

Love to Blessed Augustine and St. Maximus the Confessor

Pr. drd. Cri an Gheorghe-C t lin

„Love to Blessed Augustine and St. Maximus the Confessor” PhD thesis was written under the guidance of Pr. Arhid. Univ. Dr. Ioan I. Ic jr., profesor at Doctoral School at Orthodox Theology „Andrei Saguna” University of „Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu, in the domain of study Orthodox Theology.

The PhD thesis contains an introduction, four parts and conclusions. In order to write the PhD thesis I used a **double methodology** –Thus i follwed a contextual comparative analysis methodology based on more dimensions and topics of issues of love and a textual analysis methodology of the theological components regarding the relationship between love and the other parts of the spiritual life. In the **introduction** are shown the assumption, the main content, the intentions of PhD thesis, the research methodology and the *status* of the research.

First part („A History” of love. *Love in greek philosophy - with special reference to Plato*) aims to identify synthetic and sometimes analytic the multitude of theories about love and how it was seen over the time in greek philosophy. This part has two chapters (and adjacent subsections) where is analyzed the concept of love. Thus, **Chapter I** (*Introduction. Love in greek philosophy. Generalalities - historical analysis of love*) is based on the first understandings of love in greek philosophy and highlights a number of facts based on a historical analysis of love starting with Homer and continuing to Neoplatonism (*The beginnings of questioning / philosophizing on love: from Homer to Empedocles; The height of love in Greek philosophy: Plato and Aristotle. The love decline / replacement in philosophy at Epicurus and the Stoics; A final startle of vitality on the issue of love: Plotinus and Neoplatonism*). The main idea is that love as a „philosophical problem” has an important place in greek thought due to the extremely nuanced and diversed conceptions occurring over time upon love. The main conclusion is that the whole greek philosophy about love is born in a *mystical religious attitude marked by pythagorisme* and ends in *love-peace* of Plotinus, after passing through the Parmenides μ , through the Plato and through the Aristotle , reaching the *decline* of love which is replaced by the pursuit of pleasure and self-control to Epicurus and the Stoics¹.

Chapter II *Love problem [Platonic] in the work of Plato - with special reference to Symposium* is focused on the one of the major approaches of love over time and maybe the

¹ MARIE–DOMINIQUE PHILLIPPE, *Despre iubire*, Ed. Paideia, Bucure ti, 2011, p. 16.

most biggest in chronological order: *platonic conception of love*. The choice is simple: „everything that was told about love from banquet and after later he is the ancestry and foundation with the only exaption of the love in Crist”². Writing, about 2500 years old, probably the most stable / long-lasting and influential philosophical reflection on love³, Plato’s *Symposium* not only describe the *experience of love* [], but also *the passions of the mind/reason*. This reveals connections between sexuality eroticism and philosophical investigation and demonstrates how man is in the *erotic love’s torments* [] but also *lover of knowledge*, the way how these exepriences are intertwined and how *they are interrelated*. Thus, Plato indicates *similarities between the experience of love* [] and *the desire of knowledge*: the art of seduction is the main element in each case in order to induce the lover in acceptance and in reciprocity approach of lover as a paralel to the art of captivation of those uninitiated in the ways of philosophy. So, we can affirm that „*Plato’s Symposium inaugurates a philosophy founded on love*”⁴. As underlines Nico Nuyens, the first five speeches are *an introduction* to the theory of Platonic ’s in the work of Plato⁵. There are *all types of love in front of which there is Plato*: 2.2.1. *Phaedrus’s speech (178a-180c) - Love* [] *understood as the oldest/ancient poet of the gods, is the largest source of goods and therefore the greatest of these [eros pederast]*; 2.2.2. *Pausanias’s speech (180c-185c) - Love revealed by tradition, two ways of love - good and bad - one expressing the need, other, gratuity , heavenly and earthly love [eros Pandemic vs eros Uranium]*; 2.2.3. *Eriximah’s speech (185e-188e) - love seen by doctor identified in this case with a force / unifying principle of harmony and balance [cosmic eros, sober]*; 2.2.4. *Speech of Aristophanes (189c-193d) - Love seen as a myth by a comedian [of androgynous]: the deeply rooted instinct in the hearts of men and women*; 2.2.4.1. *Excuse: Erotic love (love and sexuality)*; 2.2.5. *Agathon’s speech (194e-107e) - love praised by an inloved and happy young men: easy and ardent love*; 2.3. *General criticism of the five preliminary speeches - the begining of speech of Socrates (201d-212c)*. In essence, each of *these five preliminary speeches* expresses symbolically „*something from love*” and *five big conception of love* but only Socrates’s speech reveals “*what is love*” and Alcibiades shows “*how Socrates feels this love*”⁶. In order to understand *the platonic love theory* is necessary to consider all the speeches about love or only that of Diotima?⁷ Therefore, the importance of *succession of speeches* until Socrates-Diotima should

² PETRU CRE IA, *Despre iubire* [Introductive study] in PLATON, *Banchetul sau Despre iubire*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucure ti, 2011, p. 5.

³ Cf. LINNELL SECOMB, *Philosophy and Love, From Plato to Popular Culture*, Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 22 George Square, Edinburgh, 2007, p. 10.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ NICO NUYENS, *What is Love? A Conceptual Analysis of „Love”, focusing on the Love Theories of Plato, St. Augustine and Freud*, GRIPh Working Papers No. 0901, p. 11.

⁶ MARIE-DOMINIQUE PHILLIPPE, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁷ LEON ROBIN (*La théorie platonicienne de l amour*, PUF/Paris, 1964) i ROBERT FLACELIERE (*L amour en Grece*, Paris, 1960) believes that in the *Symposium*, Plato express his ideas not by Socrates, but by Diotima.

not be underestimated at all: they are either *false* or there are exposures of *some previous philosophers* or represent *steps* in the philosopher's thought. However, this structure is revealing if we admit that *the method* shows a *hidden sense of the succession's speeches, the one of doing successive approximations*. When the trio *Socrates - Diotima - Alcibiades* are coming into the play, each speaker has the task to *gradually see the essence of the problem*. In other order of speaking, written as *a series of speeches about love* held by a group of friends during a banquet, Plato's *Symposium*, as I said before, "*inaugurates a philosophy based on love*": from *the passionate unrequited love story* of Alcibiades for Socrates to *the passionate love story as souls reunion cut into pieces by the vengful gods* of Aristophanes to Socrates view about love as a mediation and ascension, the *Symposium* not only that shows different images of the relationship between lover and beloved but also shows how philosophy as love occurs through work/pain/work passions. In this vision, *philosophy is more than a series of logical analysis and reasoned arguments - is a passionate desire for greater knowledge and understanding*⁸. Therefore, *the Banquet* invites us to identify *the multiple meanings of love in Plato's writings*.

Forwards there are analytical treated the following dimensions of love: *nature of love* (original dialogue between Socrates and Diotima), the myth of the appearance of love, Love like μ , Love as an intermediary/mediator [μ] with unifying role, Love as *desire* [μ]/relationship, Love as *the desire of beautiful / good*, love as desire of *eternity*, Love as *desire for eternal happiness*, the relationship between *love and with philosophy*, The love / - religious and poetic inspiration, characteristics / *qualities of love*, Love scale / "*scala amoris*" - the vision of love as a *contemplative ascension* (love and knowledge), Plato and the *eros / Good love/ Beauty*. From 2.5. *The final vision of the speech of Socrates - from love to contemplation / knowledge*, is shown that the message send by Plato is clear: *through love arises in us something that allows us to overcome our human dimension at political and social level*. Love *aquintes us with the gods and eternity*: allows us to *live in contemplation of beauty*. By beauty there will be fecundity and contemplation, and *contemplation is the fruit of love: without love can not exist contemplation*. That is reason for which the teaching of Socrates ends in a *huge vision that shows how too access the soul in the contemplation of Beauty-in-itself and good-in-itself*. In 2.5.1. *Scale of love / 'scala amoris'* the vision of love as a *contemplative ascension (love and knowledge)* is underlining that *the path to the true love is a long process of education*. The *Symposium* suggest, in a reverse perspective (in the mirror), that this passion for ideas others that those for physical pleasures shows the educational power of love.

⁸ LINNELL SECOMB, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

2.7. *Conclusions and final considerations. Plato and eros / Good's love / Love of the Beauty* are ending the section. Most of Plat's ideas about love are found in *Symposium*. From the six speeches in honor of Eros, the last and most important, the one of Socrates, is an older talking between him and Diotima. Here Socrates explains the nature of love for his friends invited to a banquet: it is either the *desire for something I do not have*, or, if in case I possess that, *the desire to not lose that something in the future*. Thus, by definition, love is "always poor" (203c). But *love is not just a desire for everything: love is the desire of good*: we have to possess it and never to lose it in all the eternity. Therefore, "love can be described, generally, as the affection to possess for eternity the good" (206a). However, eternal possession of good requires *possessor immortality*. Therefore, "all the people will really want immortality, together with the good: where should follow that *love is immortality*" (207a). In addition, since the possession of good is what makes someone happy, *the love to master always the good* is at the same time, *the desire for eternal happiness*. The final conclusion: love is *the intuition / the recognition of pure shape of Beauty*. Thus, the Banquet gives us: a) a unique teaching about love: *Love is not a god, it is only mediator / μ between mortal and immortal*; b) a doctrine meant to suggest her grandeur and the unique and capital role of love in our spiritual life: *Love lets the human to capture, to divinize through his contemplation*. Plato takes so profound vision of religious traditions on love, but it purifies by her completely character: *beyond love, there is the beauty-in-itself - Beauty, the Goodness (the Good, the Truth) - which arouses in us the contemplation*.

Thus, leaving aside the question of whether this is a *fair representation of Plato's own views*, or a rational reconstruction, which makes it more acceptable to the modern reader, for our present purposes, the question is whether it allows us to reconcile Platonic *eros* with the Christian faith? Here there are two answers that could be given. We could try either to reform the point of views of Plato in Christian terms and in doing so, to transform them into a Christian model - this version was adopted by St. Augustine. Or we could reject the idea of *eros* as non-Christian and contrarious to the christian model of *agapes* - this was the answer of Anders Nygren. Also, there is no exaggeration to say that any theorist in love after the beginners, especially St. Augustine and Freud were indebted to Plato⁹. In conclusion, Jerome Neu considers the *Symposium* as one of the greatest works ever written about love¹⁰. However, the works of Plato should be treated through the rise of love. So here's the real reasons for which Peter Crete admirably highlight the fact that „for posterity, and therefore for us now, the great secret meeting about the power and meaning of love came out of his contingent history to enter the duration of the culture”¹¹.

⁹ NICO NUYENS, *op. cit.*, p. 10–11.

¹⁰ JEROME NEU, "Plato's Homoerotic Symposium," in *The Philosophy of Erotic Love*, p. 317–335.

¹¹ PETRU CREIA, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

The second part (*The love between two worlds: Chistianity vs. paganism*) is an introduction/comparative study that analyses how love was understood and lived at the junction of two civilizations, the Greco-Roman world and early Christianity, trying to make a comparative radiography of love's status in the pagan world through its juxtaposition with the novelty brought to the domain of love by the Christianity and finally issue the necessary conclusions. Thus in **chapter 1.1** *The Greco-Roman world and the love understood as its own benefit.* "A world without love?!" (Gerhard Uhlhorn) it is shown how from the texts of that era, results that the Greco-Roman world was obsessively concerned with wealth and statues although the opulence was not by far the most important determinant of the statues, but the honor, reputation or, quoting Plato, *the desire of immortality...* for the same purpose they practiced charity¹². Therefore in **chapter 1.2.** *The Christianity and the novelty of the love understood as serving your fellows.* "Do you see how the Christians love each other?!" (Tertulian), *Biblical language and terminology* demonstrate that along with Christianity these values, established by often associating the poor and the marginalized with moral virtues and the rich and powerful with corruption, were turned upside down. The early Church also changed the Greco-Roman point of view regarding to wealth. According to Tertulian, among others, *the ambition and desire for glory* as typical sings of a mentality from the highest society represent vices; the competition of social merits was in a total disagreement with the Christian humbleness and humility¹³. In his pioneering study on the early spread of Christianity, Adolf von Harnack, will assign the growth of Christianity in the first centuries to its active faith in love; the Christians *not only had a new vocabulary regarding love, but they also lived it:* "The new language on the Christian's lips was the language of love. But it was more than a language, it was about power and action. Thus, the Gospel has become social message"¹⁴. Loving your fellows was something intrinsic for each Christian community which wanted to remain faithful to the Gospel. Furthermore, obeying love is the practical expression of the love for God.

In addition, the celebration of love is the practical expression of love of God, Therefore in Uhlhorn it is heard Lactantius (c.240-c.320), [called "Christian Cicero"], which shows that the prechristian era had no *charity* in sense of *love of others* and *civic welfare* "it was a *sacrifice for vanity, avarice or political*; it was a ransom that wealth paid to poverty *in order to not be bothered by it [...]*.. Ethics Greeks and Romans did not progress beyond *a refined*

¹² G. E. M. DE STE. CROIX, "Early Christian Attitudes to Property and Slavery" in Derek Baker, ed., *Church, Society and Politics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1975, 1 38, apud CARTER LINDBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹³ Cf. CARTER LINDBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹⁴ ADOLF VON HARNACK, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, Translated and edited by James Moffatt, B.D., D.D. (St. Andrews) Gloucester, Mass. Peter Smith, 1972, p. 118 119.

eudaimonia higher or lower. "The main principle of action is always own benefit"¹⁵, idea from Aristotle and Plato himself subscribes. In conclusion, however, it can not be said that the prechristian Greeks and Romans would have had no idea about love and that their world was a world without love (broadly) but that their understanding about love was that they did not promote the love for the good of others and nor beyond the narrow circle of their interests. Only say that in Christianity it is revealing the ultimate meaning of love in the person of Jesus Christ, hence *the manifestations of Christian love, superior to those in the Greco-Roman world*. Moreover, the supernatural character, personal, sacrificer and universalist even going to *love of enemies*, is *the degree of perfect love*, and therefore, the *novelty of love*. Starting from here it can be said the ecclesiological and community Christian love feature, which is revealed by the terms *agape* and *philanthropy*, as meeting of the love of the Christian community members, in order to participate in the Father's love revealed in the Son and made present in the Church in the Holy Spirit. If the term *philanthropy* and his implications we find in the New Testament, referring to the love of God [Tit, 3, 4-5] and loving relationships between people [FA 27, 3; 28, 2], for the name of Christian love, Scripture writings use the term *agape*¹⁶. If the love spoken of in other religions is mainly *the Eros - as egocentric tendency of self fulfillment - agape*, Christian love selfless-giving and sacrificing, differs by the fact that it did not leave the less perfect but "contrary , generous pouring over those less unworthy, overflowing and abundant on the loneliness and sadness moral immersed in their sinfulness"¹⁷. Despite these differences, between *eros* and *agape* is not canceled any possibility of co-living. Christian Love christened the platonic *eros* meaning. In the bosom of Christianity, *eros* and *agape* are two forces that are interdependent. Thus, this quality of being the founder of a religious community based on love of God shown the world, *Christianity is new to everything was religion and ethics until his appearance and modus vivendi* of christians has to be understood in terms of proceeding (by *tropics*) and not spatiality and temporality (*the topos or the chronos*); in other terms of ideas, christians are not elsewhere, nor othertime, but *here and now, otherwise* their attitude toward the world is at the same time of posting material and spiritual solidarity¹⁸.

Part III „A Theology” of Love. **(I) Love in the vision of Blessed Augustin (354–430)**

treats issues related to love as Bishop Hyppo thinks, *one of the four greatest Fathers and Doctors of the Western Church* (along with Ambrose, the Blessed Jerome and Grigorie the Great). **Chapter I** presents **Blessed Augustin as „Doctor Caritatis” in the West** based on

¹⁵ GERHARD UHLHORN, *op. cit.*, apud CARTER LINDBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

¹⁶ Cf. CESLAS SPICQ, *Agapè dans le NT*, 3 vol., 1958/59; IDEM, *Agape in the New Testament*, 2 vol., Sister M. A. McNamara, O.P. and Sister Maria Honoria Richter, O.P., trans., St. Louis: B. Herder, 1963, 1965.

¹⁷ PR. PROF. DR. ISIDOR TODORAN, *Eros i Agape*, în *ST*, 1956, nr. 3 4, p. 148.

¹⁸ Cf. DIAC. IOAN I. IC JR in his note at chap. *Cum tr iesc cre tinii în lume* în MAICA MAGDALENA, *Sfaturi pentru o educa ie ortodoxa a copiilor de azi*, Ed. Deisis, Sibiu, 2000, p. 137.

his Christian vision of the concept of love [*caritas*] and his attempt to fit the whole Christianity under the tutelage and love auspices, from the doctrine of the Trinity (in *De Trinitate*) until serving the neighbor (in *In Iohannis epistolam ad Parthos tractatus decem*). Called „Docteur de la caritaté” [*doctor caritatis*]¹⁹, author of a treatise, whose title refers to love²⁰, The Blessed Augustin is the author of works in which love holds a central place. For him love [*caritas*] is "excellent way" [*supereminetissima via*]²¹ to seek God. Not incidentally, the whole purpose of Scripture (as will be demonstrated in the doctrina christiana) is enlighten love²², and the main biblical passage is the one from *I In 4, 8*, "God is love / *Deus dilectio est*", passage which it's quoted 58 times in his works.

By close connection of love to the desire for happiness, Augustine believes that it is possible to regard love as the most basic of all manifestations of human life: no man who does not seek his happiness. For Augustine this is synonymous with the statement that there is no one who does not love and that a person "is" what he loves. Here is the basis for both theology ordered love [*amor ordinatus/ordo amoris*]. The last but not least, Augustine's theory of "love" (which for him is actually *caritas* or *agape*) is essentially linked to his doctrine on divine grace and free will. Thanks to the grace of God, people are free beings, are able to choose whether to return or not the love of God.

Chapter II of first section deals with **Augustinian vocabulary and terminology of love (love, caritas, dilectio, cupiditas)**. As to terminology, Augustine vocabulary of love contains Latin terms *amor, dilectio and caritas*. After Hannah Arendt, the three Greek terms in the New Testament *eros, storge and agape* correspond to Latin translations *amor, dilectio and caritas*, terms that Augustine's apparently quite flexible uses frequently as synonyms²³. For Augustin the love object defines love: all the three terms can signify a good love or a bad love, depending on the loved object. Therefore Augustine retaining four objects that love can lead (*to God, to themselves, to neighbors and to the body*), he doesn't forget that all the love, whatever name we give, being rooted in God. This explains the origin of words related to human love being applied as expressions of Christian faith. However, according to experts, in general, but not consistently, he tends to use *caritas* and *dilectio* as equivalent to the Greek *agape* while love keeps / retains more platonic sense of *eros*²⁴. In addition to the three terms mentioned above, Augustine uses also the noun *cupiditas*. If *caritas* is the root of all that is good, its opposite, the root of all evil, is *cupiditas*. *Caritas* ascends to God, Himself

¹⁹ Cf. J. BRECHTKEN, *Augustinus, doctor caritatis*, Meisenheim am Glan, 1975.

²⁰ Cf. AUGUSTIN, *Enchiridion ad Laurentium seu de fide, ope et caritate liber*, PL 40, col. 231–290.

²¹ AUGUSTIN, *Enarr. in Ps.*, 103, I, 9.

²² AUGUSTIN, *De doctr. chr.*, I, 36, 40.

²³ HANNAH ARENDT, *Love and Saint Augustine* (1929), Edited and with an Interpretive Essay by Joanna Vecchiarelli Scott and Judith Chelius Stark, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1996, p. 38.

²⁴ According to HÉLÈNE PÉTRÉ, *Caritas: Étude sur le Vocabulaire Latin de la Charité Chrétienne*, Louvain, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1948.

existence, while *cupiditas* comes down to inferior beings and then she continued her descent reach nothingness, *non-existence*²⁵.

Section 2. "Deus Dilectio East" begins with the **cap. I. Love and Trinity** (2.1.1. *The love between Father and Son...*, 2.1.2. *...Love between Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, 2.1.3. *Love between Son and Holy ...*, 2.1.4. *Place love in pictures Trinity [imago Trinitatis] in the human soul*, 2.1.5. *... Christ and love*). Essentially, it shows that the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father means, at Community level, not only intratrinity relationship but also pattern of love among Christians. Thus a genuine understanding of love intratrinitare leads to a genuine love between Christians and ecclesial unity (maximum triadologia finds expression in ecclesiology being for this a pattern)²⁶. Augustin will link love intratrinitare understanding and his teaching on the Filioque. In speculating about the mystery of the Trinity, Augustine conceives the Holy Spirit, as being *the love that the Father and the Son love each other* (a relationship) abolished in this process the Holy Spirit as Person. Of the three persons Father, Son and Holy Spirit the last one the Holy Spirit mediates between the Father and the Son, and *functions as love [caritas]*. St. Augustine believes that *by understanding the true nature of love, the Trinity could get to know love in that study led to the conclusion that there are three entities: one who loves, one who is loved and love itself*. Thus, through a psychological analysis, he tries to think about the nature of God by analogy with the image that the Creator has left it in his works [*vestigia Trinitatis*] by excellence in the human soul.

Cap. II. God's love for his creation, in particular for the human being has the following **subchapters** : 2.2.1. *Theocentric aspect of love*; 2.2.2. *In what way (how) God loves people using [uti] or enjoying [frui] them* (God loves us not "enjoying" but "using", but not in the sense that we use things *He is reported not his own, but in ours*, in other words, because of self-sufficiency perfections of God's love for us can not be in no way a form of *need love but love in / as a gift, or agape*); 2.2.3. *Christological and pneumatological aspect of love*. Supreme sign of God's love to people is the Son's love manifested in *redemption: the incarnation, death, resurrection and ascension (followed by sending the Holy Spirit)*. Therefore, in view of Augustine, in Christ we participate in the love of the Trinity, the supreme model of love, and so perfect love is *imitation of Christ*: a willingness to take your life for your brother²⁷. And if *incarnation as descending love makes possible the rise of man to God, the rescue, then, is not a human work, but the gift of God's love*.

Section 3 of the "Ordo Amoris" presents the **agustinian theory of hierarchical order on objects of love (with special reference to the Christianas doctrine)**. For Augustine, an

²⁵ Cf. CARTER LINDBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

²⁶ MARIUS-MIHAI ILCA, *Teologia iubirii in viziunea Sfin ilor P rin i i a Scriitorilor Biserice ti din primele patru secole patristice, cu referire special la Fericitul Augustin*, Ed. Emia, Deva, 2009, p. 195.

²⁷ DANIEL DIDEBERG, *Saint Augustin et la Première Épître de Saint Jean. Une théologie de l'agapé*, Ed. Beauchesne, Paris, 1975, p. 93.

aspect of *upward love* is a love that must be ordered [*amor ordinatus/ordinata dilectio*]. Because not even an uprise / ascent is not possible without a ladder, it must be linked to levels of existence, so that all human love (our kind, himself and everything else) should be subject to God's love [*amor Dei*] considered *proton Philon* to reach happiness. After this order, *the body must obey the soul, and the soul to God, placing in a properly ordered love*, which is the highest above the bottom of things"²⁸.

In subchapter 3.1.2. Amor ordinatus / Order dilectio as outlined Augustine, following Platon, supports the existence of a hierarchical order on objects of love. The doctrine Christiana, where Augustine developed the concept of *ordo amoris* in detail, says that we should not love all the things that we use [*uti*], but only those who, given their affinity with us are in relationship with God as human beings or things that are closely united intimately, and who themselves are gifts from God, and our bodies. This evangelical principle of love is presented as the *ordinata dilectio* and therefore presents the steps of love: junior (self and own body) and senior (our kind and God) *supra nos* = God, *iuxta nos* = our kind, *intra nos* = body, *quod nos sumus* = man by his spiritual side - and represents clearly many objects of love²⁹. Interestingly, although we expect that love to be in 4th place of other things in the world, however, Augustine did not take this step because from his point of view this love its not define as truly love but as an excessive desire / cupiditas, being a misdirected love. If **subchapter. 3.1.3. God - summum bonum and proton philon of human** shows that Augustine claims that the highest good, the Supreme Good [*summum bonum*] is God Himself and all other goods are less goods - gifts deriving from His goodness and are meant to lead us back to Him; in **subchapter. 3.1.4. The distinction (classification) of objects of love according to the dialectic of love: enjoy [frui] and use [uti]** highlights how Platonic vision based on the ladder of love [*scalla amoris*] for basic distinction Augustine underlying concept of *ordo amoris* is that between how should we love God – believed *proton Philo* – and how we must love everything else, the latter is subordinate to the former, as all things must be loved in reference to God (as for Plato all had girlfriends with reference to Good). Augustin marks this distinction in terms of *frui* (joy) and *uti* (use) distinction presented in sub path. 3.1.4.1. The distinction *frui-uti* = distinction *purpose-way* showing how Augustine, like Socrates warns us about the things that we enjoy – wrong looking at them as they would *proton Philo* – which should we use only in order to get what is *alone worthy of / to be enjoyed / to enjoy*: God. Searching them for *their sake* they will deviate from destiny / our ultimate goal. In other words, the Augustinian conception of man can not find happiness only when directs all his love towards God, the Supreme Good. Here's how Augustine's entire

²⁸ CONSTANTIN C. PAVEL, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

²⁹ *De doct. chr.* I, 45 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 81, 83].

ethical system is an outgrowth of this belief about the *ordinata dilectio* whose echoes are present everywhere in his writings.

4. "Scala Amoris" is the section dealing with the following situations analytically love: *love of God, love of self, love of our kind and love of the world*. **Cap. 4.1. The love of God (God – the true "object" of love and human desire)** Augustine shows us that, like Plato who felt that there is a principle of nature that all love is a good target, Scala uses amoris order to build his vision of the greatest and first love [*proton Philon*] have to show that man of God is considered the greatest good [*summum bonum*], true love"object" and human desire. This love has therefore a *special status* due its concept of *ordinata dilectio* according to which all human forms of love are derived and subordinate to God's love. **Sub path. 4.1.1. Love the ascent of the soul to God - the true object of love and "greatest" good in itself [*summum bonum*]** points out that the love (condescending) of God, man must respond with a love like (ascending), manifested as rising soul to the Creator. **4.1.1.1. God - the true object [eternal] of desire (happiness)** is the section showing the Augustinian view that is the ultimate goal of human existence must be something to which nothing is better, and at the same time something that can not be lost against their will. Approached from the point of view of eudaemonistic, as in Platon, love is essentially a desire bliss. The essential difference between the two visions, that if Platon's supreme happiness consists in the knowledge of Good, for it consists in the contemplation Augustine / to happy God. **Sub path. 4.1.1.2. Innate desire of the soul after / for God** deals query, difficult and constant search of love [*quaestio amoris*] which is an innate desire for God, initially not recognized as such by humans because our vision is too much of the material covered / earth. *A search for the love of God is not only the right thing to do morally, but also the most natural way possible, "because we've built for you and our heart is restless until it finds the rest in You"*³⁰. In **4.1.1.3. The way God's love** Augustine says that God should be loved not only for eternal reward but to be loved freely [*gratis*] and clean, only for himself and for nothing else because what is not loved for himself is not loved at all. Moreover, according to his concept of love *ordinatus*, no human being should be loved in the same way is [must be] loved God³¹. We can only love God through the Holy Spirit was poured out in our hearts [*Rm 5, 5*] that to love God by God (*Amare Deum Deo*)³². We ourselves are worth the price to love God.

Cap. 4.2. Self-love (good love of self and its close connection / her emanation from the love of God) highlights how self-love is in relationship with the love of God and our kind, how we talk about a natural love of body and what is a bad self-love. **Sub path. 4.2.1. Good self-love. Self-love relationship with the double commandment of love** deals with two

³⁰ *Confess.*, I, 1: „*quia fecisti nos ad te et inquietum est cor nostrum, donee requiescat in te*”.

³¹ HELMUT KUHN, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

³² *Serm.*, 34, 2–3.

aspects. First, **4.2.1.1. *The relationship between self-love and love of God***, Augustine shows how self-love in the general condition of the double commandment of love, especially the love of God, the true object of love. If for Augustin in all our actions we seek for our happiness³³, and how God is the true and eternal subject of happiness, we are loving ourselves in a truly way and therefore we are truly happy only when we give up on us and when we seek God. In general, Augustine sees self-love ("self" according to Augustine is really soul [*anima*]) as a subspecies of upward love (along with the love of God, our kind, and things including our body) and it has to be subordinated to the greatest love, which should be directed towards God Himself. In other words, the man loves himself, but in „face” he really loves God³⁴. Thus, at Augustine, self-love and love of God must match. The second aspect, **4.2.1.2. *The relationship between self-love and love of our kind*** shows how the man is recognized as a part of God’s creation, not only that this God is beloved, but man also will love himself as a part of nature created with other created nature, to be linked to the same origin and the same ending. Love for self and our kind, therefore, go hand in hand, because all man are "faces" of God. So man really loves himself only by loving God in His love for our kind because "we can’t think if only a step can be a safer way to God’s love, than the love through man to man"³⁵. **Sub path. 4.2.2. *Bad self-love*** underlines how in *De Doctrina Christiana*, Augustin will draw the image of some bad self-love in *cupiditas* terms³⁶, love of which image is maybe the clearest in *De Civitate Dei*. Here Augustine highlights the specific of bad self-love that remains in what is opposing God’s love. **4.2.3. *Good love [natural] for your own body*** is the place where we present how Augustin care of his own body it’s based on a natural love [*affectus*] (also seen in animals) because "no one hates himself"³⁷. Everyone loves naturally his own flesh [*carnem Suam quisque naturaliter diligit*]. Only martyrs have dominated this love, but without despising their bodies³⁸. *De Doctr. Chr.* 1, 48-53 is the text where Augustin makes a truly pleading about good love of his own body (but showing although the risks and derailments from normality) starting with the biblical text "no one ever hated his body" [*Eph 5, 29*]. In conclusion, *self-love is good when isn’t opposing God’s love*, and so on, is evil opposing the love of God and our kind. Therefore you find how you love yourself by loving God.

³³ PIERRE ROUSSELOT, *The problem of love in the Middle Ages: a historical contribution*, translated and with an introduction by Alan Vincelette, (Marquette studies in philosophy, no. 24), Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2001, p. 17.

³⁴ FRÉDÉRIC TRAUTMANN, *La place de la notion de charité en éthique au moment du Concile Vatican II*, Thèse de doctorat sous la direction de Marie-Jo Thiel, Université de Strasbourg, 2010, p. 64. Cf *Ep.*, 130, 7, 14; Cf. T. J. VAN BAVEL, „Amour”, in *Encyclopédie Saint Augustin. La Méditerranée et l’Europe IVe-XXIe siècle* (French Edition, ed. Marie-Anne Vannier, sous la direction de Allan D. Fitzgerald), Preface Serge Lancel, Paris, Cerf, 2005, p. 33).

³⁵ *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, 26, 48.

³⁶ *De doct. chr.*, III, 37 [trad. rom. cit., p. 219]: [‘*cupiditatem’ autem — motum animi ad fruendum se et proximo et quolibet corpore non propter Deum*’].

³⁷ *C. Faust*, XXI, 5; *De util. jejun.*, 4, 4–5, 6.

³⁸ *De cura p. m. ger.*, 7, 9; *Serm.*, 277, 3–4.

Cap. 4.3. Love of our kind- "path" to God's love begins by pointing out that there are three strong reasons for loving all people: a) they share with us the same human nature (philosophical argument); b) God commands us this; c) God is present in them. For Augustine *the love of our kind is a form of affection or a feeling [affectio] for each other*, which strikes and shapes the natural love relationships being through excellence "path" for God's love, this is the specific way in which Augustine understands the love of our kind³⁹. **Sub path. 4.3.1. Who is our brother?** received the following answer: "no man was exempt [*nullum hominum exceperit*] by the one who left the commandment to love our brother" and "every man must be considered our brother"⁴⁰, this means that in Augustine thought, *the brother is any person*, Christian or non-Christian, straight or sinner: "Every man is every man's brother"⁴¹. That's way he extends the love effect through any human, Christian or by other religious, friend or even above the enemies [*ad inimicos*]!, love [*caritas*] becoming the supreme Christian virtue⁴² – aspect underlined in **sub path. 4.3.2. Extending the love effect: enemy loves**. Therefore enemies are the subject of our love while our compassion is actually the attitude that Augustine believed that we should have in relation with them, especially we should all want that everyone should possess the same good that we are seeking for (ie. God)⁴³. In conclusion, they should not be loved for what they are, but for what they can become in Christ. **Sub path. 4.3.3. Stairs and priorities in love: "loving all the same"** shows that in stairs and priorities the love of our kind, as Augustin will clearly say that "we ought to love all the same" but we can not be helped chronologically all at once, he proposes a scale of priority in their support decided 1) *by fate*⁴⁴ and 2) by those that are linked to you [*constrictius tibi*]⁴⁵ tighter. **Sub path. 4.3.4. Specifics of loving our kind and 4.3.4.1. Love of our kind: expression of God's love and the way to Him** underlines how Augustine believed through the love of our kind the man can best express the love for God because "we can not think of any step that there is a safer way to God's love than the love through man to man"⁴⁶. The love of man kind becomes "way" to God's love. **Sub path. 4.3.4.2. treating The purpose /the effect of our kind love: his rise to the same final good goal (God)**⁴⁷ specifically emphasizes to another love of our kind.

Furthermore, in **4.3.4.3. How should be loved our brother: rejoicing or using it (uti or frui)?** shows how Augustine recognizes that every man shouldn't be loved for himself (as

³⁹ HELMUT KUHN, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

⁴⁰ *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, 26, 48.

⁴¹ *De doctr. chr.*, I, 67–68 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 93].

⁴² *De doctr. chr.*, I, 69 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 93].

⁴³ *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, I, 26, 49.

⁴⁴ *De doctr. chr.*, I, 61 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 89–91].

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 91

⁴⁶ *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, 26, 48.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 26, 49.

God) but in and for God⁴⁸. In this way, our kind (like ourselves) should be for us *uti* objects, rather than *frui*. However, there is a special sense in which we can "enjoy" our kind: we can enjoy it "God" is synonymous with "to use it with sake" in the way that we can bring him closer to God and thus to eternal happiness. In conclusion, in Augustine's view, to get to love God, we must begin by loving our kind, for it is impossible to love God without loving our kind⁴⁹.

Cap. 4.4. treats *The double commandment of love (of God and our kind)*. In one of his studies ("*The Problem of Self Love in St. Augustine*"), O'Donovan argued that until a more close inspection when it will be proved otherwise we must make the assumption that Augustine is responsible not only for "self-love" such as the theology understands it in the West, but also for the predominance of "summary" of law and the prophets – i.e. *the double commandment of love* – in the Western Christian ethics⁵⁰. In **Subchapter. 4.4.1. The importance of the double commandment of love**, Augustine shows that it is given by the God's primacy of love and our kind in Scripture. In *Sermones* 250 he will demonstrate in detail how double love (of God and men) summarizes the Decalogue commandments direct reporting of each of them at one of the two and in *De Doctrina Christiana* Augustine will underline the fact that the purpose of all Scripture is to edify in this world of love reign [*regnum Caritatis*] by God and our kind⁵¹. This is actually the reason of incarnation: no order to learn how God loves us, and that we must learn to love our fellow, there is no reason that Christ ought to make our fellow⁵².

To reach God's love / to love God, we must begin by loving our fellow. If the love of God is first in the order of command [*ordo praecipendi*], love of fellow comes first in practice [*ordo faciendi*]⁵³. Thus, there is a *temporal primacy* of love of fellow, which said in other words, means that in our life on earth *the true love of fellow is the first expression of our love for God*⁵⁴. In **4.4.2. Conclusions** is outlined how to the Augustine three loves (of God, self and fellow) are *interrelated and interdependent*⁵⁵ and *moral life is to love what you have and orderly love, that God first and then people*⁵⁶.

Cap. 4.5. Two opposite love: bad / selfish love of self and love of God. City of God: two cities, two loves certify *the theory of two opposite forms of love*: love centered on God [*amor Dei*] and love that is self centered [*amor sui*]; the first one, according with God, overflowing

⁴⁸ *Confess.*, IV, 9, 15[*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 301–302].

⁴⁹ *De f. et op.*, 16.

⁵⁰ OLIVER O DONOVAN, *op. cit.*, apud CARTER LINDBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

⁵¹ *De doct. chr.*, *Introducere* [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 9].

⁵² *In Io. Ep. tr.*, VI, 13–VII, 2 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 217, 223].

⁵³ *Serm.*, 265, 8, 9; *In Io. Ev. tr.*, XVII, 8.

⁵⁴ T. J. VAN BAVEL, „Amour”, *Saint Augustin*, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

⁵⁵ AUGUSTIN, *Despre învătura creștină* III, 3 [*trad. rom.*: Fer. Augustin, *Opusculă*, translate and notes, ierom. Drd. Arsenie Obreja, Editura Oastea Domnului, Sibiu, 2011, p. 121–122].

⁵⁶ *Epistula* 118, *ad Dioscorum*, IV, 32; CSEL, XXXIV, 1, p. 25.

above the fellow, the second is in search of his personal interest and assumes the right to dominate⁵⁷. These two loves make up two communities / cities [*civitates*]⁵⁸ which are mixed [*permixta*] till parousia: *The civ. Dei* XIV, 28: *civitates fecerunt duas amores duo: terrene scilicet amor sui usque ad Dei contemptum, caelestem vero, amor Dei usque contemptum ad sui* ("Two loves have made two cities: love of self to the contempt of God has made the earthly city; the love of God carried to contempt of self made city of God")⁵⁹. *Cupiditas vs caritas* are also two other terms that emphasizes a bipolar-antinomical love: for Augustine the love for things of the world is denounced as being *cupiditas*, the kind of love that holds us "down" to the ephemeral, because it is a "weight "on / for soul"⁶⁰ while straight love, true love, *caritas*, is the one seeking safe and absolute eternity and future (God) being able to attract in the opposite direction, "up" toward eternity. However, both *onest love / right love and the wrong love* have in common the fact that they are *passionate lust desire* [appetitus]; the difference between the two types of love standing, therefore, only the object of love.

The last **section 5. "Modus Amoris"** is focusing on love dimensions seen in its development, in concrete spiritual life. This **chapter 5.1. Fear or / and love** seeks to solve the dilemma of whether we have to relate to God in fear or love, or both. **Subchapter 5.1.1. Between the fear of losing what we love or said in other terms safety of possess eternal "object" of love or source of happiness** as it appears in the dialogue „Symposion” (Platon) and the one that recives a christian solution in the terms that chasing Platon when he says that we want only what we don't have because we believe that the object of our desire it's good and it will make us happy but he also says that after we will possess the object of love our desire is ending, exception makes only if we are threaten with his loss. In this case, the desire of "having it" turns into a fear of "[not] lose". Therefore, if "things we have to enjoy are our Father, our Son and the Holy Spirit"⁶¹ and thus the object of love is eternal, fear (the possibility of loss "against your will" and failure on the object's eternal love and possessions) disappears. In **Subchapter. 5.1.2. Augustine fear and / or love?** another issue is treated in the relationship between fear and love: God's love motivation that fear of God in the sense fear of punishment (temporal or eternal hell) or disinterested and pure love is that which ultimately motivates man in relation with God? Before observation Augustine's solution, a radiograph of the status of the problem in patristic literature is made in **5.1.1.3 Excursion: Motivation love of God in patristic literature: fear and / or love?** (short investigation) which releases the existence of three theories: the theory of selfish motivation of God's love for the interest of reward, motivation serving God in fear of punishment in hell and motivation disinterested

⁵⁷ Cf. TARSICIUS J. VAN BAVEL, „Amour”, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁵⁸ *De Gen. ad. litt.*, XI, 15.

⁵⁹ *De civ. Dei* XIV, 28.

⁶⁰ JOHN M. RIST, *Augustine: Ancient thought baptized*, Cambridge, 1994, Cambridge University Press, p. 173.

⁶¹ *De doct. chr.*, I, 10 [*trad. cit.*, p. 63]: *res igitur quibus fruendum est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus.*

love of God. Here are analyzed following: **5.1.3. Augustin relationship between fear and love: love that casts out fear prepares place fear of punishment** (positive sense of fear is that it brings after confession after which man attains peace of mind that ultimately opens the door love that casts out fear); **5.1.4. He that loveth not afraid of judgement** (even if at first start by man to fear judgement, however "perfect love can not prove otherwise than by waiting for that day")⁶²; **5.1.5. Two kinds / types of fear: fear of clean and unclean fear:** fear unclean (which is elongated perfect love) which is a fear of hell torments, and pure fear (which "remains forever") which is "fear of not to lose the good itself "- God)⁶³.

Cap. 5.2. Faith, hope and love Augustine points out that although the system remembers his courage / strength, prudence / temperance, wisdom / prudence and justice / justice - Platonic cardinal virtues par excellence - he will join the religious moral code of the New Testament, the thinking Gospel and Pauline orientated other virtues, theological, called it "the fundamental Christian virtues"⁶⁴: Fides, Spes et caritas [*faith, hope and love*]. **Subchapter. 5.2.1. The interdependence of the three theological virtues. Superiority and eternity of love** for Augustine emphasizes that "no love without hope there is no hope without love, without faith or both" (*Enchiridion* 8). If love for God has at Augustine intellectual nature, the meaning of life is to acknowledge God, and to this end, the Christian virtues of faith [*fides*] hope [*spe*] love [*caritas*] must intertwine as they are considered to be a preparation for the soul to light / face God. Therefore, from the point of view of Christian virtues, love [*caritas*] is interpreted as a desire to see God, hope [*spe*] Waiting to achieve this faith [*fides*] as a belief that the object mentally corresponds to how God really is. **Chapter 5.3. Love and knowledge** discusses how the two elements are interconnected. Man is a being thoughtful, one of its typical features is the query [*quaerere*] - constantly challenging, search of love [*quaestio amoris*]. **Subchapter 5.3.1. Quaestio amoris: Love the questioning of intellectual inquiry [quaerere]** emphasizes that one of the favorite themes are to be found in the works of Augustine's desire of knowledge. Intellectual investigation interrogation [*quaerere*] was for Augustin in essential a search for God in the sense that the true philosopher is also a true lover of God [*verus philosophus amator Dei*]⁶⁵. So the philosophy that " the love for wisdom" was for Augustine identical with intellectual love of God, and was understanding as a moving power (mobile) [*motum animi*] of soul that can ultimately unite God with man in a perfect harmony"⁶⁶. In this way, the Augustinian vision quaestio amoris is an innate desire for God, that is way searching for the love of God is not only a morally right thing to do⁶⁷, but the most

⁶² *In Io. Ep. tr. IX, 2 [trad. rom. cit., p. 279, 281].*

⁶³ *Ibid., IX, 5 [trad. rom. cit., p. 289].*

⁶⁴ *Solil., I, 3 [trad. rom. cit., p. 47].*

⁶⁵ *De civ. Dei, VIII, 1.*

⁶⁶ *De doctr. chr., III, 37 [trad. rom. cit., p. 219].*

⁶⁷ *Cf. Mt, 22, 37.*

natural and necessary. The following 2 sub path. **5.3.2. Knowledge needs love** and **5.3.3. Love is always accompanied by knowledge** shows that for Augustine *love is always accompanied by knowledge* because true love is not possible without knowledge of the "shape" of the object loved. In **5.3.4. Conclusion emphasizes that:** *Augustin makes love the center of his theory of ethics* that seems to have a very high value but underlines *the epistemology of too much love* (according to Augustine an object *can be fully known, when is fully loved*)⁶⁸ and such *love is reduced to a form of knowledge*. This is due to the fact that Augustine's doctrine remains essentially intellectualist [*intellectum valde ama*] in the means in which love for God is undoubtedly an *intellectual* character. *At the same time, true knowledge is impossible without love*. This line of thinking is clearly *circular*, but must be understood only in the context in *which knowledge is subordinate to faith*⁶⁹.

Cap. 5.4. Love and deification is trying to discover the elements of a close relationship between love and glorification problem which especially concerned Augustine for aspiring human spirit, despite the struggles body and matter, in union with the divine spirit. Eschatological dimension which places an clear accent on the role of love in the process of edification, God - the true goal [*telos*] of human existence, the will of God wants us to love Him as our highest good [*summum bonum*], man desire in research of happiness which should make him consider the order of things created because only the possession of a imperishable good can make you happy, are some elements outlined in **5.4.1. Introduction**. The main idea is that love unites us to God, our supreme and eternal Goodness, Who alone can guarantee true happiness, joy [*frui*], while all other created things should refer to the love of God [*uti*]. **Subchapter. 5.4.2. „united with God through love”** underlines how many texts from Augustine clearly describe salvation as "deification" language more familiar to the ancient Greeks than the Latin theologians⁷⁰, and then that "we are united with God through love"⁷¹. In this respect, the more increase our likeness to God, the more our love grows, and the more our perception of God becomes clearer, because God is love. Therefore Augustine would say that to love God means living together: "He lives in love and you'll be living with her; stay in love and she will remain in you"⁷². **Subchapter. 5.4.3. Love and virtues deification process** emphasizes the centrality of love in the process of deification is also in the fact that every virtue is a form of love⁷³. Although in this life our love for God is desire particularly, not in delight, however, unlike other virtues, such as faith and hope, love is an eternal character: it will not end. The mystery of faith to end with the sight „face to face”.

⁶⁸ See also KURT FLASCH, *Augustin. Einführung in sein Denken*, Stuttgart, 1980, Philipp Reclam jun, p. 135, p. 128, *apud* NICO NUYENS, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁶⁹ *cf.* H. KUHN, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

⁷⁰ HENRY CHADWICK, *Augustin, op. cit.*, p. 80.

⁷¹ *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, I, 20.

⁷² *In Io. Ep. tr.*, VII, 10 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 237].

⁷³ *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, I, 15, 25.

General conclusions shows that one of the aspect of *human love (upward)* is that it is an *orderly love [amor ordinatus]*. For Augustine *all forms of love are derived and subordinate to God's love*, this love having a *special status [ie proton philon]*. In its true love vision is *the love for good*, Good par excellence is God. Therefore, the Augustinian view there are *three things that can be good or bad loved*, which will keep our orientation. These three things are inserted in the same order and hierarchy of goods, so love that man tends to manifest the Supreme Good, to love God⁷⁴. Thus, at Augustine are *three types of love* that differ only in the *direction of travel of power of love*: 1) *God's love for his creation*, and especially humans; 2) *people's love for God*, and 3) *human love for himself, his fellows and the world*. If first love is *downward*, the second love is *upward*, and in the third case of love *both directions combined*. But still, the combination of the two directions of love, *love motivation dominates downward* and upward movement of *amor Dei* is *subordinate*⁷⁵. Thus, *Augustine's theory of love* is seen as a part of a *pattern of right life moral* that God is conceived as a *summum bonum*, and thus *the object towards which should be directed all movements of love*. Therefore the one who loves "*properly appreciate things*" and thus has a *tidy love*. Here's how love structures the whole human existence, *the man is what it is by power of love, by hardness of love*, strength and hardness are directly proportional to the orientation of his love. *Love man defines man's position*. Only this order directs me right love. Thus, Augustine's entire ethical system is an outgrowth of this belief about *ordinata dilectio* whose echoes are present everywhere in his works.

Part IV - "A Theology" Love. (II.) Love in the vision of St. Maximus the Confessor (580-662) - follows somehow the same methodological order of love treatment as spiritual phenomenon. In the introductory section Saint Maximus the Confessor, "one of the greatest doctors and confessors of the Orthodox faith"⁷⁶, is presented as "Doctor Caritatis" in the East. *Subchapter 1.1.2. Knowledge about love points out that at St. Maximus' love occupies a place of great honor*⁷⁷, as is said especially in that two writings which are treating directly this theme – The heads about love and epistle 2 (*About agapic love*)⁷⁸. That's why the task of this thesis is to gather and organize them in a systematic presentation and in this first study to substantiate and argue on the force main lines of doctrine of love of St. Maximus, title of "doctor charitatis". In **Subsection 1.1.2.1. Love in the thoughtfulness and works of St. Maximus the Confessor** it is emphasized that in maximum thought the aspects and dimention of fundamental love like „its trinitarian rootedness, its Christological concretization, its

⁷⁴ DIAC. IOAN I IC JR, *Vladimir Lossky i vederea lui Dumnezeu*, introd. Study at VLADIMIR LOSSKY, *Vederea lui Dumnezeu*, trad. Maria-Cornelia Oros, Editura Deisis, Sibiu, 1995, pp. 62–63.

⁷⁵ A se vedea HELMUT KUHN, „Liebe”, *Geschichte eines Begriffs*, München, 1975, Kösel Verlag, p. 81.

⁷⁶ JEAN-CLAUDE LARCHET, *Sfântul Maxim Mrturitorul, mediator între R s rit i Apus*, Colecția Patristica, seria Studii, nr. 1, Editura Doxologia, Ia i, 2010, p. 16.

⁷⁷ JEAN-CLAUDE LARCHET, *Sfântul Maxim Mrturitorul. O introducere...*, p. 233.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*.

sacramental foundation, baptismal and eucharistic and especially its ecclesial dimensions a mystery of unification and humanity fellowship through stigmatize (the birth of) people through grace, faith, mystery, from God the Father in Christ through the Holy Spirit, don't appear or are mentioned [in the two writings mentioned above, n.n.] than by simple implicit allusions and symbolic biblical references. They are found scattered in almost all the works of St. Maximus (who abundantly deserves the title of doctor charitatis through excellence of the Orthodox Church) from the Ascetic word and the 400 heads of love to the Lord's Prayer and Mystagogy comment until process Acts that would take him to the ultimate existential confession of love for God and man: love of enemies accepted as martyrdom⁷⁹, the act that would define St. Maximus as "one of the largest and profound theologians Church ever had, and confessed that defended the right teaching of the right- magnifying Church"⁸⁰. In this aspect it should be noted that in a way that only God knows, love was decisive in shaping the personality profile and theological monk Maxim, she tutelated and marking the beginning and throughout life and work. *Subchapter Theological actuality* emphasizes love as St. Maximus enjoyed Byzantine and post-Byzantine world of great authority⁸¹. This shows his constant actuality. If our theme, the importance and timeless message of a "theology of love" aimed especially if St. Maximus the Confessor two directions: 1) grand vision on love feast recovery *factor of unity of humanity in free communion identity of thought and will*, based on *ontological intentionality originating entered into human nature*, and 2) the overwhelming eastern theology of work maximienne requiring recovery and knowledge of all its pages more or less traffic. Starting from here, this study assumes a duty to prove that St. Maximus the richly deserves the title of „Doctor Caritatis” of the Eastern Church, demonstration we want to support with arguments based on the doctrine about the founded love traced in his thoughtfulness, his works and his life exemplified by itself, clearly visible incarnation and best done in *agapic love* - by God and people.

The second section, Love Theology at Saint Maximus the Confessor begins with the head. 2.1. "God is love". Love and Holy Trinity. As Pr. Prof. John I. Ica Jr., noticed "indeed maximian Trinitarian theology is sending a different message than the Western Trinitarian theology. Faithful patristic tradition, she avoided to engage in risky and unnecessary speculation on analog Trinitarian mystery, preferring to highlight the concrete realization of ascetic analog-ontological structures of this mystery in everyday practice. That is so in the Liturgy and in *Our Father* mystical contemplation "teleology" is completed in daily asceticism and concrete love of the poor (*Mystagogia*, 24, 713AC), or the love of our fellows were wrong to us (*Pater*, 877D-880A). Ultimate and infallible criterion of the Christian

⁷⁹ Cf. diac. IOAN I. IC JR, *op. cit.*, p. 47–48.

⁸⁰ IOAN I. IC (SN), *op. cit.*, p. 71.

⁸¹ About this aspect see J.-CL. LARCHET, *Sfântul Maxim M rturitorul. O introducecere...*, p. 269–276; IDEM, *Maxime le Confesseur, médiateur entre Orient et l Occident*, Paris, 1998, p. 14.

God "visible" in the world. God in His nature / ad enter but by attributes / His energies / ad extra - through goodness (love) and His wisdom - is shared rational beings⁸⁷. But as rational beings "were there in attendance and grace" and kindness / love and wisdom as capability, God has by himself "as one who is the very existence of the very goodness [$\text{Ὁ μὲν ὁ ἴσθις ὁ ἴσθις}$] and wisdom itself, speaking even more true above all"⁸⁸. That God is love, St. Maximus is proving truly on deification which can only be the fruit of divine energy work, in other words of grace⁸⁹. In conclusion, God's love to the world St. Maximus describes it in terms of God's *mad love* that "by His incarnation, He *seeks us every day, until he will catch us all and he will bring salvation as He did with Pavel*"⁹⁰.

Cap. 3.3. Love in the 3 stages of spiritual life begins with **Subsection 3.3.1. The commandment of love** showing that although the commandments, that they might be saved through them "every man ... should take all that the Lord commanded [...] knowing that it is not possible to bring human salvation only one of them, apart from other..."⁹¹, however, although there are many they are included in the commandment of love. "The one who strives to keep this word reaches all the commandments"⁹². In this sense the *Liber asceticus* [*The Ascetic Word*] 2 St. Maximus will say that love is the commandment of the Lord. Furthermore, all other commands are stored when the commandment of love is fulfilled because *all commands are summarized in love* are fulfilled by herand by the ones who fulfil love commandment and all the other commandments. Therefore in the vision of St. Maximus there is no commandment greater than that of love: to love God and our brother remains permanently a high calling and the purpose of every human being. The section ends with **3.3.2. Role in the 3 stages of spiritual love.**

Cap. 3.4. Love and thinking faculties of the soul underlines that in St. Maximus thoughtfulness the relationship between love and faculties of the human soul (relationship evoked by frequent references found in his work more than any of the Fathers) occupies a special place in defining and understanding the spiritual life. **Subchapter 3.4.1. The faculties of the soul as elements of psychology maximienne** and **3.4.2. The role of love in the functioning faculties of the soul** are meant to show that all this love painting has an exceptional role: if the ethical perspective, as a way of life [*tropos hypárxeos*] as rational human nature, love [] Maximian vision is the sum of all virtues [*areta*], in psychological terms - through the same virtues employed in altruistic sense - she is essentially nothing more than how to use [*tropos chréseos*] according to the flesh [*kata phýsin*] (or as

⁸⁷ *Car.* III, 24

⁸⁸ *Car.* III, 27.

⁸⁹ *Amb.* 7; 25; 66; 8.

⁹⁰ *Car.* III, 2.

⁹¹ *Asc.*, 2 [*FR* 2, p. 26–27].

⁹² *Asc.*, 6 [*FR* 2, p. 28].

rational nature) of powers [*dynameis*] or human psychic faculties / human nature to union with God, with others and with the whole created nature. In other words, how to use [*Tropos chréseos*] as rational faculties of human nature targeted by nature of love envisages ultimately union with God⁹³. In **3.4.3. *Conclusions***, is underlining how *natural faculties* are conditioned by ancient sin, which by themselves are not guilty and bad but are still likely to become so in a *bad usage*⁹⁴, they need to be converted into good. In this double virtue of love of God and our brothers plays an important role St. Maximus vision since it is the greatest virtue, end and summit of all virtues, "*the most general of virtues*" containing set them all and being the end or their end⁹⁵..

Cap. 3.5. Treats Philautia - love "bad / selfish" self. Compared to good self-love a virtuous form of philautieii about which we will talk about below, philautia as fervour is a perversion of the proper *self-love*, and is in "egocentrism" in a negative sense of the word, ie in self selfish love, self love fall, alienated from God and toward the material world, leading a life completely bodily, and not a spiritual one. For this last reason, phlautia is generally defined as bodily love or passionate love to the body and to "bending his sinful". The main idea is that diverts philautia nature of her vocation planted by God in her mental faculties through abuse. In ***Subsection 3.5.1. Bad self-love -, mother of all passions*** 3.5.2. ***Filautia: definitions***, 3.5.3. ***Filautia and fervour hierarchy (catalog)*** are treated as many aspects of *philautieii*. ***Subchapter 3.5.4. The mechanism of manifestation of philautieii*** stresses that St. Maximus recognizes masterly in *Ep. 2* how philautia is the origin of man's fall, fall first produced in the soul (at the suggestion of the devil) from *Agape to Philautia* through mental faculties abuse whose finality was breaking communion with God and humanity split unit⁹⁶. In conclusion, the work stands philautieii that arming the gnome unnatural to split it into thousands of pieces⁹⁷.

Subchapter 3.5.5. Agape the opposite of Philautieii shows that "the recovery powers of the soul according to the flesh God in His providence intervened, first by the commandments contained in the written law of the Old Testament, but *full restoration* was achieved only by Incarnation Economy, Temptation and Passion of Incarnate Word of God, who exceeded their perverse and irrational instituted through *philaut a* and renewed strength in himself Love Feast has performed it in His human nature exemplary in all three directions indicated by reason of nature: to God, to sow and to the world, claiming it as the law of grace men by the threefold commandment of love [*Mt 22, 37-39 sq.*]. In this way, the modality in which *Agape* was restored and renewed in Christ cures the human nature "hostile of self-love". So *Agape* was performed first in Christ and then in saints (of which Abraham is given as a first example), is

⁹³ Cf. i *Ep.*, 2, PG 91, 396B 5 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 52]. Cf. i *Car.*, III, 3, PG 90, 1017C; *FR 2*, p. 102)..

⁹⁴ Cf. *Thal.*, 27.

⁹⁵ *Amb. Io.*, 83 [*PSB 80*]; *Thal.*, 40 [*FR 3*, p.167]; *Thal.*, 54 [*FR 3*, p. 269].

⁹⁶ *Ep. 2*, PG 91, 396D 6—397B 9 [*trad. rom. cit.*, p. 53].

⁹⁷ *Ep 2, 3*, PG 91, 408D 5—409D.

considered by restoring the fullness of Natural Law indoor unit cleaved human passions and restoring the unity of nature. It thus unites the virtues reason gnome with nature, by which it unites with God the Creator reason that manifests through her⁹⁸..

3.5.6. Double size philautiei: lust of the flesh or / and pride clarify what *philautia* is in its essence in the opinion of St. Maximus opinion? It seems that in maximian vision (and not only), the entire set of vices is involved in the self love being her work. Irrational affection for the body, which primarily is philautia leads to other vices whose end is pride. We can thus conclude that St. Maximus, in the development of philautia design, strongly emphasizes both primary attachment to the body and vice great impact on the lives of fallen man's pride.

From the above analysis we see that one (human nature) and multiple (soul powers) are from only St. Maximus point of view contrary to one another only in the perspective of sin

Thus neither the body nor the senses or passional faculties in themselves bad but only their bad usage. In this way, *Car.*, III, 8 self-love [*philautia*] is defined as "passionate and irrational love of the body [$\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon} \acute{\iota} \acute{\eta} \acute{\omicron} \acute{\omicron} \acute{\omega}\mu \acute{\epsilon}\mu \acute{\eta} \acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\iota} \cdot \acute{\eta} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}$ $\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon} \acute{\alpha} \cdot \acute{\omicron} \acute{\epsilon} \acute{\eta} \acute{\iota} , \acute{\eta} \acute{\omicron} \acute{\epsilon} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}$]" because the body itself not bad, but because the attachment to the human body to prevent total commitment for his vocation: the deification [*theosis*]. This *sub path. 3.5.7. "Good" self-love* symboliezes that St. Maximus accepts a good self-love because "no one, says the Apostle, not hated his own body" but "it harness and drags him enslaved", not giving them nothing besides food and clothing, and of these only as much is necessary to live. Like this someone loves his body dispassionately [$\acute{\upsilon} \acute{\upsilon} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\omega} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha} \acute{\upsilon}$] and feeds him as a servant of the divine [$\acute{\omega} \acute{\upsilon} \acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\epsilon} \acute{\upsilon}$] and is warming him with only what she fulfilled the necessary"⁹⁹. If this is however St. Maximus conviction o course we will expect an understanding form him for the philautiei in a positive way involved in true love (good) self to achieve its deification. Thus, regarding its origin, you should know that there is a virtuous filautie form, which is the nature of man, mentioned by Christ when he talks about the first commandment - "to love your brother as yourself" [*Mt* 19, 19; 23.39; *Lk* 10, 27], and that is to love yourself as you creature of God, created in His image, so to love God and to love God in you. And indeed, in the Prologue Responses to Chips encounter this kind of self-love that St. Maximus called it *self-love spiritual* [*noera*] which is a natural condition of the mind which is the attachment to its goal and deifying such affection is free from the body and to this world. It is raised high above the search sinful pleasure and effort to escape the pain. Its feature is to never stop loving God, searching in Him the consistency soul¹⁰⁰. **In 3.5.8. Conclusions** we underline that the dominant position given to philautiei is really striking.

⁹⁸ *PG*, 91, 397C 11—401A 16.

⁹⁹ *Car.*, III, 9 [*FR* 2, p. 103].

¹⁰⁰ *Thal. Prolog* [*FR* 3, p. 37].

In *Capita de caritate* St. Maximus develops a true theology of "falling out of love", *subject head. 3.6. Fall out of love. Subchapter 3.6.1. Fall out of love like movement from love to hate - the ultimate form of the fall* on maximiene text underlines that in essence is the true enemy of love is hate. In this way, *Car.*, IV, provides a list of passions against love that makes the man to be "separated from the love of a friend" and thus fall out of love. Moreover, if hatred and defaming are going to fall in order that love is wicked union with The Good¹⁰¹, fall out of love is also the fall of the order of providence, problem addressed in **3.6.2. Falling out of love is the fall of the order of providence.** In **3.6.3. Conclusions** are listed ways to achieve that fall out of love and how it results in alienation of eternal life.

In *chapter 3.7* is outlined where stays *The sign of perfection in love: to love all people equally.* Heads about love is doing the most bluntly and frequent statements about that perfect love of brothers means to behave as any man, no matter who or what he is. "Happy is the man who can love all men the same" [*Car.*, I, 17]. This is a conclusion and also a elegy at rare places (but very clear ones) where St. Maximus supports the argument that the sign of perfection in love is to love all men equally. Therefore, since God loves everyone equally, just as the disciples are called to love and love for two reasons - some to virtue, others in compassion (*cf. Car.*, I, 25). About this perfect love in the end located atop the hierarchy of spiritual life speaks *Car.*, IV, 95 where we get the urge to love all men as ["from the bottom of our heart"] but the trust instand we should give it only to God the one we must serve for "with all the strength." The specifics of this perfect love is made of two features / attributes of authentic love: universal / non-discrimination and the eternity of love) as *Car.*, IV, 98 - to love everyone with your heart (honest / sincer / neduplicitar and disinterested) and to have an "uninterrupted love till the end" [$\mu \quad \tilde{\eta} \acute{\alpha}$]. Thus, from the end of the text turns out that **the true face of love - to love "as all"** – imitatates the love of the Lord who "showing his love toward us, suffered for all mankind and all it has given them the same hope of resurrection even if the latter hang on every make himself worthy to be praise or sorrows"(*ibidem*). Therefore our love is the face of love of the Son. It is "*The Love of Love*". For her sake - how St. Maximus gives a hint- we are called to deny passions that make us lovers of themselves, ignorant of God and haters of people. The next two **sucap. – 3.7.1. Love all men alike as the imitation of God's love for people** and **3.7.2. The loveof all men as equality and like honor [*homotimía*] the main of all people without distinction based on the common reason of being human nature** - are highlighted the dimensions that are staying at the base of this love. **Subchapter 3.7.3. Peak / perfection of love: love of enemies**

¹⁰¹ *Cf. Car.*, IV, 90 [*FR* 2, p. 141].

underlines that the acid test of purity / perfecting our love is love for our enemies which is possible only if we set us free from passions; without this detachment we are not truly free¹⁰².

Chapter 3.8. The double commandment of love begins with **3.8.1. The close relationship between love of God and love of our kind: a) The one who loves God loves his brother too b) The one who does not love his brother, doesn't love God either.** We can observe in Maximian visio that the two commandments are interrelated because the love of God includes / requires / pretends love of brother while although the one who loves shows pleasure lack for passion / contempt and at the same time jealousy absence for our already done good¹⁰³. We see therefore the love of the sinner and hate / contempt of his passions. **Sin in love occurs when hatred aimed passions is transferred to the sinner.** In this situation hate is not only a proof of lack of love of your brother but hatred is a sign of no love for our God because the love for God doesn't suffer in the least hatred of man"¹⁰⁴. Thus, if the one who loves God can not help but love him and his brother, in other texts St. Maximus goes on with the explaining of double commandment of love and assert the reverse, respectively the one who doesn't love his brother he can't love God (see also *I In 4, 8*). More specifically, *Car. I, 16* St. Maximus links the love of God to the achievement of the commandment of loving your brother. In **Subsection 3.8.2. The purpose of the double commandment of love** as outlined in the *Car. IV, 56* shows that the purpose of the commandments is the love of God and our kind that gives rise to knowledge and the *Car. IV, 75* we find that *the 2 loves-the love for God and for our brother – are healing the two faculties of the soul - lust and anger.* In the following chapter are listed other dimensions of love: **3.8.3. The reasons for loving our brother** (the *Car. II, 9* St. Maximus emphasizes the 5 reasons for loving our brother from which results a threefold love - one worthy of praise, one middle and one passionate), **3.8.4. Specific of loving God**, **3.8.5. Specific of loving our brother**, **3.8.6. Self-love [Philautia] - obstacle in reaching double commandment of love**, **3.8.7. Fall out of love for God and our kind**, **3.8.8. Brother-love relationship patience - fall out of love for God through hatred. Love - order Providence.**

Cap. 3.9. Fear or / and love of God presents how St. Maximus understands man's relationship with God. After **3.9.1. Introduction** are presented the following aspects: **3.9.2. Place of fear and love in the Maximian hierarchy of virtues**, **3.9.2.1. The role of fear and love in the three spiritual stages**, **3.9.2.2. Place of fear in the Maximian psychology**, **3.9.2.3. Fear birth** **3.9.2.4. Love birth**, **3.9.3 Two fears / concerns.** The section ends with **3.9.4. Conclusion: fear / reverence and love** which underlines that on the evolutionary ladder stages of the spiritual life, fear precedes love, the latter being born the first or being the product / height of all the virtues, also including fear. Thus St. Maximus speaks of a double

¹⁰² A. LOUTH, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

¹⁰³ *Car. I, 13.*

¹⁰⁴ *Car. I, 15.*

fear, or rather about *two kinds / types of fear*: a fear stemming from beginners specific sorrows and bear other virtues but disappears at a time of perfect love being disbanded, and the second [fear] which accompanies or is "Forever together with love" and keeps in soul "shyness piety" unmaking him afraid of torment. Another idea is that the fear is not bad in itself, or rather can be good or bad by the way in which man uses. True fear of man (really good) should be the fear of death, and because St. Maximus understood death [] as proper separation of God [ὁ ἄλλοθι μὴ , cf. *Car.* 2, 93], the real fear is the fear of separation from God , fear of losing God. Finally we have the answer of the dilemma of fear and / or love? Therefore - on our dilemma - we saw that the fear of God, understood in a good way, which implies knowledge of God involved in faith and humility leads to respect - which is a form of piety, virtue rational faculty - and in end must be associated with love. And not anyway, but under the tutelage of freedom because love does not take away the freedom of the beloved, but strengthens him because the one who loves wants to be loved in his turn freely¹⁰⁵. That's way, in this ethos of freedom in the relationship between two people - man-God - fear and love should be stored simultaneously [a *theology of balance*]. No fear without love [distancing, denial, hatred] but insensitive love without fear of respect / reverence [disregard, vulgarity, ignorance, boldness to manipulate him that pote not be handled]¹⁰⁶. This kind of divine pedagogy visible in the spiritual evolution of the fear of suffering the true fear understood as "shyness piety" which company he keeps in eternal love and good enrich (according to reason) of all elements of human psychology compound to deification.

Cap. 3.10. Faith, hope, love refers to the relationship between all three theological virtues. The maximian vision of love that she possesses both faith and hope, but in the same time remains permanently end [*telos*] their ultimate peak of all the good and all good cause (cf. *Ep.* 2). **Sub path. 3.10.1. Faith-love relationship** emphasizes that the two virtues are one at the beginning (*foundation*) spiritual life (*faith*) and the other at the end of it as the culmination and summary of all virtues (*love*), which are the two braces that contain within them the entire ascent of man to God. **In 3.10.2. Hope-love relationship** is shown as if hope St. Maxim adopt a different attitude from that of Evagrius. The last one "sees its function in terms of insurance and confirmations, Maxim puts the hope on a higher level, as power [*fortitudo*] of the other two. This means that the three virtues "theological" are forming a kind of divine triad, the hope is situated in the middle. All of them are alike stars in supreme

¹⁰⁵ Pr. Dumitru St niloae, *nota* 344, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

¹⁰⁶ A penetrating excursus on fear (p. 203-207) gives us Andrei Ple u in his latest book *Parabolele lui Iisus. Adev rul ca poveste* [ed. Humanitas, Bucure ti, 2012, 314 p.] (acording ARHID. PROF. DR. IOAN I. IC JR, *O fenomenologie a parabolilor i a Împ r iei în lectura reflexiv a lui Andrei Ple u i lec iile ei teologice*, în *Revista Teologic* , 1/2013).

configuration"¹⁰⁷. In *Car.*, IV, 95 we observe that if love should be targeted towards people and not only to God (as the double commandment of love), in change the hope should be put only in God: "*Let every man love from the soul, but to us we hope in God and to serve Him in all power*". In *sub path. 3.10.3. Conclusion: The superiority of love* we show how on the text of *1 Co* 13, 13 St. Maximus affirms the primacy of love in relation to other virtues "theological" and the *Car.*, III, 100 superiority of love is presented by one of the attributes / qualities of love: *Eternity love* which "remains forever" while faith and hope "are only for one season"¹⁰⁸.

3.11. Love and knowledge is the chap. where they treat the relationship between the two elements in the maximian vision. Far from being obsolete and abolished surpasses knowledge not love nor abolished but no further enlivens: *knowledge intensifies love*. From this point of view, St. Maximus place safety love above knowledge¹⁰⁹ cf. *Car.*, II, 25 where we find out that faith payment is knowledge, which in its turn nurtures love for God (as a fruit of the three stages of spiritual life)¹¹⁰. In general we might say that Maxim emphasizes- according to tradition of Evagrius - character "gnostic" of man's desire for God. At the same time, he points out that it is *love which leads man to true knowledge and enlightenment*, and that never can be completed human knowledge of God, because what God is in himself remains incomprehensible to man. Only God by giving to Him the pure man's wish in perfect love, which is expressed through a kind of ecstasy (ekstasis - man out of himself or beyond itself), unites man with God fully¹¹¹. In conclusion, love and knowledge are going hand in hand and are mutually interrelated and influence and love nourishes man's body by charity, so it feeds the soul through knowledge.

Cap. 3.12. Love and deification begins with *3.12.1. The possibility of deification through love only on the foundation of practical life* which shows that after St. Maximus, exists a deification that occurs through love [*agape*] only on the basics of practical life. So now we can see immediately what St. Maximus is calling deification is not restricted to "stage" the highest spiritual perfection - theology. Or, rather, because deification already occurs in practical life, and it should be considered the highest form of perfection and that there is a fixed chronological order between the elements in the scheme of spiritual development at St. Maximus. In conclusion, the St. Maxim; not all Christians must go through the same stages. *Sub path. 3.12.2. Deification as ecstatic output of loving oneself and moving towards God* emphasizes that although the nature tends towards deification, it's unable to achieve it because it is above and beyond our

¹⁰⁷ Cf. i LARS THUNBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

¹⁰⁸ *FR* 2, p. 123–124.

¹⁰⁹ *Amb.* 13 [*PSB* 80, p. 113].

¹¹⁰ *FR* 2, p. 84.

¹¹¹ About this teme see L. THUNBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 432–454.

possibilities¹¹²: it is the outworking of divine energies , free gift of grace¹¹³; if man possesses by nature natural powers to feel it, this is due more to God working in nature and not for human¹¹⁴. This means that the deification involves ecstasy, an escape from self to God in a movement of love¹¹⁵; out of himself possible by giving perfect mystic natural activities of all its powers, particularly the will and *nous* community, and in total teaching about this works of divine energy which it's link with this unites¹¹⁶. Thus deification - the output of ecstatic loving self and move toward God - is the work of love for "agape is the end [telos] all good as one that leads and directs those who walk within it to God, the supreme summit of all good and all good cause"¹¹⁷. **3.12.3. Love as a paradigm of God and human deification** presents the development of an maximienne original and paradoxical idea that when man becomes virtuous - the practice of virtue - not only that he become like God, he will be God, and the man becomes a paradigm of God. This idea is an implicit reference to the Incarnation of the Word, through which He takes the image of man; it also establishes a correspondence between virtues acquired by the faithful and the divine attributes; Finally, evokes a perichoresis between human and divine properties, virtuous committed believer that the two natures of Christ¹¹⁸. This process clearly expresses St. Maximus the notion of "relational communication" [] that the properties and the appointments of the united pass from one to another, based on the principle tantum-quantum man is through love God as God of love became man¹¹⁹. Last sub **path. 3.12.4. Passion movement loving and ecstatic rapture of mind by knowing divine love** that emphasizes on the role of love in the process of deification, it is specific to Saint Maximus that emphasizes some elements that allow it to be more radical than Evagrius in this topic. He underlines that such *Capita de caritate* for example that mind kidnapping is made in love, especially love the looks like desire, and that mind, in this "journey" founds the divine treasure and no longer feels neither himself nor any thing some. Thus we have the schema: *understanding, love, movement* (positive direction given by St. Maximus movement) which presents that the movement is not blind, St. Maxim is recognizing that love has a fervour character.

The penultimate **chapter. 3.13. Qualities / characteristics of love** treats aspects as: **3.13.1. The object / objects of love** (in the *Car.*, 3, 10 St. Maximus says that love branches depending on the beloved object (people, God flesh), whence the effects of love, **3.13.2. Nature and characteristics of love, 3.13. 2.1. the definitions of love, 3.13.2.2. Characteristics of perfect love**. Genuine is the quality of love is to make present in the absence the beloved one because

¹¹² *Vezi Thal.*, 61 [FR 3, p. 339–340].

¹¹³ *Cf. Thal.*, 13; 22; 40; 63 i 22.

¹¹⁴ *Amb. Io.*, 82 [PSB 80, p. 210–212].

¹¹⁵ *Amb. Io.*, 7; 29; 82.

¹¹⁶ *Amb. Io.*, 7 [PSB 80, p. 74–78].

¹¹⁷ *Ep.*, 2, PG 91, 396B 5 [trad. rom. cit., p. 52].

¹¹⁸ J. –C. LARCHET, *Sfântul Maxim Mrturitorul. O introduce...*, p. 232.

¹¹⁹ *Cf. Ep.*, 2.

Christ "planted in people as light Agape love law, that those who know how to properly care for Agape Love seeds never be absents on each other, even if they were physically separated from one another by a great distance in space"¹²⁰. Thus *Ep.* 22-23 "sketches, despite its brevity and their personal milestones of true theology communication and written and spoken word, a sign of divine image in man, as in Agape mediation the real spiritual presence of people communicating in agape spiritual, and as such an existential or tropos strengthening and unifying nature (humanity) the spiritual union of people despite their spatial distances apart"¹²¹. Other dimensions are mentioned in sub path of love. Next: **3.13.3. *What does it mean to love authentic / real God*, 3.13.4. *What does it mean to love authentic / real people*, 3.13.5. *What does it mean to love authentic / real ourselves*, 3.13.6. *The superiority of love*, 3.13.7. *Sign perfection in love and its specificity*.**

The thesis concludes with ***final conclusions - Love to St. Augustine and St. Maximus the Confessor (similarities and differences)***. This - outline of a future case study of a confrontation of two visions of love - which aims scoring compared to the concept of love in the thought of the two Holy Fathers and has the fore analyzing doctrine / vision related to each of the two authors of the love of God, neighbor and self love (and the world) and thus searching for points of intersection and divergence.

¹²⁰ *Ep.* 43 (24), PG 91, 637B [trad. rom. cit., p. 72].

¹²¹ Cf. IOAN I. ICĂR in „SF. MAXIM MARTURISITORUL, *Epistole de morală și spiritualitate* (*Ep.* 22–23, 32–39, 9), *Prezentare și traducere*”, *Mitropolia Ardealului*, 30, 1985, 11–12, p. 744.