In love the "built" merges with the "unbuilt" and the entire human person is in active perichoresis with God. Love is the absolute unity and unification since Man reaches the beginning of his unity.

According to this concept, love is the supreme unifying, ontological reality, since it is the product of the logical-scientific analysis of the world and of the experience of God as the Creator. It is a product of the philosophical analysis of the world and the personal experience of unity. Love, as a scientific and logical product, is also considered as a pre-supposition for the righteous conception and expression of the Christological Dogma.

Contrary to the one-sided view that the term ἐκχώρα means the end of the world, Apocalypse, it is here supported that ἐκχώρα means also beginning of Creation by God. In the centre of the two ἐκχώρα (beginning and end) lies Jesus Christ, Who must be a model for Man. Man can "imitate" Jesus Christ by experiencing the bi-eschatologic nature of the human existence, by experiencing the truth (the reasons of beings), by partaking in the Soteriological work of Jesus Christ (which is performed by the Church) towards resurrection at the Second Coming.
According to St. Maximus, in order to express the Christological Dogma and the presupposition-cause of Humanization, the "Saints-Fathers" analyze the world, experience the unity of the Creative cause, experience the unifying ontological nature of love and then they proceed to the right expression of the Dogma. Love is of primary importance in this process. The right expression of the Dogma does not presuppose only the comprehension of the Holy Bible and the Holy Tradition. It is in relation to the human and cosmological authenticity-truth. The Soteriological significance of the Dogma is not independent of the human and cosmological truth, of being "in the image" and of "the reasons of beings".

9. Love as the basis for the realisation of Theosis.

In his reference to simplicity (1353 C-1356 A), St. Maximus displays the venue between the Bible, human authenticity, as well as Man's potential to remain authentic.

1353 C Οθών γὰρ ἐπεμενεν εἶναι τὸν ὅπερ ἀρχαῖον, µηδὲν τὸ σύνολον περιστρέφενον τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, ἢ περὶ αὐτῶν, ἢ καὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ πρὸς τελετάων ἔνος μόνου προσδεχεµένον, τῶς πρὸς τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, φηµεὶ τὸν θεόν, καὶ ὅλην τὴν ἀγαπητὴν δύναµιν ἄσχετον κινήσεως.

Initially man appears to be driven by his addiction to lust reinforced by the irrepressible influence of speech, arts and, depending on the circumstance, nature itself. If Man had been content in his simplicity during his pre-fall state and had not made an abortive attempt to get perfected by standing on his own feet, relying on the material objects surrounding him, he would have attained his 'theosis simply by unconditionally placing his hopes and destiny in God.

According to St. Maximus there are two ways in which man tries to be perfected, both related to his authenticity. He can either rely on his galloping imagination, finite logic and nature and, by closely associating with those material objects surrounding him, he
can therefore attempt at becoming a worldly God; or, he can achieve theosis by grace of God, through his active participation in Holy Energy.

This distinction gives rise to two kinds of theosis: The material on and the God-related one. The former stems from man's individualistic motives, his tendency to get in touch with material objects only. The latter derives from his authentic unifying mood. The former is ontic and marked by agony (as Man exists and moves only in terms of a limited time-space). The latter is ontological in the sense that man wishes to eternally be united with God.

In his comments on St. Gregory the Theologian and by occasion of "Ὑπνόν τὸ ἀνάθεμα καὶ ζωὴς ἀτέχνη, καὶ δίχα παντὸς ἐπικαλήματος καὶ προθέματος. τοιούτων γὰρ ἐπιθέει εἶναι τὸν ἄν' ἀρχῆς (1353 D) St. Maximus refers to man's two states of existence, the anxious and agonizing one.

In his agonizing state of mind, Man experiences God's presence in terms of simplicity and freedom. By resting his case in the hands of God in terms of Divine loving energy, man manages to supersede his selfish individualistic mood and unite with the ontological Foundation, God the Creator. There is no kind of material support or intervention, just the sheer reliance upon Divine Energy. The only source of Man's power is Divine love. He finds himself in a state of liberty and detachment. He does not need to distinguish one person or thing from another because he lives in terms of ontological harmony.

In terms of the loving relationship between God and man, human beings have transcended their distractive individualistic wishes and live within Divine ontological reality. That determines and defines the authentic human way of living. It also allows man to live within the "vertigo of liberty". As love constitutes his sole ontological and deontological option, Man does not necessarily have to choose among more alternatives. Being made in the image of God, Man feels "γυμνὸς τὸ ἀνάθεμα", yet fulfilled by Holy personal and existential energy.
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10. The Existential Gnoseological Love.

That fulfillment by Holy existential energy is highlighted by St. Maximus at a gnosiologic level. (1361 D).

In particular, God is generous and provides "the gifts of knowledge" to those "revering Divinity" to the effect that they become capable of transcending "the present age" and every marginal and limited piece of knowledge, thus probing its innermost mysteries.

Man participates in the divine energy at a gnosiological level, he lies in the divine energy because of his love for God. The presuppositions of this love are eros and pothos for God. This eros and pothos are gifts of God to Man. By fulfilling his authentic pothos and eros, by falling in love with God and the divine truth, Man "loves" God as the creative cause of the world and the human nature and lies in his authenticity, in his ontological reality.

In St. Maximus' most descriptive words, love is of an existential, ontological and unifying nature. In its wish to disengage itself from the ontic element and the individualistic confines, the human existence, driven by its natural pothos and eros aiming at arriving at the state of eternity by God-Creator, ultimately loves God and is led up to its authenticity. According to this last reference, love constitutes the ontological personal energetic unity with God and the world at a personal gnosiological
level. The presupposition of this ontological unity, this agapetical unity is the realization of the possibilities and the actions of Man, as well as the right direction of Man’s agonizing pothos for existence and theosis. Man reaches his ontological and gnosiological reality through love, according to the realisation of his naturality, that is of theosis, in his relationship with the Personal and Trinitarian God.

Finishing our reference to love according to St. Maximus it is worthwhile our underling its main aspects.

It represents an ontological, energetic and existential unity with God, the world and truth. To identify love, one could describe it as a personal ontological unity in its natural binding from, as it has the ability to draw every being and creature around it and affiliate them with God. It helps bring out in Man those qualities, which are most dear to the Divine Power by obliterating Man’s omnic-individualistic distractive tendencies and by elevating him to the ontological unifying status. That is also reinforced by the fact it hinges on the Trinitarian Christological unity.

Man finds out his way to the ontological unity of beings as long as he repudiates his selfish individualistic pursuits and accepts the Triadological and Christological Dogma.

Man can approach God as soon as he has discovered in himself the merits of natural, mental, rational, aesthetic and gnosiological love. Furthermore, he is also capable of attaining the saintly status or, by philosophical standards, the inspiratorial state of mind, on condition that he manages to transcend tempting individualistic debaucheries.

It is a hard path to follow but there is a most generous reward: He becomes an ontological person as he gets united with beings and the ever-Existing Trinitarian God.

This chapter ends with the part of the text by St. Maximus (Amb. 1361 A-1364 B) to which we refer in a piecemeal way (discussing the parts pothos, eros and agape). This text includes the three personal unifying (with God, Man the world and the truth) actions.
(Pothos, Eros, Agape) as gifts of God, the personal exploitation of those gifts, as transcendence of the nihilistic movement—sin and as ways of reaching theosis.

The Text.

Amb. 43a. 1361 A–1365 C.

1361 A–1364 A. Ο πόθον μετὰ σωφίας φόβον ὑποσηθὸς θεός, καὶ πρώτην ἐκάστη τῶν λογικῶν φύσεών δύναμιν τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώσιν κρυφτὶς ἐνθέμενος, δέδωκε καὶ ἔμεν τοῖς ταπεινοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὡς μεγαλοῦν μετὰ ραστώνις γνώσις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς τοῦ πόθου πληράσεως, καὶ μὴ παραφυλάκατος διαμαρτεῖν οὐ εὐεκιν δεινῷ θανάτῳ, κατὰ τούτων οὖν ἐνοπίου εὐλογίων περὶ τε τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν εὐδαιμονιῶν τοὺς δῆλοις ἐμφανομένης σωφίας καὶ διοίκησεως; οπεῖς ἐναγέμεθα ἐκείνου τιμῆς, διὰ τούτων γλυκάμοιν, οὐ χάριν τὸν πόθον ἐλάφρωμεν. Καὶ τούτου μυστικῶς ἐγκωκότες οἱ φιλομαθεῖς καὶ ψευδότιμοι τῆς ἀληθείας ἔρασται μιᾶν ἐστήσαντο σχολὴν καὶ προσερήθητο εὐαίσθητος τὴν περὶ τούτου φιλόσοφον ὁδικαία, ἀκριβῶς ὡς αὐτὸς τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς ἀλήθειας κατανοήσεως τοις κατάκολουσας ραδίως ὡς, εἰπερ κατὰ τὸν αὐτόν τούτων ποιῶς δι᾽ εἰσειθένθ’ ὑπομνήματα τὸν μέλλοντας ἀλληλων εἰκονολογοῦντο, καὶ τὸν πόθον πληροφοροῦσαν, ἐπουμοίεσιν ὡς τοῖς ἐντούθα καλῷς γυμνασθέντοις τὴν ψυχὴν ἐσθηκότες, ἀκμὴν μετὰ τὸν μίλητον ἐπὶ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀλληλων μεταφράσιοι, σκύλογοι λαμβάνοντες αὐτοῖς ἢ ἄρας καλῶς διὰ τῶν ὑποτελῶν νοημάτων, ἄγονος αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ἐξάδην τὴν ἀλληλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωθῆς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ἄπλαν καὶ ἀριθμητόν καὶ ἀληθινά.

PART I.
πάσης ἀπορίας, συμβολικῶς τι πολλαπλάς καὶ πάσης αὐτικοτάτου διαφεσάς, αὐτώς παραδεικνύοντος, ἀποδήλωσης αὐτοῖς ἑπετ τῆς πρακτικῆς ὀρετής ὁδός καὶ ἄτοτις καὶ στεναγμὸς διὰ τὴν ἰευδεῖαν ὀπάθειαν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θεωρητικῆς γνώσεως, διαφεσάς πάσης καὶ ἀπορίας, διὰ τὴν ἀσφάλαν, προστεθεῖσας αὐτοῖς, ἐντεῦθεν λαβοῦσα τὰς ὑποτυπώσεις αὐτῶς, την κατα τις γνώσης τῆς ἀληθείας. Ἑκατερός γὰρ, φησὶ, τῷ ἔχοντι, δηλοῦν τὸν περὶ τῶν μελλόντων πόθον, δοθησάται, καὶ προστεθεῖσαι πάντως ἢ τῶν αἰώνιων ἀγαθῶν ἀπόλαυσις. Πλοῦσιος γὰρ ὑπάρχων ὁ θεός ἡμῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτῶν τὰ τῆς διανέξεως δόρα τῆς γνώσεως, ἀλλὰ οὐδὲν ὁμοίων κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τούτον δυνάμεθα, διὰ τὸ αὐτῶν ὄρος καὶ μέγεθος, εἰπέρ ἀληθεῖσθαι φάσθων περὶ τὰς ἐσχάτις μακριώτητος ὁ μέγας Ἀνδριόλος ὑπεραντὶ πανίδος ὀνόματι ὁμοιαζόμενον αὐτὴν εἰναι, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μελλόντι τὴν μετὰ πᾶσαν πάντων τῶν χαριτώματα διανομὴν καὶ ἀνάβασιν δειχθησόμενην τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀκροτάτην κορυφήν αἰνετόμενον, τὴν μηδένι λόγος ἢ νῦν ῥηθῶν ἢ γνωσθήσαται δυναμένην, τὸν τις καὶ τὸν μελλόντα δειχθησόμενα, καὶ ὁμοιασθήναι καὶ γνωσθήσαται τούτων ἢμῶν δυναμένων. Ἀλη γὰρ ὁ διελθηθῆσθαι τοὺς οὐρανοὺς Ἰπποίους, ο τούθεος λόγος, καὶ ὑπεραντὶ πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος, τοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας αὐτῷ διὰ πράξεως καὶ θεωρίας μεταβάζει τε καὶ μετατίθενται ἀπὸ τῶν ἠττῶν ἑπὶ τὰ κρεῖττα, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πάλιν ἑπὶ τὰ ἐκ τούτων αὐτῆς, καὶ ἄλλως εἶπεν. ἐπιδείξει μὲν ὁ χρόνος λέγοντας τὸς θεὰς τῶν ἄγων ἀναβαίνεις τε καὶ ἀποκαλπίζεις κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ ὅξον δι᾽ αὐτῶν ἀλλοιωθαίνην, ἐως ἑκατοστὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ἕδω τάγματι, ἀρμοξουσαν θέωσιν.

PART 1.
Chapter III.
Personality and Love in Saint Maximus "Ambigua".

In Ambigua St. Maximus uses, as we have already mentioned, the terms "Pothos, Eros and Agape" in connexion with the energetic unity of Man, the World and God. All three terms, which constitute states, possibilities and movements-actions, express the tendency towards unity as an innate reality of the species, the tendency towards unity on the part of the person as a part of his species, the realised personal energetic unity and the ontological unity.

Pothos, Eros and Agape, as "existential" states, signify the "pre-understood" energetic state of unity and the "innate essential-natural state" of the "ὄντα παθωμένα" (those who exist). In Pothos, Eros and Agape, the fulfilled energetic unity, as realisation of the state, is included.

This is made apparent by the fact that Jesus Christ becomes a Man because he desires Man\(^{181}\), and by the fact that Man feels pothos\(^{182}\), eros\(^{183}\) and love (agape) for God\(^{184}\), for Man and the beings\(^{185}\).

These terms also signify the movement of the persons towards unity at a personal level\(^{186}\), the movement towards the unity with the truth of the beings\(^{187}\)(with ἀγάπη τῶν ὀντών)\(^{188}\) and

\(^{181}\) PG. 91. 1048 C

\(^{182}\) PG. 91. 1076, 1080 C.

\(^{183}\) PG. 91 1088 C, 1128 D-1133 A.

\(^{184}\) PG. 91 1112 D-1116 D, 1144 B, 1145 C-1148 A.

\(^{185}\) PG. 91 1072 A, 1112 D-1116 A, 1193 C-1196 C.

\(^{186}\) PG. 91 1080 C, 1257 A-1261.

\(^{187}\) PG. 91 1080 C, 1061 A.

\(^{188}\)
the movement towards unity with the holy energy and the light.\textsuperscript{189}

The unity with "οὐ̆ον", with the ontological, is included in these three existential states of the energetic (and consequently not of the existential or of the natural or of the essential) unity since these states are Gifts of God to Man.\textsuperscript{190} They are also unifying actions of an ontological nature for two reasons: because they are also revealed by means of reason (since they are understood by the carrier-being) and because they are transformed from logically uncontrollable actions, into logical pothos, logical eros and logical agape.

The existential states-realities, possibilities and movements-actions are mainly partaking and perichorematic personal actions of unity with the ontological.

According to St. Maximus, the carriers of these unifying actions are God and Man, according to their reality of essence. The participants in these actions and unifying states are the human and the Divine persons, according to the participation in their essence and according to their singularity, since these actions are also personal.

Consequently, the person is the carrier of the unifying energy, of pothos, of eros and of agape according to the fact of his participation in the essence of his species.

The question of what is a person according to St. Maximus stems out of this concept (namely, that the person is the carrier of pothos, eros and agape).

The term person, according to St. Maximus as well as to the

\textsuperscript{188} PG.91.91 1080 A-1080 D,1081 D-1084 D.

\textsuperscript{189} PG.91 1032 A,1121 C-1124 B,1161 A-1164 D.

\textsuperscript{190} PG.91 1364 B.
Fathers prior to him, is related to the term "Hypostasis". According to the patristic point of view, the term Person-Hypostasis signifies the being which belongs to a species-nature-essence, to a common way of existing with the beings of the same species (φύσεως) and the same essence (φύσις). It also signifies the being which partakes in the common energy of the other beings of the same essence, having at the same time its own personal-hypostatic singularity and its own personal and "particular characteristics".

Although the term "person-hypostasis" originates from Aristotelian philosophy and is used by Fathers according to this philosophy, it does not carry exactly the same meaning. Instead of the term "ονοματικός" (by coincidence), as a characteristic of the person-hypostasis, the Fathers use the term "ονοματικόν ελευθερίαν".

In particular, God the Father is not the Father by coincidence (as Aristotelian philosophy seems to understand), but because ή εύσεβεστέρα καὶ έιδά "ἲγνυντος. In the same way, the Son and the Holy Spirit are Persons-Hypostases because they have their own

191. According to N. Matsoukas "essence and nature have been regarded as synonymous concepts which signify one and the same reality. Person and Hypostasis have been regarded as synonymous concepts which signify the particular thing, the particularity in the sense of individuality-personality". See N. Matsouka: "Λογιατική καὶ Συμβολική Θεολογία" vol. 1, p. 91.

192. L. Thunberg writes that St. Maximus uses the term Hypostasis with two meanings. It is either used to signify "essence" with its own ὑποστατική ζωή (according to the Cappadocian concept), or to signify a complex hypostasis which includes all the human kind and its particular qualities (according to the Neocalchedonian concept). See L. Thunberg: "Microcosm and Mediator", p. 49.

193. About the Aristotelian origin of the term "Hypostasis" see N. Matsouka: "Λογιατική καὶ Συμβολική Θεολογία" vol. 1, p. 106.

194. About the term ονοματικός See Aristotle "Μετὰ τὰ Φυσικά" 1064 b.
which express the hypostatic particular, but not essential differentiation, or essential contusion.

At this point we should present some views about the concept "Person", according to the Fathers. We should also mention the relation of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity according to the Pateristic and in general to the Orthodox point of view.

Origen uses the term "Hypostasis-person" to refer to the particular nature of each of the Persons in the Holy Trinity and to the "Trioumou athlete" (Three Hypostases) of the Divinity (B.E.11.E. vol 19 p.347, vol.11 p.297).

St. Basil "the Great" characterizes the names that refer to essence "common", whereas the ones that refer to hypostasis "particular" (see Basil the Great, "Περι του 'Ακαταλήπτου" Edition Βιβλιοθήκη των Εδαύρων, 482 CD). The same Father, referring to what has been said about the names of the Father and the Son, supports that they do not stand for "essence" but for "hypostasis" (E.H.E. vol. 10, p.133).

St. Gregory of Nyssa accuses Sabellius of using the term hypostasis and the term essence as synonyms, thus introducing "Τριβελία" (three Gods). In contrast to this concept, the Fathers support the particular nature of each hypostasis, by using the term hypostasis. They also support the common nature of the essence in the Three Persons of the Divinity, with the purpose to stress the One Divinity and the Three Persons, when referring to hypostases and to "Ινασυνητικά ινώματα" (E.H.E. vol 2, pp 115,233,247,335).

Evdokimov refers to the concept of person, according to the Orthodox tradition, as a mutual ἄντικρωμα and as perichoresis. The writer stresses, being in accordance with the Pateristic beliefs, that the person exists as community and by means of it. (See P. Evdokimov "Ἡ ῎Ορθόδοξη" p.90).

M. Dobrivčič is in accordance to St. Maximus and believes that the person of the Father signifies the relationship with the Son and the Holy Spirit. ("Τὸ Μυστήριο τοῦ Ἐκκάθαρτον" p.32 comment on PG.91 1265).

We referred to these theories about the Τριαδικότης of God in our effort to stress the continuous experience of the truth of the Triadologic Dogma on the part of the Orthodox Ecclesiastic Tradition and, at the same time, to stress the personalistic nature of the Triadologic Dogma. These theories also stress the essential foundation (the common essence) of the Orthodox personalism as opposed to the individualistic personalism. According to these theories, the person does not relate to individual aspirations but to the participation in its nature and essence. The person's choices and actions are not related to its individuality but to its essential reality. "Ινασυνητικά ινώματα" do not signify the individuality of each hypostasis but the particular, personal way
The difference between the concepts and the realities of οὐσιατικὰ ἐνέργεια is important to the Fathers196, since, according to Aristotelian Philosophy, the term οὐσιατικός, as a characteristic of personality, is not of an essential nature197. The subject, according to Aristotelian philosophy, takes on its particular nature by coincidence and in accordance to the social-cosmic states, possibilities and movements, remaining at the same time a part of the essence of the species.

On the contrary, according to the Patristic concept, the person-hypostasis takes on his hypostatic-personal particularity in accordance to the essential (οὐσιωδὴ καὶ οὐσιατικὴ) state and relationship. The sociability of the hypostasis in the divinity is not the product of a human sociability. It is not the product of the influences that lie outside the person-hypostasis.

Sociability as a characteristic of the hypostasis is mainly due to the fact of the essential and the energetic perichoresis of the persons198.

The sociability and the relationship of the persons, as a
characteristic of the hypostasis, pre-supposes the essential unity and perichoresis, as opposed to the human sociability which, according to the point of view of Sociology, makes the person reach the essence of subjectivity, of the personal establishment as well as of the personal participation in essence. The fact that, according to the Patristic point of view, sociability is a main characteristic of the hypostasis does not signify differentiation from ὄνομα (the being of the same essence) but perichoresis.

According to the Fathers, the person-hypostasis takes on its own particular nature, its hypostatic-personal difference not by coincidence or competition but in accordance to the fact of the participation in the essence. The term participation does not signify independence from the essence and, by extension, differentiation. The basis of the person-hypostasis' particular nature lies in its essential origin and in its essential relationship with the other persons of the same essence.

This Patristic Theological clarification stresses the essential-ontological nature of the personal unifying actions of pothos, eros and agape, as opposed to their coincidental nature according to the Aristotelian point of view.

Although the uniting actions of pothos, eros and agape are included (they belong to and they are in perichoresis) in the person-hypostasis, according to the aristotelian interpretation, they have, by analogy, a Platonic and a Plotinian basis. They are, according to the two philosophers, essential states, possibilities and actions, by means of which the person reaches its essence but not in an autonomous, self-contained and selfperfecting way. The states, the possibilities and the actions pothos, eros and agape signify the relationship of the person with the other person of the same essence (as the Trinitarian Divinity and the human

---

199. Also see M. Dobrilovic. "Τὸ Μοναχμίο τῶν Έκκλησιῶν" p.32.

200. About the opposition to the autonomous perfection of the existence according to the theory of the pre-existence of the souls, see PG.91 1321 D-1341 C.
being with the other human beings) and the relationship with the divine (in the case of the human being in its relationship with God).

According to the patristic concept of the person, the unifying states, possibilities and actions pothos, eros, agape take on an essential nature and not a coincidental nature. The person feels pothos, eros and agape not by coincidence but by its essential (συνεφώνης καὶ οὐκοιμητική) reality.

Jesus Christ, in particular, did not become Man because He felt pothos, eros and agape for the creature-Man. He became Man because, as God, He wanted to reveal the magnitude of His love for Man, or rather, to reveal the infinity of the divine love. Respectively, Man does not feel pothos, eros and agape for God and Man by coincidence but because they are essential, ontological realities of the unity with God, Man and the world.

The patristic teachings about the person stress the person's essential nature, its essential origin and its essential relationship. In the Fathers' point of view, the person is the carrier of the essence and of the essential way of existing. The term person signifies the unity of the ontologic and the deontologic reality, the unity of the part and the whole.

The unity of ontology and deontology, of the truth and the way of existing, highlights the dialectic nature of the person and, by extension, the dialectic nature of pothos, eros and agape.

In the person, as a member of its nature-essence and as a carrier

---

201 See PG. 91 1261 B-1264 B, 1264 C-1265 B, 1265 C-1268 B.

202 According to St. Maximus, the unity of ontology and deontology in the reality of the Person highlights the inter-perichoresis of λόγος φύσεως καὶ τρόπον υπορθέως. The one concept expresses the ontological reality and the other expresses the deontological reality which is directly related to the ontological reality (λόγος φύσεως).

About the unity and the perichorematik relationship of these two concepts see PG. 91 1940 AB, 1052 B-1053 B, 1056 A.

J. Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator" pp. 31, 32, 114, 164-166, 443.

of the unifying actions, the main aspect of dialectics (that of ontological and deontology) is included. The existence-person, Man, is of a dialectical nature in the sense that pothos, eros and agape belong to his Eἷμα (being) and also in the sense that by exploiting these realities, he is unified with other beings of the same essence and with God.

The dialectic of ontology and deontology is highlighted, by extension, as the exploitation of the reality of the person towards unity.

By moving towards unity with the beings of the same essence and with the Creator of those beings, the person is related to, exploits and is in the dialectic of the realities pothos, eros and agape.

Dialectic, up to this point, constitutes the tendency of the person towards unity at an essential and ontologic level.

However, the dialectical nature of the person is not limited only to the exploitation of the ontological categories of pothos, eros and agape. It is only by means of pothos, eros, and agape that the person is in agony to be unified with its essence, the world and God.

According to the created reality of Man by God, pothos, eros and agape are included in him in unity with speech, mental capacity, Mind, knowledge, sentiment and the senses.

The human person feels pothos, eros and agape for the experienced mental reality, the logically and rationalistically proved reality and the reality which is connected to the senses, since all of them are products of mental and logical conception. By extension, the dialectical nature of the person is not limited only to certain ontological categories but it also consists in the exploitation of all the ontological categories.

203. See Pg. 91, 1133 A-1137 C.
204. PG. 91, 1361 ABC.
205. Pg. 91, 1112 D-1116 D.
The human person is mainly in agony to be unified with the world, Man and God, not only by means of certain categories of his essence, but in his entirety.206.

According to the concept of logical pothos, eros and agape and in contrast to the phenomenological rationalistic belief, the logical unity of the human being with God, Man and the world is a natural state of essence. The human person does not feel pothos, eros and agape for the world because of its understanding. Man does not love simply because he has understood the loved ones and, by extension, dominated over them, but because, by means of his logic, he has experienced the reasons of the beings (λόγοι τῶν ὄντων) and the reality of the person (as a co-existence and as a harmonious relationship with those who are, those who exist, and the existent God).

According to St. Maximus, this ontological and deontological exploitation consists in and, at the same time, consists of the πράγματα of the whole person by the whole God.

In this ὁλικὴ πράγματα of Man by God (through the total exploitation of the ontological categories), dialectic is not a product of a conflict between elements. Man, according to his natural and deontological reality, is not part of a dialectic relationship in order to stress more one element of his existence. He does not stress his psychic state over his physical one, nor does he stress the sentiment over logic. He is of a dialectic nature trying to be unified and united with the world, Man and God.

By means of this dialectic unity, Man also unifies his ontological reality with the essential ontological movement towards theosis.207. He unities Εἶναι (being) with γίνεσθαι (becoming), the content of his reality to become God by grace with his journey towards theosis. The human person unifies Εἶναι with γίνεσθαι by experiencing them as essential categories.

206. PG. 91 1357 B-1360 D.

207. PG. 91 1368 C-1369 C, 1361 A-1365 ABC, 1336 A.
The unity between the whole and the part, between the ontologic and the subjective, consists in the person, as a carrier of the essential states of the species and as a part-member.

The unity of the ontologic and the subjective, in particular, is related by means of freedom (which also is an essential state).

According to St. Maximus, freedom is not only the possibility of choosing states or relationships of existence. The absolute of freedom is the choice of resignation from the right of choice, when it is an agonized quest for the authentic and the true. Because the being desires to be authentic-ontologic, it resigns from the right of choice of states which may not be authentic-ontologic. It resigns from ἔλευθερον ἔλεγχον. When it experiences its authentic pothos, the being does not choose between ὅν and μὴ ὅν. It chooses the resignation from the ability of movement towards "μὴ ὅν" by means of total perichoresis.

The freedom of the person, the choice of refusing to choose (after resignation), is also a product of the mental perception, the logical analysis and the relationship with the senses.

The absolute freedom, the ἔλευθερον ἔλεγχον (the vertigo of freedom), (as concession to Holy Energy) is the product of the in-depth quest of the being. It is a product of depletion of the ontological categories, that is Mind, speech, senses. It is the ontological aspect of freedom, the way of Man's freedom, deontology as the way of realising the ontological categories.

Freedom, as the realization of the ontological categories, by

---

208. PG.91 1080 C.
207. PG.91 1076 C,1353 C-1356 A.
210. PG.91 1196 C
211. PG.91 1236 D-1241
212. PG.91 1112 C-1116 D.
213. See S.Kierkegaard "Η Ἐννοια τῆς Ἀγάπης"p.111.
means of which Man-person is in an erotic and agapetic perichoresis with God, Man and the world, signifies a perichoresis of a double nature.

Firstly, it signifies the perichoresis of the Man-person with his own authenticity, his ontological reality. It signifies the dynamic inter-perichoresis of the states: mind, understanding (φνωνος), understood (φονθευ), speech, logic, sentiment and conscience.

The perichoresis of the first nature is an inner existential perichoresis of the person and the ontological categories; it is an exploitation of his essential abilities-possibilities.

Later, (after the total inner perichoresis and exploitation of the person and his ontological truth) the person is in perichoresis with the Creator of his ontological categories, with the Creator of the reasons of the beings, with God. The second form of perichoresis is the form of pothos, eros and agape of the person, in the sense that it does not only signify the unity with the ontological but also the transcendence of this ontological reality.

According to St. Maximus, the comprehensive reality of the two natures of perichoresis is Mystical Theoresis. The term (and reality of existence) Mystical Theoresis includes both the realisation of the ontological categories of being (mind, logic, senses, sentiment and conscience) and the holy energy, since, if the ontological categories are activated by the beings, they reveal God as the Creator, the provider, as an erotic way of existence etc. Mystical theoresis, as a theoretical and experiencing participation in the holy energy, constitutes the perichoresis of the divine and the human. It is the

---

214. PG. 91 1089 A.D.
215. PG. 91 1273 B.
216. PG. 91 1133 A-1137 C.
217. PG. 91 1193 C-1196 C.
experience of the reflection-depiction of God on Man, after ένόρασις, ἑναίσθησις and εὐσεβὴς κατανόησις (pious understanding).

The human person experiences the divine presence in the world and in Man (in the ontological truth) by means of the exploitation of its ontological categories, by means of the inner essential actions (ένόρασις, ἑναίσθησις, εὐσεβὴς κατανόησις). The main inner essential actions ἑναίσθησις, ἑναίσθησις and εὐσεβὴς κατανόησις, which are used by St. Maximus, constitute primarily the ways of uniting with the understood (νοομένη) and experienced truth of existence and of the beings. They are the main inner ways of uniting with the truth of the human person, with the truth of the world and with God as the Creator, the Acting Force and the Provider of the beings and Man.

The pothos, eros and agape of Man for God and the beings as well as the uniting energetic relationship of Man with God and the world come as a logical and natural consequence of the aforementioned.

According to what has already been mentioned, the human person, through all the stages of his being, of his way of being and of his reality, is in agony of existing in relation to God. This happens either because pothos, eros and agape belong to the God-created logos; or because it is in pothos, eros and agape that the exploitation of the dialectic nature of man (as essence and as hypostasis-person) culminates; or because it is in pothos, eros and agape that the exploitation of the states of essence (mind, logic, senses etc) culminates; or because Man acts in a perichorematic way according to his human reality; or because he is in perichoresis with this divine energy; or, finally, because he experiences Mystical theoresis.
The person-hypostasis, as a carrier-member of the essence and as a carrier of ἱδρυματα acts and exists by being erotically and agapetically united. The person is the carrier of the agapetic unifying force according to the reality of pothos. He acts, at a personal level, towards the unification with the other person, according to the reality of eros. Finally, he acts towards the agapetic unification with the ontologic according to the reality of love.

Finishing the first part of the study named Personality and love according to St. Maximus the Confessor, we think that the title Existence as love would be more suitable.

We are using here this, relatively similar to the initial, title as the term Ἐναρξις (Existence), according to St. Maximus, can mean ἔνδρεξέν ἑστίν and way of Existing as well.

In particular, the term Ἐναρξις connects the essence, as existing ἔνδρεξέν-ἐστιν (existing-being), with the way of existing and, by extension, it connects the essential-ontological and deontological reality of pothos, eros and agape, according to St. Maximus the confessor. The term personality also signifies the participation in the one essence, in the ἐστίν and in the reality of the way of existing. However, because this term is found, in the work of St. Maximus, in the sense of person-hypostasis of the ιδρυμα and signifies singularity, we believe that the term Ἐναρξις is more in accordance to the spirit of St. Maximus.

The Existence, as a reality, a state, a possibility and a movement-action towards the agapetic unity with the ontological reality and God, realises this unity by means of the ontological categories of pothos, eros and agape, according to the teachings of St. Maximus the confessor. The Existence realizes its essential reality, the authenticity of its nature, its ontological reality by means of pothos, eros and agape in relation to its ontological

---

271. PG. 91 1035, 1086 A, 1269 C.
See also
P. Sherwood "The Earlier Ambigua" p. 158, 164-165.
L. Thunberg "Microcosm and Mediator" p. 452.
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categories. According to teaching of St. Maximus, the ontological reality of the Person, the perpetual aspiration and agony of every human Existence, that is the unity with the truth (agony of ontology), the unity with the world (agony of cosmology) and the unity with God (agony of Metaphysics and Religion), are realized by means of the states, possibilities and movements-actions of Pothos, Eros and Agape. Maybe this is implied also by Dostoyevsky's belief that Love, and in particular Christian Love, will save the World.
PART II.
PERSONALITY AND LOVE IN MAX SCHELER
"THE NATURE OF SYMPATHY"
"Agape and Eros."
Chapter I.

General Discussion of "The Nature of Sympathy" by Max Scheler.

The "Nature of Sympathy" was first published in 1912. M. Scheler's aim in this work is to develop philosophical ethics on a phenomenological basis. He writes that that study does not only refer to the philosophers who treat problems of ethics, but to epistemologists and to psychologists too. In particular, the writer wants to treat the moral values of sympathy and love as well as certain phenomena of an emotional nature in his effort to develop philosophical ethics on a phenomenological basis by reinstating love and sympathy on their true foundation.

In 1922 a second revised edition of the "Nature of Sympathy" was published. This revised edition of the work is more systematic as far as the critique of other theories is concerned. In this edition the following chapters are added:

Metaphysical theories of Sympathy, The sense of unity with the cosmos in some representative temperaments of the past, Sympathy and its Laws of dependence, The interaction of the sympathetic functions.

In the same edition, Scheler criticizes his contemporaries' theories about the nature of sympathy and mentions the British psychologists. In particular, he criticizes their empirical

---

3. Ibid.p.li.
4. Ibid.p.li.
6. Ibid.p.xlvi.
7. Ibid.p.xlvi.
method. Instead he stresses the sociological and psychosociological phenomenological analysis of the feelings of sympathy and love, in contrast to the individualistic psychological empirical analysis. In this edition there is also reference to epistemology, to the unity with the world, and to the concept of sympathy according to Indian, Classical, Christian, and contemporary Western points of view.

In 1926 a third edition of the study, similar to the second, was published. Again it is of philosophical, psychological, and sociological interest.

In 1948 the same study is published again, this time by Maria Scheler. It is similar to the second and the third ones, apart from certain comments added by Scheler's publisher.

We have used the English translation of 1953 by P. Heath. The extensive introduction to this edition is by M. Stark.

The references to the "Nature of Sympathy" by other researchers, at least the ones we know of, are of philosophical, sociological, and theological nature.

The subject of research of this study is the presentation of personality and love (that is the presentation of love as an essential element of the personality). This study will attempt to follow the way of thinking of the writer himself. In particular, we
will present the relationship between personality and love from the phenomenological-philosophical, the sociological and the theological points of view.

By presentation from the phenomenological point of view, we mean that we will attempt to present love as a constituent part of the subject-person, by means of which the person attains ideal objectivity and the values of the loved person. By presentation from the sociological point of view, we mean that we will attempt to present love as the way in which the subject-person becomes able to recognize the values of the social reality as well as the way towards sociability, towards relationship of the person with others. Finally, by presentation from the theological point of view, we mean that we will attempt to present love as the way in which the Holy Person makes His existence felt by the other beings and existences, as well as love as the way of relating to other beings and existences.

The subject is going to be analyzed in a philosophical, sociological and theological way because all three parameters are included in the object of our study. We will start this study of Scheler by making a general reference to the work and latter on we will present the philosophical, sociological and theological basis of our methodology as well as the philosophical, sociological and theological content of this study.

16: About the view that M. Scheler analyzes the subjects he treats from the phenomenological, social and theological points of view also see R. Ibanas "The Stratification of Emotional Life and the problems of the Other Minds According to Max Scheler" (I.Ph.Q. vol. xxxi. no.4) p.462. R. Perrin "Max Scheler's Concept of the Person": p.x.
Contents

M. Scheler's "The Nature of Sympathy" is divided into 3 parts.

The first part, titled "Fellow-Feeling", contains the following chapters:

Preface.

1. The Ethics of Sympathy.

II. Classification of the Phenomena of Fellow-Feeling.
   1. Community of Feeling.
   2. Fellow-Feeling.
   3. Emotional infection.

III. Genetic theories of Fellow-Feeling.

IV. Metaphysical Theories.
   1. Schopenhauer's theory.
   2. The scope of metaphysical theories in general.
   3. The treatment of love in metaphysical monism.
   4. The sense of identity and metaphysics.
   5. The unity of life.

V. The sense of unity with the cosmos in some representative temperaments of the past.

VI. Sympathy and its laws of dependence.

VII. The interaction of the sympathetic functions.

VIII. The phylogenetic origin and extension of fellow-feeling.

IX. Pity and rejoicing and their typical modes.

X. The moral value of fellow-feeling.

XI. The relationship of love and fellow-feeling.

The second part, titled "Love and Hatred", contains the following chapters:

1. Towards a phenomenology of love and hatred

2. Positive delineation of the phenomena.

II. Basic values of love and the love of Goodness
III. Love and Personality.

IV. The forms, modes and kinds of love and hatred.

V. The limitations of the naturalistic theory of love.

VI. A critique of the naturalistic theory and outline of a theory based on the phenomena.

1. Love and instinct.
2. The facts concerning the perspective of interests.
3. The problem of transference.
4. The parallel extension of love and hatred.
5. Freud's ontogenetic theory.

The third part, titled "Other Minds", contains the following chapters:

2. The general evidence for the "Thou".
3. The perception of the other minds.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) See "The Nature of Sympathy" Contents.p.v.

PART II.
PART ONE FELLOW-FEELING.

Chapter I. The Ethics of Sympathy.

In the first chapter of his study, M. Scheler draws a "distinction" between the specific nature of love and hatred and the general nature of fellow-feeling. Both love and hate are feelings which originate in and are directed towards a specific situation, be it positive or negative. In particular, love and hatred constitute the emotional direction of the person towards the particular state of the related, following the recognition of the positive or the negative values. By extension, love or hatred emerge from the acceptance or the non-acceptance of the state of the other person. Following this phenomenological distinction a further "distinction" is drawn: a. Love is the pleasant direction of the personality towards the particular accepted state of the other person and b. Fellow-feeling is the participation in the state of the other person, regardless of the acceptance or non-acceptance of the state of the other person.

This "distinction" highlights the particular nature of love and hatred and the general nature of fellow-feeling. Love is the pleasant attitude towards the particular state of the being, while fellow-feeling is the consideration of the values, positive or negative, of the loved object.

Chapter II. Classification of the phenomena of Fellow-Feeling.

In the second chapter of his study, M. Scheler refers to the "way
of interpreting and identifying the feelings of the other person. The writer is opposed to Th. Lipps as to any "interpretation" of the experiences and the feelings by means of natural experiences. This opposition highlights the fact that, according to the writer, the identification of the feelings of the state of the other person are not only the product of the interpretation of the natural phenomena; they can also be interpreted by means of "personal participation" in the feelings of the other person.

The writer is opposed to the psychologistic interpretation of the feelings as physical phenomena. He is also opposed to the interpretation of the feelings by means of the physical states and functions of the person. According to H. Scheler, the feelings of the other person are better interpreted by means of the "internal-
personal”23 experience of the feeling of the state of the related person.

Such an understanding of another's feelings emerges from the relationship with the other person and not from any mechanistic analysis of the phenomena. The understanding of the other person's state of feeling (without it meaning identification with the feeling on the part of the interpreter) leads to the understanding and the reproduction of the feeling by the interpreter24.

Such experience by "participation" is highlighted here in opposition to any mechanistic explanation of phenomena as a way of interpreting the feelings of the other person. What is highlighted instead is personal participation in the phenomena (in which the feeling is included) and in the state of the other person as well as internal intention25.

According to this concept, identification with the state of the other person is not a product of the mechanistic interpretation of the phenomena but of the personal participation in the state of the other person as well as of intention. The feeling of the state is interpreted by means of personal participation on the part of the interpreter as well as by means of reproduction of this feeling by the interpreter26.

The interpretation of the feelings of the other person is thus of a partaking-perichorematic nature27. The interpreter does not

About the view that Scheler highlights the interpretation of the feelings by means of personal, internal experience see also M. Buber "To proftima tou anfrwnou" pp.119-120.


26. Ibid.p.12.

About the partaking nature of the interpretation of the feeling see also R. Ihana "The stratification of emotional life and the
interpret or relate to the feelings of the other person as an observer; he identifies the feelings of the other person by partaking in them in person as well as by reproducing them. Being of a personal and partaking nature, the identification of the feelings cannot be a result of observation only.

M. Scheler highlights the personal nature of the understanding of the other person's feeling once more by referring to the *community of feelings*.

At this point also the personal nature of the understanding of the feelings by means of love is stressed. The person understands the other person's feeling state because of the former's love for the latter.

A particular example of emotional identification and community of feelings is provided by the case of parents and children. The parents do not only experience the feelings of the child as natural phenomena, that is, they do not act as observers. They identify the feelings of the loved person as persons themselves, as persons who are conditioned by the love for the child. By means of this example the writer highlights the partaking nature involved in the identification of the human persons' feelings and states, as opposed to the mechanistic nature of observation.

The concept *fellow-feeling*, as a personal emotional act of understanding between persons, is introduced next.

The concept of fellow-feeling presupposes two persons: one who suffers and one who feels sympathy for the former.

Fellow-feeling also constitutes the event of community and inter-identification of the persons at an emotional level.

The writer is thus opposed to the confusion of fellow-feeling.
with sadness as seen in Spencer. 31. Fellow-feeling does not necessarily signify sorrow or emotional infection by the atmosphere of the environment. 32. It is not only a product of the infection of the environment, of the general reality. The feeling state does not necessarily come from the general external reality, or Nature or civilization. 33. Feelings are rather a product of the co-existence of persons, by means of which each person is led to personal participation in the feeling state. The true experience of the state consists in the participation and community of persons by means of induction. 34.

Feelings, in general, do not come from the collective mentality; they do not only come from the social reality in which the human person finds himself. 35. Rather they come from the absorption of the feeling at a personal level as well as from personal understanding of the other person and his feeling.

At this point M. Scheler goes beyond emotional identification as a product of the external reality of the personality, as a product of its grouping. 36. Feelings are identified by means of personal participation in the feeling of the other person, by means of sympathy for the other person and, finally, by means of the induction of the feeling at a personal level.

The personal character of such partaking also appears in the next
paragraph which is about emotional identification. At this point, the personal basis of the identification of the other person's feeling and the personal basis of the emotional communication are highlighted.

In particular the perichoreistic emotional relationship between the two persons is stressed.

The realisation that emotional identification is largely due to the perichoresis of the persons is a product of critical reference to the theory of emotional identification as found in antropology, in ecstatic religion and under hypnosis. Thereafter he also discusses pathological identification, hypnotic identification of the sexual life, the agapeistic identification of the other person as a product of egoism and, finally, to the emotional identification of the person on the basis of his mystical relationship with God.

At this point the writer goes beyond the absolute of the social,
psychological and idealistic nature as the basis of identification. According to him, persons identify with each other rather on the basis of their personal idiosyncrasy, on the basis of their common species and on their shared ontological reality.

Emotional identification, as an act on the part of the person, is not based on grouping. It is not a product of the mechanistic explanation of psychology or of the psychological interpretation of hypnosis. Persons do not communicate emotionally, by means of the emotional identification which is achieved through hypnosis or which is caused by the impulse towards pleasure. In addition, emotional identification is not due to the projection of "I" onto the other person. By no means does the person lie in an individualistic state of projecting "I" on "you"; he lies in a state of relationship between the "one" and the "other". Moreover, identification is not based upon the organic materialistic reality of the person.

In this chapter, M. Scheler does not accept the absolute nature of one "individual component" of the person by means of which emotional identification is attained. He is opposed to any absolute claims about the nature of identification from the sociological point of view. He is also opposed to an account of identification from the psychological point of view (as it is based on mechanistic causes and presuppositions), as well as to the theory of identification which is based on the projection of "I" on the other person.

About the opposition to the absolute nature from the social, psychological and idealistic point of view see Windeland Heimsoeth "'Ιδιοτη κοινωνία Φίλεια" pp. 206-207.

Also see B. Wand optim. p. 673.

47. Also see Merleau Ponty "Phenomenology of Perception" pp. 184.
Both the metaphysical-ontological basis of the human persons and the personal idiosyncrasy of each person are included in the writer's point of view on the subject of emotional identification.

Emotional identification is the resultant of the ontological factor (the unity of human beings in one species), of the personal factor (the idiosyncrasy of each human being) and of the singular-personal experience of the feeling. This point of view refutes the absolute nature of one "individual component" (sociability, individuality, impulse towards pleasure, affirmation of "I") of the person's ontological reality. Identification is due to the whole reality of the person, or better still, it is due to the psychosomatic, material and spiritual aspects of the human being, by means of which the natural merges with the supernatural and "space-time" merges with eternity. Finally, it is by means of this reality that identification becomes feasible.

At this point of the study, two important issues are also mentioned: Ecstasy and Mysticism.

In our opinion, these two issues are very important since they relate to each other and since they include the reality of the person's emotional identification in a material and spiritual form.

Ecstasy, in particular, is initially highlighted in relation to the Orphic and Dionysiac Mysteries and signifies the way of uniting with the divine. In this case, ecstasy is the way in which the human identifies and gets united with the divine, though in a

---

Also see. B. Wand optim. p.672. M. Buber "Το πρόβλημα του ἄνθρωπου" p.113.
50. Ibid. pp.20,33.
51. See M.Buber "Το πρόβλημα του ἄνθρωπου". pp.117-118.
52. Sympathy. p.20.
The mythical aspect of ecstasy signifies unity, emotional identification and community with the divine and other persons in contrast to ecstasy as a way of identifying other persons as a projection of "I", as a way of transferring things from one existence to another, as an affirmation of "I".

The reference to Mysticism and particular to "Ζωὴ γὰρ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ ζῶ δὲ ἐν ἑμοὶ Χριστὸς" of the Apostle Paul, is of the same nature. Mysticism, as a form of emotional identification, according to this expression and experience of Paul's, is the highest form of identification, as it constitutes a personal unity of the Divine Person with the Human. Spiritual mysticism of this kind is, according to Scheler, the highest form of personal identification in the sense that by means of this identification, the divine reality relates to the human and the spiritual lies in perfect harmony with the material. In terms of this mystical emotional identification, the human person partakes in the Divine Existence (although it lies within space-time reality) in a direct, interpersonal way by being emotionally identified with the other person.

Mysticism as a personal unifying state constitutes the perfect form of identification and, in our opinion, it plays the main part (compared to the other theories) in Scheler's realization that emotional identification encompasses both the spiritual and material reality of the human being.

53. About "Ecstasy" as a movement of the soul and as transition see Aristotle "Ηεπὶ Ψυχῆς" 406 B.

54. Sympathy. p.34.

55. Ibid. p.34.

56. Ibid. p.34.

---
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Chapter III. Genetic theories of Fellow-Feeling.

In the chapter entitled "Genetic theories of fellow-feeling", M. Scheler examines sympathy in the light of the metaphysical and psychological theories (pp. 37-50).

The interpretation of sympathy according to the Enlightenment is presented in this chapter. Sympathy is regarded by this school as an act of expression of individualistic experience, as an expression of "I". The fellow-feeling of the person for the other person's suffering resides in a negative attitude, in the avoidance of this suffering. According to this individualistic theory, fellow-feeling (which is caused by the suffering of the other person) is based on the notion that "I don't want this to happen to me".

The criterion of the fellow-feeling for the other person is the negation of this other person's experience in an individualistic, egotistical way. According to this interpretation, fellow-feeling is a negative attitude towards the feeling of the other person. This interpretation denies the existence of any positive state.

By extension, the interpretation of sympathy on the basis of subjective experience is mentioned.

The genetic interpretation of fellow-feeling generalizes the psychophysical organic theory, the mechanistic interpretation of

---


At this point, M. Scheler, being a phenomenological writer, stresses his opposition to the Enlightenment, to Locke and Hume, highlighting at the same time his connection to Husserl. Husserl is mainly opposed to the theories of the Enlightenment which "imprison" the human personality in the empirical reality, reducing at the same time the spiritual aspect of the personality. Husserl's Phenomenology tends to reinstate the spiritual nature of the personality without creating any idealistic schemas. It tends to reinstate the spiritual as well as the material importance of the person.

About the opposition of Phenomenology to the Enlightenment see E. Husserl "Διπτερη Λογική Ἐρευνα", "Πρώτη Φιλοσοφία", "Η Φιλοσοφία δὲ Ἀνοιχτὴ Ἐπιστήμη".

58. Sympathy. p. 40
the feeling of the person. According to this interpretation, the feeling is based on the individualistic form of anguish for survival (anxiety) and not on the personal relationship with the other person.

The interpretation of fellow-feeling according to psychological theory follows the same pattern. It maintains that sympathy for the other person is experienced according to the previous personal experience. The negative experience of the other person, by means of which sympathy is caused, brings about the memory of the previous experiences; on the basis of this subjective negative experience there is a tendency towards its transcendence. According to this theory, Man is imprisoned in his previous experience, in his previous negative state.

In general, genetic psychophysical theories highlight the individualistic judgemental and negative form of identification (the identification that brings about the avoidance of the analogous feeling) as the main factor of the feeling. They stress the main role of "I", of survival of the sophistical dogma "

---

59. Ibid. p.45.
60. Ibid. p.46.
61. Sympathy. p.49.

Psychology interprets the internal and spiritual state of the personality on the basis of repression; this signifies the confinement of the personality in its previous materialistic experiences. This interpretation restricts the personality in two ways. Firstly, it confines it in the particular, previous, individual and material reality. This theory stresses the individualistic and previous material nature of personality. According to this interpretation, personality is a "prisoner" of the subconscious memory of the previous experiences, deprived of the ability to overcome them. This state is in stark opposition to the state of the soul's conscious memory of the eternal ideas. In contrast to the Platonic form of memory, the psychological memory of repression stresses the imperfect nature of the personality and, at the same time, its inability to overcome this nature. About repression see S. Freud "Ελεγνων σην Ψυχανάλυση" pp.226,236 Χ. Τομασίδης "Ελεγνων σην Φιλοσοφία" p.585.
According to these theories, the criterion of the personal, emotional relationship with the other person is the preservation of the integrity of the personal state. By contrast, M. Scheler supports the view that fellow-feeling is directed towards the other person because of common feelings on the basis of love. Fellow-feeling and sympathy are based neither on the previous (mechanistic) memory, nor on survival. Emotional infection, experience, and perichoresis are largely based on the common nature of human feelings, on the shared ontological reality of human persons and on the personal experience and development of their feelings.

Chapter IV. Metaphysical Theories.
In this chapter, M. Scheler examines to the concept of sympathy according to metaphysical theories.
In particular he refers to the metaphysical account of Pity given by Schopenhauer according to which pity originates in the unity of life. All the emotional states of the person in general are of an intentional nature, since the unity of life is presupposed in everything. According to this interpretation, the feeling which presupposes the unity of life lays the foundations of the general basis of the feeling, reducing the personal agapeistic relationship and co-existence to it.
However, by generalising the feeling, the fellow-feeling and the emotional reproduction, the generalization of sorrow is highlighted and, at the same time, the personal nature of love is reduced. The metaphysical interpretation highlights the negative aspect of the human personality (which lies in a more general reality) and, consequently, it reduces the personal nature of unity and love.

---

63. Ibid. p. 51.
64. Ibid. p. 51.
Metaphysical Monism regards the nature of fellow-feeling as metaphysical only, thus reducing its personal nature. In general, the feeling, as a personal action of unity with the other person, is reduced by any metaphysical interpretation, since it presupposes the imposed participation in the "whole" and not free personal participation in the state of the other person.

The question of Metaphysical Monism, according to which the identification of the main reality, of the ideal, is aimed at by means of fellow-feeling, is, according to Scheler, the equivalent, by extension, of egocentricity and of the absolutising of individual understanding. Both egocentricity and the egocentric interpretation of the feeling lead to the illusion of the interpretation of the feeling. According to Metaphysical Monism, love, in particular, signifies self-eroticism, since it makes all love a form of self-love.

Egocentricism allows the interpretation of feelings according to the personal evaluation of each philosopher. The individual interpretation of feelings according to Monism (as opposed to Metaphysical Monism which aims at reaching the "whole") results in the absolute nature of the personal, individual interpretation and not in personal participation in the state of the other person.

M. Scheler is opposed to Metaphysical Monism as a way of interpreting feeling, because it highlights the egoistic evaluation and interpretation of the feeling. According to this form of interpretation, any personal opinion of the philosopher signifies the participation of other persons in the conception of the interpretation by him.

---

Sympathy. pp.53,54,56.
About Metaphysical Monism see. Ι.Ν.Θεοδωρακόπουλος "Εισαγωγή στην Φιλοσοφία" vol.Α. pp.303,306. F. Chatelet "Π Φιλοσοφία" pp. 287-316.

Sympathy p.57.
Also see N.Berdiaev "Νέως στοχασμοί περί ύπορξεως" p.223.
The criticism of the concept of love by E. Hartman follows the same pattern. According to this, there is no distinction between persons in the event of love. Every person partakes in the same love. According to E. Hartman's Metaphysical Monism, there is no personal development of love since it presupposes homogeneous participation in the common love.

This Metaphysical Monistic theory also interprets the feeling on the basis of subjectivity. It provides a hyper-subjective interpretation of the feeling which, by extension, denies any truly personal participation and development, since it goes beyond personal distinctions.

The interpretation of love by Hegel is of the same kind. Hegel highlights love as the "sense of the whole", and thereby reduces the personal development in love.

According to M. Scheler, the Monistic interpretation of love can also be found in Indian Mysticism. In it, the spiritual aspect of love is highlighted in connection with freedom. The true love of one person for another is more of a spiritual nature and it signifies spiritual freedom from personal choice. This kind of love lies in contrast to the kind of love and freedom which are regarded as isolated actions coming from and directed to a particular person. Freedom signifies liberation from the particular direction of love and fall in the general nature of love and feeling. It signifies experiencing theoretical, spiritual love as well as reaching the "whole".

The fourth chapter ends with a general presentation of fellow-feeling and love according to a. the individualistic interpretation and b. the metaphysical interpretation. The human reality of love and fellow-feeling is interpreted in a mechanistic way (psychological interpretation) or in an ontological way.

---

67 Sympathy, pp. 61, 62.
68 Sympathy, pp. 64, 65, 68-69.
69 Sympathy pp. 70-71.

PART II.
(metaphysical interpretation), resulting not only in personal confinement and the generalization of I, but in illusion\textsuperscript{70} as well.

Max Scheler believes that love and sympathy are the resultant of personal conception and of subjective interpretation, by means of which the human person reaches the whole\textsuperscript{71}. He does not accept the absolute nature of individuality nor the induction and origin of love in the sense of the "whole". The authentic interpretation of love and sympathy lies between the metaphysical and the mechanistic interpretations\textsuperscript{72}.

The person and the personality is not dependent only on his psychophysical nature or only on the unity of life.

The true-authentic interpretation of the feeling consists in the unity of life as a unity of material and spiritual reality. The human person and his realities are a result of this psychosomatic and spiritual-material reality\textsuperscript{73}.

Chapter V. The sense of unity with the cosmos in some representative temperaments of the past.

By referring to the unity of life\textsuperscript{74}, M. Scheler highlights the spiritual and material unity as the true way of interpreting the emotional states of the personality. The chapter about the unity of

\textsuperscript{70} Sympathy pp.72-74.

About Fichte see I.N. Θεοδώρακοπουλος "Ελεγχων στην Φιλοσοφία Της" Ιlogged, p.309.

N. Νικολάκακου "Η Φιλοσοφία του 'Εγώ είς την "Επιστημολογία του Fichte".

\textsuperscript{71} Sympathy p.74.


\textsuperscript{72} Sympathy pp.75,76

M. Buber "Το πρόβλημα του άνθρωπου". p.107.

\textsuperscript{73} Sympathy. p.76.

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid. p.77.
"Personality and Love in Max Scheler".

207

Life is of such a religious and theological/philosophical nature because it both refers to other religions apart from Christianity and gives an account of the Christian experience of unity with the cosmos.

To begin with, Scheler mentions the unity of life according to Indian Mysticism, (Brahmanism and Buddhism) 75. The different concept of love in eastern religions compared to Christianity is highlighted in this reference. Love in the eastern religions is individualistic and egotistical and not love for God 76.

The Indians live with Creation and with Nature. They believe in the soul of creation, in animate creation. They call the creatures friends and brothers 77. The creatures are not inferior to Man as "μετανόη ζώον", (as in Aristotle) 78. In contrast, human beings and the creatures seem to constitute a complete organism as they complete and interpret each other 79.

According to the Indian philosophical analysis, the organic conception of the cosmos comes from the explanation of the one by the other since reality signifies unity; this reality is based on the manifestation of one in a thousand forms 80. The beings and the creatures interpret each other in the sense that they lie in an

---

75. Ibid. p.77

76. Sympathy p.89
About Bruno see. I.Ν Θεοδωρακόπουλος "Ελληνική στην Φιλοσοφία" ι.Δ p.252.

77. Sympathy p.80
About the Indian concept of the world as animate creation see A. Γανούλατος "Ομιλίας" Ινδοολογοί Βουδισμού p.8.

78. Sympathy p.80.
Aristotle's point of view about the beginning of creatures is highlighted in "Μειά τι Φυσικά" 1072 B.

79. Sympathy. p.81

80. Sympathy p.82.
Also see A. Γανούλατος οπιστ. pp.8,9.

---
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organic relation of inter-dependence.

This organic concept of the world is also present in Plato, according to Scheler, because of Plato's cosmic concept of the soul as a mediator between the ideas and being. This inter-explanation of reality is also highlighted in the Aristotelian concept of "entelechy" and "movement", from the philosophical point of view.

H. Scheler stresses the unity with the world once more when he refers to the concept of Eros according to the philosophers, as the dynamic unifying transition of the person from "non-being" to "being" thereby affecting unity with the universe.

Next, the Christian concept of human reality as a psychosomatic unity is mentioned. This psychosomatic unity also signifies the unity between matter and spirit and between the divine and the cosmic elements.

This unity is highlighted in a psychosomatic way by Holy Communion, as unity with the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and in the Baptism, Crucifixion, Resurrection and Ascension.

The Holy Communion constitutes a psychosomatic, material-spiritual unity with Jesus Christ and the cosmos since the material-spiritual personal unity is realised by means of the tokens of Jesus Christ's Body and Blood. The personal psychosomatic unity is highlighted, according to Scheler, by participation in the Holy Passion of Jesus Christ on the part of the person who
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experiences sorrow and fellow-feeling for Him. The unity of the human person with the reality of the Theanthropos and with the cosmos (by means of the Sacraments and by means of the spiritual-material tokens) is highlighted in Christianity by the Soteriological work in its spiritual-material and psychosomatic form.

This spiritual-material unity is stressed by Scheler also when he refers to the Apostle Paul and to St. Francis of Assisi.

St. Francis of Assisi calls plants, trees etc. his brothers. He loves all the objects from the bottom of his heart, because any natural object is a symbol of the Spirit and the Person of God.

According to this concept, God, as the Creator of everything, loves all the creatures, and Man, as His children. The plants, the animals etc. and Man are brothers. This means that Man is in unity with all the structured creation, since this consists of God's creatures.

At this point, the writer draws a distinction between the pantheistic philosophical concept and the Christian notion of the unity of Man with the cosmos, according to which, creatures are not depictions or parts of the deity but symbols of God.

The reference to the unity of the person with the cosmos comes to an end with the acceptance of the personal agapeistic unity of the person with cosmos, not from the philosophical pantheistic but from...
the mystical point of view. Unity with the cosmos does not signify unity with the deified form of the cosmic beings, but unity with the creatures of God. Eros as personal direction towards unity with the beings constitutes unity with the ideas, the archetypes and the values of beings and, by extension, with God the Creator.

Chapter VI. Sympathy and its laws of dependence.

In this chapter, the unity of the personal emotional functions and their completion and dependence upon the emotional functions in the human person are highlighted.

In particular, according to the writer, there is a constitutive relation of vital feeling, fellow-feeling and human and divine love. The unity between identification and the vital feeling, and the unity between fellow-feeling and benevolence are also highlighted. Next, benevolence is considered to depend on the positive or the negative virtues of the person. It is argued that contemporary beneficence originates in the Christian love for God and in the teaching about the love of the person as an aspect of his reality. Benevolence is highlighted as an essential agapeistic unity with the virtues.

The agapeistic relationship and its manifestation is due to the ontological point of view of the person, to the ontological reality

---
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of Mankind and to the participation of each personality in the ontological unity. The essential nature of Christian love is based on the concept that love is addressed to the individual as a person.

In this chapter, M. Scheler tries to highlight the unifying relationship of the moral categories of the person with his ontological truth and with the Divine Truth. The feelings and the existential states of the human person lie in inter-dependence and it is only by means of this inter-dependence that the human person is able to reach his authenticity. By stressing the absolute nature of only one emotional moral function, the personal ontological nature of every other feeling is reduced.

The aim of this chapter also is the presentation of the unity of the human person's psychosomatic reality and the presentation of the unity between the individual-subjective and the ontologic. In this chapter there are references to the philosophical attitude of identification, to the unity between the vital feeling and fellow-feeling, to the divine and human love as well as to ontological reality. All the afore-mentioned references support the point of view that M. Scheler's work can be interpreted in a phenomenological, social and theological way.

Compared to the previous chapters, this one constitutes more a summary of the writer's opinion, since in the previous chapters there is simply a critique of the psychophysical-mechanistic interpretation of feelings, the sociological way of interpreting feelings and the idealistic way of interpreting feelings. In this chapter the writer stresses the reality of the human personality as the inter-dependence of its social, psychophysical, metaphysical, theological and personal states.

N. Berdiaeff "Πέντε στοχασμοί περί ὁμάρξεως" p. 142, 143.
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Chapter VII. The interaction of the sympathetic functions.

This chapter is of the same nature since the interaction of the emotional functions is mentioned in it as well. There is interaction of identification, vital feeling, fellow-feeling, benevolence and supernatural personal love.

Man constitutes the microcosm which incorporates the reality of existence in all its forms. The will for unity with beings and creatures, after the model of the personal activation of identification, vital feeling etc., rests in Man. Man is the unity of the universe since the internal personal concept of Love is based on the concept of the unity of such identification.

In general, by means of personal identification and of the concept of unity, the one united and unifying virtue in all beings and creatures is experienced.

The love of the whole of mankind (ontological love), human brotherhood and society are included in this cosmic agapistic unity.

Sexual love lies in contrast to this reality since it is of an individualistic, egocentric nature and therefore it is not a vital moral value, an ontological personal unity but an affirmation of "I". Yet true sexual love originates in the vital power, in
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the reality of personal creation, and in participation in the whole by means of creation\textsuperscript{108}

Plato's concept of Eros, which, according to Scheler, constitutes an impetus to general beauty\textsuperscript{109}, is relevant to this kind of creative sexual love. The human person reaches the whole, or rather the whole is included in him, by means of moral vital love. In the same way, by means of the Platonic kind of Eros, the person reaches the whole, the ideas.

The personal nature of unity is not presented through participation in the eternal ideas since this could imply a kind of metaphysical monism\textsuperscript{110}. Rather the personal nature of unity with the whole, the ontological person, is included in the personal experience of the spiritual essences\textsuperscript{111}.

The spiritual essences are inherent in the person because of his participation in the entirety of mankind. However, these spiritual essences are formed by means of the actions of the person and they are proportional to their individual essence. These values are in transition from ideal objectivity to the space-time reality through the instrumentality of the person and according to his actions\textsuperscript{112}. According to this formulation, the person constitutes a microcosm-mediator of values in the world by means of his emotional personal states and by means of identification\textsuperscript{113}.

The spiritual aspect of the personality is, according to this
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concept as well, inherent in the physical, biological and historical actions of the person. The ontological reality of the person includes his ideal-ontological reality and his space-time course at a particular historical moment.

Any personal development of the physical, material-spiritual possibilities is nothing more than the realization of the spiritual essence of the soul, which, from the philosophical-theological point of view, presents a part of God. Life as entirety, as the realization of the ontological reality of the human person, is a reproduction of the eternal, an inter-change of values.

Eros, as opposed to the mechanistic, psychological and biological interpretations, is the particular attempt of creation, the personal development of values. It is the connection with the universal life, the human and the divine truth and with the metaphysical unity. It is the personal action towards unity with the whole in which the human person is contained. This kind of unity is also included in the Mystical unity. Mystical unity, according to M. Scheler, is the presentation of Man as a personality "in the image" of the personality of God. Even though this mystical unity does not imply pantheism (that is, deification of every human or cosmic spiritual essence), it constitutes the most direct experience of the spiritual-material reality of the human person since it is experience of the mediating
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way towards the divine and human eternal truth\textsuperscript{121}. This \textit{mystical unity}, the unity of being "in the image", is the fundamental starting point of the identification and of the moral experience of unity between the person and his spiritual reality.

This \textit{mystical unity} highlights the personal apprehension of salvation by means of individual essences, of spiritual essences and of the connection of all the essences with God. The writer calls this kind of \textit{mystical unity} \textit{metaphysical individualism} \textsuperscript{122}. This \textit{metaphysical individualism} includes the apprehension of unity with God, \textit{metaphysical monism}, and the reality of the spiritual nature of the persons.

The human person is neither autonomous nor self-contained during identification, emotional experience and inter-change. He lies between heaven and earth, between the material and the spiritual\textsuperscript{123}.

The importance of the vital unity with the cosmos lies in the resultant love, sympathy and supernatural love of the persons which originates in the love of God. The love of God contains all the kinds of unity of the human person\textsuperscript{124}.

According to Scheler, the longing of human existence (if we are to use this term for vital unity, for the longing of Man to be perpetuated also by means of personal creation) originates in the divine love.

In this chapter as well, M. Scheler could be characterized as a \textit{phenomenological, sociological and theological} writer. He highlights the personal impetus to \textit{internal values}, to the \textit{ideal objectivity} by means of love, eros, identification and, in general, by means of the emotional functions. He stresses the mediating
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part played by eros and love. On balance, he stresses the primary factor as divine love.

Chapter VIII. The phylogenetic origin and extension of Fellow-Feeling.

In this chapter, M. Scheler refers to fellow-feeling as a basic phylogenetic function. Fellow-feeling is mainly presented as part of the feelings in general. It is innate in the subject and is manifested reflexively, that is as a reflection of the state of the relating object. The identification of the state of the other person on the part of the human existent is the cause of the emergence of the inherent reality of sympathy.

The theories of Darwin and Spencer stand in opposition to this concept of the inherent, or rather innate, reality of fellow-feeling. According to their theory, fellow-feeling originates in social influences. The social factor, the social reality and the social influences are the cause of the emotional development of Man. The sympathetic function is epiphenomenal of the social development of the human person.

M. Scheler is opposed to this concept which conceives of feelings as a transference from one person to the other. By regarding the
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feeling as transference, the heteropathetic state of persons and the singularity of each person are abolished. Moreover, the theory of the transference of the feeling, which is based on the sociality of persons, is abolished by the form of society itself. Society is the "whole" which contains the different forms of existence of each person. The reality of the society in this case is the exact opposite of the reality of transference since it includes mainly the differences and not the similarities of feelings and emotional states. It is in society that the differences of the persons are manifested as opposed to the grouping nature of transferred feelings.

Emotional functions constitute a prerequisite for social relation and co-existence. Society is the place where the innate emotional states of the person are manifested.

From the phenomenological moral point of view, society is the place where the natural endowment of human personality is realised. Society is the space-time realisation of the eternal ideas, of the ideal objectivities in which the human person partakes by partaking in the human ontological reality.

Chapters IX. Pity and rejoicing and their typical mode. X. The moral value of Fellow-Feeling.

In these chapters, M. Scheler refers to joy and sorrow and to the moral virtue of the human feelings.

Sorrow and joy are two feelings which are always in relation to
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other persons. They are feelings which always signify the 
inflection and the identification of the emotional state of the 
other person.

From this point of view, sorrow and joy constitute a relationship 
with the other person and, in particular, a relationship with the 
extent of the other person's state.

In general, all human feelings are a personal transference to the 
state of the other person. The feelings are always in proportion to 
the size and the kind of the other person's state.

In these two chapters, Scheler aims at presenting the inter-
personal nature of the feelings of human existence. From this point 
of view, such feelings are a product of the social reality of the 
person. The determining factor in this kind of emotional engagement 
is the sympathy of the human person, his participation in the 
emotional state of the other person. Sympathy is the basis of 
the identification of the other person's feelings. It constitutes 
the personal creative cause of the participation in the other 
person's emotional state. Therefore, it is the personal creative 
cause of the personal experience of the feelings which originates 
in the other person's state, in sociality.

Chapter XI. The Relationship of Love and Fellow-Feeling.

The first part of "The Nature of Sympathy" ends with a reference 
to the relation between love and fellow-feeling.

The first part comes to an end with a critical differentiation of 
love from benevolence. This differentiation is in agreement 
with the general spirit of the first part since the writer 
highlights the spiritual nature of love in contrast to the totally
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practical nature of benevolence by opposing British moral philosophers and Greek. This distinction is in agreement with the general spirit of the work since the aim of the writer is to stress the ontological basis of love and to highlight the ontological basis of the morality of love in contrast to the practical, materialistic basis of love according to psychologism and to British moral philosophy. From this point of view love is ontological and it forms a moral human category; it is not a product of the infection of the feelings from the daily environment of human existence. Love is of a Socratic nature, that is, it cannot be taught because it is an inherent experience in the human personality which participates in the human ontological reality.

The first part ends with the realisation that benevolence does not necessarily mean love. Love is related more to the virtues of the personality than to practice. Love is a movement by means of values and as such it is incorporated in the practice. Practice is the carrier of love, its daily form. Practice is based on love but love is not based on practice, since love is not a product of daily experience.

From this point of view, love in M. Scheler's work has more of a spiritual nature. It constitutes the spirituality of the person which emerges and takes on form by means of practice. When practice...
(as the formulation not only of love but of values and virtues in general) is based on love it directly connects love with virtues. Love is at the same time the ontological basis of practice and of the virtues which are included in this practice. Since love is connected with both the practice and the virtues it takes on both dimensions of the personality, that is, the spiritual one and the material one, the ontological reality of the person and its daily practice.

From this point of view, love is not a feeling but an action and a movement. It is a spiritual action which contains spirituality and the daily realisation of the spirituality.

Action (the daily practice of the human person) in its spiritual form is not connected with the individuality and the egocentricity of the person but with his spiritual nature. The action which originates in love and the love which is connected to the virtues signify the spirituality of the action and of the daily practice of the person.

By referring to the Aristotelian interpretation of the meaning of love, M. Scheler presents the spiritual nature of action and practice, the ontological aspect of the daily life of the human person which is based on love. By connecting love with practice, values and movement, both Aristotle and M. Scheler highlight the agapeistic relationship of God with the cosmos and the agapeistic
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At this point, Scheler refers to Aristotle’s point of view that God moved beyond Himself because of love and created the world and that Man has fallen in love with the Divine in his quest for fulfilment.

S. Aristotle, _Meta ta Phainomena_, A. 1072 B.

The concept of the erotic and agapeistic movement of God for the world and that of Man’s love for God is common in Scheler and St. Maximus, highlighting their apparent common basis, that is Aristotle. Both St. Maximus and M. Scheler stress the love of God as movement towards the world and the love of Man as movement towards God aiming at perfection. In both cases, the desire of the personality to reach perfection by means of the movement of love in relation to God, is highlighted.
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relationship of man with the cosmos. From this point of view, love is not only the driving force of beings but of the relationship of beings and creatures as well.

This philosophical and phenomenological realisation of love highlights love as the main ontological basis of the Creation of the cosmos by God, as the ontological basis of the continuation of the cosmos, as the agapeistic relationship of man with the cosmos. By extension, this ontological interpretation of the basis of love highlights love as the basis of the human feelings. Love is the ontological foundation of every feeling of the human personality which is also related to its ontological reality. All the human feelings that lead to the ontological reality are connected with love as opposed to the feelings which are connected with individuality.

Sympathy as a particular feeling of the human personality, is connected with love. Sympathy, according to the concept of spiritual practice, originates in love and, at the same time, it formulates love in daily practice.

From this point of view love is of primary importance in the work of M. Scheler and in the human personality. By such a concept he relates the human personality to its ontological reality and to its daily practice. He connects philosophy, as a quest and a projection of the ideal, with phenomenology, as a projection of the ideal on the human personality. By referring to the spiritual nature of practice, he also connects the philosophical, ontological basis of the human personality with the social reality, with social relations.

In this way he connects the metaphysical-philosophical reality,
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the phenomenological analysis, with the social manifestation of this reality in the human person.
Chapter I. Towards a phenomenology of love and hatred.

The second part of "The Nature of Sympathy" refers to the two opposed emotional directions of the human personality, namely, Love and Hatred.

In the first chapter love and hatred are pinpointed as relationships of the human personality and as causes of the feelings. All the feelings seem based on those two directions but having opposite courses.

M. Scheler considers Man to move and relate sometimes by means of Love and sometimes by means of Hatred. This results in the emergence of the positive and the negative feelings in his relationship with another person. Love and hatred are the two main experiences by means of which the acceptance or non-acceptance of the state of the person in relation is experienced. Love and Hatred constitute the way of identifying the positive or the negative values of the personality.

In this connexion also, M. Scheler is opposed to absolute metaphysical and psychological theories of the feelings. By highlighting love and hate as the way of conceiving values, he expresses opposition to metaphysical and physical generalizations of the two feelings. He is opposed to the psychological interpretation of love and hatred, as to the mechanistic explanation of these feelings, as well as to the generalization of the mechanistic interpretation of the feelings that depend on love and hatred.
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Love and hatred are neither the metaphysical foundation of the other feelings, nor the psychological cause of the identification of the other person's feeling and value. Love and hate are the personal basis from which the identification of the other person's high or low value starts. Love and hatred express the unifying or the separating relationship between the person and the values of the object. The evaluation of the values of the person or the object related to the person is based on love or hatred. It is based on the identification of the positive or the negative values of the person. Love and hatred constitute the personal criterion of the value of the person, the mark of his personal state.

By being the personal criterion of the identification of the values of the reality to which the human person is related, love and hate are also a form of sociability. Love and hatred constitute the ways in which the sociability of the person is highlighted; they are the ways of social relation. Love and hatred are the directions of the existent towards someone, they constitute the social reality of the human person.

Self-love and self-hatred stand in naked opposition to the reality of love and hatred, as the deprivation of the sociability of the person, the confinement in individuality.

In this reference to love and hatred, M. Scheler expresses opposition to the generalization of the two basic directions of the human personality, to the metaphysical and holocratic interpretation of the feeling as well as to the individualistic interpretation. He highlights love and hatred as the basis of emotional identification. He also highlights the sociability of the personality on the basis of the two emotional foundations, that is,
love and hatred\textsuperscript{155}. At this point also, the writer aims at stressing the personal nature of the feelings as well as the personal action towards the identification of the values and sociability. M. Scheler could be characterized as a phenomenologist, offering a personalistic and social interpretation of the basic existential states of the personality.

The next subject in this chapter refers to love as movement from a simple value to a higher one\textsuperscript{156}. Love constitutes a form of establishment in the supreme values\textsuperscript{157}; it is the superior identification of the values of the related person\textsuperscript{158}.

Love is the intentional reality\textsuperscript{159} of the person in the supreme value and virtue. It is the identification of the supreme values of the loved person. It is the spur to those same values\textsuperscript{160}, in the truth of nature, and in ontological reality. Love is the way of reaching the virtues and eternal values, as the philosopher Plato would support\textsuperscript{161}.

But opposed to the Platonic memory\textsuperscript{162} according to which priority is given to the metaphysical basis of the values and of the person, M. Scheler highlights love as the action of the person
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towards these higher values, towards ontological reality\textsuperscript{163}.

At this point, M. Scheler highlights the central concept of love as personal and directed towards identification with the supreme values by means of the relationship with other persons. The personal nature of love as an action towards the identification of values, as a personal way of reaching ontological reality is stressed here.

Next, love and hatred are highlighted as actions of the person which refer to the object and to its values\textsuperscript{164}.

Love of knowledge\textsuperscript{165} is love for aspects of the human reality, for the formulations of values and virtues. The love of art or of knowledge is, as a movement towards the identification of the person, the manifestation of love for key aspects of mankind, for the values of the person\textsuperscript{166}.

Love for God is love for the internal sanctity that lies within Man\textsuperscript{167}. Love of God is the manifestation of the unity and of the emergence of the internal kindness and transcendency of nature.
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Love is seen as the basis of philosophical anthropology, that is, the revelation of the truth of Man by means of the directions of the human spirit. This point could be considered as the basis of Max Scheler's philosophical anthropology since it encapsulates the unity of all human spiritual sciences. At this point Scheler goes beyond the phenomenological nature of his study and introduces the reader to his philosophical anthropology in his effort to reveal the true nature of his teaching about Man by means of philosophical, theological, sociological, scientific, and epistemological discoveries. Love is highlighted as the supreme form as well as the basis of his anthropology, providing the basis of his identification of the values of the human reality by means of the humanities.

Here Max Scheler seems to support the contention that the love of the human person for the truth and the values constitutes the basis of the humanities.

According to this concept, every spiritual occupation of the human person, every form of identification of the values is based on love as a personal movement towards the identification of the values.

From this point of view, love is the movement from an inferior (to the object) towards a superior value by means of other values. By means of this love, the person reaches the ideal paradigms, the main truth of objectivity.

In this inductive form, love also means the improvement of the relationship with the object or person, as well as the improvement
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of the person by means of this relationship\textsuperscript{172}. By means of love the person longs to be united with superior values of the loved person and superior values in general. Love as mobility towards the superior values is a pedagogical personal course towards the superior feelings and towards superior forms of existence. By identifying the superior values of the loved person, the person longs to partake in them and therefore he becomes the carrier of these superior values.

By identifying, by means of love, the values of the beautiful, the true, the good etc, the person partakes in these superior values; the result of this is an internal, existential, personal metamorphosis and participation.

As opposed to the afore-mentioned, hatred constitutes the inability to identify the values of the person\textsuperscript{173}. Love is an opening towards values and virtues whereas hatred is the reality of isolation from these virtues.

Always referring to love and hatred, M. Scheler presents a sharp contrast in the relationship of the person with other objects and persons. The virtues are identified or otherwise by means of love and hatred and always through the relationship of the person with this reality, with the objects and persons.

The illusion of daily life stand in sharp contrast\textsuperscript{174}. Scheler is opposed to the concept of feelings as products of daily experience as he wants to stress the essential nature of love as a higher form of identification and participation in values. From this point of view, ephemeral experiences are not ways of identifying the values; they do not consist in a spur to the values and virtues of the person. The "wide-awakeness" of the values and the virtues is due to love and to the differentiation of the levels
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of interest and attitude of the person\textsuperscript{175}.

According to this interpretation, love is the absolute criterion of the reality of the person.

Such spiritual love is highlighted by the hagiographical models of Mary Magdalene and the Prodigal Son. These models present the forgiveness which is based on love and is beyond particular premises of never again falling into sin; they present the transcendence of the predetermination and the agreement for forgiveness; they constitute the transcendence of any agreement according to which all sins would be forgiven provided repentence was guaranteed and the promise of never again falling into sin was fulfilled. According to the writer, this transcendence of the conditions for forgiveness signifies love in its highest spiritual form. It signifies love as the main factor in transformation of the human personality.

Love as presented in the person of Jesus Christ is love beyond persons and objects; it constitutes the manifestation of the spiritual personality. This form of spiritual and pedagogic love is founded upon identification with the spirituality of the other person. The person expresses his spirituality which is based on love, by experiencing the spirituality of the other person since it is towards this spirituality that love and pedagogy are directed\textsuperscript{176}.

In this spiritual form, love constitutes the main identification of the values in the other person. This spiritual and pedagogic love, has three constitutive elements: the person who loves, the person who is loved and the state of the loved person, that is as a carrier of values, of ontological reality. Love, in its pre-manifestation state, presupposes the identification of the ideal objectivity in the person towards whom it is manifested. It presupposes the personal identification of the value of the other

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid. p.158.

\textsuperscript{176} Sympathy. p.159.
A. Nygren "Agape and Eros" pp.65,132.
person as well as the identification of the values in the other person.

According to this interpretation, love is the supreme form of the identification of values both at a personal and at an interpersonal level. Love constitutes the main form of the identification of the values and virtues of the other person. It constitutes the main form of the sociability of the person.

Chapter II. Basic values of Love and the Love of Goodness.

In the second chapter of the second part, M. Scheler highlights the authenticity of the direction of love. Love as a movement of the personality is directed towards the particular loved reality and is included in the particular act. Love, as a way of identification and participation in the values is not connected with generality, or rather, it is not possible in the generality of love. At this point the nature of love as a corollary of the particular act is stressed as opposed to the concept of love as a direction towards generality. The generality of the "love of goodness" is not true love; it does not constitute the true identification of the value of the loved. Generality is Pharisaism, since it does not signify personal participation in the values of the loved person or object. The Pharisaism of generality is not a morality of love but a veneer of love and morality since it does not originate in the identification of the value of the particular to which the person is related.

Love of beauty or of knowledge, as forms of love, are indeed of moral value, as long as the acts are related to the acts of the person. The general love of beauty and of knowledge which is

177. Sympathy, p. 162.
178. Ibid., pp. 162, 163.
179. Ibid., p. 162.
180. Ibid., p. 162.

PART II.
not related to a particular act however cannot possibly have moral significance since it does not involve love as an event in the relationship of the person with the loved object.

Love takes on moral nature when it is connected with the relationship of the person and with the practice of the person.\(^ {181} \)

*Love for God* as participation in the moral act of love cannot be understood as love for Him only, but as participation in His love for the cosmos. Loving God in general is not a moral act since it does not have an impact on daily life and on the relationship of man with the cosmos, as it does not originate in the *love of God* for the world. The *Love of God* at a general level is *pharisaic love*, it is a veneer of the *love of God and of Man*. The *love for God* is real in its expression in the manifested *Divine Love*, in the cosmos created by God. *Love for God* is indeed of a moral significance insofar as it is experienced in the relationship of the person with the creatures of God.\(^ {182} \)

At this point, M. Scheler refers to St. Augustine, who experienced creatures as depictions of God,\(^ {183} \), and aimed at highlighting the interpersonal nature of love. At this point also, it is possible to refer to a kind of *Paternal* interpretation of the love for God.\(^ {184} \) Although the writer does not seem particularly familiar with the Patristic thought, his idea is of a paternal nature when it comes to the reality of love as a connection of the human person with the creatures-acts of God the Creator. From this point of view, love can be considered as an active *perichoresis* of the human person with the creatures and the divine energy. (This does not mean of course that M. Scheler has in mind the distinction

---

\(^ {181} \) Ibid. p.163.

\(^ {182} \) Ibid. p.163.

\(^ {183} \) Ibid. p.164.

\(^ {184} \) Ibid. p.164.
between the energy and the essence of God.)

According to Scheler, love is connected with the reality of the person, with the practice and the relationship of the person without at the same time being connected with empirical reality\textsuperscript{185}. Love is not a product of experiences, of psychological influences\textsuperscript{186}, nor is it a product of generality and virtue in general. It is not a product of direct relationship with persons and objects and it is not included in the general Pharisaic love. Pharisaic love is a false goal. The love of the person is a result of a specific identification with the value of the other person, as a result of daily practice and relationship. It is love of a social and interpersonal nature.

Chapter III. Love and Personality

In this chapter M. Scheler refers to the relation between personality and love.

Through searching to ascertain which principles are related to the essential reality of the personality, he highlights love for the values and the principles of the personality\textsuperscript{187}.

Love constitutes the ontological attitude of the person, the movement towards truth and values, the way of participating in ontological reality. By means of love for the values and the virtues, the person lies in a state of ideal objectivity, in the authenticity of his nature.

Even though the love of values is the ontological reality of the person, it does not introduce the concept of generality in love and participation in the idealistic reality. Love as an attitude of the personality, as the identification of the values, constitutes the personal, subjective side of the participation in the truth.

\textsuperscript{185} Ibid. p.165.

\textsuperscript{186} Ibid. p.165.

\textsuperscript{187} Ibid. p.166.
The love which is related to the personality is not of an idealistic-monistic nature, nor is it of a materialistic-mechanistic nature.

Love as an attitude, a way of the personality, can be characterised as a personal act of unity with the truth, without it being imposed upon the personality (according to a certain metaphysical concept). In addition, love cannot be taught by means of experience, by means of the relationship with particular persons or things. The persons and the things are the carriers of the values with which the person can identify by means of the attitude of love.

According to this notion, love is the way of existence of the personality by means of which ideal objectivity becomes feasible. It is the act of the person, the deontology by means of which the person reaches ontological reality and becomes united to both eternal and the space-time truth since it is the space-time objects that include the virtues.

Chapter IV. The forms, modes and kinds of Love and Hatred.

The next reference includes the forms and the modes of love. Love, as a way of reaching the values can be mental love, subjective and vital love.

By referring to these forms of love, M. Scheler appears to be, once more, a metaphysical, phenomenological and, at the same time, social writer, since he does not exclude the ideal, psychosomatic or social dimension of the personality. The attitude of love allows the human person to unify the dimensions of ontological reality without regarding the ideal, the social or the empirical dimension as absolute. The person, by means of love, which

\[188\text{Sympathy.p.167.}
\text{Also see R. Ibana (I.Ph.Q. vol. xxxi no.4) p.462.}
\[189\text{Ibid.pp.169-170.}
\[190\text{Ibid.p.171.}
stretches from the space-time symbols to eternal truth and reality, is the carrier and the connector of all the dimensions of existence 191.

As a carrier of love and as a psychosomatic unity, the person is the connector of all the supreme concepts, of the values and of space-time reality 192. The person becomes a connection after exercising his own free choice and it is by means of this choice that he goes beyond any confining understanding of the truth and of love. Love is not confined in the ideal objectivity nor does it originate in the ideal objectivity or the empirical reality. Love, as an act and an attitude of the person, connects ideal objectivity with empirical reality. Love is the energy which connects the person with the idealistic-eternal dimension and with the space-time dimension. The person, as a carrier of love, unites the truth with the cosmos and the cosmos with the truth by identifying the values in the cosmos, by means of love of the cosmos and on the basis of love as the content of the relationship with the cosmos 193.

Chapter V. The limitations of the Naturalistic theory of Love. VI. A Critique of the Naturalistic theory and outline of a theory based on the phenomena.

The next chapters refer to the theories of love and hatred. The style here is critical 194.

At first, M. Scheler refers to the naturalistic theories of love which derive love from human feelings and ascribe love to

191. Ibid. p. 171.
194. Ibid. p. 175.
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imitation, reproduction and illusion. There is also reference to the phylogenetic theory according to which love originates in the social factor. He also alludes to the ontogenetic theory of Freud. The love of God, for Feuerbach, as a product of the vital impulse of Man, is nothing more than the formulation of the desire of human beings. Feuerbach's theory the only thing that happens is a transference of "existing" to the divine. From this point of view, the love of God is merely the quest for an eternal status for man. This theory highlights the vital importance of love, as well as the negation of Divinity. Divinity is a creature of the human desire for eternal "existing" and therefore signifies the negation of Divinity.

The 19th century British theory regards feelings as products of reproduction and consequently it denies the spirituality of both love and the person as well as ontological truth and

195. Ibid. p.175.
196. Ibid. p.175.
197. Sympathy. p.175.
About Freud's theory see X. Tomažić's "Ethiskogni sthn Psychología" p.616.
198. Sympathy. pp.175,176.
About Feuerbach theory see I.N. Theodoračkovulos "Ethiskogni sthn Filosofía" vol.B. p.60
I.N. Theodoračkovulos "Ethiskogni sthn Filosofía" vol.B. p.60.
201. Sympathy pp.176-177.
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participation in it on the part of human existence.

Freud's ontogenetic theory also abolishes love since it is based on previous experiences and complexes. It abolishes the free choice of love, the spirituality of love and spiritual participation in ideal objectivity.

As opposed to these theories, vital love is a general essence and does not signify the act of love. It does not signify a love originating in direct experience.

The personal spiritual form of love is highlighted by the example of St. Francis. His love is love for God by means of the phenomena. The saints integrate their love for God and for other persons, thus stressing the ontological and cosmic nature of personal love.

Monogamy as well, according to Scheler, signifies personal and interpersonal love, since it is based on the essential relationship between two subjects.

The naturalistic theory which attributes biophysic organic significance to love and is opposed to the love of values, stands in contrast to the afore-mentioned concept of love. The naturalistic theory does not accept the act of love as such, it does not accept the fact that love is included in the values nor does it accept love as mobility and transition from the lower to the higher values.

In addition, by scaling love in lower and higher forms, the naturalistic theory does not regard the forms of love as general kinds of feeling love. By saying that the love for one's country is

---
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inferior to general love, that self-love is inferior to friendship and that the love for one's family is inferior to the love for one's country, it highlights the forms of love and not love as a feeling. Accordingly, love is manifested by its forms and not by its reality.

In contrast to this theory, love is personal and subjective and the person constitutes himself a carrier of values. By means of this personal love, the person is united to the values, to ontological reality beyond its particular forms. Scheler thus highlights the ontological nature of personal love which lies beyond its particular forms.

Love is the act of the person which unifies all the forms of existence. Love is an expression beyond particular forms.

As opposed to the naturalistic theory, love does not originate in the object and it is not transferred mechanically from the one to the other. It is not based on rules of reciprocal transference and depiction. Love is at the same time of an ontological and a personal nature, of an essential and an empirical nature, of an idealistic and a space-time nature. Love is the content of the ontological, the space-time and the social dimensions of the person.

Next, M. Scheler declares his opposition to the interpretation of love by Freud and Darwin. He is opposed to the notion that...
the increase of love is the product of the growth of society or a product of the erotic behaviour of Man\textsuperscript{212}.

The writer is in opposition to the external and mechanistic interpretations of love which abolish love as a movement of the person towards superior values by means of persons and objects. The two interpretations limit love to objectivity and to the ego\textsuperscript{213}. According to these theories, love is not an expression of the spirituality of the person nor does it connect with cosmic and eternal reality. Any concept of spirituality and identification of the values is abolished with the person seen as a carrier of a mechanistic and egocentric kind of love.

By his opposition, M. Scheler highlights love as a movement of the personality from the lower to the higher values of persons and the cosmos\textsuperscript{214}. He also stresses the spiritual and phenomenological nature of the love of the personality without regarding one dimension of the personality as absolute. By critising the mechanistic and psychophysic interpretations of Man, the writer aims at an ontological interpretation of love and personality.

\textsuperscript{212}Sympathy,p.196.

\textsuperscript{213}See also M. Sadri (A.Ph.Sc.R. vol.83) p.278.

\textsuperscript{214}See also I. Bochenski "Ιστορία τῆς Σύγχρονης Ευρωπαϊκῆς Φιλοσοφίας",p.181. R. Perrin "Max Scheler's Concept of the Person" p.54.
"Personality and Love in Max Scheler".

PART III. OTHER MINDS.

In the third part of "The Nature of Sympathy", M. Scheler refers to the personality, to love and to its relation with society. In this part, personality is referred to as a link between cosmic reality, eternal truth, and the ontological reality.

Chapter I. Nature and scope of the problems.

In the first part Scheler's opposition to absolute formulations of knowledge is highlighted. In particular, the writer is opposed to any absolute sociological interpretation of knowledge, to the egocentric interpretation of knowledge and to the psychological interpretation of knowledge.

The knowledge and the perception of the person, inasmuch as they connect space-time reality with the ontological, are not only products of external influence, or of empirical-phylogenetic experience, or, finally, of absolute metaphysical influence. The sociology of knowledge, the social aspect of human knowledge, can only be founded on a philosophical and theological basis, since the relationship of the persons is not only a result of

---
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empirical-daily intercourse but of the spiritual unity of

219. The mechanistic interpretation of this relationship, of
society and of love, does not give full answers to the problem of
the relationship of human beings and knowledge, as it does not take
into account the spiritual aspect of the society and of the persons
that form it220. The metaphysical and religious dimension,
highlight the spiritual foundation of persons and society, as
opposed to the absolute mechanistic and sociological
interpretations221.

The human person, both in his spiritual and in his material
aspect222, forms the centre of the sociology of knowledge and of
social knowledge since this presupposes society (relationship with
others) and spirituality223. This concept is based on the person
as a primary factor of society and on love as an act of the person,
as a unifying act.

In this chapter M. Scheler goes beyond the unilateral absolute
basis of society and sociability by unifying them as external
realities and as spiritual realities224. He highlights the

See also P.A. Schilpp "The Formal Problem's of a sociology of
knowledge" (Philosophical Review. vol.xxxvi. 1927).pp.105,106.

See also M. Sadri. "Person and Polis: Max Scheler's personalism as
political Theory" (American Political Science Review vol.83. 1982)
p.878.

See also P.A. Schilpp optim. pp.102,103,106,110,112,115.
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personal connective nature of knowledge and of the sociology of knowledge without interpreting everything on the basis of subjective or of individualistic repressions and conceptions. Knowledge and conception are not just products of external influences or of internal repressions (which, in turn, would be products of external influences negatively interpreted by the person) 225.

Love constitutes the basis of the sociology of knowledge and of the relationships of the person; it is the love which includes spirituality and which is identified and takes on form in the society and in the relationships of the human person226. At this point also, love is the determinant since it is in love that spirituality is developed and the personality created.

Chapter II. The general evidence for the "Thou".

The second chapter of the third part, once more refers to the personal and spiritual nature of the sociological knowledge.

In this chapter, the writer mentions Robinson Crusoe227, a character who does not have direct experience of society and so experiences knowledge internally. Even though this person does not have a direct experience of society, he feels that he belongs to a community consisting of the same species. Here, the internal nature of sociability is highlighted on the basis of an innate ontological identification. Despite the fact that the person does not have an experience of community, he feels that he belongs to a community of persons. This reality emerges from the internal nature of his

Also see J.A. Varacali optim.p.199.


existence, from his understanding of ontological reality. According to this example, social knowledge has an ontological, metaphysical and personal basis.

Chapter III. The perception of other Minds.

The third part of M.Scheler's study ends with these questions:

How is it possible to distinguish one person from others since all of them belong to a common essence? How is the personal differentiation of persons belonging to the same essence possible, without stressing the egocentric and psychological nature of the person, since this person is constituted by a general ontological truth?

Scheler provides a phenomenological person-orientated answer which lies in contrast to overemphasis upon the personality of each person on the basis of repressed psychological states and to interpretations of personality according to Metaphysical Monism. The phenomenological answer can be summarized in the phrase "internal life". This signifies the personal evaluation, observation, identification and ascertainment of the values as well as the personal experience of the values in society.

The phrase "internal life" refutes the mechanistic nature of interpretations of subjectivity, since it does not only signify the empirical reality of the personality. It is not equivalent to the interpretation of personality on the basis of previous experiences which have been repressed into the subconscious. Internal life goes beyond the egocentric interpretation of reality without denying the social reality and the social external relationship of the person. Personal experiences belong exclusively to the human being, they go

---
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beyond the unilateral biological interpretation and limitation of existence to individuality since they become personal by means of personal criticism on the basis of internal life. Inner sense is considered to be the criterion of experiences, of internal life, as well as of the reality of the relationship with other persons (sociability). The writer highlights the inner sense of the personality as a criterion of reality, as of society.

Even though inner sense seems to be of an absolute egocentric nature, it does not exclude any dimension of the personality since by its nature it is an act of personal evaluation of reality on the basis of the emerging truths of the person, on the basis of vital feeling and on the basis of biological categories. M. Scheler considers inner sense, internal life and internal perception to be the basis of the relation of the person with external reality.

Considering internal life, inner sense and internal perception as the central axes of the personality from the phenomenological point of view constitutes an innovation in Philosophy. The writer refutes the absolutely causal nature of both the psychological and metaphysical interpretations. On the one hand, the writer goes beyond the limitation of the personality to the repressions and absolute nature of social influence, and on the other, he goes beyond the limitation of the personality to the absolute nature of its metaphysical origin. In particular, the human person does not become perfect by being attracted to a previous perfect state, but by moving towards it by means of inner sense.

By highlighting the critical ability of the personality based on an inner sense, the writer refutes the imprisonment of the personality in the flesh. He goes beyond the limitation to previous repressed experiences, which are manifested on the basis of the "body".

---


234. Ibid. p. 253.
The confinement of the soul to the body as a form of punishment by a previous pre-bodily form of existence and the confinement of the human personality in an ideal objectivity are transcended here.

The person reaches ideal objectivity by means of the identification of the values in the world and by means of inner sense. The social relationship and knowledge of the personality are not based on the psycho-physical, biological or spiritual reality of the persons. The human person, principally a self-creation, is related to other persons and, by extension, to metaphysical truth on the basis of internal intuition and of his internal nature.

The internal nature of the personality, the inner particular understanding of every human person, is the axis around which every thought of the writer revolves. The particular internal perception and identification is the cause of the differentiation of one person from the other. This does not imply essential differentiation or egocentric-individualistic limitation. The person belongs to an identified ontological truth on the basis of the values distinguished by means of inner sense in his relationship with other persons.

"The Nature of Sympathy" is a work of moral phenomenology, that is a work which deals with subjects of ethics from a phenomenological (inductive and person-oriented) point of view. The assumption of our study has been the writer's intention of developing in this work a moral phenomenological analysis, based on the ontological, as well as the social and theological reality of the person. According to the concept of moral phenomenology, the aim of such a study should be to highlight the truth about Man on the basis of the emotional nature of human person and, in particular, on the basis of the feeling of love.

For Scheler the truth of the human person and the truth in

235. Ibid. p. 254.
general, as well as the way of the quest for truth on the part on the person, are based on love and on its development by the carrier-person.

Philosophically speaking, love constitutes both the content of Being and the way in which the person reaches Being by means of his relationship with other persons and objects. By means of love, the person partakes in his personal ontological truth and in the ontological truth of the world. It is by means of love that the person is related to other beings and creatures at a daily and social level.

The truth and the relationship with other persons and things is not a product of a unilaterally analyzed ontological reality. The truth is not imposed upon the person because of a common ontological origin. "Being" is not imposed upon and does not attract the human person, as Metaphysical Monism maintains. The truth is the point which the human person reaches through his relationship with other persons; it is not an imposed truth on the person. In contrast to Metaphysical Monism, love does not constitute a part of the metaphysical truth; it is the main way of participating in it.

In addition, the truth is not a product of the psychological and mechanistic interpretation. The reality of the personality is not a consequence of particular influences of the past. The hypostasis of the person, as a member of a whole and of society, is not just a product of previous experiences, the experiences of childhood or of its biological categories. Love is not just the result of previous external influences nor is it a consequence of the biological need for vitality. Love is a way of relating to other beings and creatures.

In this study, M.Scheler transcends the metaphysical and mechanistic interpretations of the person. He transcends the limiting interpretations of the human personality by applying the truth to its limit. It is between the metaphysical reality and the social experience that the human personality can acquire the truth. The human person discovers the truth and becomes an
ontological reality by means of its relationship to ideal objectivity. The person acquires his ontological reality by moving between the part and the whole. M. Scheler highlights this movement and the movement within the limits as a way of searching for the truth. The person is the carrier of the truth and the person can project the truth on society by means of the social relationship. It is in the person that the whole and the part, the ontological and subjective, meet and merge in the realisation of love, which is of metaphysical origin and constitutes a personal act in its development. By highlighting personality and love, which constitute subjective formations and are of metaphysical origin, the writer stresses the ontological reality between the limits.

We will proceed to present the ontological unifying personal importance of the whole (the ontological) and the part (the personal) by referring to the relation of personality and love according to M. Scheler. We will initially present the conditions on which love signifies a personal unifying act. In particular, we will refer to his view of "Eros" and "Agape". We will then present "Agape" and "Eros" as acts of unity with the cosmos, Man and God, our intention being to demonstrate the unifying reality of the personality as a carrier of these acts.
Chapter II.

The terms "Eros" and "Love" according to M. Scheler.

M. Scheler, as any other philosopher, regardless of the mentality or the school to which he belongs, seeks the truth and the ways of partaking in it. The philosophical thought seeks the truth of cosmos (cosmology), the truth of Man (ontology), the truth about God (Theology, Metaphysics) by means of logic, feeling, participation, actualization, movement, ecstasy, inner sense, and impetus towards the ideal objectivity and so on 236.

Philosophy, as an action of Man towards the truth, has always been characterized as love for wisdom (φιλοσοφία) as a science of principles, as Metaphysics 237, always referring to the innate longing of the human existence to exist according to its own

236. This point of view refers to the ways of partaking in the truth of the cosmos according to the Pre-Socratic theory, in which the transition from mythos to logos appears for the first time (see Ν. Νικολακόκου "Εθνική Φιλοσοφία" pp.75-209), to the Platonic theory, in which the logical conclusion is combined with the emotional reality and the participation in truth by means of methexis is stressed (See Plato Meno 62 e, 86 b), to the theory of Aristotle, in which logic, the dominant factor, reveals the movement of the cosmos and entelechy (Μεταφυσικά Α, 7), to the philosophical theories of partaking in the truth by means of ecstasy (Plotinus), and finally to the modern person-oriented and existential theories, which, being in agreement with certain methods of the past, highlight "ένθορνας" and induction to the ideal objectivity as the way of partaking in the truth (about "ένθορνας" as way of partaking in the ideal objectivity see E. Husserl "Δεύτερη Λογική "Έρευνα" p.96), (M. Heidegger in his "Επίστολη για τον 'Ανθρωπό"o, refers to ecstasy as a way of partaking in the destiny of existence p.101, in the "horizon" of Being p.71, and as providence for Being p.119).

237. Philosophy in its first form (the Pre-Socratic theory) is characterized as Love of wisdom (φιλοσοφία) in opposition to the term Wise. This distinction brings forward the nature of philosophy as quest for wisdom and not possession of it (see Ν. Νικολακόκου optim. p.80). Philosophy is also characterized by Aristotle as a science of principles (Metaphysics 981 a).
eternal truth.

The love for wisdom, Philosophy, is presented as the personal longing for existence as ethics and deontology in order for it not to be limited to the quest for the eternal ideas and principles and to their discovery and formulation (ontology).

Deontology (ethics) is the part of philosophy which stresses the ways in which the human person exists according to the truth. Deontology, whether based on an ontology or investigating the ways of participation in the truth without originating in a particular ontology or metaphysics, is the part of philosophy which connects the person with the whole, with the ontological. Ethics can be an extension of a particular ontology as well as the revelation of truth, of the ontology by referring to the ways of partaking in the truth, without however being based on a particular ontology but on the desire of the particular existent.

Deontology can be an extension of an ontology by being based on the latter. Furthermore, it can reveal certain ontological truths by studying the ways of existence. The second kind of deontology, as opposed to the first, is based on personal existential experience. It is based on the direct experiences of existence, on the agony of existing and on feeling. In contrast, the first kind of deontology is based either on the ideal reality, or on scientific discoveries, or, finally, on the psychological interpretations of the existence which, very often, if generalised, take on the form of ideal objectivity.

It is the second kind of deontology in combination with the principles of phenomenology by E. Husserl, that M. Scheler chose in his quest for the ways of the unity of the person with the truth, with the social reality and with himself.

The writer chose this combination at a time when Monistic Philosophy and Social Philosophy tended to decrease the importance
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of the part (the person) in comparison to the whole. In addition, M. Scheler's choice of ethics, as a part of Philosophy, lies in opposition to the psychological theories which, by regarding the mechanistic causal interpretation as absolute, deleted any ontological perspective from deontology. The psychological interpretation of the experiences of the human personality alienates the personality from its own truth since by this interpretation the personality is confined in the previous space-time experiences without having the possibility of going beyond them and of partaking in the truth.

Philosophy as love of wisdom according to the Monistic and psychological interpretations started to lose its unifying nature either by being too committed to one principle or by regarding the space-time reality as absolute. According to these interpretations, love, as a primary factor of philosophy, is seen merely as a principle of philosophy or as the outcome of the biological and social states.

M. Scheler stresses the reinstatement of the importance of love as a primary element of philosophy and of the personality in its struggle to be ontological. He does so by expressing love as the main way of the person existing who longs to be real and to be related both to his own ontological truth and to the world at a daily level.

We shall now go on to examine what Scheler has specifically to say about Eros and Love in turn, thus facilitating comparison with St. Maximus the Confessor.
The term "Eros" according to M.Scheler.

In this study, M. Scheler uses the term Eros to indicate a unifying personal act. In spite of being a personal direction and a personal action, Eros is not limited to one aspect of the personality. It is not only Eros for beauty, for eternal ideas or for the cosmos. As eros for eternal ideas, it is an action of unity being, beauty and the world without being confined to one interpretation. It is a unifying personal action of a wider scope since it does not constitute a unilateral relationship and action. It is more a sympathetic unifying function of the human personality. In short, it constitutes the ontological personal action of the human person.

In M. Scheler's work we can see the ontological aspect of Eros as a personal action at a philosophical, theological and social-cosmic point of view. At this point we refer to the concepts of eros according to Plato and to Plotinus.
Unity with the Cosmos.

In the chapter about unity with the cosmos, Eros is initially used in its ancient Greek sense. In this sense, unity with the cosmos is dominated by Eros as a transition from the material to the divine. Eros is the action of the human spirit towards unity with the universe and with divinity, as well as the movement from "non being" to "being".

In this connexion, Eros is highlighted as a personal action, as a way of unity with the universe and with the divinity, and as an action of transition from "non-being" to "being". From this point of view, Eros is a personal action extending to the ontological level. It is an action of unity with the cosmos in its true ontological form, an action of unity with the Divine as the creator of this cosmos as well as an action of kinetic transcendence of "non-being", ("μὴ δὲν").

These four points of reference (person, cosmos, God and the transcendence of "non-being") stress the personal, ontological and theological importance of Eros as well as its importance in connection to existential longing.

At first, by highlighting eros as a personal action, the

M. Scheler provides a sociological, philosophical and theological dimension to this subject of his study as well, maintaining however the principles of philosophical anthropology (highlighting the truth through all three dimensions) as we are about to see. In this case, eros can accept a sociological, philosophical and theological interpretation not only because it has been previously interpreted in all three ways, but also because eros, as a personal act and direction, refers both to the space-time order and to eternal truth and God.
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appetitive personal nature of love as a way of co-existing is stressed. Eros as a personal action is not directed towards individuality, towards the individual himself. Eros as a personal action is the direction of the personality towards the object; it is the way of communication and unity of the person with the loved one.

At this point, the desiring nature of Eros is acknowledged, at a personal level, in its social form. Longing fully to exist, the person moves erotically towards the other person and enters into relationship with the other person. The appetitive nature of this kind of Eros, the formulation of Man's longing to exist is highlighted by the act of community and communication as well as by the reciprocal transference of the emotional states by means of Eros.

Eros, as a personal action and movement and as a community is directed towards unity with the cosmos and towards the inter-penetration of the cosmos and of the person. It is highlighted as a way of unity of the person with the cosmos and it signifies the transition of the values of the cosmos to the person, the development of the values of the cosmos by the person, and, finally, the transference of the development of the values to the cosmos.

According to this interpretation, Eros is a personal unifying action with the cosmos, a personal event of co-existence of the person with the cosmos, as well as a metamorphosis of the cosmos by the person. The eros of the person for the cosmos, the identification of the values of the cosmos in the event of Eros constitutes the primary form of the communion of the person and the primary metamorphosis of the cosmos on the basis of the values of the person.

This interpretation of Eros is of a phenomenological nature since Eros is considered to be a personal action, an inductive action as well as an action of metamorphosis (from the point of view of the values).
Eros as a direction towards the divine is also of a personal nature. The person, in its ancient greek sense, moves erotically towards the divine in its desire to be contained in the creator of the beings. Eros of this kind does not entail inter-penetration since the divine remains immutable in its relationship with the human person. In this relationship, only the human person and the cosmos change. The divine cannot change since it is self-complete and constitutes a value itself.

This kind of eros cannot be considered interpersonal since only the human person, and not the perfect divine element, changes. This non-interpersonal relationship with the immutable and self-absolute divine signifies eros as a movement towards the ideal, towards the absolute idealistic form of eros. This kind of eros constitutes the longing for unity with the divine without interpersonal

Scheler believes that God exists insofar as the essential unity of the cosmos can be identified (See Formalism p.396). By extension, God belongs to a macrocosm. According to this concept, from Scheler's point of view, God is not directly attainable by Man. Consequently, Man cannot be in direct community with Him. It is also stressed that relationship with God and the expression of the love for God is achieved by means of the love for the creatures.

The afore-mentioned lead us to the realization that Scheler's concept of God is more of a philosophical nature, highlighting God as an absolute existent (see E. Clarke "Max Scheler on Religion" - The Philosophical Review-vol.xzii.p.582). Consequently, this concept leads to the negation of a direct, social and interpersonal relationship between God and Man.

At this point, we detect a similarity and a difference between St.Maximus and M. Scheler regarding the erotic relationship of God and Man. According to St.Maximus Man feels eros for the "vootqevov" divine as the Creator of the beings by means of "vohkroto". Even though the divine can not be fully understood, the direct erotic communication with God is feasible because of the way of existing. According to St.Maximus, Man feels eros for God in two ways: as an absolute creating reality and as an existence which exists and moves erotically towards the cosmos and Man. According to Scheler however, God is the object of the human eros without erotically existing and continually moving towards Himself and the cosmos. Scheler supports the Aristotelian concept of the agapelistic movement of God, that is, God moved only once, when He created.
relationship, without being drawn by the divine person (according to the ancient Greek notion of the divine).

Eros, in the form in which it is presented, is the formulation of the longing of the person to be eternal and to exist eternally in unity with being. It is an action of perpetuation of the existent in co-existence with the eternal and in perichoresis of the eternal with the temporal.

According to this presentation, Eros is also of an existential nature. It is a relationship of the existing in the transcendence of Ἰπποκάταλος. By experiencing the threat of Ἰπποκάταλος of personal annihilation, the person feels eros for the absolute, and partakes actively in the absolute, in the prospect of eternity in contrast to the prospect of annihilation; the person transcends its eros for Ἰπποκάταλος by means of its eros for the absolute.

According to this concept of eros, M. Scheler accepts Eros as a personal action of the human spirit, as an action of unity with the cosmos and God and as an appetitive expression of the existent. In the writer's mind, Eros is of a personal, ontological, theological and existential nature. It signifies the action of the person towards ontological unity, unity with God and the transcendence of Ἰπποκάταλος.

Unity with the cosmos and with God.

At this point we can see yet another similarity between the two writers in referring to eros as transcendence of Ἰπποκάταλος. Both writers refer to the erotic relationship at the level of a space-time experience in the quest for fulfillment of the person. Eros of this kind constitutes a quest for the filling of the emptiness of existence by cosmic objects. It is the longing to eliminate the emptiness and the imperfection of existence by means of relating to objects and persons. St. Maximus transcends the imperfection of existence by means of the erotic relationship with persons and with God as self-complete and self-perfect. St. Maximus stresses the desire to be fulfilled by means of the relationship with the imperfect and with the perfect God, who abolishes and eliminates any kind of emptiness or imperfection by being self-complete and creative.
M. Scheler also presents eros as a personal unifying act with the cosmos and with God in the same chapter in which he refers to St. Francis of Assisi. In this reference eros constitutes a personal act of unity with the cosmos and, in particular, with specific objects within the cosmos as transitional towards unity with God. The objects and persons are loved objects since they are creatures of God, manifesting His presence. The objects are loved not because of their earthly usefulness but because of their intentional ontological reality. The person does not feel eros for the objects as earthly things by means of which he can satisfy his daily needs and stress his existence. On the contrary, the person feels eros for objects within the cosmos in the perspective of the unity with God.

Eros, in this sense does not signify concentration on the objects of the cosmos or pantheism. The loved objects constitute depictions of the holy energy and power without being forms of deity themselves. The eros of objects, in its theological perspective, is not equivalent to pantheism or deification of the objects. This kind of eros is of a phenomenological nature, that is, it is a propulsive relationship of the person towards divinity by means of the creatures. Eros constitutes the way of identifying the divine origin of the creatures. By extension, eros is the way of identifying divinity by means of the cosmos as well.

From this point of view, eros constitutes the way of phenomenological induction to the divine creative energy by means

---
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of the cosmos. The person is thereby connected with the cosmos in the personal act of eros with the intention of being united with God. The realisation of the act merges with the perspective, the cosmos, the human person and God as the Creator. According to this interpretation of eros, the person longs to connect his space-time reality with eternal reality; he is in agony to achieve the realisation of his ontological reality as cosmic, space-time and eternal. In the manifestation of his act of eros, the person achieves the realisation of his nature as temporal and eternal, connecting the cosmos, in its authenticity, with God without deifying the cosmos at the same time.

Metaphysical, Psychological and Phenomenological Interpretations.

In the chapter about sympathetic functions, M. Scheler refers to eros in its ideal function, according to Schopenhauer. According to the latter, eros is considered as the unifying force of beings on the basis of blind will.

The aim of this reference is to stress the metaphysical basis of the erotic unity of beings in opposition to the sexual basis of the unity of beings. The cause of the erotic relationship of the persons is not Libido but lies in the metaphysical basis of the creation and the erotic co-existence of persons. Eros is not based on the biological need of the person but on the appetitive quest for unity with other person.

Thus M. Scheler's concept of eros is clearly different from the concept of eros which is based on psychological and biological causes.

Eros, as a relationship of persons, is of a metaphysical nature,
insular as it presupposes the metaphysical basis of the *sociability* of persons as well as the metaphysical basis of creation.

Here we see the writer influenced by *phenomenology* in two ways. Firstly, he is a phenomenological writer because he is opposed to *psychological interpretations* of personal states and acts. Secondly, he is a phenomenological writer since he attributes a *phenomenological interpretation* to personal experiences.  

**Eros and Universal Life.**

In the mind of Scheler, *eros* is connected to universal life in its eternal course. It is a universal, ontological and metaphysical event with every person. It forms the way of offering to the cosmos, of perpetuating the cosmos and for this reason it has a metaphysical basis as well.

*Eros*, as an act of offering to universal life and the eternal course of the human race on the part of the person, connects at the same time the person in his ontological, aeonic and space-time form, with the whole. It highlights both the subjective-individual and the metaphysical element in the person. By means of *eros*, the person acts in an interpersonal and personal way. The act is also of an ontological kind and significance. Eros is not an act towards the individual; it constitutes a transition from the individual to the ontological.

The carrier of *eros* is the person in his metaphysical and ontological origin, in his direction towards ontological and metaphysical fulfilment and not as a product of biological and

---
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psychological functions.\textsuperscript{259}

The writer does not exclude the space-time, cosmic nature of eros nor does he consider the materialistic nature of eros (on the basis of the psychological behaviour of the person) as absolute. On the contrary, besides the eros of a space-time and eternal origin, the person is also stressed as the carrier of eros in his personal and metaphysical basis.

In Scheler's mind, the two realities, person and eros, are connected (as carrier and the act of the carrier) in their particular natures always in relation to their ontological reality and unity. Eros and the person constitute the specific contents, the specific realities which are manifested in cosmic reality; however, they have and belong to an ontological reality. It is in eros and in the person that the unity of the whole and the part, the temporal and the eternal course, the origin in and the induction to the ideal objectivity, can be found.

Platonic Eros.

Platonic eros is contrasted with sexual eros in the same chapter.\textsuperscript{260} The eros for beauty and participation in the beautiful constitute the main spiritual forms of eros by means of which the person partakes in the previous form of his existence.\textsuperscript{261}

In its Platonic version eros for beauty is the eros for the previous form of existence, the eros for the state prior to the imprisonment of the soul in the body.\textsuperscript{262} It is the eros for the absolute ideal reality and it constitutes a reversive movement to the previous form of the soul by means of its memory of the prior

\textsuperscript{259} Sympathy. p.112.
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It is not clear whether Scheler accepts this reversion movement, but he does consider eros as an act towards ideal objectivity as opposed to sexual eros.

By stressing the absolute idealistic nature of eros, the writer seems to aim at the transcendence of the absolutely materialistic nature of eros (sexuality). The idealistic nature of eros acts as a counterbalance to any assertion of its absolutely materialistic nature.

According to M. Scheler, the truth of the theory about eros can only be found and highlighted as lying between the theories of sexuality and of the ideal form of eros. At this point as well (where the two extreme theories are presented) the writer intends to present a unified theory of the metaphysical basis of eros in relation to the cosmic and space-time course of the personality.

Being a phenomenological philosopher, M. Scheler seeks the truth in the limits of metaphysics, of the temporal nature and of cosmic reality. As far as eros is concerned, he aims at the unity of the temporal and the eternal, of the materialistic and the spiritual by means of referring to their respective theories of eros.

**Eros and sympathetic function.**

Eros, as a link between metaphysical and cosmic reality is highlighted here as a sympathetic function and infection by means of which the person is connected with what he is, with universal life, and with metaphysics. This reference to eros contains the following five points: a. eros as a sympathetic function, b. eros as a connection with what the person is, c. eros as a connection with universal life, d. eros as a connection with metaphysics and e. eros as infection.

---
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The first of the afore-mentioned points highlights eros as an act of the personality. Eros constitutes an act of the personality, a personal event of unity with reality. Here, eros is also highlighted as an emotional function that draws one to the sphere of ethics. Since ethics deals more with feeling and less with logic eros as a sympathetic and emotional function can be seen as drawing persons to the sphere of ethics. The emotional basis of the uniting reality of the personality is stressed by these two aspects (feeling and logic) of eros as an emotional function.

The basic element of the ontological unity of the personality is the feeling, eros in this case, more at an ethical and emotional level, and less at a logical level. The unity and the ontological unification of the personality in the field of eros are due to the emotional reality of the person, to the reality of induction more than to the logical-critical reality. Eros is the basis of an ethical ontology, the basis of an ethical philosophy or better still the basis of a philosophy which based on the emotion, induction, and on personal participation to eternal truth.

Furthermore, eros as an emotional act stresses the metaphysical foundation of the ontological unity since the feeling in general includes agnostic and apophatic elements as it lies in between the logically and non-logically controlled. By overstressing the emotional reality of the person, the writer can also stress the agnostic and apophatic reality of the person (highlighting freedom and metaphysics at the same time), since the absolute logical analysis of eros (in this case the rationally critical attitude) is reduced.

The interpretation of eros as an emotional function stresses the possibility of partaking in it beyond rationalistic limitations and

---
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beyond the causalistic relationship. It stresses eros as personal choice and activation without it being caused by the biological reality or the psychological aspect of the personality. Eros as an emotional function is an act of freedom on the part of the personality in relation to its metaphysical reality.

The metaphysical basis of the feeling of eros is highlighted by the next three points, as unity with what is the person, as unity with metaphysics and as unity with universal life.

The unifying nature of eros with what he is and with metaphysics highlights eros as a link with the reality of the personality, with what the personality is as well as with its metaphysical basis. The concept of eros as an active emotional unity with what the person is, is open to many interpretations due to the fact that the question what is personality can be answered in many ways or cannot be answered at all. The interpretation of eros as unity with what he is may mean unity with all the attributes of the personality, with all the dimensions of reality, with the logical conclusions of the interpretations of the personality as well as with the failure of logic to reach a particular interpretation of the personality. In addition, the interpretation of eros as unity with what he is includes elements of the apophatic and the unlimited.

The interpretation of eros as an act towards the metaphysical unity is of the same nature. Metaphysics, being a field in which both all and nothing is said, being the outcome of the eros of the person, includes elements of the logical and of the apophatic at the same time.

The third field of unity, universal life, apart from its metaphysical content, can also include space-time and cosmic reality. Apart from being eros for the metaphysical reality, (eros for what the personality is and is not), eros as an act of unity with universal life can also accept a space-time interpretation and importance. Eros and its carrier, the person, are not only metaphysical realities but space-time realities as well. They are realities of both cosmic and social importance. The human person does not only belong to a cosmos beyond the ordinary but he also
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belongs to a direct social reality.

Turning to infection we may say that infection is mainly of a personal nature. The infection of eros is a social event which is, on the one hand, based on the metaphysical nature of sociability but which is realised in the cosmic reality. Infection is more of a social cosmic nature but not at an absolutely logical-rationalistic level, since it is of an emotional nature. By regarding eros as emotional infection the writer attributes a social importance to eros; he considers eros as a form of the sociability of the person.

The five points to which we briefly referred present eros as a personal act of unity of the metaphysical and cosmic reality, a unity in which the emotional and the ethical reality of the personality is stressed. By such a stress the monistic, the psychological and mechanistic (causal) interpretations of the personality and its feelings (in particular of eros) are transcended.

In conclusion we may observe that Scheler uses the earlier theories of eros in order to refute psychological interpretations of eros as an expression of sexuality. He uses the platonic and idealistic (monistic) concepts of eros as a counterweight to the mechanistic psychological theories, and thereby highlights the ground in between the two absolute theories.

He is original, as far as we know, in his synthesis of the theories. The personal nature of the act of eros as well as its social, cosmic and metaphysical nature constitute the personal contribution of Scheler (as far as we know) to the subject of the interpretation of eros. Trying to understand the writer's point of view about eros and according to the theories that he accepts (which by being accepted form a part of his thoughts) we can say that eros is a sympathetic, emotional act of the person towards the ontological, metaphysical, social and space-time unity.

Eros constitutes the personal longing of every person to be united with metaphysical and cosmic reality. It forms a personal
act of unity of the temporal with the eternal. The person, being the carrier of eros, and eros, being the content of the person, relate in their ontological, metaphysical and cosmic basis as also as course-movements towards ontological unity.
The term "Love" according to M. Scheler.

M. Scheler uses the term Love widely in his study to stress an ontological unity. The ontological unity achieved by means of love is presented both in its metaphysical and its personal aspect. Love is at the same time the content of unity and the way in which the person is united to other existences. Love is the point between the personality and metaphysical truth, the personality and other persons as well as the way of the unity of the afore-mentioned.

The researcher understands the importance and the significance of Love in the mind of the writer not only by means of the content of his thought (by means of the ways in which the writer understands love) but also by means of earlier theories which the writer uses in order to present his way of thinking or by means of his critique of certain of them.

The distinction.

In the first part of his study, M. Scheler presents love as lying between metaphysical, ontological truth, the social reality and the person by considering it a pleasant direction towards persons and the objects of the cosmos as well as towards concepts, aspects of reality and towards the sciences.

The human person is directed in an agapeistic and unifying way towards the cosmos, persons, objects and theories in his appetitive quest for his unity with both the direct and the remote. Love is the act by means of which the person is related to and becomes familiar with what is around him and with what he experiences as the content of himself and of others (metaphysical reality).

268. Sympathy. p. 5.
Also see. I. Bochenski "Ιστορία τῆς συγχρόνης Ευρωπαϊκής Φιλοσοφίας" p. 186.

269. Also see E. Vacek optim. p. 157 who refers to Scheler's concept of love as the power of the reign of God.
According to this first form of love, love is an act of the person towards what lies beyond his subjective reality. Love is an act of exit from individuality towards social relationship and perichorematic relationship. The gap that this leaves is filled by the person or object with which the personality is in communion. In this way, love is the way of relating of existences and persons in a common form of creation and infection. Love forms the way of community of the person and persons at an energetic level.

The community of feeling.

At this point, love is stressed as a pre-supposition of the community of feeling. This includes the social and personal aspects of love.

Love is considered here as the prerequisite for the experience of the other person's feeling. It constitutes the prerequisite of the relationship of identification and of personal participation in the state of the other person.

Love is the inconspicuous basis of the understanding of the other person. It is inconspicuous since it is not directly conscious during the act of the identification of the feeling. The identified feeling covers love with its appearance, as love is not the content of the identification but the feeling of the state. Love, the presupposition of the identification of the feeling, exists (without its importance being reduced) in every other emotional identification as the basis and the content of every identification as well as of every unifying feeling.

The egocentric interpretation.

Love, being the content of every feeling and being a form of
identification of the feeling of the other person in its unifying reality, cannot be considered as a form of egoism. The egocentric manifestation of love (love as a projection of the subjectivity on the other person), does not constitute a direction towards the reality of the other person and so, by extension, it is not of an ontological nature.

The writer opposes the notion of love as a kind of projection of the "I" on other persons since this love is not of a social or interactive nature. Egocentric love does not signify inflicting subjective feeling and states because it deprives the personality of its completion and of sociability with other persons. Egocentric love is a phenomenal way of relationship of the persons without any perspective. Egocentric love, as a projection of "I" on the other person, is a self love and not love as identification of values of the beloved person, or love as community.

The Monistic interpretation.

The Monistic concept of love is also without perspective since Monism overstresses the metaphysical origin of love thus reducing its personal nature. This makes love be only of an intentional nature by carrying it to levels above the sociability of the personality. According to this interpretation love is not a personal act and aim but an imposition of metaphysical unity upon the person. This concept of love reduces the personal nature of love, love as a personal act and, by extension, love as a product of personal freedom.

The Monistic interpretation of love stresses love's metaphysical basis and its theoretical establishment as the essential identification of subjects; it does not consider love as a personal
choice and act of existence. The foundation of metaphysical monism, the theoretical identification of Being, reduces the personal nature of love and on the basis of the concept of Being it can mean at the same time everything and nothing. According to such a metaphysical, monistic interpretation, love, having lost its personal nature as a personal act, can be interpreted in a general, indefinite and inaccessible way. Even though it can be regarded as absolute on the grounds of the absolute nature of Being, metaphysical monistic love reduces to the individualistic interpretation of particular philosophers. On account of the unlimited possibilities that the multiple interpretation of Being provides, every philosopher can interpret love in a metaphysical way, highlighting his subjective views.

Scheler is opposed to both the egocentric concept and the monistic interpretation of love since they reduce the social, interpersonal and personal nature of love. The egocentric interpretation of love confines it to subjective aspirations with the monistic interpretation reduces the personal nature of love, thus making it possible to overstress the individualistic viewpoint of every philosopher. In particular, the monistic interpretation includes both egocentric and metaphysical interpretations either by generalizing love or by annihilating the sociability of the person.

Love and the Gospel.

Next, we must consider Scheler's attitude to the Gospel's view of love. The Gospel stresses love for the other person to the degree of love one has for one's own self. From this point of view, love is the personal identification of the other person on the basis of subjective reality. Love is the identification of oneself in the personality of the loved person without this implying the

---
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egocentric form of love.

Regardless of it being Christian teaching, the writer accepts the teaching of the Gospel about love, as this teaching expresses love as a personal unifying act. According to both the Gospel and Scheler's own view, love constitutes a personal act of unity and identification.

In accordance with the Gospel's interpretation of love the person is united with the loved person or object to the point that the latter aims to be loved. The loved person is the criterion of the agapeistic unity and not the person who loves. The criterion of this agapeistic unity is the personality, its state and the degree of manifestation of this unifying act.

The Gospel's teaching about love stresses the personal nature of love at two levels: a. as personal and interpersonal act and b. as personal and interpersonal completion.

According to this understanding, love is the act of the person towards unity with the other person on the basis of personal longing to exist. The person loves and is united in order to experience himself as a person to the point that he fully experiences his existence. This kind of love is not egocentric; it constitutes a transference of the existential reality to the loved person. According to the Gospel, the person, by loving to the point that he loves himself²⁷⁹ (which also means loving the other person as much as he longs to exist), realises love as an inter-existential and perichorematic relationship. By loving the other person this much, the person is related to other persons both at a unifying ontological and at a daily social level. By loving to the point of fulfilling his existence, the person transfers his unifying act and his love for God, for other persons and for the truth to other persons. The person who experiences and manifests his love this much has reached the point where the person is united with God, with the metaphysical and ontological truth as well as

²⁷⁹ Ibid. p.69.
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with his social reality. Love, as an appetitive personal act, as an act of agapeistic unity with the other persons to the degree of "oneself", is the highest point of unity with both the direct and metaphysical reality.

The criterion of this unity and love is always the degree to which the person loves himself; in other words, his longing to realise fully his own existence.

Love and unity with the cosmos.

Love as a personal act of unity with the cosmos is discussed from two different theological perspectives, the Indian and the Christian.  

Love and the Indian Ethos.

The Indian Theological concept of the cosmos considers love to be a personal act of unity with the cosmos as animate reality.  

Such unity with reality, which is fundamentally equivalent and equal to the reality of the person, is achieved by means of love. Love is the first stage of unity with the cosmos in something that is continually evolving. According to the Indian concept, love is the product of panvitalism and pantheism and the agapeistic unity is an organic unity with the cosmos as animate reality.

This kind of love is an act of unity with objects and persons in...
the form of interdependence 284. Reality and the cosmos are loved by the person as depictions of life and of the human person. This kind of love is devoid of any metaphysical or ontological foundation since its theoretical framework is devoid of any particular deity. According to Indian theology, the person may believe in one or even in a thousand gods or in no god at all 286.

A general evaluation of the religions of Indian origin will lead to the conclusion that they are devoid of explicit teaching about God. This comes as a result of their anthropoic and vitalistic interest. The religions of Indian origin are interested more in the perpetuation of the cosmos within time than in the perpetuation of the personality in relation to God. It is Man, and not the divine, that lies at the core of these religions. (This is also implied by the fact that certain divinities possess human properties and others show explicitly deified human properties).

Love and the Christian Concept.

In the same chapter the writer refers to love as an act of unity of the person with the cosmos. In order to present a general and wide expression of love as unity of the person with the cosmos, he refers to the following kinds of love:

a. Love as a mystical act of unity with the cosmos 287.

b. Love as a content of the organic unity of the cosmos with God by means of Holy Communion (This kind of love is participation in the teaching, Holy Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ by partaking in His flesh and blood though cosmic-bread and wine
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objects.

c. **The spiritual agapeistic unity** with God according to the ecstatic (orphic) kind of transference and the personal kind of unity with God achieved by means of sensory objects.

d. **Love** according to St. Francis of Assisi: unity with the cosmos which, being a creature of God, is also His child. In the agapeistic relationship of the person with the objects of the cosmos created by God, the latter are called *brothers and friends*.

e. **The mystical agapeistic unity** with the cosmos according to Apostle Paul, who, even though he lives in the cosmos, feels united with Jesus Christ.

Such love is considered to be of a *Theocentric and Theanthropocentric* nature.

The Theocentric nature of love is stressed by its mystical form in which the person tends to be actively united with the divine. The Theanthropocentric nature of love is highlighted by the Holy Communion. Love is also of a Theocentric nature since it is an expression of unity with the cosmos whose creator is God (this entails cosmological, unifying and ontological significance).

In the manifestation of love as an act of unity with the cosmos, the person is consciously or unconsciously drawn to the ontological basis of the cosmos, to its ontological foundation in God and to the truth of the cosmos as a creature of divine origin.

The concept of love offered by Apostle Paul theoretically also involves Theanthropologic nuances since by this kind of love the person is united with God and with the Theanthropos Jesus Christ.

---
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Scheler characterises the two theological personal manifestations of love, the Indian and the Christian ones, as romantic and platonic respectively. In the romantic kind of love the person is united with the cosmos through the hope of life and its preservation. In the platonic kind of love the person is united with the cosmos at the prospect of eternity. In the second kind of love the person is united at the prospect of a relationship with the eternal, the divine which created beings and Man. The second kind of love, (without conceding the title "platonic love"), Christian love is more correct as far as the reality of the person is concerned, in as much as the person is a merger of the eternal and the finite, the temporal and the metaphysical-ontological. The soundness of this interpretation is also indirectly accepted by the Hindu religion which deifies certain human properties. Yet the acceptance of the metaphysical aspect of the personality by the Hindu religion stands in opposition to Christian Theology. Christian Theology experiences the truth as revealed by God in the person of Jesus Christ whereas the Hindu religion reveals the divine elements on the basis of the human reality alone.

Love and Benevolence.

In another part of his study, Scheler refers to benevolence as a particular kind of love. Benevolence constitutes a form of personal spiritual love and is based on the Christian teaching about the person, on the ontological aspect of love and on participation in the values. Benevolence includes ontological love (as its basis), the personal nature of unity (as interpersonal relationship) and spirituality, the ontological truth of the values.
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Benevolence is love in a particular social, inter-personal and personal form. Despite the fact the benevolence is based more on practice, on the external aspect of the personal and in spite of not being love in its absolute form, it is based on the love of the person for the other. Benevolence in its ontological sense is a kind of anthropological and personal interest in and unity with the other person.

By means of, benevolence, the human person expresses his love for the other person and by extension, his personal love for the other unique person. Benevolence, the expression of love, brings forward the uniqueness of the other person and their ontological unity. The expression of the love of the person expresses the concern for the loved one who belongs (as much as the loving person) to a general and wider ontological truth.

In particular, benevolence, the expressed love, presents love as a personal and interpersonal event which is based on the metaphysical and ontological unity of the person as a part in relation to other parts of the one ontological reality.

By means of this kind of love two aspects of the spirituality of the personality emerge: the spirituality of the person who loves and the spirituality of the beloved. Love is the form and the way of relationship in which the personality reveals its spirituality and partakes in the spirituality and the values of the other person.

A critique of interpretations of sexual Love.

Next, M. Scheler refers to sexual love as a movement of creation of the personality by means of friendliness and metaphysical love.

Sexual love constitutes the abridgment of certain dimensions of the personality. It is in sexual love that the longing for
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perpetuation within the limits of time, metaphysical love, the personal relationship and the feeling of friendliness merge. Sexual love is the expression of unity with life at its daily level, with its metaphysical reality as well as with other persons.

Sexual love is not only of romantic inter-personal nature. It is not the kind of love in which friendliness is over-stressed. This kind of love is characterised by Freud and Schopenhauer as pseudo-love supporting their theory of Libido. According to M. Scheler love is of a spiritual, vital and unifying nature. This concept refutes the two absolute forms of expression of sexual love, that is the phylogenetic and friendly. These theories are refuted since they regard as absolute only one part of the personality and reality. By connecting the vital experience with spirituality and the inter-personal relationship, Scheler unites the dimensions of the personality in the event of sexual love. By means of this kind of love the person belongs both to the temporal and to metaphysical reality, always in a personal way. By means of sexual life, the person (in his personal relationship with other persons) unifies his vital, phylogenetic, space-time, eternal and metaphysical reality. At this point also, love and the person are highlighted in the unifying reality of the part and the whole, of the temporal and the eternal.

Love and Metaphysics.

Scheler connects the metaphysial unifying kind of love with Christian teaching about the person as "made in the divine image".

The mystical form of love in which Man is "made in the image" of...
God is the consciousness of the metaphysical unity of the person with the cosmos and with personal spiritual essences. The teaching of Christian theology about the person "made in the image" is the main metaphysical and personal foundation of love. Through this teaching the person is unified in an agapeistic way with the metaphysical reality whose Image he is and with other persons as carriers of the same metaphysical reality.

By means of this teaching the person is unified with the whole, the ontological and the metaphysical, at a personal level. He is unified with the essential metaphysical reality as a carrier of the same Image as well as with the personal singularity of every carrier of this Image. Christian teaching about the Image as a foundation of the concept of love connects the whole with the part, the first and the second Aristotelian essences, that is, the general and the particular essence of every person. The love of this kind is at the same time an ontological and a personal unifying reality. By means of this love, the person is unified with the metaphysical and the personal essence of every loved person. Mystical love is the main personal, metaphysical form of unity with the truth and with personal truth.

Love as movement through the values.

The writer goes on to present love in its spiritual form, characterizing it as movement through the values. He attributes a general nature to love by saying that all the feelings which include love as a spiritual act are contents of the values. Love is thus the content of every feeling. The feeling is an act based on love.

This reference characterizes love as the unity of metaphysics and
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practice. It unifies the metaphysical basis of the person and his practical daily reality. Love is at the same time an expression of the metaphysical reality in the daily reality. By means of love the person lies at the turning point of metaphysics and daily reality. The person who loves is grounded in his metaphysical reality as a content of love which takes on form in the space-time reality. According to this presentation love is the unifying act of the person in every day life with metaphysical reality. Therefore, the person who loves is highlighted in both his metaphysical and his space-time reality. At this point the writer also unifies daily life with the metaphysical reality of the love of the person. Love and the person constitute the two ways of expressing the metaphysical and space-time unity.

The metaphysical kind of love.

According to the Aristotelian interpretation, in which God moves in the created cosmos as the "beloved", the absolute form of expression of the metaphysical and space-time unity is the love of God.

At this point, the writer stresses the metaphysical character of the agapeistic movement in its unity with the world. He highlights the main metaphysical form of love as God (who is totally metaphysical) moving towards the cosmos and relating with it, completing it, without being completed Himself, on the basis of love.

Love here constitutes the unifying act of the metaphysical ontological foundation and of the cosmos. Love is the way in which God acts in the cosmos and by means of which the cosmos is preserved.

According to these two references love is the content of the
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human feeling, the way in which Man tries to bring to consciousness the divine and metaphysical aspect of the cosmos and the way in which God moves and acts in the cosmos. Love is the human act of connecting the cosmos with divine creation and the way in which God acts upon His Creation. The two concepts can characterise love as both an upward and a downward movement. The person with his love for the cosmos moves upwards towards the *theosis* of the cosmos and God moves downwards towards the cosmos to guarantee its preservation.

Love with its upward and downward direction is thus the way in which the metaphysical and space-time reality lie in unity. It is the expression of the ontological unity of the person with the cosmos and the expression of the unity of God with the cosmos.

**Love and Hatred.**

The writer goes on to present *love* and *hatred* in their social and interpersonal form. *Love* and *hatred* constitute the expressions of the personality, its choice at the level of feeling. Love and hatred show the emotional direction towards objects as well as the intention. It is by means of love and hatred that the person identifies the positive or negative values of the object and relates to them. Love and hatred are aspects of the personality which are manifested in the relationship with objects.

According to this concept, *love* and *hatred* constitute personal acts which signify unity with the objects and their negative or positive values. *Love* in particular is the way in which the personality is related to the objects and to the values which they
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include.

Love is a movement from the lower to the higher values of the loved person and hatred is an act based on the lower values. Love as an active unity with the loved person establishes the person in the higher values of the beloved in its intentional reality. By means of love the values of the beloved are identified. Love itself however, is above any value since it constitutes the basis of the identification of every value. The role of love is thus to cause the highest value, the ideal form of the loved ones, to emerge.

Scheier writer presents love as the way in which the person is drawn to, and discovers, the essential, ideal reality of the beloved. At this point, he underlines the moral, deontological aspect of the personality by means of which the personality can be drawn to its ontological reality.

Being opposed to philosophical concepts which create ethics and deontology on the basis of a single ontological truth, the writer starts from love in order to stress the revelation of a plural ontology generated by ethics. Deontology, being the way in which the personality relates to objects and persons, constitutes the authentic way of revealing ontological truth. Philosophy (the love of wisdom) is based on the ethics of love, on the agapeistic way of relating to persons, by means of which the ontological truth is revealed. This concept stands in opposition to the predetermined determination of love on the basis of ontological truth.

At this point the writer does not seek to reveal the truth itself, but the ways in which the person reveals the truth.

By characterising love and hatred as acts which refer to objects and reveal the positive or the negative aspect of the loved persons, Scheler presents an ethics of love, the way in which the
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personality relates to persons and objects. Apart from the manifestations of love to persons, objects and political-social forms, he highlights the revelation of the positive aspect of the loved ones by means of love. According to this presentation, love is the identification of not only the values of the loved personality but also of the forms of the social life as well. The love for the forms of civilization leads to the identification of the values of the cultural social forms, of the spiritual reality of society. Not only the particular person or object but social reality and civilization are considered as carriers of the values.

From this point of view, love is both an interpersonal identification of the values and the way in which the values of the social reality are identified. The person is drawn to the ontological and metaphysical reality of society by means of love. Love and the person are not only direction towards the persons and the objects but towards social life as well. In relation to social reality and on the basis of love, Man discovers and partakes in the values and the ontological reality. The social manifestation of love stresses the essential nature of the sociability of the person which is always based on love. Love and sociability constitute two basic categories of the personality.

Next, love is presented as an interpersonal relationship by means of which the ideal characteristics of the beloved, his ideal form and values, are displayed. The identification of the values of the loved person is of pedagogical nature both to the identifying and to the identified. By means of love as the way of interpersonal relationship, the values of the beloved are stressed and taught to the person who loves.

According to the writer, love opens our spiritual eyes to the
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higher values of the beloved and at the same time it opens new horizons and interests. In this way love is the "enhancement of the values".

The parable of the Prodigal Son and the forgiveness of Mary Magdalene constitute an example of love as enhancement of personal values. The basis of pedagogical love is the abrogation of the limits of love. Jesus Christ constitutes a model of such unlimited pedagogical, interpersonal love.

Personal love and Pharisaism.

The writer goes on to present the personal nature of love by means of which the values and the virtues of the beloved come forward. In contrast to love of general nature, love as personal is the way of identifying and partaking in the values. The love of general nature, the love of value without reference to the beloved is characterized as Pharisaism by Scheler.

Love as generality is pseudo-love since it does not originate in the relationship with the person and object of love, as it is not personal love for the object.

In contradistinction to such Pharisaic love, true love is only possible as an interpersonal relationship of the persons. Love is a real and personal act of unity. The general aspect of love and the love of generality is pseudo-love since the beloved originates in the lover himself. The love of generality is based on a reversible circular movement since the beloved originates in the personality of the lover and is directed again towards it.
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True love as an interpersonal, social and interpenetrating event. Personal love is only possible as a relationship with the other person as a carrier of the values and not as an self-generating relationship.

Love is more a personal attitude towards persons and objects by means of which the person is drawn to the values and the ideas of the beloved. The personality is a unity of essence always in relation to the beloved. Love constitutes the essential way of the personality and personality and love are manifestations of the physical, emotional and essential values of the personality by means of relationship.

Love is not only a personal event or an event of the persons at a daily level, but an ontological event as well. By means of love the person is unified in an interpersonal way with the beloved and with thus both ontological reality. Love is thus both a personal and ontological event.

The forms, modes and kinds of love and hatred.

Love can be manifested in the following forms: spiritual love, mental love, love of individual self and vital or passionate love. In these forms of love the essential interests and the essential dimensions of the personality are manifested. The interest of the personality in being united with the spiritual, mental and space-time reality as well as the longing of the personality to be united with ontological and space-time reality are expressed.

The forms of love and its manifestations on the part of the
personality are an intentional reference to the values of the beloved. By means of *spiritual love* the person is united with the spiritual values of the beloved; by means of *mental love* he is united with the mental values and finally by means of *vital love* he is united with the daily social values of the loved.

By presenting the forms of love, the writer highlights the longing for unity with metaphysical, ontological and social reality. Scheler presents personality and love at a metaphysical, ontological and social space-time level without regarding any dimension as absolute. Personality and love consist of, originate in and are directed to, the metaphysical, ontological and social space-time reality.

A critique of Naturalistic theories.

His presentation of love ends with a reference to naturalistic interpretations of love.

These interpretations consider *fellow-feeling* as the source of love and attribute love to *imitation and reproduction*. They explain love according to social reality, and are often based on the *ontogenetic theory of Freud*.

Feuerbach explains love on the basis of social reality, and perspective interprets the love of God from the human, that is as a manifestation of the love of humanity, as an expression of the longing of Man in the face of death.

M. Scheler does not accept Darwin's and Spencer's theories of love and fellow-feeling as they are based on the *phylogenetic reproduction of feeling*. The writer disagrees with these theories because they interpret *feelings and love* in a mechanistic way on the basis of *biological reality*. Another reason for his
disagreement is that they regard the biological and social reality of the personality as absolute in comparison to metaphysical and ontological reality.

The writer is opposed also to the historic-philosophical interpretation of feeling and love since it provides interpretations based solely upon the past. He disagrees with these interpretations mainly due to the fact that they are based on an ontogenetic theory and mechanistic interpretation of the feelings.

He is particularly opposed to Freud's interpretation since the latter interprets love on the basis of Libido, thus eliminating any inwardness of the personality.

Naturalistic theory does not explain the phenomena of the spiritual and sacred love, which express the spiritual and interpersonal unity with the beloved and with God the Creator.

The writer refers to St. Francis of Assisi as a model of spiritual love in order to underline the reality of the spiritual love which is not adequately interpreted by the Naturalistic theory. The main aim of the writer is to stress the limited potential of the Naturalistic theory and to highlight the spiritual dimension of the personality.

The saints, on the basis of this spiritual love, transfer their love for God to others, thus making its ontological personal nature apparent, Monogamy, which is based on the spiritual
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relationship of persons, stresses the spiritual nature of love as well. M. Scheler attributes the spiritual form of love to the love of humanity which starts from the love of all objects as directed at God. The love of humanity is based on its creative cause, on God, who created the objects because of love and who moves towards these objects as beloved.

In contradistinction to the psychophysical and mechanistic interpretations of love, the higher forms of love constitute donations of the spirit and do not start from the Libido but from the moral values of the personality.

According to Scheler's view of love, love is considered to be a personal unifying act as well as an ontological act. The person, as a part and a carrier of a whole, acts in a unifying way on the basis of love in his longing fully to exist and to be ontological.

According to this concept, love is the way of relating, identifying and partaking in the values of the loved person or object, of the forms of social life and civilization as well as of metaphysical reality. Love is a personal act of unity with the cosmos and society at a daily space-time level. It is at the same time an act of unity with the metaphysical, ontological reality through experiencing and partaking in the values of the loved persons and objects.

Love as a personal act of unity or as a basis of the unifying acts of the personality includes both the unity at a space-time vital level and the unity at a metaphysical ontological level. Love is at the same time a space-time cosmic and metaphysical act of unity, though at the time of its realisation neither its space-time nor its metaphysical nature become absolute.

In opposition to the absolute nature of manifestations of love postulated by the Monistic, Sociological and Psychological
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theories, M. Scheler stresses the unifying nature of the manifestations of love. He stresses the fact that the nature of love, and of its carrier, the person, lies between the space-time and the metaphysical reality.

Love and the person are not confined only to their space-time, cosmic and material (phylogenetic and biophysical) reality or to their metaphysical, monistic and subjective reality. Love and the person are included and function in all dimensions without regarding any as absolute.

The only love of absolute nature is the love of God. M. Scheler presents the love of God as love of an absolute person because God is not a spiritual-material reality but only a spiritual one. God loves the cosmos, as it is His creature, in its metaphysical basis, at the level of the values (or "the reasons of beings", to use St. Maximus' term). Only the love of God as an absolute person is solely of metaphysical nature. Man can, in virtue of being "in the Image", love the cosmos in a metaphysical way (at a theological level or at a level of belief) in his desire to reach theosis.

M. Scheler presents love from a Philosophical, Phenomenological, Sociological, Epistemological and Theological point of view, in his effort to unity all these concepts, transcending at the same time any partial absolute concept. The writer highlights love by mentioning these theories and by criticising all partial "absolute" concepts. His method is the juxtaposition of the opposite absolute concept. He considers Metaphysical theories to be the counterweight of psychological and biophysical theories and psychological social theories to be the counterweight of the Metaphysical ones. He is original in his intuitive critique.

Based on his concept of love as a spiritual-material, unifying, personal act we can say that M. Scheler's thought lies between the metaphysical and the space-time reality, between the theories. The person, by means of love, as a carrier of love, as well as love itself, lie at the turning point between space-time and metaphysical reality.
"Agape and Eros."
Chapter III.

Personality and Love according to M. Scheler.

According to M. Scheler, love is a personal act of unity with the cosmos at the level of the values. It constitutes the metaphysical foundation of the moral act in the sense that it is by means of love that the person stands in unity with the beloved at the level of the identified and experienced values of the beloved.

The writer believes that love is the content of the unity with the social reality at the level of the values and, consequently, it is the metaphysical foundation of the society.

Love is thus seen to tend more to a metaphysical interpretation, since it is related more to the values of the beloved. The writer stresses the metaphysical aspect, that of the values, more than the material, phylogenetic or biophysical reality of the personality.

This way he refutes psychologism and the psychological mechanistic interpretation of the personality (which is one of the principles of Phenomenological Philosophy). By highlighting the values in the act of love in opposition to the biophysical reality of the person, the writer refutes the mechanistic interpretation of the personality.
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Nevertheless, the aim of phenomenological philosophy is not to highlight metaphysical reality. Phenomenology does not tend to an idealistic philosophy but to the elevation of the person. Phenomenology is not a kind of idealistic philosophy but an attempt to elevate the person. It does not intend to become a servant of idealism but to stress the importance of the person, the material-spiritual reality of the personality.

The synthesis of person and act is the core of M. Scheler's concept of the person. The term Person refers to the particular individual being who performs acts, that is actions with a particular output.

This concept, without any further explanation, might lead us to the impression that the writer supports the mechanistic concept of the person.

But this concept of the person as a performer of acts rather, stresses the singularity of the being Man who performs particular acts in a particular direction, in a particular social environment which could be called the microcosm of the person.

This concept of the person in relation to the act stresses the singularity of the person, the singularity of the personal direction and the singularity of the relationship with the particular social environment of the personality. By regarding the acts as a basic element of the singularity of the personality, the person is no longer considered to be a generality, a member of an a priori generality by means of which this member is established as a
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As a member of a generality the person is deprived of his singularity, of his unique importance, since both his way of partaking in the truth and the reality of the truth are predetermined. The person, in his idealistic form, belongs to a set metaphysical truth and is realised only by means of it.

This connection between person and act refutes the general nature of the person-singularity, emphasizes personal choice and freedom and stresses the space-time and social directness of the person. Metaphysical truth, the ontological importance of the person, is thus not predetermined; it is experienced by means of relating with the cosmos. The moral act is not predetermined by the metaphysical reality but it is included in it when performed. The moral act does not have a mechanistic, causal or metaphysical foundation but is based on the personal identification of the value as the content and the foundation of the act.

By regarding the value as the content of the act of the person, the mechanistic psychological interpretation of the personality is left behind since the value is not the product of a psychological state based on complexes340. The person does not identify the value by means of its biological categories or by means of its external influences. The value is rather a product of the personal relationship of the personality with the object and of infinite attraction341. The person identifies the value of the beloved by means of the relationship, of inner sense, of induction and of intuition.

According to this concept, the value is a personal event, a state of experience. It is not an a priori imposed reality or a social influence but a personal relationship with the truth, a free
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personal participation in the ontological, in the a priori values. The personal act, as a content of the value, is a spiritual act, a personal possibility of the determination of the value through singularity and interpersonal relationship.

The person and the personality are thus capable of choosing the values by means of the developed, particular and personal intelligence and personal maturity.

The act, the individuality and the spirituality constitute the basis of the person, depending on the personal effort in development of the spirit, intuition and experience. The personality consists in the personal realisation of these states, the possibilities and the movements in the performance of the moral act on the basis of the morally identified values. The personality and the person constitute the moral category of Man, in which his actions have a moral and ontological basis. The personality and the person form the unity of the values in the subjectivity which relates to the cosmos and truth.

The personality and the person, according to M. Scheler, are connected with the act, the values and the society (their microcosm). The realities of the act, the society and the values determine the content of the person.

The person is a moral category of the human being which is realised at a space-time moment and which, when realised, contains certain moral values.

As a moral category, or better still, as the most authentic moral category, it is at the centre of the writer's attention.
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Scheler stresses the moral aspect of the personality for two reasons: firstly, because this aspect is more directly related to the human existent (in contradistinction to metaphysical monism) and secondly because the moral aspect of the personality connects it with the values (in contradistinction to the mechanistic psychological theories). The personality lies between the metaphysical and the space-time reality, without regarding either as absolute. The person constitutes the moral category which connects the ontological reality with daily reality.

The term Personality, which expresses the realisation of the concept Person, signifies the realisation of the unity between the act and the values at an everyday space-time level. Personality is the human hypostasis which acts in accordance with the intuitively experienced values in the society. The way of performing these acts which contain the values is the personal relationship with them and with the object to which the personality is related.

Love, the main unifying and inter-personal way of relating, is the basis of this interpersonal and value-oriented relationship. The foundation of the personality, of the way in which the moral category of the person is related, is love, be it conscious or subconscious, as the main way of both unifying and relating.

According to the afore-mentioned, love is the specific unifying direction of the personality towards the person and the cosmos. It is the way of unity with the cosmos and the person on the basis of the identified values. It is a basic personal, emotional and sympathetic function. It is the expression of the unifying relationship of the personality with the other person without limitations in the direction of the pedagogical progress of the beloved. It constitutes a directed personal act of unity of the personality with God (as the basis of the mystical relationship). On balance, love is the movement of the personality by means of the values; it is the main moral aspect of the personality.
The person, the personality and love lies in a moral sequence in the mind of M. Scheler. The one reality is contained in the other; the "\( \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \)"-content of the one is the "\( \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \)"-content of the other. The person, as a moral, phenomenological category, is the personality. The moral and the ontological realisation of the person is love. Love belongs to the person and the individual becomes a person and a personality by means of love.
PART III.
PERSONALITY AND LOVE
SAINT MAXIMUS
AND
MAX SCHELER.
The Place of the Thesis.

The Philosophy of Religion as part of the human spirit and as a way of reaching the truth and values uses the Phenomenological approach, that is, the turn to the things themselves and the reference to personal experiences. This notion includes two basic directions: a. the analysis of the existential states and b. its relationship with contemporary philosophy. The turn to the things themselves, the existential experiences and the relationship with contemporary philosophy correspond to the Patristic way of thinking.

The Fathers of the Church formulate their concepts about the Trinitarian Nature, the Divine and human Nature of Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, the Holy Sacraments, cosmos and Man on the basis of the Gospel, of earlier Fathers, of Greek Philosophy and of the personal experience which aims at the theosis of Man. The fathers formulate the truths on two bases: the basis of the problems of their time, using θεραπευτική φιλοσοφία (the philosophy of their time) and of the personal struggle and longing for Salvation. They are also critical of the philosophical interpretations of their time which lie in opposition to the Christ's saving Work and to the theosis of Man in a Philosophical-theological way.

The Fathers are selective and critical when using the philosophy of their time. The criterion of this selection is the
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personal struggle and longing for theosis, the most precious experience of every human existence.

The Philosophy of Religion or Philosophical Theology, which follows the Patristic method, deals with existential experiences in relation to the experienced life of the Church's tradition, to Patristic concepts as well as to its contemporary Philosophical setting. It lies between Tradition and vanguard, between Patristic thought and modern Philosophy in its effort to bring forward the truth of the object of study on the basis of the Divinely revealed and experienced truth and on the basis of its contemporary philosophical concepts and problems.

The fact that Philosophy of Religion is based on contemporary philosophy does not mean that it accepts those particular philosophical beliefs. On the contrary, it signifies the critical acceptance or non-acceptance of a certain methodology, as well as the critical review of the concepts of this contemporary philosophy.

According to the afore-mentioned, the Philosophy of Religion uses and is critical of the various existential problems that emerge from its contemporary philosophical beliefs since it aims at highlighting true experience by means of which Man can attain theosis.

These days the Philosophy of Religion is existentially orientated; it refers to the existential experience without however performing an absolutely apologetic task. Its critique of philosophical beliefs is not of a reactionary, apologetic nature. On the contrary, it is of a clarifying, humanitarian and God-Man-orientated nature the concept of existential experience. Its aim that highlights the genuine interpretation of the existential struggle.
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In particular, as far as existential struggle is concerned, its critique of nihilistic interpretations of agony (agony as the experience of μνήμη, agony as confinement to cosmic matters) is negative, thus highlighting struggle as the experience of eternally existing in relation to God (the donator of existence). This overemphasizing and particular study of struggle on the part of the Philosophy of Religion comes as a result of the turn of philosophy towards existential experiences (Existentialism and Phenomenology). In addition, the Philosophy of Religion deals with struggle also because the nihilistic interpretations of struggle are highlighted, which stress the annihilation of the existence, the dominance of μνήμη, pessimism and so on.

The fact that struggle as an existential experience is one of the subjects treated by the Philosophy of Religion shows that the Philosophy of Religion is interested in existential experiences, that it is influenced by its contemporary philosophy (whether it accepts the latter's beliefs or not), that the basis of its critique is the experienced truth of the Church and of the Fathers and that it follows the patristic selective approach.

The Person, Personality and Love also constitute objects of reference and analysis on the part of the Philosophy of Religion and are of the same existential importance as struggle. The Person, Personality and Love constitute objects of reference and analysis for the Philosophy of Religion, for the contemporary philosophy and for the Fathers at the same time. Modern philosophy has turned to the concept of the person in an effort to unite the truth with the direct experiences of existence and of the person. This concept of the person is one of the basic points of reference of the Philosophy of Religion since the Orthodox Patristic Tradition, the truth about the Trinitarian Nature of God, about the Divine and Human Nature of Jesus Christ and about the personal salvation of every human being are person-oriented. In addition, modern philosophy makes a specific reference to love as a personal event and act of unity with the truth, cosmos and God. Love constitutes an object of the Philosophy of Religion in its effort to follow the
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method of the Fathers, since Love is the basis of the Trinitarian nature, of Humanization and the Theosis of Man.

These two basic subjects have constituted the main axis of our reference so far to St. Maximus and to M. Scheler in relation to their contemporary theories and problems and in relation to particular personal truth. Personality and Love, being the specific subjects of both writers, have been highlighted in relation to the transcendence of their contemporary interpretations and in relation to their participation is this personal concept of the truth.

In what follows we will refer to four subjects relevant to the two writers:

a. In the first subject the similarities and the differences of their contemporary theories are highlighted.

b. In the second subject the similarities and the differences of Ἀγαθοί ἀληθείας as contents of the participated personal truth are highlighted.

c. The third subject includes the bases, the similarities and the differences of the concepts of the Person and Personality in the work of the two writers.

d. The fourth subject includes the bases, the similarities and the differences of the concept of Love in the work of both writers.

PART III.
Personality and Love St. Maximus M. Scheler.

a. The theory of the pre-existence of the souls, Monothelitism, and the unity of the two Natures, Acts and Wills in the Person of Jesus Christ. Psychologism, Idealism Epistemology and the Phenomenological synthesis.

St. Maximus.

St. Maximus is opposed to the theory of the pre-existence of the souls which constitutes the basis of the theories of Monophysitism, Monoenergetism and Monothelitism. He is also opposed to the concept of the body as the prison of the soul which results in underestressing the bodily aspect of Man and in overestressing the divine nature in the Person of Jesus Christ. He does not accept the overestressing of the absorption of the human nature, act and will in the Person of Jesus Christ and, by extension, the underestressing of the Salvation έξ οπωτεμένου-προοάνου. He believes that the concept according to which God became Man in a way which is accessible to the latter results in underestimating the love of God. Instead he highlights the theosis of Man as a personal event in the divine κατάβασις.

This opposition brings forth the personal participation in divine essentially unlimited love by means of which God becomes Man and Man becomes God by grace. It also stresses the participating and active nature of the deifying and humanizing divine love. Love is stressed as the personal way in which the divine and the human element relate, as the personal way of unity of the divine and the human and as a way of transcending the theoretical gap between the

10 P.G. 91 1069 AB, 1100 A.
11 P.G. 91 1037 AB.
12 P.G. 91 1037 B.
13 P.G. 91 1040 BC.
14 P.G. 91 1114 B.
divine and the human. Finally, this contrast also stresses the evolutionary and participating movement towards theosis which lies in contradistinction to the reversive autoneous movement towards theosis, or rather, autotheosis.

The human person moves towards theosis by participating in the soteriological work of Theanthropos and by experiencing the apophatic unity of the divine and the human element in His person. The human person is reinstated in his previous state by means of the active perichorematic relationship between the divine and the human, by means of his participation in the work and the reality of Theanthropos (through the Sacraments of the Church given by Jesus Christ), by means of the rational analysis of the cosmos, by means of mental perception and finally, by means of the direct sensory experience of the ωμάρα in the cosmos.

The opposition to theories of the pre-existence of souls, of Monophysitism, Monoenergetism and Monothelitism stresses the divine-human orientated nature of redemption and participation in the truth. It stresses the unity of the divine and the human, of the divine and human love, and of the spiritual and material elements.

The material reality of the human reality is not the imprisonment of spirituality but the starting point towards spirituality by means of reason and logic directed towards ωμάρα. The nature of practice is not to reduce the material reality of the human person but to reduce the materialistic egocentric will. Practice does not fight matter but the individualistic egoistic
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15. P.G. 91 1052 A.
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will of the personality which deprives the person of his spirituality.

By lying in opposition to the theories which overstress the spiritual element over the space-time element and by highlighting practice as a balancing factor of the corporeal and the spiritual, St. Maximus places the truth, the authenticity of the nature of the human person, between the divine and the human elements. The truth is God-Man oriented based on the Person of Jesus Christ and on Man as a divine and human creature.

With this concept, St. Maximus stresses balance at a theoretical as well as practical level. He stresses the truth towards theosis which lies between the divine and the human, the spiritual and the material.

Max Scheler.

F. Scheler's effort is in the same direction as he also is opposed to Psychologistic, Idealistic and Epistemologic theories. His thought lies in opposition to the absolute nature of the phylogenetic, biological, social and theoretical bases of the truth of the personality. He is against the quest for the truth by regarding one of the aspects of the personality as absolute, but rather stresses the unifying nature of its dimensions. The truth is not included in the spiritual, biophysical or social reality of the personality but in all of its dimensions. The truth consists in the act of the person which includes the spiritual, material and social elements without emphasizing an

---


---
absolute egocentric nature. The truth does not consist in the personal philosophical, psychologistic or social concept of a given time, but on the whole of these concepts and interpretations. The authenticity of the personality consists in the identification of values as the contents of the relationship of the person with the beloved and not in any absolute interpretation on the basis of one dimension of the personality.

M. Scheler seeks the truth in the whole of the contents of the act of the person, in the spiritual identification of the values which this act contains, in the space-time social relationship of the act as well as in the directions of this act as a relationship with the material object.

In this sense, the writer tries to unite all the dimensions of the personality at an ethical level, going beyond any absolute mechanistic, social or idealistic nature.

In order to bring the theories to a balance, the writer uses an alternative theory as a counterpoise to these absolute theories.

In certain points, the writer is God-oriented and God-Man oriented, aiming at refuting the absolute materialistic or idealistic theories. The use of the Theocentric or Theanthropocentric basis of identification for the spiritual and the material-spiritual truth stresses the attempt as a quest for the limited truth.

Synthesis.

The attitude of both writers towards their contemporary theories is the same: it is person-oriented and non-absolute. They go beyond the absolute concepts of theories of idealistic foundation, thus stressing the directness of the experiences or the phenomena which relate to the personality. They transcend such absolutes by stressing the directions of the experiences or the phenomena which relate to the personality.
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relate to the personality. They transcend the absolute concept of the material reality of the person, highlighting the divine or the metaphysical basis of the experienced ἄγων ἡν ἄνων or values as contents of the phenomena. Both writers use inner sense and intuition as a way to identify and experience the truth.

The difference in the attitude of the two writers towards the theories lies in the criterion of this attitude.

St. Maximus is opposed to theories which regard the divine reality of the truth as absolute because his aim is to stress the transcendence of the gap between God and Man. M. Scheler is opposed to theories which regard the material, the egocentric or the egocentric-idealistic interpretation as absolute so as to highlight the directness of the truth in the human person. St. Maximus is God-Man oriented and M. Scheler is Man-oriented.

The criterion of the former is the truth revealed and given to the Church by the Theanthropos Jesus Christ; the criterion of the latter is the untenable nature of the absolute philosophical concepts.

St. Maximus is a Father of the Church and M. Scheler is a Phenomenological Philosopher. The criterion of St. Maximus is to highlight in an authentic way the course towards the theosis of Man by means of the relationship with the Personal God. The criterion of M. Scheler is to highlight the truth at a personal level in relation to the objects and persons of daily reality in the microcosm of every person. The former's concept of theosis consists in the personal relationship with God by means of the Church as a carrier of the truth revealed by the Holy Spirit of the Theanthropos. It also consists in the ability of human logic to understand and experience the Cosmos as Holy Creation. The latter's concept of theosis consists in the potential of the human διανοητικότης to conceive the truth. According to St. Maximus the presence of God in the cosmos and in existence is experienced in the cosmos and in the person. According to M. Scheler, it is

value which is experienced in the cosmos and in the person.
The concept of ἄδοξοι τῶν ὀντῶν in St. Maximus highlights the experience of the presence of God in the cosmos and the experience of the divine truth on the part of the human person.

According to St. Maximus, ἄδοξοι τῶν ὀντῶν constitute the truth of beings. They are the truths of the cosmos, the created parts of the truth which are contained in the things created by God that exist.

Philosophically and theologically speaking, ἄδοξοι τῶν ὀντῶν in St. Maximus' work are the philosophical realisations of the general and particular principles of the cosmos. The fact that the cosmos consists of various elements, as a philosophical conclusion deduced from the concept of Creation as a creature of God, signifies that this creation consists of certain created "reasons of beings".

According to this philosophical-theological concept, ἄδοξοι τῶν ὀντῶν are elements and truths of the cosmos created by God which are revealed to Man by means of the logical analysis of the cosmos.

By using the attribute ἄδοξοι and not principles or values in order to define the truths of the cosmos, St. Maximus stresses one more thing: their perception also by means of the logical analysis which follows the observation of the cosmos. The definition of the truths or the values of the cosmos as ἄδοξοι τῶν ὀντῶν thus signifies the human personal participation in their revelation.

According to these concepts, ἄδοξοι τῶν ὀντῶν, initially signify the human quest for the truth of the cosmos by means of logic which

---
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30. At this point we refer to the philosophical concept of the principles of the cosmos according to the Pre-Socratic philosophers.
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ends up in the divine creative energy and power. Consequently, λόγοι τῶν ὄντων are the contents of the creatures of God which Man is able to perceive and understand by means of Logic in the personal struggle and longing to co-exist harmoniously with the cosmos as a divine creature since Man is also a divine creature.

The perception and the experience of λόγοι τῶν ὄντων lead the human mind and reason to experience the divine presence in the world as a Creator, Provider and Judge. Man experiences the fact that by revealing λόγοι τῶν ὄντων and by experiencing the harmonisation of the beings he partakes in the Mind of God, in the Divine Οὐρανός as a content of the beings of the cosmos.

According to St. Maximus, the deeper experience of λόγοι τῶν ὄντων as participation in the Mind of God signifies participation in the divine personal virtues. Λόγοι τῶν ὄντων, the logical and mental realisations, signify, by extension, the participation in the divine virtues, in the absolute ontological and ethically active relationship with the beings and with God as the Creator, the Provider and the Judge. Consequently, the virtue of creation as an offer of love and the virtue of agapetic solicitude for the cosmos are experienced.

The participation in λόγοι τῶν ὄντων and in the divine virtues, signifying by extension harmonisation with the cosmos, God and the human race, highlights the logical harmonisation of the truth, logical preservation as well as logical classification.

The Theocentric and Theanthropocentric foundation of the concept of reality and the projection of the truth as λόγοι τῶν ὄντων stress the unlimited nature of the Logic of God, the God-Logos as the Second Person of the Holy Trinity as well as the Trinitarian
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51. P.G. 91 1133 A-1137 C.

52. P.G. 91 1077 B, 1080 C, 1085 B.

53. P.G. 91 1081.


55. P.G. 91 1081 C.
In particular, the Trinitarian foundation of the creation is obvious in the sense that: a. the logical harmonisation of the cosmos and the logical continuity of the cosmos reveal the God-Logos Jesus Christ, b. the virtues as contents of spirituality reveal the presence of the Holy Spirit, and, finally, c. the Creation as a creature of God highlights the Creative force, God the Father. Consequently, the concept of λόγοι τῶν ὑμῶν is Triadologic and Man-orientated as it merges with the Creative divine energy, with the logical and spiritual nature of this concept and with the human quest for the truth (by means of logic, ὕμνος etc.)

The presentation of λόγοι τῶν ὑμῶν according to St. Maximus highlights the Triadologic, Theanthropocentric and Anthropocentric nature of the truth.

According to this concept, by experiencing this form of the truth of the cosmos, the human person experiences the Presence of God in the cosmos in a Triadologic and unifying way. He also experiences the presence of the Theanthropos Jesus Christ and his participation in the truth of the cosmos and in the energy of God.

By characterising the truth as λόγοι τῶν ὑμῶν, the personal agapetic participation of Man in the divine presence, in the divine energy, in the divine virtues and in the truths of the Divine and human person is brought forth.

The personal participation in λόγοι τῶν ὑμῶν also signifies, by extension, the passionate longing for unity and harmonisation with the cosmos, Man and God at a logical, mental and daily level of experience.

By highlighting the truth as λόγοι τῶν ὑμῶν as discovered through personal longing the personal unifying nature of the personal abilities (logic, understanding, experience, sense), the personal unifying nature with the cosmos (since the object of relationship and analysis is the cosmos) and the personal unifying nature with God as the Creator, Provider and Judge are all stressed.

This concept of λόγοι τῶν ὑμῶν also stresses unity with all the dimensions of the personality (the social, cosmic, human and God-
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M. Scheler highlights participation in the values as the foundation of the act of the person in opposition to empirical theories which consider experience as the content of the personal relationship and to the formalism of ethics which considers general truth as the content of the person.

The identified values of the beloved are found in the truth as a product of the meeting of empirical and idealistic reality. The person relates with the persons, with the objects and the forms of civilization by identifying the values as the contents of the relation to.

The values are the content of the relationship of the person with the person or object. The values constitute the content of the act of the person. The values as contents of the act of the person and of the relationship are divided into superior and inferior, positive or negative values. However, the values do not necessarily signify the ideal truth since they are identified on the basis of Love or Hatred. The positive and superior values of the beloved are identified by means of Love whereas the inferior values of the beloved are identified by means of hatred.

---
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The criterion for the identification of the superior or inferior values is the attitude of the person, the attitude of love or hatred. This distinction goes beyond identification on the basis of experiences and on the basis of ideas (as a content of the values as an absolute idealistic form) since the values can also be inferior originating in hatred. Love and hatred as ways of identifying the values stress the personal nature of the values and of their identification since they are based on the attitude and the content of the relatedness to the object or person.

According to this concept, the values are connected to the particular related object or person; they are the content of the microcosm and they originate in the microcosm of every person.

The values are divided into sensory, vital and mental values as well as values of the holy and the profane. The values cover all the dimensions of human reality and personality. The values are the contents of the daily, ontological and metaphysical-theological dimension of the person. The person can identify the values by means of relationship, be this based on love or on hatred.

According to M. Scheler as well, the values constitute the contents of the relationship of the human person. They are the particular contents of the related object or person, they are parts of the personally partaken truth. From the phenomenological point of view, the values constitute the ideal objectivities of the relatedness to the person's reality.

Synthesis.

St. Maximus and M. Scheler stress the unity of the person with the cosmos, Man and God by the significance of λόγοι τῶν ὄντων and of

\footnote{Sympathy. pp. 105.}

\footnote{Sympathy. pp. 169, 170.}

\footnote{Also see I.M. Bochenski. "Ιστορία τῆς συγχρονής Ευρωπαϊκής Φιλοσοφίας" pp. 175-182.}

\footnote{Sympathy. pp. 105, 106, 127.}
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The participation in λόγοι τῶν Óντων is a personal act of unity with the truth by means of ἐνδροτική, logical analysis and νοησις. Both writers stress the personal ontological unity.

They differ as to the origin of λόγοι τῶν Óντων and the values, as also in the stressing of the negative values (Scheler) and in the experience of the Divine (St. Maximus).

Lambda τῶν Óντων are created by God whereas the values are either the ideal paradigms of God (as in the case of St. Francis of Assisi) or general values.

According to St. Maximus, λόγοι τῶν Óντων do not include the negative reasons of beings in Ἐννα as is the case with the values according to M. Scheler. In St. Maximus' opinion, the negative values are manifestations of μηδέν. They constitute the nihilistic experience of the personality, whereas according to M. Scheler they are aspects of the personality. At this point, the main ontological nature of λόγοι τῶν Óντων is stressed as opposed to the potential nihilistic nature of the values. St. Maximus stresses the harmonisation and the ontological unity as opposed to the potential nihilistic choice of the personality.

In addition, St. Maximus experiences God as the Creative Cause of λόγοι τῶν Óντων whereas M. Scheler experiences God as the Person of the persons in Ἐννα, the values of the sacred and the holy are expressed 46. In the first case God is the personal cause of λόγοι τῶν Óντων and in the second He is the expression of certain values.

In St. Maximus' work we can see the personal, ontological and metaphysical unity while in Scheler's work there is a personal critical unity with the values, with the elements of metaphysical and ontological unity. The personal, ontological and metaphysical unity highlights the theosis of man by means of partaking in λόγοι τῶν Óντων. The critical unity highlights the unity with the personal concept of the truth.

In the first case, we can see the longing for unity with God and

46. P.G. 91 1080 A.
the direction of that longing towards theosis in the second case, we can identify the personal struggle for unity with the personal concept of the truth. St. Maximus stresses the personal participation in the personal subjective concept of the truth. The participation in άλογοι τῶν ὁμοιώμαta highlights the participation in the cosmic ontological and metaphysical truth; the participation in the values highlights participation in personally identified values.
The human person, the *Trinitarian* God and the person of the *Theanthropos*. The person as subjectivity in relation to the act and the Society as a *Microcosm*.

St. Maximus.

The concept of the *person* according to *St. Maximus* is based on the *Trinitarian Nature of God* \(^{47}\). The Trinitarian God, the Three Persons or Hypostases, the one Essence, the one Energy, the common way of existence of Three Persons and the Personal Singularity are the basis of his teaching about the person \(^{48}\). The unity of the whole with the part, the personal singularity and the common essence are dominant in the *Patristic concept of the person*.

It is directly evident that the *person* signifies *Relationship* \(^{49}\). The significance of the *Person as relationship* includes at the same time both the essential and the inter-personal relationship. In the *Trinitarian God*, the *Persons* relate on the basis of their Common Essence as well as on the basis of the personal singularity which again is of an essential nature. The terms *"Ἄγνωστος", "Τεννήστος"* and *"Εκπορευότων"* signify the personal singularity and the essential relationship of the Three Persons of the Divinity in the sense that *"Γνώσις" is related to "Τεννήστον" and "Εκπορεύων" to "Εκπορευόμενον" in an inter-completing or rather, *μισ-ichorematic way*\(^{50}\).

According to this *Patristic concept*, the *Person* is the essential singularity which is related to the singularity of the same essence on the basis of *agapetic perichoresis* \(^{51}\). The agapetic

\(^{47}\).P.G.91 1036 AB.

\(^{48}\).P.G. 91 1036 C.
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\(^{50}\).P.G. 91 1193 CD-1196 AC, 1221 C-1224 A.

\(^{51}\).P.G. 91 1257 C-1261 A.
perichoresis in the Trinitarian Nature means the personal free relationship of the Person with other persons of the same essence in connection with two realities: the essential unity and the personal singularity.

According to this concept, freedom constitutes the event of participation in the essential reality after a personal choice. The freedom of the person of the acceptance of the relationship with the other person of the same essence is based on the one hand on the essential unity and on the other on the acceptance of the essential reality on the basis of singularity on the part of the person. From this point of view, the person is not prior to the essence in the same way as the essence is not prior to the person or to the choice; this concept stresses the simultaneous, eternal participation in the essential reality and the participation in personal freedom. In this case there is no temporal, essential or personal distinction among essence, person or hypostasis. The Person in all his manifestations is his essence, his singularity, his free choice, the essential love and his essential relationship and act as a characteristic of his Hypostasis.

The reality of Divine Love, for instance, is at the same time the content of the Divine essence, a characteristic of Hypostasis of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, an essential way of relating for the Three Persons and a way of expressing-relating to the creatures.

The paradigm of love highlights the person as an essential unity, a personal singularity, a personal and essential relationship as well as a relationship drawing the creatures towards it.

The person as an essential and personal unity is also highlighted on a Christological basis in St. Maximus' teaching about the person. In the person of the Theanthropos the essential unity of two natures, the two energies and the two wills is stressed. According to this mainly person-oriented concept, the person, being based on the particular person of Jesus Christ, is the...
particular, essential and unifying reality which acts freely and personally even as to participation in essence of the kind. We can understand the personal free choice in the multiple references to the moment of agony in the garden of Gethsemane when the human agony before death, the human pain and Crucifixion reached its peak. The personality of Theanthropos in the moment of agonies in the vertigo of freedom to choose personal disobedience to the divine will in favour of the human vital will.

In this reference, the person and the personality is inherent in the divine and the human essence, energy and will; it is the divine-human unity in a particular and unique person, who is in agony to realize his authenticity (the divine-human redemption of the human race) and who can choose between the realisation or otherwise of his essential personal aim.

The concept of the person as "καὶ στὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὰ ὑπολογίαν" and as a carrier of ἄθυμον τῶν ὑμνῶν is of the same nature as the Theocentric, Triadologic and Theanthropocentric concept.

The unity of the Divine and the human exists in the human person as well. It is in the nature of the human person to be human, a member of the human race as it is in his nature to become "καὶ Θεόν ὑπολογιάν" after realising his natural states, possibilities and movements. According to this concept, the human personality is related to its ontological reality but not under compulsion since the participation in and the development of ἄθυμον τῶν ὑμνῶν is a matter of personal choice as is participation in the Divine essence of the Three Persons on the part of the Persons of the Trinitarian Divinity or participation in the divine and human reality and will on the part of Jesus Christ.

The difference of the divine, the divine-human and the human personality lies in their essential disparity and by extension in the movement towards μὴ δύν and μὴ δύνειν δύνειν. Only the human person can choose the movement towards μὴ δύν, towards μὴ δύνειν while God...
The anthropos being self-existences and perfect existences transcend any form of personal annihilation.

St. Maximus' concept of the person can be summarized in the formulation that Person is the carrier of his essential reality, of the divine and the human reality; he is the particular and unique personality and singularity. In addition, it is the Person who is able to choose or not his ontological truth. The personal relationship with the other persons of the same essence and with the cosmos in general on the basis of both love and hate as well as the agony for existence and perpetuation belong to the person. The relationship of love or hatred emerges from either the unifying attitude towards the beings or the nihilistic and destructive attitude of the personality towards itself and the beings. The personal attitude, the personal identification or not of ᾠνων ὧν ὑπάρχων, constitutes the criterion of the agapetic or the nihilistic relationship.

Max Scheler.

In contrast, according to M. Scheler, the person is considered to be a subjectivity which performs spiritual acts or rather an act of a valuative, ontological and unifying content. The person is characterized by the act of subjective critique in the relationship with the object of love or hatred. The person constitutes the moral category of the relationship of Man with the related person or object of his microcosm, in which the identification of the positive or negative values, or, to use a different terminology, the superior or inferior values, is included.
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From this point of view, the person is the individuality which signifies the relationship with the particular objectivity as well as the relationship of unity and identification with the ontological truth on the basis of the identified and experienced values. According to M. Scheler, the person is the unity of the part and the whole but not according to ontological and essential priority. Absolute priority is not given to the essential and ontological unity, to an ideal reality but to the possibility of the person as a subjectivity identifying the value, or the content of the value of the objectivity to whom he relates.

Consequently, the person is the moral category of the subjectivity in the relationship with the particular social reality, the microcosm, in the relationship with the particular person or object of superior or inferior values, following the emotional identification by means of ἐνέργειας and διάλογος. The person is connected to the spiritual act which contains the values without regarding the ideal reality or the phylogenetic and social influences on the personality as absolute. The personality is the event of the free spiritual act of acceptance or non-acceptance of the values. The personality constitutes an innate unity of the material or spiritual content of the superior or inferior values, of the choice of the positive or negative values, of the ontological or the non-ontological unity.

According to this concept, the personality is "ό ποιμήν τοῦ Ἐλώτι". The personality is not guided by the metaphysical or the social or its biological-physiological Ἐλώτι. It constitutes a
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resultant of all these states. The personality is its choices.

According to M.Scheler, God is the Person of the person as He creates and relates to all the cosmos and to all His particular creatures on the basis of Love. The reality of the spiritual act in its absolute form dominates the concept of God as Person as well. This concept is also dominated by the absolute form of the agapetic relationship with the cosmos and with every particular creature on the basis of the (values) created by God. God as the Person of the persons lies in a state of Love and value with His creatures in their entirety and in their subjectivity.

Religiousness is the expression of the human struggling unity with the superior values of the Holy and the sacred; it is also a struggling effort of unity on the part of the human person by means of the cosmos and of the particular beings as carriers of the divine values. It is an struggling effort of unity in the Image and with the Image. The highest form of spirituality of the personality is the Mystical unity as personal participation in the values of the cosmos and of the objects which are created by God.

Synthesis.

According to what has been mentioned about the concept of the person, it is obvious that both writers consider the person to be a part of an essential ontological unity.

In St.Maximus' work the essential origin and the personal acceptance or non-acceptance of the essence on the part of the person carries more weight; in Scheler's work what carries more weight is the subjectivity and the participation in the ontological unity following the identification of the values of the person or object related to the person. In St.Maximus' as well as in

---
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Scheler’s mind, the concept of the person as subjectivity merges with the relationship of the person with the essence and the cosmos. Both writers refer to the person as a unique and unparalleled subjectivity, their only difference lying in the scope of the dimension of the personality.

In St. Maximus’ mind the personality extends beyond the limits of the particular social reality, while in M. Scheler’s mind the person depends on the microcosm and the particular values it contains.

According to M. Scheler, the personality is the directness of the relationships with intentional and valuative significance, whereas according to St. Maximus, the personality is the realisation of the essential relationship of the person with the cosmos and God on the basis of λόγου τῶν δινῶν. Scheler’s concept of the person is limited to the scope of the human διανοητικότης, ἐνοριαῖς and διαλογικοῖς; St. Maximus’ concept of the person goes beyond the limits of human διανοητικότης, following the transcendence of the limits of logic, νόημα and ἐνοριαῖς. In St. Maximus’ mind, the human personality transcends ἐνοριαῖς (Scheler’s limit) and reaches ἐναιτίναις, the experience of the mystery of God’s Trinitarian Nature, the personal participation in the truth of λόγου τῶν δινῶν, the participation in the Mind of God as well as the personal experience of the Mystery of God, that is apophatic.

In both cases the concepts of the person are of an ontological and person-orientated basis. The person lies in relation to the cosmos, the persons, the objects and the ontological truth. In both cases the person acts on the basis of Love and has an agapetical relationship with the persons, the objects and the cosmos as a way of identifying and experiencing the values or the reasons of beings. The difference lies in the basis of their teaching about the person and in the range of the possibilities of the person. In St. Maximus’ mind the person is based on the concept of God as Three Persons in One Essence, on the concept of Theanthropos as a unity
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of the Divine and the human and on the concept of Man as "in the Image" of God, as a synthesis of the Divine and the human. M. Scheler's concept of the person is Transcendental, Theocentric and Man-oriented. In Scheler's concept we can notice a course the limit of the transcendence of God and of the space-time reality of Man. The concept of God as the Person of the persons and the concept of Man as a subjectivity which performs spiritual acts reduce the potential of the human personality to participate in Theosis as a relationship with God. The Theosis of the person in M. Scheler's mind is Man-oriented whereas in St. Maximus' mind the Theosis of the person is Theanthropocentric in the sense of the relationship of the Divine and the human at the level of energy and in the sense of the original form of unity of the Divine and the human in the person of Jesus Christ.

The difference between the two writers in the concept of the person lies in the directness of the experience of the Holy Energy and in the concept of God as an absolute being.

The concept of God as the Person of the Persons stresses the transcendency and the "ομορρηξία" of God, whereas the experience of the Divine as a personal way of relating agapetically and erotically bridges the gap between God and Man.

In Scheler's work the potential of the human personality reaches the unity with the cosmos and the ontological truth while to St. Maximus' mind the human person is united with the cosmos, the ontological truth and, by extension, with the Holy Energy, thus becoming God by grace following the realisation of his mental possibilities. In the first case the struggle is philosophical; it is struggle of the person to be united with his truth and with the cosmos. In the second case the struggle is Theanthropocentric; it is a struggle of unity with the human, cosmic and Divine truth.

In Scheler's work the reference to concepts of theological content are of an apologetic nature against psychologism, epistemology and idealism and they signify the unity of the material, spiritual and corporeal elements with spirituality. They are used in order to stress the material-spiritual reality of the human personality. The
nature of these theological references is mainly explanatory and confirmatory of the value of the modern phenomenological approach to matters of ethics.

In contrast, the theological references in St. Maximus' work are of existential, struggling and theotic significance. St. Maximus' refers to the Trinitarian Nature of God and to the Personality of Theanthropos experiencing them as the only authentic basis on which the human personal theosis is feasible, as the only basis on which the authenticity of the existence and the struggling for it are realised. St. Maximus' is an existential person-orientated writer based on the Orthodox Patristic Tradition, using philosophy selectively in order to formulate his points of view and in order to check the absolute nature of the philosophical concepts against the hallmark of the Holy Revelation.

The criterion of difference between the two writers as far as the concept of the Person is concerned, is, once more, the theological, theanthropocentric and anthropocentric person-oriented basis of St. Maximus and the theological, transcendental and subjective Man-oriented concept of M. Scheler.
Personality and Love St. Maximus M. Scheler.

Love as a Trinitarian way of existence, as the cause of God's humanization and of the Theosis of Man. Love as the basis of the Creation, as a content of the values and as a way of identifying the values.

St. Maximus.

St. Maximus' concept of Love, just as his concept of the person, is based on the Triadologic teaching. In particular, God is a way of love with Three Hypostases and due to this agapetic existential completeness He creates the cosmos, He provides for it. The Logos of God is Humanized and His creature, Man, is Deified by responding to the love of God and by realizing his ontological category of love as created by God.

According to this brief presentation, love covers all the dimensions of both reality and personality. Having mentioned the concept of the person according to St. Maximus, which includes the reality of the Trinitarian God, of the Person of Theanthropos and of the human person, the relationship among them and their relationship with the cosmos, we can say that love is the ontological reality of the person, the authentic way of existing and the ontological and existential relationship of the person with the θυσινωσία, the ἔμπειρον and the cosmos. Love is at the same time (in its three forms and manifestations: pothos, eros, agape) the manifested unifying act and relationship with the person's ontological truth, with the Transcendental as well as with the cosmos.

Love, as a relationship and as the essential way of existing, is the movement of one singularity towards unity with the

---

68. P.G. 91 1260 B.C.
69. P.G. 91 1048 C.
70. P.G. 91. 1072 A.
Personality and Love St. Maximus M. Scheler.

singularities of the same essence, with God and with the cosmos. It is the movement of the singularity towards the personality, towards the experience of the ontological unity, towards the transference of the experienced ontological truth to the other persons, the other beings, as well as the manifestation of struggle as movement towards the relationship with the eternal, towards existential completeness 71.

Love, as movement of unity, is also expressed in the Trinitarian way of existing as the self-movement of God in the Trinitarian Being and as movement of manifestation of the Trinitarian unity in the creation and the providence of the cosmos 72. Furthermore, Humanization, caused by the love of God for Man, stresses the mobility of the love of God as Θεια καιρόθαυμας 73. This kinetic form of love is also evident in the redemption or the theosis of Man by God as a movement of God attracting Man 74.

This kinetic form of love can also be found in the human person since it signifies the relationship of the human person with God, Man and the cosmos 75. By expressing his ontological love the human person moves towards the existential active unity with the divine by means of νοματις, the logical analysis of the cosmos, philosophy, Ευφάναις and μεθέξις 76. St. Maximus highlights the tendency towards unity with the transcendental, the human and the cosmos in its ontological reality in all forms of expression of human love. By means of love, the human person is unified with the truth about God as revealed by Jesus Christ, with the truth of the human ontological reality and with λόγοι τῶν ὄντων. According to
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this concept, love is unity with the ontological reality and with the cosmos in its ontological reality. The human subjectivity becomes a Person by means of love and by means of agapetical participation in the ontological truth of God, Theanthropos, Man and cosmos. It is in the person by means of love and in the person as a form of love that the truth in its entirety lies, following the realization of his natural states, possibilities and movements.

The human subjectivity becomes a person by means of love and in love transcending his nihilistic and isolating tendency. Love, as a human personal act, is the product of the experienced and identified imperfection of the person which can be left behind by means of the relationship with the other persons, with the beings of the cosmos but mainly by means of the relationship with God. By means of love, the human person completes the gaps of his imperfection, annihilates his personal emptiness (since he is not self-complete or self-perfect) and at the same time transcends his nihilistic tendency, his self-annihilation.

From this point of view, love is the resultant of struggle without being mistaken for it; the relationship of love and struggle is one of inter-completion. The human person moves agapetically towards the beings and the creatures in order to transcend his imperfection and towards God struggling to exist eternally and according to his ontological reality.

From this point of view, the human person is interwoven with love and with the struggle for existence in his movement towards unity with God and with his ontological and cosmic truth. Love and the person are interrelated in the culmination of the struggle which is not only the moment before annihilation or death but also before his ontological reality, his becoming God by grace. The human personality is disclosed in his agonized agapetical culmination, also in the experience of his ontological reality of becoming God by grace, of transcending the limitations of the human nature. The person achieves in the culmination of his struggle in the
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experience of his course towards theosis by means of love, as he experiences his transition to a state which is not directly accessible. The personality is in agony before death and annihilation, a non-accessible state in daily life. In the experience of his theosis, the person lies in the longing of a state not accessible in daily life. In both cases the human personality moves towards an inaccessible state by means of love and agony. However, he experiences the fact that when directed towards annihilation the quality of his existence is reduced, whereas when directed towards theosis the quality of his existence is fulfilled.

According to St. Maximus, love is the way of fulfilment or emptiness of the personality, depending on the state freely accepted by the personality. Personality and love are interwoven in St. Maximus’ mind whether referring to the Trinitarian God and His movement, or to the Anthropos Jesus Christ or to Man. What is dominant in all cases is the concept of the personality as love for the beings, Man and God, and the concept of love as a constituent element of the personality by means of which he relates with the beings, Man and God always in relation to the beings of the same essence and to the other ontological categories of the personality. Personality, as an ontological category of unity, is attainable by means of love and in the realisation of love.

Max Scheler.

M. Scheler also highlights God as love since creation is a product of His love and since He moves towards the cosmos as the beloved. This concept lays the foundations of the transcendental origin of love with cosmic radiance. The cosmos is both a creature and a recipient of the love of the transcendental God, the Person of the persons.

According to the concept of the Love of God, the love for the
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whole, the ontological attainment on the part of the person is highlighted. Love is highlighted as a personal act of unity with the whole, as a way of realising the ontological at a transcendental level.

In addition, love is the basis of the relationship of the Theanthropos Jesus Christ with the persons. The love of this kind is without boundaries or limits; it is pedagogical love in the identification of the values of the loved person. The teaching of the Theanthropos Jesus Christ is based on the personal identification of the values of the loved person and on the projection of these values upon the beloved as a pedagogical means. The Person of the Theanthropos identifies and projects the values of the loved person; consequently, the beloved is elevated as to the content of his values. In proportion, the human person identifies the values of the beloved in the perspective of his own pedagogical and evaluative elevation since by identifying the values of the beloved he tends to partake in them.

Love, as the content of the human person, constitutes the way of unity with the cosmos, the way of perpetuating universal life, the way of identifying the values, the way of partaking in the spiritual values, of transcending \( \mu \theta \delta \nu \), of intercompleting and partaking in ontological truth. Love is the movement which connects the person with the superior values and which is included in the act of the person. Love is the ontological, valuative and personal content of the human person. Since it is not the love for generality, it is a way of unity with the microcosm and it can be formulated in mental, vital or subjective love determining its ethical and ontological significance.

According to M. Scheler, love is at the same time the content of
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the person and the way of relating of the person with human persons and with the forms of civilization. It constitutes the ethical relationship of the person, the realization of his ontological reality.

Synthesis.

Both writers highlight love always in connection with the person. Love and the personality are two interwoven realities since they belong together.

St. Maximus considers love as an essential reality of the person, as the way and the content of the relationship of the person. M. Scheler regards love as the foundation of every moral act of the person as a way of experiencing and being drawn to the values of the beloved.

The difference in the two writers lies in the concept of the origin of love. According to St. Maximus, love originates in the Trinitarian Divinity since love constitutes its content and the reason for the creation of the cosmos originates in this love, thus directly connecting the Person-Creator with the person-creature. According to M. Scheler, love originates in and belongs to the human person.

St. Maximus' longing and care is the theosis of the human person by means of love and of the agapetic relationship with the cosmos (in ἀγάπη τῶν ἄνθρωπων), with Man and with God. M. Scheler's agony and care is to highlight the moral relationship of the human person by means of love at a personal and microcosmic level.

St. Maximus' longing and struggle for unity is expressed in the love for the cosmos, Man and God, thus highlighting unity with the whole reality. M. Scheler's longing and struggle for unity is expressed in the love for cosmos, and the Man-God at a subjective, moral level.

In his effort to reach the fulfilment of a course between two seemingly contradictory concepts of the same reality, namely "Personality and Love", the researcher initially has a feeling of absence and emptiness but a feeling of completeness as well. Reaching a final conclusion, a logical outcome or proof regarding a subject on which he worked for three years, he lies in an existential situation which is dominated by the conflicting feelings of emptiness and completeness.

Emptiness is one of his feelings because reaching a final conclusion inevitably reduces his interest in the particular subject. Strange though it may seem, he also has a feeling of completeness because having experienced a long and strenuous period of study on a particular subject, he has acquired a lot of knowledge, be it contradictory or not, both about the topic and the wide intellectual context of the two writers concerned.

Though aware of the personal temporal and cultural limitation of all such research, nevertheless, the connection or the relation with a subject or, better still, a form of reality, in addition to broadening the spiritual horizons of the researcher in superior values (to use the term of M. Scheler), ought to have an outcome, to reach the formulation of a personal view on the subject, regardless of the uncertainty of the researcher.

The researcher ought to complete his thought, to yield fruit, since this is the purpose of the research. He ought to contribute however insignificant that contribution may be.

Reaching this point the researcher first asks himself about the reason why this study was written and about the aspect of human spirituality to which it belongs. He wonders what the place of this study in the human quest for reality is.

The answer to these questions in our view are as follows: "Personality and Love" is the answer to the question "What is
Man. It constitutes the answer to the question which has been predominant (in Philosophical Anthropology) since at least the 19th century.

In our opinion, this answer to the main question of Philosophical Anthropology, provides also an answer to particular questions of Philosophical Anthropology such as: "what is inner life", "what is self-knowledge", "what is the problem of the essence of Man", "what are the main characteristics of ΕΙναυ", "what constitutes the difference of Man from all the other beings" and "what constitutes the relation of Man with God, other Men and the cosmos in general".

The writer of the present study can give only one answer to these questions: "Personality and Love".

This is the only answer which can be given since Man is at the same time a particular and unique kind of being. For man is the only being which can determine the whole of ΕΙναυ. Only Man can conceive, by means of νοέωνς, the truth of the cosmos and reach the energy and the Grace of God.

From a more progressive point of view, Personality and Love is the answer because Man is the Person who can, by means of the logical ability given to him by God, experience Αυτού τῶν ὁμών or the values carried by persons or objects. Man is the person who can reach the limit of logic, that is Apophatics, after exercising all his mental abilities.

Of course this answer cannot be final. The final answer to the question "what is Man" cannot be that he is a mental, logical and apophatical reality since Man is not only these states, possibilities and movements.

Mind and logic are not independent of feeling. Mind, in particular, as well as the mental functions can not first of all be regarded as a superior human value if there are not other inferior ones. Moreover, it can not be said that there is a mental reality if there is no experience of a non-mental reality, a reality which is more direct than the mental one.

From another point of view, mental reality as an acquisition of the human mental function is unattainable if there is no prior
direct cause which would lead us to reach it.

If there are no beings, according to St. Maximus, or if the cosmos does not exist, according to M. Scheler, then the logical and ontological analysis by means of which Man can conceive the mental reality as \( \text{\textit{A\=o\=y\=o\=t \tau\=o\=w \\d\iota\nu\=w}} \) or as values is unthinkable.

Moreover, from the extreme philosophical-theological point of view, if there were not any beings as carriers of the mental reality, then the Existence of God would not be conceived by the being prior to the Humanized Logos.

A consequence of this negative hypothetical trend of the human conscience and \( \varphi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \), that is that the beings are not carriers of the Divine truth, would be abolition of the role of Man as the Mediator of the Creation. This abolition would, consequently, annihilate every sense of the possibility of renovation of the creation. By theological and Christological extension, this would also annihilate one of the reasons-causes of the presence of the Logos of God in the cosmos, namely the reinstatement of the relationship of Man with the cosmos. Furthermore, the reduction of the importance of the cosmos and of the enticement to mental truth by means of the sensory would abolish the whole basis of Christian civilization. It would abolish the reason for its existence since one of the reasons of Humanization and therefore one of the bases of the Christian civilization, namely this Humanization, would have been abolished.

At an extreme philosophical level, the experience of the absence of \( \text{\textit{A\=o\=y\=o\=t \tau\=o\=w \\d\iota\nu\=w}} \), of transcendent values would annihilate the difference between human reality, (human kind) and the other kinds of \( \text{\textit{E\=i\nu\=w}} \) (the whole ontological reality). It would abolish Philosophy as a science of principles, as study of values, as induction to the ideal and so on.

The negation of the mental reality of beings, the negation of the fact that the beings are carriers of the mental reality abolishes not only the possibility of the theosis of Man by means of the identified and experienced \( \text{\textit{A\=o\=y\=o\=t \tau\=o\=w \\d\iota\nu\=w}} \) or virtues in them, but also the experience that Man can deify certain of them (which would
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lead to pantheism).

Furthermore, at an extreme utilitarian level, it abolishes the fact that Man can fulfill his individualistic aims by using the beings if the latter cannot offer an inner, egocentric or mental satisfaction.

From all points of view (theological, philosophical, utilitarian, psychological and so on), the whole of the human reality in every aspect then leads to the concept that Man possesses a mental, logical and sensory aspect.

At this point we should make clear that there is no intention of stressing only the sensory aspect of human reality. The sensory aspect has been particularly mentioned because, according to St. Maximus, it is in it that the conception of φαινεται merges with the logical in a causal way.

It is in the sensory aspect of the personality, as an event in which human existence lies in its Ενωσις and Ενωσις conception, that the φαινεται can be experienced. By extension, after logical analysis of its causation (that is, of the relationship of Man with the φαινεται and with the object which caused the analysis), the human existence reaches a perichorematic causality based on a relationship with the object and with the φαινεται at a daily level.

Moreover, according to M. Scheler as well, it is in the sensory aspect of the human reality that the values are experienced as contents of this reality by means of intuition. Consequently, after an energetic search for self-knowledge, these values are transformed into forms of civilization and are identified as values of the Microcosm, taking on a pedagogical and inductive nature.

The consequence of the sensory reality, as synthesis of sense, φαινεται, logic, φαινεται, λόγος τῶν φαινών and values, is the relationship of the human person with God, and the cosmos. In the whole of the human reality, the unity of the metaphysical and space-time elements, the unity of matter and spirit and so on, consists in the fulfillment of the states, possibilities and movements of the human person in relation to each point of the...
mental, logical and space-time reality.

The human personality consists in the fact that it is a member or a carrier of the whole reality as well as in its longing to become part or a member of that ontological reality. By ontological reality we mean the constant fulfilment of his sensory, logical and mental states, possibilities and movements in his desire to be united with other members of this direct reality as well united with his metaphysical reality, with God.

At this point, this study could be considered complete, offering a feeling of satisfaction that, at last, up to a point, the unification of the human personality is feasible at a mental, logical and sensory level. This of course would satisfy the vanity of Man that Νόμος and logic can dominate feeling. It would offer the satisfaction that Man was finally able to conquer love as a way of relating with the Metaphysical and Space-time reality in his Νόμος and reason.

Nevertheless, Man cannot reach a conclusion without first both asking and being interrogated in turn. Man must acquire an interpersonal relationship at a higher personal level.

Firstly, in order to discover the value of ἄγεος τῶν ἄνω, Man must accept that there are beings. He must both relate to those beings and accept the existence of certain values or ἄγεος τῶν ἄνω within these. Next, in order to discover who he is he must ask himself and other persons as a Man about Man. He must have an inter-human dialectic relationship. In order to ask about God, at a higher level, he must then relate with Him either by asking Man or by asking the cosmos.

Finally, in order to accept the value or the non-value of any reality he must question it, accept it as reality and then either accept it fully or reject it definitely.

According to both writers, the relationship with any of the aforementioned realities is based on the feelings of Pothos, Eros, Agape, Hatred, Sorrow and Pleasure. The relationship of the person with the related one, in particular, is based on the intention of relating (Pothos), on the personal relationship (Eros), on the
general relationship (Agape), on the forms of the negative relationship (Hatred, Sorrow) and on the completion of the relationship (Pleasure). The completion of the relationship might signify the completion of the personality in the completeness of the inter-personal relationship (with the cosmos, Man or God) or the decline of the personality in the ephemeral, the disruption.

Starting from the negative concept of Pleasure, the personality, in contrast to the existential agony for ontological completeness, reaches disruption, regarding the mediocre and the partial as absolute. By means of the negative concept of pleasure, in contrast to the longing for unity, what is realised is a projection of the self onto the desired object of love or eros. In this case the possibility of identifying the values which the object carries does not exist.

The consequences of this kind of pleasure are, isolation, egocentricity, negation of sociability, and self-theosis (that is theosis of the individual pursuit).

From the point of view of the positive concept of pleasure, the human person experiences his completion in society, in the interpenetration and perichoresis of values, in the community of Ἀγάπη τῶν ἔννοιων and in the active perichorematic relationship with God, Man and the cosmos. By means of the positive aspect of Pleasure, the human person is unified in a mental, logical and sensory way (as the extension of νομος and logical analysis) and lies under the impetus and attraction of the ἀγάπη, its values and reasons.

In this kind of relationship, the human person does not only identify the values of the related but also learns, changes and transcends his individuality. He fulfills his existential longing for unity with the whole of his reality and finally with God as the Creator, Provider, Judge and Distributor of this reality.

Speaking in St. Maximus' terms, we could say that he partakes of the Divine virtues, of the Theosis as well as of the Trinitarian and Christological reality. He fulfills the human reality which consists in "being in agapetic unification with the truth". He fulfills the Christological reality as unity of the divine and the
human, as expression of the absolute form of Love. Finally, he fulfills the Mystical significance of the Trinitarian Divinity which is the agapetic unity with persons of the same kind and essence, and by extension, the expression of this agapetic community of the persons towards the cosmos.

According to this presentation, the answer to the question "what is Man" is "Personality and Love". Man can answer in all certainty that every Man is a unique singularity of human kind and that he is in relation with the whole of reality (Metaphysical and Space-time) on the basis of Love.

In other words, Man is the person who "loves being loved" (St. Diadochus). Every man can answer the question "what is Man" saying that he is a person, a member of the human kind who exists, relates and co-exists on the basis of the persons, states and forms of civilization (freely loved by him).

These simple answers exclude neither the personal singularity of the human person nor the participation in human kind. In addition, they do not exclude the metaphysical struggle of every human person.

Every Philosophical, Existential and Theological formulation of the truth can be founded upon this simple answer. It can be proved that the Personal Trinitarian God, in whose Image Man is, Creates, Provides, Rules and so on and in general Exists on the basis of Love. Furthermore, the infinite nature of the love of the Trinitarian God, the Transcendental form of Love can be proved since Man (the one in the Divine Image) is in agony to be loved more and more. On the basis of this existential agapetic longing of the image to reflect its reality, it can be proved beyond any doubt (at least to the one who is asked) that the basic cause of Humanization is the Love of God for man. It can be proved to every person who longs to love and to be loved that the sanctifying energy of the Father "&iota; Ιεων ἔσται ἡ σεληνή" is always active in the Church by means of the Sacraments.

At a philosophical level, the person who loves being loved constantly discovers the values of his existence and of the

Conclusion.
beloved, thus learning more about the agapetic identification of the values.

At a social level, the person who constantly experiences the agapetic relationship with the cosmos, society and civilization feels that society is where love is expressed.

Of course this point of view cannot be proved by means of experiments. It is revealed to the Person only by means of Εννομία, Εννοιολογία and logical, mental and sensory experience.

Man himself discovers that Man is Personality and Love in the intuitive analysis of his relationship with the cosmos, Man and God.

From this simple personal intuitive proof of the truth about Man as Personality and Love a complex Perspective can emerge. Every human person, with genuine unifying attitude can see that the unity of the Theological and the Philosophical way of thinking is feasible. He can see that every Man can reach the concept of a Philosophical Theology as Philosophical Anthropology which, when based on the Phenomenological intuitive and inductive method, can offer an answer to the question of the existential agony. It can answer the question "what is existing" through the intuitive experience of Love. It can answer that every Man, every particular person, exists and struggles to exist eternally by means of the agapetic unity. Finally, it can in all certainty prove that existence itself, in terms of both the space-time and the eternal, is to love and to be loved with all the ΕΙναι of your existence and with all the ΕΙναι of all "those who exist" (God and Man) and all "those who are" (the cosmos).
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