

DORU NASTASĂ

**THE TESTIMONY OF GRACE
AND COMMUNION**

IN ORTHODOXY
PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICISM

DORU NASTASĂ

THE TESTIMONY OF GRACE AND COMMUNION

IN ORTHODOXY
PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICISM

"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism"

Electronic Version

Translated using Google Translate

*Please consider the limitations and check
the original text where translation is not clear*

2022

© Doru Nastaă

<https://www.unitateortodoxa.ro>

CONTENT

| | |
|---|-----------|
| A word before | 9 |
| | |
| I. Testimonies of Christian denominations for communion and grace | 11 |
| 1. About mysticism and the supernatural, legitimate and illegitimate | 11 |
| 2. The testimony of confessions | 19 |
| Protestant Testimony | 19 |
| Catholic testimony | 30 |
| Orthodox testimony | 48 |
| | |
| II. What is <i>Grace</i>? <i>The Uncreated-Created Grace Argument in</i> | 67 |
| <i>Orthodoxy and Catholicism</i> | 67 |
| 1. Introduction | 67 |
| <i>Structuring the argument</i> in the discussion of grace..... | 67 |
| God's sharing of Himself in grace..... | 83 |
| What is <i>Grace</i> ?..... | 85 |
| 2. <i>The first step of the argument</i> : starting point, premises | 88 |
| The categories of information we have about grace..... | 88 |
| The Informational Premises and Missing Information in the | |
| Catholic Harian Thesis..... | 91 |
| <i>The criterion of the necessity of principled unity</i> , of the existence | |
| of a "shared uncreated essence" , coming from the model of | |
| intratrinitarian union in essence. <i>The principle of union</i> , | |
| announced in <i>the pattern of unity of divinity</i> with humanity | 121 |
| construction in the Catholic thesis of a position for divinity, | |
| transforming the simplicity of the divine Being into existential | |
| isolation. The Catholic Syllogism of " <i>Isolation</i> " | 128 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 3. <i>The second step of the argument: building the argument</i> | 143 |
| How are the Orthodox and Catholic arguments for the theology of <i>uncreated grace constructed?</i> | 143 |
| 4. <i>The third step of the argument</i> : theological consequences | 161 |
| The connection of grace with the Hypostases of the Trinity | 161 |
| Catholic created grace becomes a <i>spiritual matter</i> that is called divinity, <i>without a principle of connection with divinity</i> | 166 |
| <i>Neo-Arianism</i> , consequence of created grace | 184 |
| 5. How should a theology of grace be constructed? | 192 |
| 6. Conclusions. The impact of Saint Gregory Palamas' thesis on Catholicism..... | 205 |
| | |
| III. How are <i>Grace</i> and <i>Communion</i> in denominations? | 211 |
| 1. The experience of grace in the Church | 211 |
| Introduction..... | 211 |
| The experience of the Church is the experience of Tabor, of the Transfiguration, of the Change and enlightenment of man through Christ | 222 |
| Grace, real experience, felt, realized. Elevation of nature and inner transformation into grace | 231 |
| Communion with the other world, with God's saints..... | 255 |
| 2. work pseudograce in unorthodox confessions..... | 259 |
| Catholicism does not have an experience of grace | 266 |
| The Protestant Presumption of the Holy Spirit | 267 |
| The Protestant model of communion..... | 275 |
| The clarity brought by the Holy Spirit cannot be found in the theology and prophecies of any other denomination..... | 284 |
| 3. Validating the experience of communion and grace | 288 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Demonic Deception . The mysticism of demonic hallucinations..... | 292 |
| Catholic pious mysticism, an example of mistaken mysticism | 309 |
| theology and false mysticism in Protestantism | 312 |
| 4. conclusions | 326 |
| | |
| IV. God is light..... | 337 |
| | |
| Bibliography | 345 |

A WORD BEFORE

The theologian Dumitru Stăniloae, in his work *Life and teaching of Saint Gregory Palamas*, speaking about Treatise III of the First Triad, shows in the Saint's teaching (p. 323) this importance of understanding the work of grace :

" Saying something about God and being with God are not the same thing. But to acquire God in us and to spend in purity with Him, and to mingle with the most pure light, as far as human nature can, is impossible if, in addition to purification by virtue, we do not come out of ourselves or , rather , we do not rise above ourselves (...). Thus we enter the ignorance that is above knowledge, and we are filled in it with the all-shining splendor of the Spirit, coming to look unseen at the goods of the immortal world."

St. Gregory Palamas directs theologically very precisely how the problem of communion, of grace, of finding the theological direction in communion with divinity, in the correct validation of this experience, should be approached. This point, the difference between the theoretical discourse about divinity and accessibility, is a fundamental one in the actual understanding of the proposals of the cults. Saint Gregory Palamas shows in his theology the difference between discourse about God and authentic communion. In the pages of the mentioned work, the testimony of the taboric communion and the experience of light are easily found, as foundations for authentic theological discourse. These are always the fundamental elements of theological logic, recognized and shown by the theologians of the Church, kept as fundamental elements, in which the entire cultic experience, the communion, is verified and validated .

The volume deals with the fundamental point in the interdenominational discussion of the theology of grace, that of uncreated character (created, in other denominations). I have dealt only with this point, considering it to be the fundamental point in this

discussion, the rest being consequences related to it.

Likewise, the volume brings a discussion about the specific testimony of Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Protestantism regarding grace and communion. In order to be able to discuss grace and communion, these two directions must be explored, the discussion of uncreated grace (created, in Catholicism) and the typologies of witness to grace and communion, found in confessions.

Doru Nastasa

Bucharest, 2022

I. TESTIMONIES OF CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS FOR COMMUNION AND GRACE

1. ABOUT MYSTICISM AND THE SUPERNATURAL, LEGITIMATE AND ILLEGITIMATE

The testimony of the communion can be seen and it is necessary to be discussed on the basis of the own testimony of each cult, found in its books, which should provide a unitary image and clearly show the communion and the grace witness of the cult. It is important to see, for each individual cult, what is the specific of the testimony, without it any discussion on the subject is outside the testimony of the cult and the objective reality. It is also important to be able to see, comparatively, all these cultic testimonies, to identify the specifics of each and to be able to compare them.

This section contains some extracts, for each Christian denomination, from several books of the cults, for the testimony of their communion and grace, as testified by each cult. There are enough passages for each testimony, so that a unified picture of each testimony can be formed, for more references you can refer to the bibliography mentioned at the end of the book.

Before presenting for each cult the specific testimony, I add some considerations that must be followed in the chapter, being important in the context of the discussion about communion and grace. The Protestant and Catholic communities have no experience in the communion with the other world, of the *spirits*, and they fail to correctly identify the mysticism of the spirits neither in their own cult, nor in other cults. From here, the innumerable errors made by both communities in the acceptance, in the body of the community, of various experiences, which are not legitimate in fact, pass in

their entirety as genuine mysticism, in Catholicism the whole experience of " the saints " post-Exodus (post-Schism), and in Protestantism the experience of " spirits " by the whole community. Both experiences (Protestant and Catholic) have as their foundation the " *voices* " (spirits) without identity, who do not discover who they are (found below in both experiences) and continuously dictate, to the Protestant community, in its entirety, and to the Catholic community, through the saints, the way to follow.

This experience of hidden *voices* (spirits), experienced by both communities, is equally serious. Unfortunately, for the Protestant community , it fully followed the advice and the way of the voices, after the break from Catholicism. Catholicism was already into this mystique of voices, with the Catholic community adopting, after the Schism, these voices and their mystique as the new mystique, through the new Catholic saints (throughout their post-Schism Catholic millennium, found below). They are all guided identically , like all Protestantism , by " voices " (spirits) and the so - called *powers of voices* . For Protestants, however, a new mystique was created, fully anchored in the experience of voices . This is a point of fall for both communities, a complete fall for the Protestant one, and a break from authentic communion for the Catholic one. Fortunately for the Catholic community , it still has much of the right teaching that keeps it from total fall .

The problem of the voices in the cults is that only they appear in the respective cults (as testimony of the communion) . God's camp discovery is not seen. Voices (spirits) that cannot show themselves, reveal themselves, refuse to reveal their identity, never show themselves, and draw believers into new ways to God (new confessions). Genuine revelation of God is always pure, all divine revelations are always clear. Protestant and Catholic voices are always hidden . This testimony is right in front of everyone, in the historical testimony of every community, of every cult; it just needs to be checked and understood correctly.

In theology, one must always see what spirits are at work in the community of worship and in the witness of the community. Believers only look at the big public events of the cults , trying to somehow anchor them in the experience of God, but they forget that *the Spirit* and *spirits* are constantly at work , especially where there is or is a desire for communion with God.

Without verifying the identity and authenticity of the (spiritual) experience, nothing is accepted in the Church (although in other cults this illegitimate supernatural is immediately legitimized and assumed as authentic, thus resulting in countless "*discoveries*", "*returns*" and the like). Verifying the identity and authenticity of experiences has a foundation in Scripture and beyond; Christ Himself shows that it must be done right, because it is a fundamental problem of this kind of experiences; in the same way, both the typology of appearance and problems (angels of light, false prophets), but also the verification mechanisms are explained by Christ in the Gospel: for spirits, triune worship and the confession of worship to the living God, and for man, listening to the Church and those in the light.

If in the Protestant and Catholic religions it were a single isolated case mistakenly believed to be the " voice " of God , we could be talking about a misunderstanding of an experience. But the evidence is overwhelming and the entire experience of the Protestant community and the experience of the post-Schism Catholic saints is built on this self-evident, unitary, undisputed identity of post-Schism Protestant and Catholic mysticism. The sanctity and legitimacy of Catholic holiness and Protestant experience come from these voices (and the testimony of their work), which are supposed to be communion with God. The Protestant and Catholic testimonies are not similar to the Orthodox one, of the discovery of the taboric light and the taboric meeting with God, which should be a constant of holiness , experiencing and knowing God throughout the worship (see the entirety of this experience in the lives of the

pious Joseph Hesychast and Paisius the Aghirite , but also of all the Orthodox saints).

These voices are also historically found in idols, in oracles, in many other ancient forms of idolatry and idol worship. Voices appear historically in all kinds of forms, to teach man " new things and new ways to God ", in the form of angelic apparitions in other cults, who discover new " sacred texts " and " returns to God " . Voices always appear in history to create " new ways to God ", under various simplistic motivations, creating new cults, new derivative confessions, which carry the legitimacy of " hidden voices " and the whole mysticism created by them.

The voices from the old idolatrous cults, of oracles and idols, which called for " new gods " , are now found in other forms, in new religions. These are the voices of the spirits of history, who are not God, and who break the way to God, as they have continually done throughout history, to divert humanity and break humanity from the way to God and from communion with He. This is the historical typology of man's fall into other ways, listening to the " voices " (and their manifestations) that pull man into other ways.

Christ says " *do not go after them* " , according to the " *many who will appear* " prophets , appearing historically in the present, at the end of the ages, in a word with historical significance, referring to this problem and historical typology of the fall. Christ teaches us that this will be a historical problem for the Church and humanity, a problem that will also test Christianity. Christ speaks to us of this historical problem and point of humanity's fall, where the voices and the Christians who listen to them attract humanity in other ways. The recognition, *mention by Christ of this historical problem and its typology of appearance* are easily seen in the historical testimonies, in many cults and confessions. It is a *divine warning* about the emergence of other ways and the fall through this typology, through deception (angels of light, but without proven identity, and false

prophets, both cases being the work of voices without identity). Orthodox mysticism is not of voices, of experiences without identity, confused, but of communion with the other world, camp, like the discoveries of Moses and Christ, like the testimonies of Scripture.

Idolatry is directly associated with voices without identity, present in various forms, in history. That is why the first commandment was to beware of idolatry, the voices of other gods (spirits), the hidden voices without identity, which draw humanity to communion and other spirits, and not to the living God. This communion is specified as illegitimate, historically mentioned as a commandment, and in the New Testament it is recalled and shown to be a historical problem again, in the *false prophets* who ask humanity to follow: *you shall have no other God*, for other gods are other spirits that are not gods. That is why this commandment is placed in the list of the Old Testament commandments, not to be in communion with other spirits. And in the New Testament, communion by identity is shown and the historical problem of false prophets is mentioned and their presence in history, in various forms, "which seem legitimate", of the misunderstood communion with other spirits, in parallel with the legitimate, historical Church.

Voices are an inconsistent typology of discovery. And from voices in history all kinds of possible discoveries have been received, in all directions. Voices are the foundation of idolatry, but also of deception. Islam is founded as a cult in voices and such mysticism. *Voices are one of the greatest problems of mysticism* and are assimilated in the Gospel by Christ to the "angels of light" who appear so believably, in many forms, in hallucinations, in deceptive visions, as voices so convincing, being angels of light even and for the experienced, illusions that dissipate at the mention of the name of Christ and the Mother of God.

Angels of light, mentioned by Christ as manifestations of deceiving spirits, are a theology of persuasion by various deceptive

methods, which may appear as light, but which are deception, always being false children of divine light and authority. Illegitimate mysticism always seeks legitimacy precisely behind light and authority, trying to copy them, but failing to do so in real terms.

legitimacy of the mysticism of cults and confessions is seen historically in the testimony of each community, in the model of communion, the discovery of communion with the other world, camp, or through voices (pseudovisions and pseudomiracles), but also the testimony of the work of grace, of light, in Christians and the community, within this communion.

The theology of the legitimacy of spiritual experiences. Discussion of grace and communion always comes with the premises of the legitimacy of the experiences presented, which must fit within the clean typology and theology of legitimate experiences. In Orthodoxy we find a systematic approach to the legitimization of these experiences, they being a millennial problem and comprehensively addressed, in countless books; in fact, all Orthodox mysticism is directly related to and continuously touches this subject, being a direct expression of the struggle between man and spirits.

Going through the Protestant and Catholic texts to see the typology and testimony of communion, I noticed great differences in the experiences confessed in each case compared to the Orthodox typology. Hoping to find a testimony only of some evidence of Christian piety, of an ordinary experience of confession of faith, but without genuine charic experience, I found something else entirely, in specific typologies. I found a strong presence of these as illegitimate mysticism.

Unfortunately, from my point of view, which is also confirmed by Orthodox mysticism, the found experiences of these cults are entirely illegitimate, there being no point at least that I can consider legitimate, as authentic evidence of communion. Because the

first step in validating experiences is analyzing the legitimacy of experiences. And after this follows the analysis of the clear evidence of communion. I expected to find a naturalness of Christian piety and evidence of participation in community life, but no charic and mystical communion.

this limit of the illegitimate supernatural, which is present in the testimonies , cannot be exceeded . A few examples of this type of supernatural and legitimization through illegitimate supernatural are added, being in fact the very ones that legitimize the communion of cults, through (illegitimate) supernatural. They override any other testimony that may be adduced for corroboration. Authentic testimonies of communion do not exist. *Only dreams, visions, voices and experiences* that cannot be legitimized in any way, but which are also experiences in a limit of the supernatural, which can only come from spirits, only spirits having this limitation in the work, only limited, in a few dimensions, with a bizarre, deformed content each time. In the case of Protestantism and Catholicism, nothing can be added as an authentic testimony of communion and grace, because the typology found (being a clear typology) is illegitimate and the limits of the specific typology are never exceeded. Therefore, the only thing I could add to the book, further, in this case, is the typology found, used by these cults to legitimize themselves, which is illegitimate in itself, but which is used for legitimization by them. In mysticism these are exactly the things you must look for, legitimate mysticism and illegitimate mysticism, voices, dreams, visions, supernatural of any kind. The testimony added below is out of necessity, in this case, being kept to a minimum compared to what can itself be added, needing to be presented.

Orthodoxy has deep analyses, in countless works, made by many Saints, throughout history, complete theological analyzes for the mysticism of spirits and for all theological problems of Christian mysticism, which can be used by anyone to clarify and debate the problems of communion, grace, but and the mysticism of spirits

and the legitimacy of spiritual experiences, within which the discussion below falls.

2. THE TESTIMONY OF CONFESSIONS

PROTESTANT TESTIMONY

Below we find some testimonies and explanations given by Protestants regarding prophets, grace, charisms , communion.

" **The Gift of Prophecy. Practical Guide** ", the work of Dr. Jack Deere , summarizes the entire Protestant path of grace, the mystical path of a pastor, the practical works, how the Protestant (holy) spirit is, how *the spirit speaks* , how it behaves, how the Protestant spirit works. It is a particularly good reference, being unitary for the entire Protestant experience , being able to be used as an expression of communion, grace, Protestant theology, the Protestant movement as a whole. In addition to this book, there are many others mentioned, which, however, do not have the capacity for synthesis, nor do they highlight the practical aspect of the Charic Protestantism and communion so well, being found in the bibliography.

The pastor relates several episodes of *his encounter with a Protestant prophet* and his conversion. After the prophet tells him some things from the past , the new pastor concludes: " The prophet has put aside the subject of my past and turned to the future. As long as these words were exclusively about the future, they, of course, could not be verified. But because he had correctly told me four essential aspects of my past and interpreted them equally well, I also believed his predictions . ¹" I no longer had any reason to maintain my facade. It was over. The prophet had told me the secrets of the heart . The prophet was true" ².

¹ Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , Succeed publishing house Publishing , Medgidia, 2010, p. 21 .

² Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , p. 22 .

The problem is that this kind of sentimental *discovery* is exclusively related to the emotional side and emotionally preys on the one in front of the prophet. All the "discoveries" made had the role of sensitizing him, he was easily brought to a maximum point of credulity for the future, which "is revealed to him abstractly, generically, prophetically", by no means precise. The prophet was a Presbyterian, in the Protestant movement being, anyway, irrelevant what denomination you are, everyone being *gifted* .

This alleged prophetic gift is explained by the pastor through his own experience, the discovery of the pastor's own gift being related by the new pastor: " Sometimes, prophetic gifts start like this. The Lord does not bother to let us know in advance. He gives us prophetic experiences, interrupting a predictable and boring religious life. He brings mystery and adventure into our lives so that we can live in the realm where all things have become new (...). Often these gifts come into our lives at conversion" ³(Personal Note: *As do spirits, when their ministry begins*) .

" testing" of gifts is recommended by the Protestant pastor to be done in the following way: " If you regularly have prophetic experiences, they indicate that you have a prophetic gift. At first, this fact may seem a little scary. You can know certain details about others without anyone telling you. You can *hear a soft voice* , you can fall into a trance, you can be taken to another place, in a vision. These experiences can make you think you've gone crazy. Of course, there is always that possibility, but *the most likely* thing is that the Lord has blessed you with a prophetic gift" ⁴ .

The pastor mentions many ways in which (he assumes) God is revealed and outlines **the theology of voices (spirits) in Protestantism** :

" The Audible Voice . Each of us would like to be guided by

³Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , p. 28.

⁴Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , p. 37.

a clearly audible voice... God still speaks by an audible voice... *Reliable and national evangelical leaders of our time* have claimed to *have had the audible voice of the Lord* , and their integrity cannot be questioned " ⁵. (Personal note: *This testimony is a confirmation by a well-known Protestant theologian of the spread of the phenomenon throughout the Protestant leadership, the Protestant religious leaders, being a widespread phenomenon and a clear typology of specific communion, only through deceptive voices, dreams and visions.*)

" The voice audible only to your ears. One may hear the voice with his own ears, and others, even if they sit near that person, may not hear this voice speaking. " ⁶

" The inner audible voice (...). I have experienced this inner form of voice a few times, but it is the most unusual way God speaks to me, and it always involves something very important to me. " ⁷ (Personal note: *There is another spirit that dwells in man for sin and untruth and speaks to him " from within", which spirit should be ascertained before one converses with him .*)

The book has a whole collection of strange dreams of the prophet, some of which are more special, exactly in the typology known in Orthodoxy as demonic dreams; the book is a reference for wrong mysticism, supplementing illegitimate prophetism with dreams, fitting exactly into the Orthodox typology and theology of (voices) illegitimate "dreams, visions and various manifestations", all these elements being present in the book. It is a Protestant reference for misguided mysticism.

In the chapter " Prayer, exercise and risk", the Protestant pastor mentions the Protestant "*prophetic*" typology of discovery and the procedure of " testing the prophecies", which in Protestantism have a non-existent percentage of success, the prophets *cautiously*

⁵Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , p. 48.

⁶Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , p. 48.

⁷Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , p. 49.

engaging in prophesying, because often they are forced to accept their own deception, which they themselves confirm. Below we find a short paragraph in which the Protestant *prophetic typology is shown*:

Are you satisfied with the level of gift you have? If not, remember what James said: " You do not have, because you do not ask" (James 4:2). Pray every day that God will prepare you to use your prophetic gift. Pray to increase the accuracy of your gift. Pray -for specific aspects of your prophetic work so that you can measure whether you are developing the gift of prophecy (...).

Without practice, you cannot develop in any field. The mature prophets are those who have learned, through use, to distinguish between good and evil (...).

A prophetic friend of mine, Steve Thompson, *often asks the Lord to speak to him about the strangers around him* while waiting in line at the bank or grocery store. *If it seems to him that the Lord has told him something about the bank clerk*, he immediately checks the information, so he asks a harmless and friendly question:

- Don't you have a sister named Darla ?
 - No, why do you ask?
 - Oh, I must have confused you with someone else.
- no problem arises . *No one but Steve knows he was wrong.* "8

(Personal note: *Steve really hears and knows, but the spirits tell him untruths, and he does not understand this. God has absolute knowledge and shares it in a pure form. Divination knowledge is not from God, it is pythonic .*)

Watchman 's " **Communion of the Holy Ghost** ." Nee is a work that tries to be complete, about manifestations and work of the Holy Spirit, dealing with topics such as the Holy Spirit and the Church, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Some excerpts from the

⁸Dr. Jack Deere , *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , p. 141.

book:

" The main difference between the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the outpouring of the evil spirit is in the area of speech, not in a movement or attitude of the body (...). The fact that a man has or has not had the outpouring of the Holy Spirit can be recognized from the words of his mouth (...). If a man is not inspired by the Holy Spirit, he cannot say " Jesus is Lord " . Whoever cannot say this has certainly experienced an outpouring of the evil spirit (...).

Cooperation with the Holy Spirit is as follows: when the Holy Spirit comes upon you , *he asks you in a soft and quiet voice* how much you allow him in your life (...)."⁹

" *The manifestations of the outpouring of the Spirit* are diverse. Some rejoice, others weep; some feel a power, others feel that something is over them (...). Some feel as if electrified, and others feel as if they are wrapped in something. Some seek the outpouring of the Spirit, and the result is accompanied by tears and cries, while others may experience completely different manifestations (...). Every man has his own experience. We cannot say that because someone's experience differs from mine it is false. *If someone receives a supernatural spirit* and is able to say that Jesus is Lord, *then it is from God* , regardless of the outward manifestation (...). We must not imitate others and insist on having the same manifestations ¹⁰. (Personal note: *These manifestations are ones that indicate emotions, different types of unclear, confused, uncertain feelings, being always a typology of confused manifestations, completely different from the clear manifestations of Scripture, in which the soul feels precisely joy, love, peace, but quite different. It is a kind of unclean feeling of an interaction with another world and other powers through manifestations of the type of coiling, electrification, shouting.*)

⁹ Watchmen Nee , *Communion of the Holy Spirit* , Lampadar de Aur Publishing House, Oradea, 2011, p. 34.

¹⁰ Watchmen Nee , *Communion of the Holy Spirit...*, p. 34.

In the chapter on the benefits of the outpouring of the Spirit, the following is mentioned about the work of grace, testimonies inconsistent with Scripture, in complete dissonance with it:

" What benefits does the outpouring of the Holy Spirit bring ? (...) Let's see , then , what are the practical benefits that result from the outpouring of the Spirit.

It gives the power to communicate. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit gives you the power to communicate, that is, to transmit to others what is inside you (...),

Instill courage.

Remove the fear of people's opinion .

Change the atmosphere .

He may have power to work (...)."¹¹

In another chapter it is mentioned about the personal guidance of the Spirit: " We must do what the Bible says, but in addition, we must also have an inner guidance. The union of these two things ensures us a correct direction (...).

Many ask me if it is bad to do or say this or that thing. My answer is: Do you have the Holy Spirit in you? If so, why don't you learn to know his inner guidance instead ? (...) You must learn to recognize the inner guidance of the Holy Spirit.

To live guided by the Holy Spirit, the first question we must ask ourselves is: What does the Holy Spirit say? Do not ask from the beginning what the *Bible says* . Always ask first what the Spirit *within you says* . Today most Christians look first to what the Bible says, instead of first asking what the Holy Spirit says in them. "¹²

(Personal note: *Protestant spirits in the believer have a unitary identity and typology to work, keeping Protestants in their movement,*

¹¹ Watchmen Nee , *Communion of the Holy Spirit...*, pp. 71-72.

¹² Watchmen Nee , *Communion of the Holy Spirit...*, pp. 71-72.

guarding them with great power from Orthodoxy and truth; unitedly confessed by Protestants, the spirits in them have another form of manifestation than The Holy Spirit present in Orthodoxy, being considered by the Orthodox to be other spirits).

In the Pentecostal pastor Trandafir Sandru 's book , " **The Work of the Holy Spirit** " , which is a theology of the Holy Spirit , several Protestant *miracles are mentioned:*

" In the spring of 1947 I attended a series of Bible studies in Albany, Oregon. A brother from the Episcopal Church served with me. Before such a religious service, that is, before we got on the platform in the hall, the Holy Spirit showed me a young woman who was sitting in the congregation. She was in great spiritual trials. In my spirit I saw her face, where she sat, and how she was dressed. *The Holy Spirit gave me instructions: what to talk to her and how to help her. (...)*

While the Holy Spirit had spoken to me before the divine service, I wrote on paper everything he told me and showed me (...)." ¹³

" We were invited to a conference that was held in a suburb of Phoenix . It was one evening before the beginning of the divine service, when the Holy Spirit began to speak to me in this way: *Tonight a servant of My Kingdom will come to the meeting, who is struggling with great financial difficulties ...* I was now fully convinced that God had spoken to me." ¹⁴

" In November 1971, I preached in the town of Poplar Bluff , Missouri. One evening , *the Holy Spirit spoke to me* before the be-

¹³Trandafir Sandru , *The Work of the Holy Spirit* , Scriptum Publishing House, Oradea, 2010,

p. 330.

¹⁴Trandafir Sandru , *The Work of the Holy Spirit* , p. 334.

ginning of the religious service, while I was still praying in an adjacent room : Tonight, a woman will sit in the congregation to the right of where you will sit and she was wearing a blue dress. She has several tumors and I will heal her. Call him from the assembly to come forward . ” ¹⁵(Personal Note: *The same is testified by sorcerers and those who have a pythonic spirit about voices and powers that “help” the sick, but then take the duty done by the “healthy”, tenth, by disturbing or possessing it).*

In the work " **In the footsteps of the Holy Spirit** ", by Ezechel Suci, there are several similar testimonies about the work of the Protestant spirit.

“ On October 8, 1964, my future wife was invited to visit the Pentecostal Church for the first time... There was no one in the station and on the street and she did not know what to do.

Then *he heard a voice*, which told him: *Go after the man who will appear in front of you (. ..).*

Being on sick leave, on Christmas evening he went for the second time to the same church he had visited before. While he was in the church, *he heard a voice again*, which said to him: *If you do not receive the Holy Spirit this year, you will never receive it again .* (there was still one week left in the year!) (...).

Once there, only the shepherd, her father, the shepherd's mother-in-law and wife and another brother entered a room. The pastor announced to those present that the young woman wanted to receive the Holy Spirit. As they knelt down, *the Holy Spirit came powerfully* upon my future wife and a great joy accompanied by *speaking in tongues possessed her for more than an hour.* "¹⁶

¹⁵Trandafir Sandru, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, p. 334.

¹⁶ Ezechel Suci, *In the footsteps of the Holy Spirit*, Scriptum Publishing House, Oradea, 2010, p. 146.

In " **The Work of the Holy Spirit** ", by Daniel N. Matei , we find several examples of the work of spirits working in Protestantism :

" When I returned to Romania, I was invited to teach a study about the Holy Spirit to the youth of the Elim Pentecostal Church (...).

One of the pastors told me that the way this baptism is received is too simple. I was very surprised at what I was hearing. I looked at the other shepherds , on whose faces I could read confusion and doubt. Then , *I heard the Holy Spirit who told me: " You cannot pour new wine into old vessels !"*. Then I asked Him: «What is to be done, Lord? ». " A new church is starting !", the Holy Spirit told me.

And so the Agape Church came into being. "¹⁷

Another testimony from the same book: " We were in Bucharest to start a new work and we were praying for the change of the spiritual atmosphere in Romania, but especially in the capital of the country where we were. The Holy Spirit guided us and told us to go to the hill of the Orthodox Episcopate. Arriving there together with other intercessors from the Agape Church , from Timișoara, the Holy Spirit, through a word of wisdom, told me: "Anoint the soles of the feet of those who are with you and walk with confidence in My power!". That's what I did. Then we sat in a circle and prayed. Two nuns passed by us and fell to their knees, making the cross . They were permeated by the presence of the Lord. I entered the Orthodox church where the religious service was taking place. We were praying in other languages and, after a while, I saw that the priest could no longer continue the service, heading inside the

¹⁷Daniel N. Matei, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* , Alfa Omega Publishing , Timișoara, 2018, p. 50.

altar. Then we went outside and the Holy Spirit came again with a word of wisdom, and we began to proclaim the future of the Orthodox Church."¹⁸

In the book " **The presence and work of the Holy Spirit** " we find the very clear presence of spirits in Protestantism:

"...Therefore I looked up and said, " Blessed Spirit of God, you are here. I'm not alone. If you have anything to say to me, I am ready to listen', and He began to reveal to me deep and precious things about my Lord and Savior... The next thing I know, I fell asleep.. So, of henceforth, whenever insomnia strikes, I simply remember that the Holy Spirit is present and look to Him , *letting Him speak to me and teach me. He talks to me*, and the insomnia flies away..."

"I saw a man who I knew had lived a life of sin testify and I was waiting to see what he had to say. When he finished, we continued down the street. I had not gone many steps, when *a strange power seized me*, brought me back, and brought me to your church, to a meeting." ¹⁹(Personal note: very interesting how, in Protestantism, believers are brought into Protestant meetings by *strange powers that take possession of believers*, in a typology of *possession* of believers by these spirits.)

In the work " **2,000 evidences of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church** ", we find the following testimony.

" The services usually began about ten o'clock and lasted until three or four o'clock the next morning. One participant describes

¹⁸Daniel N. Matei, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* , p. 113.

¹⁹RA Torrey , *The presence and work of the Holy Spirit* , Casa Cartii Publishing House, 2006, p. 69, p. 83.

a typical service as follows:

Someone was starting to speak. Suddenly , the Spirit descended upon the assembly. God himself was making the call to the front of the altar. People were falling all over the room like someone slain in battle, or running in great numbers to the pulpit , seeking God. " ²⁰

The whole Protestant testimony is a unitary one , which a whole movement confesses. The references used are to different denominations, there being no difference between them in the testimony.

It is very difficult to be able to receive any advice from Protestants, while they have the theology of voices and spirits as the foundation of communion and mysticism, but also to be in communion with such practices and communion. All Protestant rhetoric against Orthodoxy is null and void in the presence of this argument of Protestant theology of voices and communion with Protestant spirits, promoted by them with power.

²⁰Eddie L. Hyatt , *2,000 records of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church* , Casa Cartii Publishing House, Oradea, 2010, p. 166.

CATHOLIC TESTIMONY

I present the Catholic testimony chronologically, because it is important to correctly place Catholic mysticism in its historical context and evolution. The new mysticism in the Catholic community is updated and substantiated after several great events in the history of the Una Church: the first event is the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, from 879, where the *Filioque dogma is anathematized* by the Una Church, followed by the adoption of the *Filioque formula* in Catholicism, starting with 1014 (the Creed being spoken by Catholics with the addition of the *Filioque*, starting from that time), and the last event is the Great Schism of 1054.

The Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, held in 879, addressed a special dogmatic problem : the problem of the *procession of the Holy Spirit* and from the Son, a new Catholic dogmatic proposal, which came after a very long time in history. In this Ecumenical Council, this *Filioque* proposal was anathematized; The synod deals with an important issue of truth, of identity. It is important to mention the significance of this historical event of the respective Synod, for the understanding of Catholic mysticism: The Synod clearly establishes that non-compliance with the historical teaching of the inherited Creed on the procession of the Holy Spirit is considered a serious deviation, heresy. Catholicism adopted the new dogmatic formula, the *Filioque*, beginning in 1014, this moment marking a new beginning for the Catholic community. And the last important event is the Great Schism of 1054, in which the Catholic community unilaterally separated from the Orthodox Church, in a historic act of breaking communion, preceded by the adoption of the *Filioque dogma in Catholicism* .

These historical moments bring with them, as a dogmatic consequence, the anathematization and the dogmatic removal from communion, from the One Church, of the Catholic community. The events historically mark a millennial beginning in the history

of the Catholic community, which initiates a new path, unitary in manifestation, specifically Catholic, in a new identity and typology of the manifestations of faith, different from the Orthodox ones, but also from the previous, common, historical ones. Below I will briefly mention some milestones of this course.

Immediately after these historical events (the Synod of 879, the adoption of the *Filioque* in 1014, and the Schism of the First Church), a new wave of saints and a new mysticism appeared in the Western community, completely different from the old mysticism and asceticism of the fathers of the desert, the new mysticism immediately post-Schism replacing and becoming the new mystique of the Catholic community. Unfortunately, this moment in time, immediately after the Schism, which is continued in its entirety in all the mysticism of the Catholic community (post Schism), is one of falling into temptation and deception, being abandoned by the grace of God, but also by all experience and obedience to healthy mysticism.

All the experiences described below are complex, because it is difficult to recognize the authentic experience of grace and communion, of service, and the authentic ascetic trial. But the deception is visible in all the experiences below, enough evidence being found to this effect.

These statements are not new in Orthodoxy, they have already been made previously by many Orthodox saints, and in the Church; what we find below is only a setting in the general post-Schism framework of this typology of unitary mysticism of the Catholic community. For each experience I highlight both the points that seem legitimate, and the points that are clearly wrong, and also the points that are missing, so that everyone in the case has an overall knowledge of something in Catholic mysticism.

Francis of Assisi (1181-1226)

In the book " The Life of Saint Francis of Assisi ", we find many accounts from his life. It seems that his life was continuously guided by voices, by the " voice" of the Lord: "Having just arrived in the nearest town, he heard the Lord speaking to him at night, in a familiar tone (...)" ²¹. In the same way, the voice continuously tells him what to do, guiding him in all the *important moments* : " Go back to your little town" ²².

We find in his life examples of service, asceticism, dedication, fulfillment of monastic orders, which give an apparent legitimacy to the experience. But all these examples are interspersed with others, which break this experience: "(...) while he fixed his tearful eyes on the Cross of Jesus , he heard with his bodily ears a voice coming down to him from the cross and saying- and three times: «Francis, go and repair my house, which , as you see, is all in ruins »!"²³

Many dreams appear, which try to legitimize Francis from the outside, such as the dream with the golden cross, this type of dream being unique in asceticism, just like the following testimonies.

"(...) a chariot of fire with a wonderful brightness entered the door of the house, circled the house three times; above the chariot was a luminous orb in the shape of the sun, which scattered the darkness of the night (...) to show them that they were to walk as true Israelites under his guidance."²⁴ (*Personal note: And in the life of Archimandrite Cleopas Ilie, a chariot of fire appeared in a spiritual trial, but which turned out to be a temptation, after the Archimandrite prayed for its removal; Orthodox asceticism includes countless temptations in this form, in which a chariot of fire appears as imagination,*

²¹ Saint Bonaventure, *The Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , Serafica Publishing House, Roman, 2017, p. 37.

²² Saint Bonaventure, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , p. 37.

²³ Saint Bonaventure, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , p. 43.

²⁴ Saint Bonaventure, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , pp. 75-76.

easily dispelled by the invocation of God and the Mother of God, and which is revealed as it really is, as soon as the true God is powerfully invoked. This banishment of temptation does not appear, which shows the lack of testing of the event and the certainty of the deception brought about.)

" When the Saint returned to his brothers, he began to investigate and reveal the secrets of their consciences, to assure them of the meanings of that wonderful vision and made many predictions (...). And because he was making many discoveries beyond the capacity of human intellect, the brethren had to acknowledge that the Spirit of God had settled in all its fullness upon his servant Francis; therefore , the safest thing for them was to follow his doctrine and life. "25

" It seemed to him that he had picked up very small bread crumbs from the ground (...). But a voice from on high said to him: "Francis, from all these crumbs, make a single *host* and spread it to whoever you want to eat " (...). But the next day, while he was praying with great perseverance, he heard this voice coming from heaven: «Francis, the crumbs you saw last night are the words of the Gospel; The Host is the Rule»."26

" This brother, fellow traveler (...) was kidnapped in ecstasy. He saw in heaven many seats, and among them one more splendid and glorious than all the others, wrought in precious stones. Admiring the splendor of that wonderful throne, he began to wonder uneasily who was destined to occupy it. In the midst of these thoughts, he heard a voice saying: "This chair belongs to one of the fallen angels and is now reserved for Francis the humble."27

" One morning, around the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, while he was praying on the side of the mountain, he

²⁵Saint Bonaventure, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , p. 76.

²⁶Saint Bonaventure, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , pp. 86-87.

²⁷Saint Bonaventure, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , pp. 112-113.

saw a figure like a seraphim with six wings, as bright as they were fiery, descending from the heights of heaven (. ..) the effigy of a crucified man appeared between his wings. (...) Disappearing, the vision left a miraculous ardor in his heart and equally wonderful signs he left imprinted in his flesh. Indeed, immediately there began to appear in his hands and feet the marks of nails like those which a little while before he had observed in the image of the crucified man." ²⁸Francis of Assisi dies two years later from these wounds.

In none of Francis' testimony is the correct spiritual validation of the experience made. In fact , no Catholic saint makes any validation of spiritual experiences, nor do Protestants, all of whom assume that they have legitimate experiences. You do not find in his life the spiritual progress, the testimony of growth in grace, the gifts, the communion, the contemplation; even if they are mentioned, they have no content and substance in themselves. You find nothing of the communion with the mysteries of Christ and of the blessed wealth acquired from them, unitedly confessed by the orthodox saints. The call to Christ and the Church, which is the main message of every saint , is not found either .

Instead , there are many " dreams" given to others, which do not aim at any help, but have the meaning of " legitimizing" Francis as a saint, not discovering him as a helper, but " legitimizing" him as a " saint " , for credibility . That is, Francis' entire mystical experience has as its only meaning the legitimization of his path, by no means any discovery of God. This is not a testimony of communion with God, and from this testimony no conclusion of communion can be drawn; however, it is a testimony of legitimization through pseudo -visions , dreams, and the supernatural not properly understood, supernatural which is not itself legitimate on careful analysis. Like all Catholic saints, visions and revelations glorify him from his lifetime as *great and holy* .

²⁸Saint Bonaventure, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , p. 221.

Clare of Assisi (1194-1253)

The Catholic Saint Clare of Assisi has an experience somewhat similar to that of the Catholic Saint Francis of Assisi, she follows the path of monasticism , being guided by Francis of Assisi, repeating his entire mysticism.

We find in her life many things that give an apparent legitimacy, such as service, asceticism, prayer. In the same way , many things that seem like miracles and which are reported on this model of miracles (Catholics passing easily among the holy believers on the basis of miracles, their books being created on this model of miracles , and not of the precise reporting of facts, communion with God, of highlighting the full communion that legitimizes , in fact , holiness). But these are interrupted by countless passages , which are identical, on the same pattern:

" Unexpectedly, a voice like a child's sounded in his ears, which mercifully approved a new grace: "I will always protect you " (...), And Christ answered him: "He will endure many trials, but he will be protected by my guard ». "²⁹

Christ never spoke in secret, through hidden " *voices* " , Himself clearly saying that when He spoke , He did so openly, revealing Himself cleanly. The voice is identical to the Protestant one and to the voice also found in Francis of Assisi, its guide, which " legitimates " the one who receives it. The voices of Catholic saints are always hidden and work in secret.

A very precisely related experience clearly shows us the typology of mysticism and deceptive vision: " Ms. Clara also related that once, in a vision, it seemed to her that she was taking a bowl of warm water and a towel to Saint Francis to -dry his hands . (...) Arriving at Francis, the saint took out a breast from his breast and said to the virgin Clara: " Come , receive her and suck " . And after

²⁹Trans. Eduard Ferent , *Saint Clare of Assisi* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2009, pp. 38-39.

she had sucked, the saint urged her to suck once more; what he was sucking was so sweet and delicious that he could not explain it in any way. "³⁰

As a note, this pseudo -vision has a very interesting phrase at the beginning, " it seemed to him ", which shows the vagueness, but also the confusion, the deception behind the vision. The content of the vision is unique in Christian mysticism, found only in Catholicism, in an eroticism and carnal, specifically Catholic. This vision has neither explanation nor spiritual meaning, any idea of filiation and disciple-spiritual relationship being often described, in patristics and mysticism, in completely different ways, but in no way in this vulgar , erotic manner. This is a constant theme in patristics, but never presented in this way. But in deceptive mysticism there are countless such discoveries, in a diseased eroticism and flesh, easily accessible to evil spirits and often used by them (a classic theme of spirits, condemned in Orthodox asceticism, in crutches), which is already a typology of dreams demonic, the spirits not being able to touch and clearly discover the face of God, of the Saints, of the Mother of God, in visions, in discoveries, and these when they appear are deformed creations of the original and that is exactly how they are presented in the Catholic discoveries. These never appear clearly in Catholicism.

As a typology, there are no clear discoveries with divine faces in Catholicism , their discoveries always being vague apparitions – and there is always this explicit mention of blurring and deformity, which are clear indications of demonic apparitions. Likewise, there is no clear indication that in any way shows genuine communion with God, and the events recounted for legitimization do not in any way bring about the discovery of God, but present an illegitimate supernatural, connected with Christianity, passed over into legitimate mysticism in incorrect way. These experiences are mistakenly

³⁰Trans. Eduard Ferent , *Saint Clare of Assisi* , p. 164.

passed off among the legitimate supernatural, when it is in fact illegitimate, only through dreams and deceptive pseudo -visions.

Anthony of Padua (1195-1231)

An event from the childhood of Saint Anthony of Padua attracts attention: " The hiker put the bag down, opened it, called Ferdinand to look and said: "This is what I want, child! Look, here !". When he looked, Ferdinand saw in the bottom of the bag a bunch of red and almost alive hearts and he was very surprised. The hiker added: "This is what I want, child! Give me your heart and I'll put it here!" (...) But who are you? And the hiker replied: "I don't need to -tell you !" ³¹There is no spiritual explanation for this apparition of spirits, there being no spiritual consequence and benefit from it, not being able to put anything from God behind this pseudo -discovery. In all patristics there is no typology of creating any spiritual benefit from such a bodily, material discovery. Discovery also lacks the validation of spirits required by Christ and the Apostles.

" Between these, the first one is the benefaction that a certain Brother Petru, from the monastery of Brive , acquired from Saint Anthony . He, being sorely tempted, decided to leave the monastery. The saint, penetrating his soul, called him aside and revealed his temptation. He opened the young man's mouth with his hands and blew into his mouth saying: "Receive, my son , the Holy Spirit!". At this, the young man fainted and fell. "³²

These testimonies do not conform to orthodox asceticism and mysticism , nor to the common, ancient one, and they are easily seen as demonic appearances and the work of spirits , and not of

³¹Rev. Anton Bişoc , *The life of the great miracle worker Saint Anthony of Padua* , "Seráfica" Publishing House, Roman, 2016, p. 27.

³²Fr. Anton Bişoc , *Life of the great miracle worker Saint Anthony of Padua* , p. 106.

gifts, spirits that do not reveal their identity, but speak hiding what they are.

A very interesting thing is that , although all the Orthodox saints announce their death years in advance, knowing both the day and the hour, in the Catholic ones you do not find this testimony, but in all of them you find , a few days before death, spirits that come to them to glorify them. This is a fine feature of *Catholic holiness* , they are glorified from life, before any need, all knowing that they will become saints.

Catherine of Siena (1347-1380)

We find several testimonies in the saint's life: " One day, Catherine -saw the divine bridegroom holding her to his chest, but then he took her heart out of his chest to give her one similar to his own, this was the putting into practice *literally of the prophecy* expressed by the Scriptures: "I will give you a new heart" ³³. Again, strongly questionable testimonies appear, which have no spiritual explanation. This testimony serves neither as an exhortation to spiritual effort nor as an exhortation to faith.

Rita of Cascia (1381-1457)

Saint Rita has a testimony similar to that of other Catholic saints: " In the end Jesus wanted to fulfill her wish. Rita fervently begged the Lord Jesus to make her share in his sorrows. And lo and behold, a Thorn , detaching itself from the crown of the Crucified One, came and planted itself in his forehead so deeply and with such pain that he fell unconscious, almost dead. No one was present at this incident, but the wound testified to his divine gift. In addition to the pain, Jesus wanted to add humiliation and isolation. Saint

³³Antonio Maria Sicari, *Portraits of the Saints* , 2 (XI-XV), Carmelitan Publishing House , 2012, p. 162.

Rita's wound emanated a heavy-smelling pus. So the poor sufferer, so as not to fill the house with a heavy smell, was isolated in a distant room , where a nun brought her food. "34

There are no such diseases given in this way anywhere in Orthodox mysticism, nor in the common, historical one, having no spiritual meaning nor any logical explanation, the disease having appeared again, following the Catholic typology of *illnesses after pseudo -visions* , ending in some cases with death soon after.

Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556)

Ignatius of Loyola is known in the Catholic community for several visions he has of the Holy Trinity, Creation, the presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar; other visions are of Christ's humanity. He speaks of his " dialogues with the Three Divine Persons" 35. His experience is about some important topics (the being of God), but this type of visions should , in fact , be in a different format of discovery. The Holy Trinity is not revealed in visions , but in contemplation, which is something else entirely. It is the result of special asceticism and a testimony of purity and spiritual progress, and it is not instantiated , it does not appear suddenly in everyone's life, and it is always confirmed by the synax of the saints (through similar discoveries).

For the discovery of the Holy Trinity in contemplation , see the life of Saint Joseph the Hesychast and the differences between his experiences and those of Ignatius of Loyola.

³⁴*The Life of Saint Rita of Cascia* , <http://sfantaritadecascia.blogspot.com/p/vi-ata-sfintei-rita.htm>.

³⁵Antonio Maria Sicari, *Portraits of Saints* , 3 (XVI-XVII), Carmelitan Publishing House , 2012, p. 99.

Teresa of Ávila (1515-1582)

We find the following passages in the life of the Catholic saint:

" In a sudden rapture of the spirit - felt for the first time - she distinctly hears these words: "I do not want you to talk with men anymore, but with angels". The order is decisive, and from now on Teresa will only have friends with those people whom she knows well love God."³⁶

" Whenever the Lord asks me for a certain thing during prayer, if afterwards the confessor orders me another, the Lord himself speaks to me again, telling me to obey the confessor; then His Majesty makes him change his given order ."³⁷

" Then the Lord said to me: "Don't be sad, I will give you a living book " (...) I saw, being in prayer, next to me or, rather, I felt that I saw nothing , neither with human eyes nor with those of the soul, but I had the feeling that Christ was next to me , I was thus justified in believing that He was the one speaking to me. "³⁸

" I saw near me, on the left, an angel, with his bodily form (...) I saw that he had in his hands a long golden spear, and at the end of it, it seems to -me -, a flash of fire. I think I felt then how that spear was planted several times in my heart, (...) leaving me all burning with a great love for God. The pain was so vivid, that I was making those moans that I mentioned (...) It is not a physical pain, but a spiritual one, however the body also participates a little, well, I would say, quite a lot. "³⁹

"Here is a sample from Teresa of Avila : "Often Christ says to me: From this day forward, I am yours and you are Mine". These

³⁶ Bernand Sese, *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2006, p. 47.

³⁷ Bernand Sese, *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila* , p. 48.

³⁸ Bernand Sese, *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila* , p. 48.

³⁹ Bernand Sese, *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila* , p. 49.

reproaches of my God make me plunge into an indescribable emotion. Where pain and pleasure go hand in hand... I saw an angel. He carried in his hands a golden spear tipped with iron, above which flickered a flame; from time to time, she thrust it into my heart, making me feel my whole body penetrated by her, and when she took it out it seemed to me that she was pulling out all my entrails. The pain was so intense that it was all a moan, but the pleasure was also so strong that I wished the pain would never end. The more that spear penetrated my body, the more I struggled, but I also enjoyed it."⁴⁰

"The prayer calms Teresa, but what she hears from His Majesty is that the persecutions will double"⁴¹. "His Majesty says to me very often, showing me great love: "You are mine from now on and I am yours".⁴²

The entire book is full of such accounts, the book being a reference for *the Catholic mystical dialogue with the supposed Catholic Jesus (voice)*, *dialogue similar to the Protestant one*, with spirits speaking to Catholic saints, similar to Protestant voices. And commenting on experiences related to eroticism and sexuality does not make sense. The presence of this point related to carnal eroticism is not only a clear indication, but an explicit confirmation that the whole experience is demonic, since this type of temptation, carnal, is recognized and ubiquitous in asceticism and explicitly condemned as being from demons.

Such experiences are known and easily recognized as demonic. The Holy Spirit does not heat up the flesh. This type of ascetic experience is called bodily heating and deception (through the direct appearance of demons in all kinds of "angels of light" guises, as they are also called in the story) and is well known to any

⁴⁰Devil. Andrei Kuraev, *The Challenges of Ecumenism*, Sofia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006, p. 128.

⁴¹ Bernard Sese, *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila*, p. 52.

⁴² Bernard Sese, *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila*, p. 58.

ascetic with a minimum of ascetic training and experience in the spiritual struggle, being one of the first temptations that the devil sends, for deception. The related carnal pleasure does not exist in asceticism, being elements of sexuality and carnal sexual pleasure (sexual excitement) brought by the "angels of Catholic saints" in Christianity. Mystical sexual excitement and sexual, carnal, erotic imagination exist only in the stories of Catholic saints and in ascetic casuistry, condemned by the Church. In this experience, the spiritual delusion in the bodily heat and in the conversation with the hidden voices makes it clear that it is an experience of deception.

Not understanding simple examples of mystical deception like this shows an area that cannot identify essential things in asceticism. Any ascetic recognizes this experience from afar, being a ubiquitous temptation brought to ascetics by devils. The experiences in the book are an overview of Catholic mysticism, being a reference for a deceptive mysticism.

Padre Pio (1887-1968)

Padre Pio 's experience is particularly interesting, starting at the age of 15, with a vision in which , like all Catholic saints, he fights a monster and is crowned, exalted, before carrying out all the spiritual battles: " the splendid character and more bright as the sun placed on the forehead of the victorious Francesco a crown of rare beauty, which would be described in vain" ⁴³.

" At Venafro , in November 1911, Father Evangelista and I observed the first supernatural phenomena. I witnessed several ecstasies and many diabolical torments. (...) Sometimes , the poor father was beaten to the point of blood, tortured with deafening noises, full of foam. He managed to free himself , invoking the name

⁴³ Teresio Bosco , *Padre Pio. A short biography* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2014, p. 18.

of Jesus. ”⁴⁴(Personal note: *As do all those who in Orthodoxy profess to be troubled by spirits or possessed*).

" I was in the choir after the celebration of the Holy Liturgy. (...) And while this was taking place, I saw myself in front of a mysterious personage: my hands, legs and rib were pierced and were dripping with blood!"⁴⁵. Padre Pio testified to loss of blood from these wounds (sickness after the pseudovisions), which do not reveal any real spiritual need or spiritual progress and are not testified to by him. Likewise, it is impossible to find in this experience evidence of genuine communion, finding instead superficial but illegitimate ones that actually show illegitimate communion.

In the experience of Padre Pio you find no elements at all that show that the testimony is of communion with God, in a clear way, but you find countless experiences that are not debatable, but illegitimate, which show that it is a communion in itself, but which are not it is legitimate, it is with other spirits. The experiences are wrongly assimilated and assumed to be supernatural experiences from God.

In Catholicism, the supernatural of authentic communion and the authentic manifestations of communion are not properly understood. This typology, misidentification of communion, is easily found in the Catholic experience where, when some supernatural elements appear, they are easily passed into legitimate experience, without correctly and completely validating the connection, the communion with God, it being impossible to say that an experience from those reported "is from God", but finding countless serious aspects of illegitimacy in many Catholic testimonies.

Teresa of the Infant Jesus (1873-1897)

The book " History of a soul " , by Saint Teresa of the baby

⁴⁴ Teresio Bosco , *Padre Pio. A Short Biography* , p. 29.

⁴⁵ Teresio Bosco , *Padre Pio. A Short Biography* , p. 35.

Jesus, is a personal meditation of the saint on religious themes. It is just a suite of simple meditations on an emotionally assumed Jesus. It has little to do with asceticism, spiritual progress, meditation, contemplation, the acquisition of grace. They do not resemble similar Orthodox testimonies of saints who knew Christ and His grace. We also find a testimony about her that she will be a saint: " He made me understand that my true glory will not be shown in front of people and that it will consist in becoming a great Saint!!!"⁴⁶ Again, Catholic saints are, from the beginning, announced that they will become saints.

Saint Faustina (1905-1938)

Faustina 's life begins like many others in Catholicism. She hears a phantom voice that speaks to her and blames her: "(...) during which Jesus *came to speak to her* : "How long will I put up with you and how long will you disappoint me ?" ⁴⁷" Later, he hears the words " Leave immediately to Warsaw (...) there you will enter the monastery" ⁴⁸. Any call from God is not made by blaming, but by exhortation, having a completely different form, Orthodox mysticism having completely different calls, not by blaming.

In the monastery he has a continuous dialogue with a voice that he considers to be Jesus, which tells him "I receive you, you are in My Heart". She is guided by other sisters in the convent to correction, the superior sisters around telling her that she has fallen into deception and proposing that she be exorcised - somehow this phenomenon is clearly visible to those around the nun. But she is still chastised by that Jesus (hidden voice) who continuously blames her for not listening to him and not doing her duty: "(...) but Jesus continued to patiently explain to her the greatness of the work he was doing had chosen " *Know that if you neglect the painting of this icon*

⁴⁶*About Saint Teresa*, http://www.sfterezaiasi.ro/?page_id=137 .

⁴⁷Sister M. Elzbieta Siepak , *The life and mission of Saint Faustina* , Galaxia Gutenberg Publishing House , Târgu Lăpuș, 2008, p. 15.

⁴⁸Sister M. Elzbieta Siepak , *The Life and Mission of Saint Faustina* , p. 15.

and the entire work of mercy, you will have to give an account, on the day of judgment, for a large number of souls ". (...) These words filled his soul with horror. "⁴⁹

Another dialogue: " Jesus personally gave her the strength to recognize this unfathomable reality: *My daughter, know well, once and for all , that only grave sin drives Me from the soul and nothing else .* "⁵⁰

Finally , Saint Faustina becomes Jesus' secretary, in a mystical discovery: "One day, while she was writing in her diary, she saw Jesus leaning over her and asking her: «My daughter, what are you writing ?». He answered: "I am writing about You, Jesus". (...) And He said to her: «Secretary of My deepest mystery, know that you are in an exclusive intimacy with Me; your duty is to write all that I make known to you concerning My mercy. (...) So , I want you to devote all your free moments to writing »" ⁵¹.

Faustina is completely enslaved by that Catholic Jesus (voice) who continually dictates what she should do in life and blames her every time she disobeys him. The book relates a completely illegitimate experience, framed by Orthodoxy in illegitimate mysticism.

Mother Teresa of Calcutta (1910-1997)

A popular figure in Catholicism is Mother Teresa of Calcutta. The book " Teresa of Calcutta, *Pencil of God* " shows an example of dedication and Catholic missionary work, of devotion to Catholic values. But it is difficult to find an authentic testimony of the life in Christ and the charic communion like those mentioned in Orthodoxy . Here we should mention the episode (prayer) of exorcism to which she was subjected at the end of her life, at her own

⁴⁹Sister M. Elzbieta Siepak , *The Life and Mission of Saint Faustina* , p. 33.

⁵⁰Sister M. Elzbieta Siepak , *The Life and Mission of Saint Faustina* , p. 46.

⁵¹Sister M. Elzbieta Siepak , *The Life and Mission of Saint Faustina* , p. 48.

request, after several nights of disturbance, insomnia and agitation.

Protestants and Catholic saints (post-Schism) are guided by voices (spirits) that dictate to them, step by step, everything they must say, do, experience accompanied by so - called *pseudo visions* and countless dreams , with a clear illegitimacy and coming out of mysticism and patristics, carnal views, with strong manifestations and unspiritual feelings in the body. The Catholic and Protestant testimony shows what is confessed by them as grace, communion, holiness. It is within a specific limit and typology. In the bibliography, there are not so many things to mention , most of them being either in the typology above, or a series of events considered miracles or various pseudovisions , for legitimization. The legitimization of the experience of grace and communion starts primarily from the validation of the legitimacy of the experiences.

There are so many evidences and inconsistencies in each of the previous testimonies that the certainty that emerges is that this level of testimony is intentionally preserved, even though it is wrong, knowingly, without any comment on its legitimacy, in order to preserve " tradition", in the same Catholic spirit in which he preserves celibacy and other historical errors, in order not to disturb a tradition that is well embedded in the conscience of the faithful, but which really cannot be supported. Catholicism maintains these theological mistakes historically so as not to disturb the community with the hardness of the truth, the lack of holiness of the Catholic saints and the complete lack of communion with God of the community. That is, it is better to lose the truth, for the survival of the community, a decision similar to the Jewish one. A decision of a weakened faith, which does not understand that life is only by assumption and truth. That Christ is better in truth, in Orthodoxy, than a lifeless tradition.

Even if you go through countless Protestant and Catholic books, the result is identical and unitary with the texts presented,

being the same testimony to the illegitimate supernatural. What I have selected is relevant and unitary to the testimony. This is the testimony , both Protestant and Catholic.

Seeking grace should not be a difficult exercise, and the witness of communion and the work of grace should be full and immediate. Any *difficult* search exercise for it shows its absence. Unfortunately, the believers of these cults do not have a reference for authentic testimony and therefore consider the little wrong found in their own texts as correct.

ORTHODOX TESTIMONY

Saint Matrona says: " *Everyone, everyone, come to me and tell me your troubles, as if I were alive, because I will see you, hear you and help you* ". It is a unitary but also specific proof of the work of communion in Orthodoxy. The testimony is found with great power in Orthodoxy, in all its fullness, in the Orthodox saints, being a reception from God of a little of his all-seeing vision and a little of his all-encompassing science, for the benefit of man, in communion between heaven and earth. Man is like God both in sight and in power, through His light. This is an important point to note in the communion with God of the saints, the sharing which God Himself makes of His sight and power.

Below we find some Orthodox testimonies of communion and grace, from the lives of Orthodox saints; the bibliography contains many other testimonies that can be consulted on this topic.

From the life of the Reverend Joseph the Hesychast (1898-1959)

" Then his soul was filled with joy, enlightenment and divine love, and prayer began to flow from inside him with such ease that he thought: This is Heaven, I don't need another Heaven . And he saw the prayer being said inside him with a mathematical precision, just like a clock. And the wonderful thing was that the prayer was performed by itself, without any effort on his part (grace working in him) (...) And seeing that the prayer continued and he felt happiness within him, he asked himself full of joy: "This is it the Prayer of the mind that I was reading about in the nyptic books of the Philokalia ? Does it taste like this? Is this the Light ?⁵²

⁵²Archimandrite Efreim Filotheitul , Starețul *meu Iosif Hesihastul* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2010, pp. 40-41.

" He only said the Prayer a few times and immediately his mind was rapt into contemplation. (...) Suddenly he was caught up in contemplation, being completely beside himself. (...) It was no longer surrounded by walls and rocks. And this was happening without his will, in an unspoken peace, in a light that poured forth abundantly, in a boundless breadth. No body. And only this thought in his mind: let him not return to the body, but stay there forever."⁵³

That evening , Father Joseph stayed in his little cave and began to say the Prayer of the Mind. Suddenly, around midnight, his little cell was filled with a brilliant light, which was not at all like that of the day. This light grew so much that the Abbot felt that he was coming out of himself and that he no longer had a body. Then three little children appeared before him, who were no more than ten years old. They all had the same height, the same clothing, the same face and the same beauty. They were the Angels of the Lord. And father Iosif, completely out of his mind, admired how beautiful they were. Those, holding each other, blessed him all three at once, as the priest blesses .

The three children were approaching and moving away from him while singing: As many of you have been baptized in Christ (and they were approaching), in Christ you have also clothed yourselves. Hallelujah. (And when they said this they walked away without turning their backs.)."⁵⁴

" I don't remember," he says, "how I started the vigil, but I know very well that I didn't manage to say the Name of Christ a few times and my heart was filled with love for God." And this love increased so much that I could no longer continue the prayer, but marveled at its outpouring. I wanted to hug and kiss all the people and the whole building. At the same time I was thinking so humbly

⁵³Archimandrite Ephrem the Philotheist , *my Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 41.

⁵⁴Archimandrite Ephrem the Philotheite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 85.

that I felt I was lower than all the construction. But the fullness and flame of my love was directed to Christ, Whom I felt to be present, but could not see Him, and fall at His most pure feet, and ask Him how He inflames hearts so much, and yet remains hidden and unknown?

Then I had the inner conviction that this is the Grace of the Holy Spirit and this is the Kingdom of Heaven, which our Lord says is within us. "⁵⁵

" Abbot Joseph was very experienced. When we went to him at night for the confession of our thoughts, most of the time he explained our problem in detail and gave us the solution before we described what exactly concerned us. That is, he knew our inner state in advance and explained to us to what fact it is due and how it must be faced, whether it was about thoughts, or passions, or works of Grace .

He didn't need to ask to analyze the problem and answer. With a simple glance he read our thoughts. And this, because , on the one hand , he had a huge ascetic experience, and on the other hand , he had the Grace of insight.

We marveled at the fact that he knew our inner self so well, which even we ourselves often found difficult to describe. However , it was not clear that he was reading our thoughts. Naturally, we didn't hide anything from him and even if we wanted to, we couldn't, because he told us. "⁵⁶

" Enlightenment is followed by the completion of prayer and frequent contemplations, the rapture of the mind, the cessation of the senses, the stillness and complete stillness of the limbs, the union of God and man in one ."

⁵⁵Archimandrite Ephrem the Philotheist , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 212.

⁵⁶Archimandrite Ephrem the Philotheite , *my Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 237.

He describes this union of man with God in more detail as follows: " When Grace works, then immediately the door opens and it reaches the gate of Heaven and prayer rises like a pillar or like a flame (...).

And when man is filled with Grace , he is also filled with enlightenment , and with unspeakable joy. Then, no longer able to control the fire of love, the senses cease and he is rapt in contemplation. So far are the movements of man's will. Beyond this he no longer has dominion over himself, nor does he know himself anymore, because he has united with fire, being completely changed, becoming god by grace. This is the divine union, after which the walls collapse and then man breathes another air, that of contemplation, free, full of the fragrance of Heaven. "⁵⁷

The Life of the Venerable Joseph Hesychast is a *manual of Christian asceticism* , in which *all his disciples* reach the divine light, in an experience felt, realized, repeated in unison by an entire community, not in a superhuman effort, but in a common asceticism, accessible. It is a fundamental Orthodox testimony for accessibility, in which *the path of Christian asceticism* is repeated identically, unitarily, not as a mystical desideratum, but as an immediate reality, which, under the right path, is immediately reached. And Venerable Joseph shows us a manual of perfect asceticism, from which if we do even a little, we reach the first steps of divine vision, as all his disciples reached. It is a turn for the path of Orthodox asceticism.

From the life of Abbot Iacov Tsalikis (1920-1991)

" Once, on a winter's day, when the snow in the courtyard of the monastery had frozen, I went down carefully going to the church , to the service. But before I got to the church, I slipped on the frozen

⁵⁷Archimandrite Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 289.

snow and hit my spine, because for 29 days I couldn't make the slightest movement. On the 29th day of suffering I saw the Holy Doctors without money, who came and healed me. And so I was able to continue my struggle."⁵⁸

" The needy, gentle and humble Father Iacov became in recent years, through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, a spiritual teacher through simple and sweet words. Those who knew him considered it a great happiness to hear him speak, recounting events from his life, from his childhood and youth, from his family life, or recalling the miracles of the much-loved Saint David, or learning various spiritual teachings. With these he gave exact answers to the problems that the listeners had, helping him with the gift of foresight that God had given him.

This divine gift, some believed that it was something natural, like some knowledge gathered from the countless relationships that the Abbot had with his spiritual sons and with the crowd of worshippers, but they remained frozen, when at their first meeting with the Abbot, the Father called them by name of baptism and began to speak directly to them about their hidden problems, giving them wonderful answers. In others he revealed their hidden passions and sins in a way that seemed like a joke. "⁵⁹

" People, my son, are blind and do not see what happens in the Holy Altar during the Divine Liturgy. Once I served the Holy Liturgy and I could not do the Great Vohod (Exit with the Holy Gifts) because of what I was seeing. The singer was always repeating " Noi car pe cherubimi", when, suddenly, I felt someone push me by the shoulder and lead me to Saint Proscomidia. Then I thought it was the singer and I said: «Blessed. Such impiety ! He entered through the Holy Doors and is pushing me!". I turned and saw a huge wing that the Archangel had placed on my shoulder and was

⁵⁸Monk Pimen Vlad, *Un abbot Sfânt Fericitul Părinte Iacov*, "Bunavestire" Publishing House, Bacău, 2005, p. 42.

⁵⁹Monk Pimen Vlad, *Un abbot Saint Blessed Father Iacov*, p. 62.

leading me to do the Great Vohod .

What happens in the Holy Altar during the Divine Liturgy...! Sometimes I can't stand up anymore and I sit in a chair. Some of those who serve think I have health problems, but they don't know what I see and hear. How angels fly, my son! And when the priest says "For the prayers (...)" then the Heavenly Powers leave and in the Holy Altar there remains complete silence ."⁶⁰

"Once I had a thought and hesitated to confess it to the Abbot, considering it insignificant. In the end, I decided to confess him. At that moment the Abbot was leaving the Church of Saint Haralambie, and I was climbing the last step of the stairs to the church. By the time I reach the top, I can already see the Abbot opening his cell door and entering. I was amazed how the Abbot was so far away, in the blink of an eye, from the church to the cell (...).

Two or three young men asked the Abbot to accompany them to the cave of Pious David, not knowing that this was impossible due to his (leg) disease. The abbot said to them: "You go, my children, and I will come too." After a quick march, the youths reached the cave, only to find the Abbot waiting for them inside. Amazed, they began to ask him: «When did you come, Father Abbot, so quickly? We did not see you overtake us on the road». The abbot answered them: "I have come, my children, I have come".

We find such cases in Synaxar with certain saints, such as Saint Maximus the Kafsokalivit of the Holy Mountain or Saint Mark of Athens. It seems that these charisms are repeated even in our times."⁶¹

From the life of Abbess Nila (1904-1999)

⁶⁰Monk Pimen Vlad, *Un abbot Saint Blessed Father Iacov* , p. 86.

⁶¹Monk Pimen Vlad, *Un abbot Saint Blessed Father Iacov* , p. 139.

"It happened that the abbess did not immediately answer the questions of those who came. When she was asked why this happens, she answered: *I have to pray, and God reveals to me about man.*"⁶²

"During the first week of Great Lent, the disciples read the Great Canon of Penance, according to the order. On Wednesday they raised the mother in a sitting position and, with her blessing, continued the reading of the canon. After they had finished reading the canon, the mother spoke unexpectedly: The pious Mary of Egypt told me: "Prepare to go home: on Saturday, at 8:15 in the morning you will die."

The words of the saint came true exactly: schimonahia Nila died on Saturday at a quarter past 8 in the morning."⁶³

"Right before she passed to the Lord, the mother told her spiritual sons: come to my grave and tell me your troubles and worries, like now. If I have boldness before God, I will pray for you."⁶⁴

"It was very instructive to watch how the mother talked with the visitors. Each was addressed differently. To one, with severity, to another, restrained, and to some, with gentleness and carelessness. It became very clear to me that the mother, seeing those who came for the first time, knew what trouble each one had come with, what diseases, what problems, what difficulties each person had.

Not everyone had been able to prepare ahead of time and formulate their questions, so it was wonderful that she answered everyone not only the expressed questions, but also the secret ones, the thoughts and opinions of the mind. Everything went like this: the mother was constantly moving from one topic to another, and

⁶²Alexandru Trofimov , Zinaida Sviridenkova , *Schimonahia Nile Kolesnikova . Life. The tips. The Prophecies , Areopag Publishing House, Bucharest, 2014, p. 70.*

⁶³Alexandru Trofimov , *Schimonahia Nile Kolesnikova* , p. 84.

⁶⁴Alexandru Trofimov , *Schimonahia Nile Kolesnikova* , p. 87.

from her words you could tell to whom these words were addressed. Thus I also received the answers to some unspoken questions, even before I approached my mother."⁶⁵

"I finally decided to go to the abbess with my main problem: my wife and I could not conceive a child for a long time. And here is what the mother said to me: *Your wife is pregnant, she will give birth on August 1 to a little boy, whom you will name Simeon, in honor of Simeon the Righteous* . When I got home, my wife confirmed what my mother told me, and at the predicted time our long-awaited son was born, whom we named, of course, Simeon."⁶⁶

From the life of Venerable Paisie the Aghiorite (1924-1994)

" Once, said the Abbot , we were going up to the Hut loaded with a lot of weight. On the path I met a commoner from Tricala , who offered to help me. But the poor man was possessed, and on the way he shook the devil and fell to the ground. Then I marked it in the image of the Holy Cross with the cross from Metania. But the demon grabbed my right hand and wanted to break it off. Then I took the mat with my left hand and again made the sign of the cross over it, saying: In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, come out, unclean spirit ! And immediately he calmed down and asked for my forgiveness. And then the Abbot added with amazement: My, my, my, the metania has great power!"⁶⁷

" Once I was at a certain monastery (Stavronikita), the Abbot told the story . It was evening. (...) After I finished, I grabbed her on the road to go back to my Hut . I entered the path and had to go through a narrow and steep place. When I got to that place,

⁶⁵Alexandru Trofimov , *Schimonahia Nile Kolesnikova* , p. 97.

⁶⁶Alexandru Trofimov , *Schimonahia Nile Kolesnikova* , p. 226.

⁶⁷Ieromonah Isaac, *Viața Cuviosului Paisie Aghioritul* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2005, p. 184.

because I couldn't see and didn't have a flashlight with me, I fell between the branches and the rushes and I was stuck in them. (...) As I was sitting there I thought *Now what to do? Let me at least do Pavecermita* . And begin *Holy God* ... and the others. But suddenly a bright light came on, and my head became like a light bulb. It was day around me! Then I saw where I was and , climbing up , I got out. The light continued to shine around me. My heart was full of heavenly joy. I arrived at the Hut , took the key from where I had it, opened it, entered the church, lit the candles and only then did -the light go out . "68

Then the Abbot told him the following: " I had just returned from the world, where I had gone out for a church matter. On Tuesday, around 10 o'clock in the morning, I was sitting in the cell and doing the Clocks. Suddenly I heard a knock on the door and a woman's voice saying: *For the prayers of our Holy Fathers* ... Then I thought: How did a woman enter the Holy Mountain? However, I felt a divine sweetness within me and I asked:

- Who is?

- Euphemia.

Which Euphemia? I asked myself. Didn't some woman do something crazy and come to the Holy Mountain dressed in men's clothes? Now what was I to do? That one knocked on the door again, and I asked again:

- Who is?

- Euphemia.

I was in doubt and that's why I didn't open it. When he knocked the third time, the door, which was bolted from the inside, opened by itself. Then I heard footsteps down the hall. I jumped to open the cell door and saw before me a woman with her head covered. She was accompanied by someone who looked like the Evangelist Luke and who immediately disappeared. Although I was sure

⁶⁸Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 198.

that this was not an illusion from the cunning one, because it had a special glow, I asked -her who it was.

- Martyr Eufimia, she answered me.

- If you are the Martyr Euphymia, come let us worship the Holy Trinity. Everything I do, you do too.

But when he was still in the hallway, he started making gas, but not towards the church, but towards my cell. At first it seemed strange to me, but then I remembered that I had a paper icon of the Holy Trinity above my cell door.

Then I entered the church and made a prayer saying: In the name of the Father. She also repeated after me, making a mess. *And of the Son. And of the Son* , she repeated in a thin voice.

- Louder, so I can hear it too! And she repeated louder.

After we bowed the third time, saying: And of the Holy Spirit, I told him. (...) After that , the saint sat on the chair, and I on the chest, and she solved the confusion I had (in relation to a church subject)."⁶⁹

We will reproduce here the testimony of Mr. Evangel K. from Thessalonica. " Since the age of twelve , I have suffered from a devil possessing me. My life had become martyrdom. After every exorcism they read to me, I felt as if someone had beaten me. On the first Saturday of Great Lent in 1995, my priest ordered us to go to Suroti and stay there for the vigil. Before starting, however, I felt a terrible war. During the entire vigil , I did not feel any numbness. I was sitting in the middle of the church, and around me the nuns. When the vigil was over, they began to read the Water Consecration Service (Agheasma) . Then I got really wild and that's why I went to kiss the relics of Saint Arsenius. It was the first time - even now that I'm telling the story I tremble - that I felt that burning in my

⁶⁹Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Reverend Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 212.

body. Then I started saying: Pai..., Pai...". Then the abbess asked me: *Paisie?* And I nodded affirmatively. After that , I got really wild and started screaming. Seeing this, they took me to the tomb, and there I shouted three times " Holy". I started to run away, but they caught me and stretched me on the grave of the Abbot . Then I saw Father Paisie rise from the middle up, as if he had awakened from sleep. It was like when he was alive. Then the Abbot put his hand on my forehead and at the same moment I saw black smoke coming out of my mouth. This lasted a few seconds. I -calmed down completely, but the body pain did not disappear immediately. I fell asleep, but after a while I woke up because of the pain and said: *It hurts a lot.* For forty days I felt such joy that I was constantly crying.

"⁷⁰

" After the Abbot fought with the beginners and the powers of darkness and came out victorious, he received from God the charisma *the exorcism of devils.* He could tell if someone was demonized or their brain was diseased. Many times , the Abbot said , the mentally ill is also demonized. The devil has the demonized as a vacation home. As an experienced doctor, he gave the exact diagnosis as well as the right prescription. He healed the demon-possessed with prayer. (...) For the devil to enter someone, he must have given great rights (committed great sins). Young children are helped by exorcisms and Holy Communion , because they are not responsible. For adults it is not the same. First the cause should be found and then the priest should read exorcisms to help them . "⁷¹

" Once , they brought a possessed woman to Suroti to cure her. The poor woman was very exhausted and she showed me a lump like a stone that she had on the right side of her ribs. Then I took out the box I had hanging around my neck , in which I had a tooth of Saint Arsenius. I took it out and started pressing on the bump with it. Then she began to shout so loudly that she raised the

⁷⁰Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Reverend Paisie the Aghiorite*, p. 342.

⁷¹Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 554.

whole monastery to its feet. He was trying to throw up. I then placed the Holy Relic around her neck, and she began to move her head from side to side with such rapidity that she was in danger of jumping from its place, and therefore she held it with her hands. Finally , the devil left and the woman calmed down. "⁷²

" *The abbot hears when he is called to prayer.* A pious woman met the Abbot at a monastery and asked him: - Gheronda , do you hear me from the Holy Mountain when I cry to Your Holiness? – What, you think I'm deaf? he replied. Indeed, the Abbot heard, but in a spiritual way, the invocations and prayers of some Christians, who were calling him from hundreds of kilometers away. And he helped them unseen by his prayer or sent an answer in some other way. (...) The abbot, having also the charisma of foresight , knew in advance, with the grace of God, sometimes the arrival of the visitors, their disposition, spiritual state, name, place of origin, the problem that concerned them, their past and future. He had his own television (spiritual) and he could see even a person who was far away from him, what he was doing, how he was spending time, what he was doing. He also knew what was written in a letter they sent him and gave the answer without reading it, as well as what a package contained without opening it."⁷³

By the grace of God, there are many Saints who make this confession and who show that they see and hear the prayers of the faithful, wherever they are. Saint Matrona , Saint Paisius, Saint John Maximovich, Saint John of Kronstadt and many other Saints say exactly this, hearing the faithful by the power of God, seeing and hearing the faithful by the power of the Holy Spirit. This vision, knowledge, announcement, participation in all can only be had by God, who sees all. That is, this participation in everything, knowledge of everything in the world, is only a divine work, shared

⁷²Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 556.

⁷³Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Reverend Paisius the Aghior* , p. 573, p. 581.

with man, to a degree that man can carry.

Speaking in other languages. It is known that the Abbot knew no other language than Greek. However, time and again - when there was a serious reason - it happened that he conversed and got along wonderfully with those of another language.

Once, Hieromonk EK recounts, I was at the Abbot's Hut together with three other visitors and a Frenchman , who knew no Greek at all. When it was his turn to speak to the Abbot , they moved aside and for fifteen minutes they talked sitting on the logs. I could see them chatting with interest. How did they get along , since there was no common language to communicate? The stranger left happily. The satisfaction could be seen on his face.

A French tourist agreed with a certain monk to go together to see the Abbot . That night a vigil was held at the monastery where he lived. After the vigil , the monk went to his cell to rest. The Frenchman , driven by the desire to see the Abbot, went down alone to his Hut . They talked together in a wonderful way and from the discussion he was left with the impression that the Abbot knew the French language without fail (*although the Abbot spoke to him in Greek, he could hear in French*).

Father Vasile from Grigoriu Monastery testifies: One day I went to the Abbot 's Hut at noon, but the gate was locked. A young man was lying on the ground waiting. He was Greek-American and only knew English.

– How are you going to get along with the Abbot? I asked him.

- God will send someone, he answered. Behold, Your Holiness has sent you.

And so I also witnessed their discussion , acting as an interpreter with my broken and little English, which I had also forgotten.

However, I noticed , to my great astonishment, that Father Paisie understood everything that the young man said to him, better than I did and answered him with many simple and wise parables, of course in Greek, which I translated. .

Father PL's testimony: I once went to Panaguda and a stranger was waiting to talk to the Abbot . I offered to act as an interpreter . At first the Abbot waited to listen to the translation of the questions, but after that he answered the questions before I translated them (...).

Then I entered the archondaric and saw a foreign visitor. Until the Abbot prepared the treatise, I started a conversation with the stranger with the little English I knew. He told me that he had come to Panaguda late in the evening because he had lost his way. Since he was late , the Abbot hosted him at his place. They chatted without any difficulty, and the stranger believed that the Abbot knew English. "⁷⁴

Speaking in *tongues* , as it is understood by Protestants , is not according to the Scripture , because it is the light, the grace that *facilitates, translates* , helps each party to understand what the other says, by the power of God, as the Orthodox practice (are several Orthodox saints for whom we have this testimony) also show us how it happens in the other world , where everyone gets along by grace. And speaking in tongues, as a gift of the Spirit, in which grace helps to speak fully in another language, is a similar gift, in a similar consistency, but also through the work of the Spirit. Orthodoxy brings this clear proof of this gift, and also proves the work of the Holy Spirit in it, by validating the gift. Protestantism fails to produce a testimony of a gift, Protestant speaking in tongues being largely unarticulated speech (which is not found in Scripture, speech in Scripture being fully articulated and understood in this way), nor its validation from God.

⁷⁴Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisius the Aghior*, pp. 565-567.

From the life of Venerable Arsenius the Cappadocian (1840-1924)

" Once they brought from Telelides to Hagi Efendi (the pious Arsenie), on a Wednesday , a blind Muslim woman named Fatma , to read them and get well. As he was locked up, the companions of the blind man knocked at the door of his cell for a long time, and not opening it , they let him out and went to rest. At that hour , a woman from the village, whose hand was ankylosed, went to Hagi Efendi's cell and took soil from under the door, with which , rubbing her hand , she got better. (That's what all the farasiots did in those days when he was locked up and they didn't bother him). When he saw the blind man, he asked her why she was waiting, and she told him the reason. Then the villager said to him: Why are you wasting your time? Don't you know that Hagi Effendi doesn't open on Wednesdays and Fridays ? Take earth from his doorstep and anoint your eyes and you will be well, as we all do these days when we are sick.

The villager went about her business. The Muslim woman , although at first she was surprised by what she had heard, but after that she began to look for the threshold of the door and, finding it, she took earth, began to rub her eyes with it, and immediately began to beat like a madwoman at the door of father Arsenie, who opened and seeing that she was a Muslim , although she did not speak that day, made a prayer and asked her what she wanted. He told her the reason and the Father took the Gospel, read it to her and immediately the light came to her eyes. Then , with great joy, she fell at his feet and worshiped him with reverence, but the father scolded her and said: If you want to worship, worship Christ, who gave you light, and not me "75

" Stela Koglanidu tells that they brought a thirty-year-old mute Turk to her parents' house and her father took him and took

⁷⁵Venerable Paisie the Aghior, *Saint Arsenius the Cappadocian* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2006, pp. 87-88.

him to Father Arsenie to read to him and get well . While Hagi Efendi was reading the Gospel to him, before he finished, the mute began to speak. Then he brought the mute who was now speaking back to his house. The next day his relatives took him and left . Sotira Hristoforidu told that a blind Turkish girl named Meriama was brought to Father Arsenie, who read to her and restored her sight.
"76

" The Farasiots of Drama who settled in Thessalonica told that two Sehi (first rulers of the Muslim nation and sorcerers) from Hatzi-Pechtes visited Father Arsenius. The father received them and made them coffee. The sheikhs , however, began to ask him stupid and dizzying questions, which only gave him a headache. The father, in order to get rid of them, said to them:

– I can't listen to you because my head hurts.

But they did not understand and one of them said to the father:

- Father Efendi, we will make you a talisman that if you wear, you will not have a headache for the rest of your life.

The father then told them harshly:

– I have more power than yours, and with the power of Christ I can make you not move at all from the place where you stand. He immediately left them and went next door to his cell. When they finished their coffee , the sheikhs wanted to leave, but in no way could they move from the place where they were sitting, as they felt bound by an unseen bond. Then they had to call Father Arsenie to untie them.

The father immediately went, but did not speak to them, but only motioned for them to go. That was the only way they could break free from their seats. The sheikhs realized their mistake and

⁷⁶Venerable Paisius the Aghiorite, *Saint Arsenius the Cappadocian* , p. 93.

asked the Father for forgiveness , saying to him as they went :

- Father Efendi, forgive us! Your power is greater, because you derive it from your great faith. We work with Satan."⁷⁷

When you read the life of the pious Arsenius the Cappadocian , it's as if you find him again, you see Christ, in the same miracles, with the same power, the pious bringing an amazing testimony, the same as that brought by Christ. A divine love and power shared by God through the Saint, to everyone.

testimony of grace and communion in the Orthodox Church is complete, full, historical, in the faithful, according to the Scriptures, in the saints, in the mysteries, in the prophets, briefly presented above, and full in all the books in the bibliography, in a wealth, clarity, total cleanliness of the discoveries, which do not need clarifications, explanations, nor a special mystique for understanding (such as the Protestant and Catholic ones) , being clean and easy to understand and receive as a correct work of light and communion with God. I didn't have to look for references for this, all the books of orthodox mysticism are exactly in this pattern, of continuous discovery of authentic communion with God. This is the nature of a genuine mysticism. Orthodox mysticism is a continuous discovery of God and only highlighted in this spirit, there being no other texts and no other typology than in the spirit of the above discoveries. And the naturalness of these discoveries, but also the unnaturalness of the discoveries in Catholicism and Protestantism is of clear evidence for those who receive some pointers in this regard. How natural and clean is the Orthodox testimony compared to the other testimonies, there being no elements that cast a shadow on it!

The two levels of discovery, that through voices, dreams, visions and supernatural only to this extent, with clearly illegitimate

⁷⁷Venerable Paisius the Aghiorite, *Saint Arsenius the Cappadocian* , p. 89.

characteristics, without any kind of validation of its authenticity, of trinity validation of authenticity, and another typology of clear discovery of light divine and of God in light are two levels of the mystic, clearly highlighted in two typologies, present as a typology in cults. In fact, the cults (not only the Christian ones) fall entirely into one of two typologies. Only Orthodoxy has a legitimate supernatural.

Such must be the testimony of any community that claims the work of grace. There is no other similar testimony, and no other testimony can be built outside of communion with the Christian community, which has the light of God, the Orthodox one .

II. WHAT IS *GRACE*? *THE UNCREATED-CREATED GRACE* ARGUMENT IN ORTHODOXY AND CATHOLICISM

1. INTRODUCTION

STRUCTURING THE ARGUMENT IN THE DISCUSSION OF GRACE

The theme of grace, of divine energy, is one of the themes of this volume. It is an important topic of debate in interfaith discussions, because grace, light, divine energy, by its presence and work, shows, reveals God's presence and communion with Him. Due to the importance of the witness of grace, each denomination has created a theology of grace and communion, specific, supported in different ways, each trying to prove it from Scripture, from life, from different testimonies, each trying to give a framework of legitimacy to their own experience, to prove to their own believers the "legitimacy of the confession", the presence of grace, of God, therefore also the validity of the path they are on.

Looking to see what can be brought for interfaith convergence on the subject, related to the thesis of uncreated grace of Saint Gregory Palamas, I noticed that all the main ideas related to theological consequences are already present in his thesis. Father Dumitru Stăniloae, in *Philokalia VII*, in the introduction to part of the works of Saint Gregory, but also in the work "*The Life and Teaching of Saint Gregory Palamas*", emphasizes the main ideas of the debate. The grace thesis of the Greek theologian Dimitrie

Tselenghidis, " *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition of the Fourteenth Century* ", likewise traces the main theologies of grace and their consequences in detail, making a detailed biblical substantiation, structuring the thesis, using the argument Saint Gregory Palamas. It is the orthodox works mainly used for this discussion of grace.

The present volume wants to complete certain dimensions of the analysis that are not pursued in these works, namely the pursuit of theological information in the argument, starting from the biblical information, largely following the theologies used, related to how the haric logical argument should be constructed at a formal level . How theological information appears and is used in the haric argument, and what are the consequences of misuse. It is a comparative analysis of the Catholic and Orthodox argument related to grace, *from the perspective of the use of theological information and argumentation* , mainly looking at *the connection of grace with divinity, created/uncreated character* . In this way it is much easier to see where the errors are and you can make a traceability of the errors in all dimensions. At the informational level, premises, at the level of the argument, at the level of the conclusions. And at the level of theological and dogmatic impact.

What can be highlighted additionally in a Haric thesis is *why* the orthodox argument is constructed in this way, *how* the orthodox argument is constructed as *an argumentative structure* , why certain theologies are used. And how is the Orthodox argument constructed at the level of theological information compared to the Catholic one, but also how the Catholic argument fails theologically both in premises, in argumentation, and in conclusions. It is important to explain in theology why certain information is used (due to the nature of this information, its direct or indirect character, consequences), why certain theologies are used (due to the transmission of information about the uncreated/created char-

acter of grace and energies indirectly). These things must be explained, in order to fully show the completeness of the orthodox argument at the level of argumentation, at the level of logical argument.

My aim is not to recreate the thesis of Saint Gregory Palamas, who fully understands the biblical directions of this thesis and elaborates them at the level of theological consequences and biblical foundation, nor to structure the Haric thesis, as Professor Tselenghidis does, using the thesis of Saint Gregory Palamas . The purpose is to show *why* Saint Gregory Palamas chose this theological path and *why* Catholics chose another path. To highlight the structure of the argument used by each cult, to show that not using the premise information correctly leads to a completely erroneous argumentative path. To show how theological information appears in the argument, how it is taken up and analyzed in each argument. To place a great emphasis on the correctness of processing theological information, on the structure of the theological argument about grace.

An important question in the grace thesis is what happens to the biblical theological information about the uncreated/created principle and character of grace? Where does it appear, where is it transmitted, where does it matter? Where in theology is the information about the uncreated/created character of grace present and shared? It is crucial to explain the methodology by which you produce a thesis. All theology looks for the uncreated/created character information in the consequences to invalidate the unorthodox propositions, only through the theological consequences, not through the analysis of the haric logical argument , instead of seeing where the theological information appeared and disappeared in the discourse and why. Because the information about the uncreated character is present but not tracked correctly.

What the whole of theology does in this created/uncreated

grace thesis is to look for two main pieces of information:

1. To seek *the existence of a connecting principle* between God and man
2. To seek *the nature of this principle* .

First of all, we were looking for a single piece of information, both principle and reporting-nature. Theology seeks essentially one piece of information on this subject, that there is a principle (related to divinity) between God and man. There is only one piece of information, in fact, that is recapitulated in theology. And here it must be seen where this information should be found, in Scripture-Tradition or deductively, as the Catholic thesis proposes.

grace thesis is very much related to the correct tracking of the information about the uncreated/created character in each thesis, related to the starting point of the thesis, but also the presence of the information about grace and its presence in other theologies. The Catholic grace thesis is through an alteration of the logical argument about grace. What needs to be pointed out most strongly in order to unravel the Gordian knot of this dispute is where the information about uncreated character appears in the biblical thesis and how it is correctly used. Which information from the entire thesis of St. Gregory Palamas explicitly, directly links Scripture to the uncreated character ? What is the root information of Grigorie Palama's thesis on which the entire thesis is built?

If theologically it is not precisely understood what should be pursued in this discussion, what information we are looking for, what nature the information should have, how it should appear in theology, the discussion about the theology of grace will be one and confused, but also too broad and will not be able to be properly tracked. And exactly at this point, in the lack of structuring of the argumentation for this subject, not only lapses appear, but very large deviations from a methodical discussion, from a discussion in which every step of the argumentation for this subject

is followed.

Wrong theological theses depart from or build on wrong informational premises, which are not admissible in theses (for example, the Protestant or Catholic thesis, which removes information and adds non-theological external informational premises)⁷⁸. Some theses force deductive logic and wrong consequences (primacy). Mainly, in these two points are the (formal) theological errors in the arguments, in their vast majority.

A question related to the orthodox thesis is why Gregory Palamas adopted this (orthodox) path for the theological information about grace? Because he understood how it is retrieved, how the information is present, and the consequences of misidentifying it. And it explores all the theological dimensions where the information about the uncreated character of grace appears and

⁷⁸ In order to have a unitary approach in the works for the proposed theological analyses, I mention here the analysis methodology used for each information in the Church. It should generally respect/contain the following steps: 1. Analysis of the informational premises and verification of their admissibility in the argument, 2. Analysis of the starting point in the argument, 3. Verification of the deductive logic, the logical theological argument, presence of syllogisms, 4. Analysis of the consequences theology, harmony with other theologies, 5. Analysis as the de facto informational status of the Church of the proposed conclusions and information (Scripture, Synods-Tradition), 6. The inclusion in a natural process of discovery and guidance in identity by the Holy Spirit, 7 Pursuing that the argument is in informational unity with all the information of the Church, in all its dimensions, Revelation, Tradition, as part of its unity of faith. These aforementioned steps of analysis bring clarity to the thesis, in countless directions, starting with the informational premises on which it is built, with the deductive theological logic applied, the consequences brought, with the proposed impact in theology, with the acceptance of the argument as a natural part of an identity discovered in guidance of the Holy Spirit. As an act of clarity in history, part of the Orthodox identity under the assistance of the Spirit. Theses from the volumes brought for Christian unity are analyzed following these directions, as those that bring clarity and a comprehensive methodology for analyzing a logical theological argument.

explains what happens if it is distorted in different theologies.

Unorthodox theology must first understand how an argument about grace is constructed at the level of information and argument. More specifically, how theological information is pursued in all dimensions in affected theologies. That is, a methodology for pursuing this information in theology. Because, once the logic about the presence of information in different theologies is understood, then certainly the Orthodox theological argument related to grace will be clear, universal , for all.

The question in the Catholic thesis is not why grace is deduced starting from nature, it is why Catholicism chose a deductive path? And the answer is because he assumed that information is absent from the biblical thesis. Either this is impossible, because the biblical thesis of the link between man and God, in which the principle of the link is theologically over-stressed, being impossible to accept an indirect deductive way. In the countless arguments, information brought by the biblical thesis for grace, it is impossible not to also bring the information about how it is as a principle – uncreated and connected to the Being of God or created and broken by the Being. Why do Catholics begin the discussion of grace from nature? They actually don't know how to start the argument. What I was looking for is how this information is expressed theologically. There is? Certainly - there is so much biblical content about grace, the God-man connection, that we cannot accept that this information is not somehow expressed, being only a matter of precisely identifying the way of communicating it. How? It must be seen. Catholicism says it does not exist directly, indirectly, intrinsically, in any way. But only deductively. It is a different perspective on the assumption of the non-existence of this information in the biblical thesis, but also on the way of communicating it.

How can this orthodox argument of the theology of uncreated

grace be universally accepted? By understanding the correct way to construct the argument and follow the theological information. Orthodoxy has to point this out. And it must show how in the Catholic argument the information about uncreated character is lost-ignored, how it is misrepresented, and how a false informational premise is covertly created, which is then falsely recovered as consequences. That is, it must be shown precisely in the Catholic argument where, at the level of theological information, the alteration occurred.

We need to explain not only at the level of what happens theologically if the information about grace is altered - this is the current and historical theological direction of the grace thesis . But it is an incomplete one, not being able to prove the problems at the level of the Catholic heretic thesis by arguments from the consequences alone. We do not precisely point out where in the Catholic logical argument the error is present, but only combat some consequences, leaving the entire Catholic argument uncovered and not precisely pointing *out why, how , where* the error appeared in the Catholic argument and why it is not present in the orthodox thesis. It is not enough on this topic to discuss only the theological consequences, but it is important to specify how the arguments are constructed differently in Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Protestantism.

The consequences of the Orthodox uncreated grace argument are combated by various methods or denied by Catholics. We must also explain how an argument for grace is constructed, where the information is found, how it is assumed, what theologies are affected, how the information is conveyed. And what is the point in the Catholic argument where the information is distorted. We must show where, in the Catholic thesis, this information is distorted, how and what is the correct way to recover this information, the uncreated character of grace. That is, let's also point

out at the formal level, of constructing the argument, how the argument is constructed wrongly, and at what points, so that Catholicism also understands its mistake and can correct it.

Where in Catholicism is the information about the uncreated character of grace ignored and distorted? *What is the specific fallacy of the Catholic argument? Where did he get stuck in the Haric thesis, unorthodox theology?* Exactly where he did not understand the structuring of the argument, the use of the information about the uncreated character, how this information is brought into the argument and used from the biblical thesis. In fact, the universal theological misunderstanding outside of Orthodoxy on this subject is from a misunderstanding of where the formation of the uncreated character, directly and indirectly, is present and how it is recovered. This is what Orthodoxy must explain, how to correctly recover the information and the theological consequences. This is one of *the points of clarity* that must be brought in the orthodox thesis, to be explicitly specified this aspect. Point of clarity showing why we are using this information and why we are constructing an argument in a certain way. The starting point of the thesis, and its justification, but also the path of the argument are important to specify in the orthodox thesis.

This work on grace pursues only one major theological point, that of uncreated/created character. The paper's thesis is that the Catholic argument is wrongly constructed, focused on the created character of grace, Catholicism ignoring the biblical information about grace. Because this point is fundamental in this discussion, being the capital attribute of grace, which completely changes the entire theology of each confession, which is developed using this attribute, from a theology of adhesion, of unity-union, like the Orthodox one, into an external, symbolic theology, broken from God, such as the Catholic one.

The paper also shows that the Catholic argument is a natural knowledge-argument (logical deduction from matter, using nature as a mirror for information about grace) for a problem of supernatural revelation. Only this point itself, uncreated grace, gives shape and direction to an entire theology and validates or invalidates it as a whole, being the key point of salvation theology, the one that encompasses the essence of salvation. The paper points out what *information is missing in Catholic grace theology*, where it was lost, in what process it was lost, how it had to be recovered, how Orthodoxy correctly brought the information into the argument built for the Orthodox thesis of grace. The thesis highlights how the Charic Catholic thesis diverges theologically due to a lack of informational capital.

This point of the connection of grace with Being, uncreated grace, is a point with major implications in all theology, in all theological areas. Because it changes the position of man next to God, but also the work of man next to Him. It is not just a simple theological point, but an absolute paradigm shift between man and God - that is why it was treated and emphasized so strongly by Grigorie Palama. The mission of Orthodox theology is to see what information appears in the biblical thesis, what information appears in the Orthodox thesis, and what is missing in the Catholic thesis. Because Catholics have lost information in these biblical excursions and have a thesis in informational incompleteness.

The key information, *the missing informational link* of Catholic theology is *the biblical information about the uncreated character of grace*. Once this lack is demonstrated, Catholicism reaches a position of fully reassuming the entire Orthodox theology, anthropology, soteriology (but also other great theologies), no longer having the vital information for the theological construction, all these theologies being linked to this information, to the character uncreated of grace. The uncreated character of grace is

the key information, the pillar on which anthropology and soteriology are built, the whole human-God connection, the whole theology of the Church. It completely changes man's position in existence next to God. From a settlement external to divinity, through the uncreated character of grace, it reaches a continuous advance in divinity, in God. Theology acquires an entirely different dimension in a grace linked to Being, one of a continuous and stronger attachment to God. A theology is completely corrupted if it lacks its foundation, the explanation of salvation as participation in the Godhead through the uncreated character of grace.

Analyzing the information proposed for grace by Catholicism and Orthodoxy, trying to reconstruct theologically from scratch this thesis of uncreated/created grace, I wondered what is the correct way to arrive at this information about grace. Forgetting absolutely everything that has been said in theology about grace, what would be the directions to recover information about grace? Where does the argument begin?

I have tried to (re)construct this thesis of uncreated grace from scratch, ignoring absolutely everything that has been said about it. The approach I considered natural to start looking for this information (uncreated grace) was to see the reporting that the divinity itself makes to this work, here there can be several options, direct or indirect information, intrinsic or extrinsic reporting, statements linking divinity to humanity, principles, patterns, usage, typology. I primarily looked for the types of information that can be found (direct, indirect) for the uncreated/created character, and how the information gets to the thread level. This is how I built an argument, arriving exactly at Saint Gregory's thesis, which, although not organized using information typologies, has exactly the same structuring in the argument using the same logic of information (direct, indirect, intrinsic reporting, consequences). I have reached exactly the arguments brought by Saint Gregory. I recapitulated Saint Gregory's thesis, but starting from another perspective, one

related to the direction of theological information and its communication method, *starting from the divinity* , and then seeing the theologies in which it should appear at the level of nature, explicitly following the information direct Scripture on this subject.

This information is one that the divinity imparts, the divinity knowing the nature of this work from Himself - from the divinity comes this information. We are talking about two existential planes, that of divinity and that of humanity, which cannot be united as information by deductive logic, needing supernatural revelation, direct information on this point. Certainly, there must be information in an explicit, direct format in the Gospel. And it must be placed in a dedicated format, to be contained as information correctly, in the main dimensions needed to be transmitted. With certainty, the divinity directly and explicitly answers the *fundamental theological question about grace, about its uncreated character* . Following the thread of information, I tried to see if, starting in this direction, I reach theological convergence with the thesis of Saint Gregory Palamas.

The uncreated character of grace is an explicit given in Scripture and cannot be accepted by indirect deduction logic, as a consequence, starting on informational paths that do not actually have that information and cannot bring it. This information cannot be accepted as indirect, as a result of an extremely complex argument of natural knowledge. We are talking about a critical information about grace and about a supernatural revelation, which must fully explain the realities, but also the relationships between them. Information about the uncreated character of grace is present in supernatural revelation. Being primary theological information, the primordial relationship between God and his work, there is the necessity of its existence in this given, explicit form. God explains and has a clear, explained relationship to His own work.

major points that need to be clarified about grace, the major questions that should be asked are added below.

Context of the discussion:

1. What is *the context* in which we are discussing grace - the self-imparting of divinity and man's participation in divinity.
2. *What* actually is grace? Can we say what grace is? What can we say about grace?
3. What is *the ultimate purpose of grace* —real participation in godhood and unity, in the self-sharing of divinity, in the trinitarian pattern of union.
4. What are the *big theologies* in the grace discussion? Unity-union, love, the law of love, anthropology (image and likeness), soteriology, Christology, pneumatology.

The root of the discussion, the uncreated/created character of grace:

5. How does Scripture answer the question *Is grace bound to Being or severed from Being?* Where is the information about the uncreated/created character of grace present in Scripture? Does grace spring from Being or is it a creation external to Being?
6. How is grace information assumed, where is it present in theologies, how is it theologically assumed, in which theologies does it appear, and how is the Orthodox and Catholic theological argument for grace constructed?
7. Is grace a theology of attachment or an external theology, broken by God?
8. How does one build an argument for this discussion, from

deductive, natural reasoning, or solely through biblical information, supernatural revelation, by which alone such a discussion would be possible?

Theological consequences for grace (uncreated-created):

9. The relationship between the divine subject and the human subject, related to grace.
10. Affecting the theologies of unity, love, anthropology of image and likeness, soteriology, through created grace.

What is the big paradigm difference between Orthodoxy and Catholicism regarding the theology of grace? It is related to how grace is seen in relation to Being. Grace is a *bridge of adhesion*, of union with divinity, in Orthodoxy, a principle of deification, and it is a *spiritual matter created*, broken by God, in Catholicism.

Why does Catholicism reach such a wide range, and with such complex notions, brought into the discussion of grace and its uncreated/created character? Why does Catholicism arrive at an indirect deductive logic, that is, it logically, deductively, indirectly extracts, as a consequence, information, and does not retrieve information directly, from supernatural revelation? Because he cannot correctly identify in the thesis of Scripture the presence of information about the uncreated/created character of grace. The first thing that can be said about the Catholic thesis is that *it lacks information from supernatural revelation about the uncreated or created character* of grace. Why did Catholicism arrive at its own way of retrieving this information using the discourse of nature - supernature and the simplicity of Being? Because he did not discover the information about the uncreated character of grace in Scripture.

Is the information about uncreated/created character a direct one, given in the thesis of Scripture, or is it a natural one, to be inferred in an existential area where we cannot apply logical deduction? This information must have visibility, but also a direct response from the deity, being the first thing the deity should say about grace. It is information of vital importance that cannot be accepted by natural argument, by natural knowledge or deduction. In its essence, information shows us whether man is joined to God by grace or whether he is outside of Him. It is a maximal positional information in existence, information that does not accept a treatment by indirect deduction or by a natural argument. It shows us how the union and unity between man and God is accomplished. It is the first information that should be communicated by the divinity in the thesis of the Scripture related to the connection with the Self. It is the most important information about grace, because it brings a different positioning between divinity and humanity: from a break from divinity, isolation of creation from the Being of God (through the created character of grace), to a connection with the Being of God, to communion level. That is, all the dimensions of the act of union change, from one related to the Being, through adhesion, internal, to a representative one, through an external principle of union, through a created matter.

Uncreated grace versus created grace is a paradigm shift between divinity and humanity , from an internalization and gathering of humanity in God, by gluing, to an external preservation, in isolation, through a delegate, through a represented, who transfers the attributes the divinity of a created spiritual matter, bringing also the discussion of a *created principle of the transfer of divinity outwardly, in the spiritual matter called Catholic created grace* .

The biblical thesis of the deification and union of man with God can only be supported for an uncreated grace , otherwise an additional principle of the transfer of divinity externally, in a spiritual matter, in a created grace, needs to be present in the biblical

thesis, in order to he could call this spiritual matter by the name of divinity and assimilate it to deification. The biblical thesis is built on the basis of the information of an uncreated grace, information present in the thesis, which links the deification and union of man with God to the Being, without the need to explain and add a principle, it already exists in the uncreated grace, in the information added by the thesis.

Father Stăniloae says for this point: "In general, that part of Catholic theology that has remained enslaved to Thomism does not conceive of any other connection of God with the world than through the mediation of creative causality. By this, everything God gives to the world would be something created. We are confined within the boundaries of creation. ***The creature is like a wall that implacably rises between us and God.*** God does not communicate directly with the world once created. As soon as God wants to approach the world through an act, something created appears between Him and the world, between Him and man, says this theology. In this way all the notions of the Fathers take on an improper meaning. Deification itself is a created state. *Energy is the act of the divine essence whose causality creates the deification of people*, says Catholic theologian Garrigues in a *sui generis* interpretation of Saint Maximus the Confessor."⁷⁹

What I followed in the Catholic thesis were:

1. What is the starting point?
2. How is the premise information chosen?
3. How the argument is built, the strategy of argumentation (positive, through biblical or patristic information or logically, through deduction, and where the argument moves from positive argumentation, through direct, biblical information, into

⁷⁹Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 264.

deductive-negative argumentation, where wrong information appears) , how is uncreated/created character information searched?

4. How do Catholics see the union between man and God?

The structure of the argument is critical in this discussion and is a point where the validity of this thesis can be demonstrated. It is a way to see more clearly the differences between theses. The Orthodox and Catholic thesis are a big paradigm difference on this topic, which should be visible in the different structure of the argument. Since they are completely different arguments, countless problems should arise in an argument if it is not constructed correctly. If the starting point and the informational premises are not correct, then surely more and more bizarre consequences will appear.

Catholicism has exactly this problem throughout the grace thesis , for created grace. Problems arise both in the starting point and in the premise information and in the construction of the argument, but also in the consequences and the paradigm of man's existence vis-a-vis God. In all these points gathered, only one conclusion is drawn, of a wrong historically constructed argument, in Catholicism. For which a syllogism was built and not a theological argument. Catholicism has a syllogism as an argument for uncreated grace. The work follows these points, the starting point, the premise information, the construction of the argument, the consequences in the union between man and God.

Below I add some considerations to present the main points in the discussion of grace, in the Orthodox understanding of it and in Catholic theology ⁸⁰.

⁸⁰ In the main, Protestantism retains the Catholic line of argument for grace, so I have added the treatment in the Catholic context.

GOD'S SHARING OF HIMSELF IN GRACE

What is the starting point of the discussion of grace? God's sharing of Himself is in grace.

Karl Rahner says about the self-sharing that God makes through grace: "God in his most proper reality becomes the most intimate constituent of man. That is why it is about a self-participation *related to the Being* (*seinshafte*) of God.(...) Self-communication from God therefore means that what is communicated or shared is really God in his own being and therefore the communication consists in embracing him and in having God in direct vision and in love. This self-communication signifies precisely that the gift and the communication, the culmination of subjectivity on the part of the communicator and on the part of the receiver, are objective."⁸¹

Grace is not just an act, a stand-alone work, independent of God. Just as the Father shares with the Son and the Spirit the essence of divinity, in the same way, he shares with humanity himself and from himself, in order to include humanity in himself, in another "essence"⁸² which is from himself, which is in a way all His Self, and which humanity can hold, can bear, as being united with God perfected through this infinite work, after the pattern in union in essence of the Holy Trinity. As the Trinity is united in the essence of the Godhead, we are also united with the Trinity, but in another "essence", which we can receive, which is also a kind of essence of another communion and work, but otherwise, called *uncreated energy*, which eternally proceeds from God and in which God is present and through which man participates in the eternal

⁸¹Karl Rahner, *Fundamental Treatise of Faith, Introduction to the Concept of Christianity*, Galaxia Gutenberg Publishing House, 2005, p. 187, p.189.

⁸²It is not about the essence of the deity, nor about the hypostasis, but about the uncreated energies.

divinity.

God does not remove the creation from what he also shows in himself, in the Trinity, from what he is in himself, unity and sharing of the essence, and he does not break the creation from the sharing of himself, which he also does to the Son and the Spirit, in a beauty of the manifestation of divine love in fullness and towards creation, in equality and in the same form of intratrinitarian love. God is in perfect sharing of Himself, and the greatest proof is both in the Son, in the Spirit, but also in humanity, which "are one", by sharing the Godhead in the essence of the Godhead or in the uncreated energies, fully participating in the eternal Godhead, on as humanly possible.

Grace is God's sharing of Himself with man. And this so that man can also have a share in God, in an existence like His, in a good, eternal, happy existence. Grace is something that man can receive, a work related to Being, to God (not as hypostasis nor as essence, being something eternal from Himself) and in which God Himself is, so that man also has a participation related to Being, to the Godhead, like the Trinitarian one. Grace is an emanation from God, something that flows continuously, eternally, from God.

WHAT IS GRACE?

What is grace as a category? This is the first question about anything. What is like inclusion: subject, act, work, idea, object, relationship, seeing in this question a clarification of what is in relation to what we know? Can we put grace into a category, so that we can apply a logic like that applied by Catholicism to the theory of grace? The answer is that we cannot encompass grace in this way, in a category—we do not know what grace is as a substance and in its nature-comprehension.

We can say of grace that it is a gift, a work, a light, an energy, an emanation from God. These are the usual descriptions for grace. *Grace is also called energy*, being the work of God, which both man and creation receive, assimilated in the name (dimension) of *energy*. It is received at baptism, only as a result of the correct confession of the Truth about God, in the Christian community united with Him and by immersion in holy water; whoever is not in God, in grace, is cut off from the Spirit of Truth. It is updated in communion, in the Church. It is not a passive energy, but an expression of God's will, and is obtained only in right communion with the divinity.

Dimitrios Tselenghidis, in a comprehensive study of grace and freedom, says: "In the realm of theology, the word *grace* denotes that particular, *natural*, and essential *energy of the Godhead*, which, when partaken of, charismatically deifies those who partake of it."⁸³

For grace, a primary question to be asked is: *What is grace in relation to the divine being-essence?* What we want to cover in this answer is *whether the grace is related to the divine being or is outside it*. The rest of the things about grace as a work, as a gift, we know

⁸³Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and freedom in the patristic tradition of the 14th century*, Doxologia Publishing House, Iasi, 2015, p. 16.

from the explanation of these in revelation. We wish to express whether grace is of the essence of the Godhead, whether it is an uncreated energy from God, or whether it is something wholly broken, external to being, created. Is grace from God or is it outside of Him?

Grace brings an elevation to human nature, it is a power of nature, received through the attachment of man to God. For this reason, Saint Gregory Palamas says: " God's grace is a natural state, that is, the work and display of a power of nature" ⁸⁴. And "Saint Gregory Palamas affirms the role of man's religious experience, an experience that means sharing the grace of God in the uncreated and deifying light." ⁸⁵The apostle Paul likewise shows grace as a power of nature, which perfects all and in which we work all in power.

Grace is light. Eternal existence is not a philosophy of philosophical categories, it is a way of living together in the uncreated/created character. God is a Being who shares Himself. Eternal existence is itself communion in uncreated/created character.

If God is light and grace is light, is grace a light outside of God that can be called light, that can be counted in the same typology as God? Can it be a created light just like the eternal light? Or counted somehow as being of This, as having something of This? *This very name and this way of looking at God, as light, definitely shows the uncreated character. The light is one, it is in one way, it is God revealing himself. As light in Being, as light in participation, in uncreated energies.* Which are all light, being of God, having God in them. Which shows the nature, the internal connection between God and the light that comes out of Himself and that bears all His name, He

⁸⁴Translated by Constantin Făgețean, *Life and sufferings of the one among the saints Grigorie Palama, Archbishop of Thessalonica*, Egumenita Publishing House, p. 94.

⁸⁵Coord. Rev. Prof. Dr. Ștefan Buchiu, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. I, p. 42.

being in the light of Himself. Light as a reality, a concept, related to essence and also related to grace, also shows us the logic of its uncreated character, in grace. Light shows us that God is an essence of a certain kind. And *grace is all light* . That is, it is also a kind of essence, from God, related to God, which is also called light. And that he bears God, that he is God in that light, that he can bear exactly the name by which God is.

Grace is named and assimilated to the divine light, by the name borne. That is, it is assimilated to what God is and is defined by what God is in Himself. Grace is light, it is in some sense an essence and work that can be called the same as God, and that only by its uncreated character. And it bears the name of God, that of light, showing the uncreated character and participation, in the light, in a different light, but just like the Light, all light, all God. Grace is all light, from the Light of God, being of God, being God who shares himself as light, in a shared essence.

2. *THE FIRST STEP OF THE ARGUMENT:* STARTING POINT, PREMISES

THE CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION WE HAVE ABOUT GRACE

The discussion of grace is so broad that it becomes important to show the typology of the biblical information we have, to point out the correct way of constructing an argument, which depends on the nature of the information, but also to see how current arguments are constructed.

What are the categories of information we have regarding grace? It is critical to understand the nature of grace information and how it should be found in Scripture, in what theologies, and in what dimensions. If the nature of the information is not understood, it will not be searched correctly. Grace is a central communication between man and God. It is one of the information that connects man to God, in existence. This is the first information about this link. And the information is presented in several dimensions:

1. Intrinsic reporting, direct information.
2. As usage and principle of union. In which Christ shows that union with humanity has a pattern and principle in grace.
3. In what dimensions should this information be shown? Exactly in these two. In which to see the relationship to the Being, but also the meaning of this information, the union, but also the model of union, naturally linked to the Being.

However, Scripture fulfills and brings theologians exactly to these two points, to specify the grace-Being relationship and

what is the meaning of grace. The meaning of grace is this *as we are one, the* fulfillment of the union in a pattern, in a likeness, in a principle, which brings deification - not as a symbol . Scripture does not develop a symbolic theology (imitation) for deification, but develops a principle, it shows grace as the one that brings about a deification, a clinging to God.

The information brought by the Scripture for grace is not an isolated one, it is in a broad informational context, which does not allow to go astray regarding the assumption of this information about grace. If there is a model of union and if there is the discussion of the model, then there is also the discussion of a *principle of union* that fulfills the model, but also brings exactly what the model carries, the uncreated character of grace, the essential reporting, as Father Stăniloae calls it.

Is there information in Scripture about union, unity, the principle of unity, the meaning of union? If there is not, why not, what would be the meaning of the absence, in Catholicism, of this information? If it exists why does it exist? The informational premises must first be unpacked, because here is a large part of the argument of grace, on which premises it is built, what is the meaning of this information about union, unity, about intrinsic reporting, present in Scripture. Because it is information related to Being, related to man, that actually presents this principle of connection between man and divinity.

The grace information is:

1. *Primary, direct* biblical information - direct biblical information about grace is from the implicit, intrinsic relationship between the Holy Spirit and grace; this is effectively the direct information on which the whole theology of grace is founded, discovered in exactly this

way, being the most powerful way to theologically comprehend this information. Likewise, we have information about the existence of a principle of union, found in the model of union between divinity and humanity, such as the trinitarian model of union.

2. *First-hand patristic information.*
3. *Indirect information, consequences* - deduced from different theologies. We deduce indirectly, from the following theologies, the character of work related to Being, i.e. uncreated energy:
 - From *the theology of union in an essence* we deduce that it is necessary to have an essence related to Being, uncreated, for union, for the connection between man and God, like the union in the Holy Trinity.
 - From *the theology of participation* we deduce that the work of grace implies the existence of a connection with Being, a connection we call uncreated energy.
 - From *the theology of image and likeness* we deduce that nature is fulfilled by a participation related to Being, similar to participation in an essence, which necessitates the existence of a grace related to Being, an uncreated grace.
4. *Information from experimental knowledge.* Grace is part of objective reality. That is why Orthodox mysticism correctly comprehends and expresses this reality, in full agreement with the testimony of Scripture and tradition. The information in reality is identical and strengthens through experience the primary testimony of revelation. Grace is light, and the theology of mystical experience must be a theology of light. Theology must testify to the light of God and its unity with the

original revealed testimony.

A correct placement of each information on the page certainly brings a theological convergence on the argument much easier and highlights each step in the construction of the logical argument, without the possibility of error. The fundamental question for every argument and piece of information is where the piece of information came from in theology and whether it is admissible in the argument. And if one can build an argument along that theological path, using that admitted information as a premise. Especially in the theology of grace, this is an especially important exercise to do. Clarity at the level of information in the premises brings a theological path that is easy to assume in theology. That is why a broad focus on the highlighting of all available information, on the relationships between information, on the admissibility of information is mandatory in theological endeavors.

THE INFORMATIONAL PREMISES AND MISSING INFORMATION IN THE CATHOLIC HARIAN THESIS

There are several statements in Catholicism that show the wrong starting point in the Haric thesis. I place them here, as they are precisely presented in the New Catholic Encyclopedia, a work in which one can find the main points about how the Catholic grace thesis is constructed, being a reference ⁸⁶for the discussion of the Catholic theology of grace:

1. "Catholic theologians continue the task of penetrating the nature of man's real destiny to the order of grace" (Original in English. " Catholic theologians are continuing the task of penetrating the nature of man's actual destiny to the order of grace ").

⁸⁶The work is also available in digital format, online.

2. "Grace is the free and undeserved favor of God" (" the free and unmerited favor of God " ⁸⁷).
3. "It is precisely this fundamental emphasis on the absolute gratuitousness of grace that effectively binds the entirety of his Catholic theological exposition to the claims of Christian revelation." ⁸⁸
4. "While no Catholic theologian would claim that such a state existed, a very large number of theologians insisted that *only by formulating such a notion of a pure nature* as a genuine possibility, *the absolute gratuitousness of the supernatural raising of man can be clearly understood and defended* . For *once one can say precisely what belongs to nature* , then the theologian is in a *position to determine what grace is* , and thus *what is to be affirmed as the undeserved gift of God* ." ⁸⁹
5. What is seen here is the construction of an information support in nature, for a deductive logic, of matter, related to grace. This passage is one that overturns the entire Catholic approach to the argument made for created grace, being a passage that shows how Catholicism creates in matter a state from which to reflect the nature of grace

⁸⁷ *New Catholic Encyclopedia, Second Edition* , Vol 6, p. 417.

⁸⁸Original text: "It is this fundamental emphasis on the total gratuity of grace that effectively relates the totality of its Catholic theological exposition to the affirmations of Christian revelation ." *New Catholic Encyclopedia* , *Second Edition* , Vol 6, p. 417.

⁸⁹Original text: "While no Catholic theologian would maintain that any such state ever actually existed, a very large number have insisted that only by formulating the notion of pure nature as a genuine possibility can the absolute gratuity of the SUPERNATURAL ELEVATION OF MAN be clearly understood and defended. For, once it can be ascertained what precisely belongs to nature, then the theologian is in a position to determine what GRACE is and, therefore, what must be affirmed as God's unknown gift.", *New Catholic Encyclopedia* , *Second Edition* , Vol 11, p. 901.

and information about grace. That is, it shows us a natural argument for a problem of supernatural revelation. We are also shown that the theological notion of pure nature did not exist in theology, historically, as an informational status in the Church.⁹⁰

I don't know if Catholicism understands the seriousness of the theological approach to the problem of grace in this way of a natural argument, because the discussion about *pure nature* is a discussion to create in matter premises for a deductive logical argument starting from matter - it is a rationalist way of deduction of God through different logical constructions. What this path attempts is to say whether grace is related to Being or not, starting from a mirror in the matter of grace, the rhetoric of pure nature being a mirror in the matter of this information.

A big question brought *up here is why* is this Catholic deductive construction needed? What information do we get from this construction, why is there no other information to use? In the end what is important here is how the argument is built, how the information is retrieved.

In the Catholic thesis I was mainly looking for one thing: where does the Catholic thesis get information to build the argument? It is about a single piece of information in this case, a uniting principle and its nature. Where do Catholics get the information about the principle of union that must fulfill the model of union? The struggle in the grace thesis is not just about consequences, it is about getting the biblical information right. We

⁹⁰The problem of the notion of pure nature is also found by Henri de Lubac , who challenges this notion: "The cumulative position that Father de Lubac raised regarding the validity of the theological positions that maintain this notion of pure nature is necessary.", *New Catholic Encyclopedia, used Edition* , Vol 11, p. 823.

don't just oppose consequences, which seem logical to us for various reasons, because it is not just a thesis of a seemingly logical argument, but it is a thesis of a (unique) biblical information and a complex of affected theologies. Catholicism does not properly follow the character and nature of information about grace, from their own premises, where and how each information is present in theology.

What Catholicism does as a method regarding the direct and indirect nature is this:

1. For primary, direct biblical information - it is ignored and misunderstood .
2. For the indirect information:
 - a. Oneness theology does not use this theology at all, which is foundational to the sharing discussion, and does not infer this necessity of union in an uncreated, shared Being (uncreated energy) related essence.
 - b. For the theology of participation, participation is affirmed, but it ends up being representative and not related to Being, and can no longer be called participation.
3. For experimental information:
 - a. It is not used in the Haric thesis.

Can the thesis of grace be an indirect informational thesis, deduced in a complex way, starting from nature, as in Catholicism?

Of an information deduced indirectly, only theoretically? This possibility is excluded. Especially since the divinity speaks precisely and explicitly about Spirit, about grace, about all works, existential importance and existential condition, and there is a reporting be-

tween said works. The explicit and direct theology of the mysteries, in which this direct information about grace appears, in different dimensions, shows us that the information about grace exists in the Gospel presented systematically, in all dimensions - it is a direct, explicit given in the Christian theological thesis. There is much information about grace given in Scripture, which shows a concern in fully communicating the information about grace, which absolutely indicates that the divinity specifies what grace is in all its dimensions. The divinity-given presence of the theology of grace (baptism, communion, light, eternity, tabor revelation) shows a precise and direct elaboration of all the primary, primordial information about grace.

A fundamental question arises that Catholicism does not answer correctly for the thesis of uncreated/created grace: *Does the information about deification and the principle of deification exist as an informational status in the Church, in Scripture, in the Holy Fathers, in the informational unit of the Church?* It is information with maximum visibility, being about the essence of this union between man and God. It is about the principle of union. But Catholicism indirectly states:

1. That there is no such information, bringing a new one
2. That it is necessary to create a deductive way to deduce information, through nature, over a millennium.

Catholicism's claim on the absence of this information from the Church, as perennial information, in unity, as informational status, is absurd. It is an absurdity at the level of information, which cannot be accepted. It is about the primordial information between man and God, on the basis of which anthropology and soteriology are built. Therefore, it is the foundational information present at the beginning of theology, on which theology is built.

In the existential plane, for divinity, there is a work called grace. Which is free relative to the existential plane of humanity.

Catholicism concludes, following a logic in the existential plane, for humanity: *so the work is outside of God and is a spiritual matter* . What on the existential plane for humanity could determine the ultimate attribute of work relative to divinity? And how? It's like trying to grasp the information about the relationship with God by reflecting on the gratuity at the level of nature. The problem is that one cannot make such a discourse of reflection of an information, not being able to reflect this information at the level of nature and in other attributes of grace. Anyway, we should not bring such an exercise of reflection of the information, by nature, of the attributes of grace (of something else from the existential plane), in other attributes, being an exercise that seems a wrong approach from the beginning.

To have such an exercise in theology is profoundly wrong. We cannot accept an argument of reflection of one information in another, by means of a mirror- *nature* . In theology there is no such exercise in the entire history of theology. It's something unacceptable as an approach. It is an error that stops the whole Catholic approach just by thinking about the approach. We know that man is deified, as omnipresent information in the history of the Church. That can only be through a principle related to Being, which brings Being into relation with man, in a way related to Being. We can accept an indirect information on a principle of deification and connection related to Being, to divinity, but we cannot accept a deductive path through reflection, nature-mirror.

If we have the information about the freeness of grace as a major biblical information (as well as existential condition and existential importance), why does Catholicism assume that the other part of information, that of uncreated/created character, does not exist? Why is one information present and why is one not in the biblical thesis, according to Catholics? It is a very good question for the Catholic thesis, which began a theological approach without validating informational premises and their admissibility, the

possibility that they do not exist in supernatural revelation. A theological oddity appears in which part of the information is present in the biblical thesis and part is not. Why would there be this lack at this point, on a fundamental information, when all we discuss/live is about the union of man with God, the information about the uncreated/created character being continually before our eyes?

No thesis can be supported without the admissibility of the premises. How can one support the Catholic thesis of grace with an uncertainty of informational premises, in the absence of informational premises? What kind of informational premises does the Catholic thesis use for argument, a mirror of reflection, nature, and information that does not have the power to bring other attributes with it, gratuitousness? For what exactly, what does the Catholic thesis want to solve, not to identify an information that is direct, about grace? Why is it necessary to adopt a deductive way, but also a natural argument for an information from the center of theology, for the zero information about grace, that of grace as linked to Being, or broken, created, information that completely changes theology from one inner to outer, a foundational information for union and unity? How does God communicate this paradigm of man into existence, of clinging to Being or external rupture?

Grace is exactly this paradigm of union, of positioning between divinity and humanity. In grace there is this communication of how oneness with humanity is fulfilled. Through a principle related to Being or through matter? Is grace an external principle or a principle of internalization, of sticking to the Being? Can we accept that this paradigm of existence, that the maximum information about man's position vis-à-vis God is not communicated, and is, is deduced by reflection from nature? We also see the nature of this principle of union in the Trinitarian model of union and unity.

It is an incomprehensible theological absurdity of the Catholic position, as well as the Catholic approach on this point. The paradigm of man's existence vis-à-vis God cannot be accepted as uncommunicated, and that it is deduced by reflection in nature, as Catholics do. Uncreated grace versus created grace is not a simple theological debate on an attribute of grace, it is a theological abyss in which the principle of participation in divinity is discussed, the critical point of the theology of humanity before divinity, the maximum point of connection between man and God. If this point is wrong, all the related theology of humanity and its connection with divinity is wrong.

There are several points where the divinity raises this point of union, of the model of union, of the connection of grace with the Being, and there is a broad thesis brought by the divinity on this subject, not being one by equivocation, the work showing the theologies used, but also the biblical information and the points at which this theology of uncreated grace appears . There is direct, complete (primary level) information about grace, from divinity, especially for this theme of grace.

Christ pays great attention to this and makes an extremely clear enumeration in the Gospel for: 1. works of grace (mysteries), 2. their importance, specifying precisely the attributes of these works (existential condition, existential importance), 3. reporting to the Person of the Spirit of these works. The existence of this precise detailing of these works makes it impossible to accept the existence of information about grace in an indirect, only deductive nature, as Catholicism postulates.

Where does this information in Catholicism about "pure nature" come from? This information and notion is created in Catholicism to understand more about grace, primarily to create a support for this break between man and God, at the level of nature. Not understanding the nature of the unifying principle of grace

and not following this direction, Catholics go in a marginal direction, in the direction of the works of grace on nature, as "gift", as "object", circumscribing grace as object-matter, trying to discover from these works what is grace as the uncreated/created character, indirect, deductive. Catholicism postulates deductively that "if grace is absolutely free, then human nature is in a way, *therefore grace is...*". That is, participation is not really necessary and grace is not related to Being, necessary, the supernatural being an absolutist abstract concept. What Catholicism does is to definitively break man from God in all dimensions, *postulating that man is by himself, without need of anything*, non-transparent, somewhere in the argument.

In fact, Catholicism introduces a *hidden premise* that *man does not need anything from God*, building a thesis of an autonomous nature, severed from God. It constructs an anthropology of man cut off from God. And from here he postulates a lack of necessity for anything that comes from God. And he renounces the divine-centric theologies that convey the information about uncreated character to nature. And it starts on this scale of the theological construction in separation from God, those about God, in which obviously, man being separated from divinity, no longer needs anything from God, so God is in an abstract, unnecessary, unnatural plane. ***Catholicism has severed the connection between man and God more than anything else in this theology, and this is where the Harician thesis begins.***

By postulating absolute gratuity, a theological error is committed in which a theory of a pure, complete nature is created, and in this exercise the real work-information of grace over man, in nature, above nature is annulled. Therefore, grace is in Catholicism only as a more symbolic presence, and does not need a body, being a dogmatic representative, but not an act related to the Being. Breaking man from God, Catholicism postulates in all direc-

tions: God is not really necessary for salvation in Catholicism, being only a spiritual matter, grace is not necessary, nature has everything, grace is created and must not/cannot be related to God. But how did Catholicism arrive at this position of the human being in relation to God? This flawed premise is the foundation of the Catholic thesis. And after this point of gratuity, Catholicism enters into theological speculation. Because after this point there is no more information on which to build a reflection, as Catholics want.

In the theology of grace, what do we build first, as theology and informational support, or what do we build on theologically? Do we build on the theology of participation, by participation, by image and likeness do we infer the nature-situation of nature, anthropology, or do we construct the nature of nature and determine the nature of participation in this way? Obviously, the theologically correct way is the first. The participation and dependence in creation between nature and the Creator is shown by God as a starting point in the discussion. The theology of human nature as nature in Catholicism is created outside of any relationship with God.

This is the fundamental problem of Catholic theology for grace – *ignoring the human-divinity relationship in the dimension(s) in which the attribute of uncreated character is actually conveyed* . And then, wrongly in Catholicism, they start from the nature of human nature, which is settled in a certain way, and deduce attributes of the divine work, as a consequence of a certain settlement of nature.

Information about uncreated/created character must come from divinity to man in different theologies. The informational problem in the Catholic thesis lies in *the non-transparent creation of this information-position that man is cut off from God* . What carries the information about uncreated/created character to the

threads are these theologies. And yet, Catholicism ignores the indirect information and cancels it, creating another anthropology, in which man is cut off from God, and in this anthropology a consequence of grace that is not necessary, not needing anything from God at the level of nature for such anthropology.

The root misinformation for the Catholic thesis is *the severance of man-creation from God*⁹¹. The wrongly created root information is man's separation from God. Catholic created grace is the result of man's previous break with God. Although grace is what connects man to God, being a communion bridge, and it carries the information about the connection, being the means of connection itself, yet Catholicism produces the information of breaking from God in another way, in another way, and then deduces that grace is not connected to God, is not connected to Being, created, because man is separated from God.

Created grace is a consequence in Catholicism, following the production of the information of man's separation from God, in another way. And this information is produced non-transparently, at several points. The break is made in the exercise of forcing the consequences of absolute gratuity, wrongly assumed at the level of nature. A nature without God, severed from God, is considered by Catholics as the only possible solution for assuming absolute gratuity at the level of nature – in the extension of absolute gratuity in a position of absolute non-necessity of grace, which implies the separation of man from God, a position extended not only as absolute, but also as an anthropological consequence. Catholic created grace is a solution to a fallacious, Catholic-created artificial problem of forcing the gratuitousness of grace as absolute futility on the level of nature, it is not a genuine biblical conclusion.

⁹¹ Achindin does the same in distorting the position of the simplicity of being in isolation.

But this proposal at the level of nature is one that did not understand what grace is and what grace brings to nature, that grace is not only a gift and does not only complete nature, but is a communion bridge, it is something related to Being, that unites us with God, personally, and cannot lend himself to an exercise of separation between nature and the supernatural, nor to an exercise of breaking and dissecting his works at the level of nature.

It is Catholicism's exercise of dissecting grace at the level of nature that distorts the works of grace upon nature. Grace is directly posited and constructed as a thesis, as a notion of spiritual matter that complements the works of nature, insisting that nature is "perfect." But grace is much more than that. The theological limitation in Catholicism is by creating an anthropology without God, and thereby extending the deduction of man's total break with God and in grace unbound by Being. In parallel, the theologies in which information is transported and appears at the level of nature are ignored.

The perfection of divine creation, pure nature, as an argument in Catholicism has the following basic statements:

1. *If grace were a substance added to the substance of the soul*
2. *The soul was not fully created*
3. *It would contradict the perfection of creation*
4. *So grace is not necessary and is created.*

A substance is added to the soul in created grace, the divine spiritual matter, for its supernatural functions, so the soul is not completely created and would contradict the perfection of creation. Where is the syllogism, the logical fallacy? We have an object added to the soul, which has a work of helping the nature. The greatest and most important information related to grace comes from Scripture, that it is connected with God. And that we have an intrinsic reporting. The only theology that can be constructed to find the properties of grace is coming from God, related to Him. Here it is actually postulated that the supernatural function is not

actually necessary, otherwise the logical constraint of the perfection of creation cannot be fulfilled, which is a wrong fulfillment clause in the argument.

The perfection of creation is assimilated and brings the obligation of the futility of grace at the level of works on nature - this is the point where a syllogism occurs, where grace is distorted informationally, by faulty deductive logic. The perfection of creation is assimilated to an absolute futility of any other participation, so somehow creation is absolutely broken by God. And deductively, grace is not necessary. What is asserted here more than anything else is not the lack of necessity of grace but the breaking of God's creation, and thus also of grace. Either perfection of creation, understanding a *functional perfection of nature*, does not mean depriving creation of a *communion bridge*, at least in this dimension the Catholic thesis is wrong. The functional perfection of creation is not the ultimate existential argument over nature, because nature is not meant for autonomous perfection but for unity and union, for a *principle of communion and unity*. Creation has a perfection in unity not in functional, as Catholicism states in functional perfection (because that is what it actually talks about). Catholicism has confused the existential maxims here, seeing the functional of nature as its maximal criterion, when in fact the maximal criterion of nature is communion. Creation is thought in an act of connection with the Creator, not in a perfect autonomous act. Starting from perfection, to deduce the relationship between God and man, is completely wrong, and it shows how Catholicism does not understand the meaning of creation, and how it starts from a particular dimension of the discussion about nature to build a logical argument. The lack of discussion about the need for a communion bridge, but also about the need for the fulfillment of creation according to the model of trinitarian unity (this should be the authentic point of departure in the discussion), shows how Catholicism does not actually understand the point of departure in the argument. This is *the syllogism of functional perfection, of*

the absolute autonomy of man , which nullifies the discussion of the communion principle and the unity of creation.

Catholicism sees creation through the functional perspective, creating a purely functional creation, without the need for communion.

Or it is an antithesis between the way of existence of the Trinity, in communion, unity, and what Catholicism proposes for creation, a functional perfection. The Trinity is communion existence, and the Catholic creation is a functional existence, perfect in itself, autonomous, cut off from others. They are different paradigms of existence, one by communion, and one by itself.

Catholicism creates at this point of the perfection of creation an antithesis between the two modes of existence, communion-perichoresis-unity and the Catholic, by itself. And the Catholic syllogism is of the assimilation of the perfection of full existential autonomy. Catholics do not say that creation is perfect, they say that it is absolutely autonomous. It is the syllogism of the "perfection-autonomy" of creation. From this notion of "perfection," Catholicism extracts something entirely wrong, an autonomous position of creation. Somehow looking at the perfection of creation, they forget about its maximum dimension, which is communion, and then syllogistically deduce that perfection also implicitly brings a separation from God.

The primary dimension of the human being is not functionality, but communion , the unity-perichoresis seen in the Trinity. Man's first meaning in existence is for communion. It is not for a perfection by itself alone, an autonomous, self-perfection, cut off from others. In this concept of perfection, which actually hides much more, Catholicism actually hides this break between man and God. *Absolute autonomy Catholicism* coming from the absolute perfection proposed by Catholicism, *does not exclude communion and a communion bridge* , as Catholicism syllogistically deduces.

By starting the discussion from perfection and not from communion, Catholicism shows that it does not understand the main dimension in which the discussion should be conducted, but also that it ignores the main direction of argument for the subject. The first discussion of grace is about communion, about grace as a communion bridge, not as a functional work on nature. Catholicism actually introduces here, non-transparently, this concept of rupture between man and God.

Grace cannot be found and nothing of grace can be found starting from the human being, deductively, and separated from the divinity. Grace is transcendent, beyond creation. All that is of grace is by relation to God – by a certain kind of relation that can take on the most important attribute in question, the uncreated/created character. In fact, the whole discussion is whether grace is related to Being, participatory (uncreated energy), or whether it is non-related to Being, representative (created energy). All the properties of grace are related in one way or another to Being, springing in different theologies from It. The nature, the source, the type, the uncreated character, the participation, what grace is is determined in relation to the One who imparts this work. This is a normality of a deductive logic in which what is of the subject, of the divinity, can be seen in grace.

Of grace nothing can be learned from man, apart from a relationship that shows the work between man and divinity. Apart from a dependence in a dimension, or as a communion bridge, or as a substance, or in some other way, dependence between divinity and man, nothing of grace can be inferred in any way. Direct information and deductive logic must be used correctly in this initiative. It is an argumentative error in Catholicism to depart from human nature in the argument, ignoring the importance of all connections between man and God, keeping in isolation only some information from which no conclusions about grace can be drawn - theological informational premises are ignored and information

is introduced assumptions , through non-theological notions and non - theological information .

Catholicism forces consequences like *grace is not necessary* and *grace is not uncreated* , having no logical bridge to these consequences. *Nature, in its functions, (called natural by Catholicism) does not need grace* - this is the created, erroneous Catholic informational premise, which is a premise introduced somewhere in the exercise of creating the theory of grace - because man is completely cut off from God and is considered perfect.

Catholicism ignores two other pieces of information that need to be added, which are works of grace over the nature: 1. the power and transformation brought by grace to the natural nature, and 2. grace as a communion bridge with the divinity and participation/working together with the divinity (through the uncreated character of). These two additional pieces of information must necessarily be present in any discussion of nature and the relationship between nature and grace if we are to build this thesis. Because an anthropology broken from God is created and grace is ignored in its authentic information brought to nature. Grace is not only an enfoldment of nature and only a strengthening of human nature. It is also a union related to Being, as biblical information. Here one sees the major deficiency of the Catholic thesis, in which works of grace are lost and grace is considered only an extension of nature and not a bringing of works over nature by its uncreated character. Catholicism circumscribes the grace of nature, bringing a hidden premise of grace into the argument, grace as an extension of nature.

Catholicism reaches a point where, starting from absolute gratuity, it immediately concludes that man is complete, by pure nature, and *does not need anything related to the Being* of God, otherwise *grace can no longer be absolutely free* . At this point the information about grace as related to Being, incorrectly deduced from the informational premise of absolute gratuity, is destroyed.

In the exercise of defending the position of absolute gratuity, one mistakenly ends up destroying the information about the uncreated character, which is already present in other theologies, altered by this incorrect exercise. And they nullify and destroy all theologies affected by uncreated character to force the wrongly assumed consequence of absolute gratuitousness. An error has crept into the Catholic argument, related to the destruction of the information about uncreated character.

In order to defend absolute gratuity, Catholicism commits the mistake of creating an unbiblical, unpatristic, *pure nature theological notion*. And in this notion he brings the hidden premise that man is separated from God (and therefore grace does not need to be linked to the Being). Instead of taking the information about grace from divino-centric theologies, it creates this information at the level of this new notion, created in Catholic theology, and then wrongly "reclaims" it through various mechanisms.

The discussion of gratuity leads Catholicism to the wrong point, where it creates notions with an incorrect body of information, with hidden premises, which cancels out the biblical information, new body of information from which they further wrongly extract their information. If the information about the "created character of grace" arose at the level of pure nature, separated from divinity, it was certainly created at that level, and did not come from divino-centric theologies, was not transported to the level of nature through other theologies. How was that information transported and how did it appear on the wire? Created character is an information obtained by Catholicism related to nature, not to divinity, although man is related to divinity in various theologies.

The paradox is that grace, being absolutely free, is no longer necessary in pure nature, although it is necessary in the biblical thesis at the level of nature. Not only as a notion, but also as a work is cancelled. By wrongly inferring from absolute gratuity that

grace is unnecessary, the biblical thesis of grace as a condition for salvation and the fulfillment of nature by grace is nullified.

Where is the error in tying absolute gratuitousness to threads and canceling the importance of grace apart from threads? In the deductive logic in which grace can no longer bring anything to nature, so that it can be free, so nature is perfect by itself. To justify absolute gratuity, Catholicism creates a pure nature – an anthropology broken by God. But in this nature it cancels the information about the uncreated character. And thus, grace becomes external so that it can be "free" in pure nature. The information about the uncreated character is removed by a consequence of lack of necessity. Seeing grace only in the dimension of work on nature, and only in the dimension of "completion" of the faculties of nature, Catholicism says that grace cannot be free unless it has nothing left to complete in human nature. But grace is nevertheless communion, strengthening, elevation of human nature, and its gratuity does not alter human nature. The gratuity of grace cannot by itself create an anthropology severed from God. Catholicism creates out of "gratuity" an anthropology of rupture, in which man is definitively severed from God. That is, he rewrites anthropology, just so he can support a misunderstood position.

In Catholicism, creation-nature is perfect, so man does not need grace. The Catholic thesis of absolute gratuity is invisibly extended into a thesis of absolute separation between God and man. Absolute gratuity in Catholics brings behind it a principle of absolute separation between God and man. Catholicism says something completely different in absolute gratuity, it does not discuss only a principle of gratuity. *It forces grace not as absolutely gratuitous* , but *absolutely functionally useless upon nature* . That is, grace is broken from the nature and is considered non-functional for the nature, so that the nature is not altered by the work of grace, in order to preserve a perfect, pure nature. What Catholicism says to man is not that grace is free, but that grace does nothing to help

nature. Catholics bring to absolute gratuity a thesis of the absolute uselessness of grace, in fact. Nature is complete, perfect, and grace is not necessary. I understand the perfection of creation as absolute perfection, completeness, so grace brings nothing. In fact, Catholicism brings information to the level of nature, creates an anthropology by deduction, not by revelation. That is, Catholic anthropology is a natural one, a natural argument.

There are several logical deductions present in the basic thesis of Catholicism, at points where we cannot use logical deduction. Absolute gratuity (actually absolute uselessness) leads to absolute separation between God and man. This is the illogical extension, and by faulty logical deduction, in Catholicism. Catholicism makes this separation between God and man, always by a faulty logical deduction, at several points:

1. Or starting from the *absolute gratuity of grace*, which is extended into *absolute futility*, which brings a nature broken from God, which does not need grace related to Being. By a change in the position of grace. A syllogism at the level of nature.
2. Or starting from the supernatural, inferring that grace is unnecessary, but in fact uses the same foundational premise of man's separation from God, a hidden premise recovered in the consequences of created grace. By changing the position of nature.
3. Or he uses Achindin's argument, the *simplicity of Being extended as self-containment and self-isolation*, from which he wrongly recovers, by logical deduction, that grace is created. By changing the position of the deity. A syllogism at the level of the position of the simplicity of divinity.

Somewhere in the Catholic argument, this separation between man and God is achieved, non-transparently, by a wrong extension of a notion into something else entirely, an extension in which this rupture and separation secretly occurs. Separation is done by changing positions, or forcing gratuitousness as uselessness, or simplicity as isolation. That is, either at the level of nature, or at the level of divinity, a change of position is made, forcing gratuity and simplicity and bringing a break between divinity and grace.

Achindin makes the same error, extending the position of the simplicity of Being into self-containment and isolation, wrongly inserting this information at the level of Being, which he wrongly recovers as "created grace", which is in fact a rupture of the creative divinity. Catholicism makes a mistake in extending gratuity to a position of absolute futility of grace over nature, futility which brings the consequence of separation, so grace is uncreated. The separation between man and God was made through various wrong expansions, misunderstood in historical rhetoric, which today, however, must be highlighted and avoided in theology.

In Catholicism, major biblical concepts, but also biblical positions, are distorted by logical deduction. And a Catholic position is logically constructed. Orthodoxy, however, takes every biblical information and builds only positively, by adding to the argument of biblical information.

What good is this absolute gratuity to Catholics theologically? The thesis hides much more than just a gratuitousness, it hides a fundamental premise for the man-God relationship, it hides a position of man's separation from God. In this premise of absolute gratuity, Catholics introduce a theological foundation, in a severance of man from God. It is an existential paradigm different from the orthodox one (of a principle of the connection of

grace with the Being brought into grace), a paradigm of an exteriority to God, compared to the paradigm of the connection of grace with the Being in uncreated grace.

Absolute gratuity is wrongly extended in an existential paradigm, in Catholicism. And from here anthropology, soteriology, Christology, ecclesiology, all take on a completely different meaning, one broken, external, outside of God, without a real principle of connection with God. Once the principle on which all of this is built is in another paradigm, all of this becomes something else and completely changes its meaning. Catholicism is a completely different paradigm of positioning towards the divinity, it is not only a theology of a created grace, *but it is a paradigm of an external existence, in rupture, unrelated to Being, outside the model of divine unity.*

"The absence of any allusion to *pure nature* , in the modern sense of the word, in the theology of the Orientals is explained by the fact that the ancient Greek tradition did not support such an idea for anything. (We do not say that it would involve its negation.) But we believe that the same is true of the Latin tradition, and that this state of affairs was maintained until a much advanced age."⁹²

Henri de Lubac confirms the impossibility not so much of the existence of the concept of *pure nature* , but the impossibility of separation between man and God. Basically, here we come to the discussion, if man is broken, not dependent on God, or if he is in an anthropology and dependence, naturally connected to God. The point at which the discussion is reached is the relationship of dependence between man and God and the principle by which dependence is fulfilled - for which direct, biblical information is needed, not logical deductions.

⁹²Henri de Lubac , *The Mystery of the Supernatural* , Translated by Rev. Dr. Eduard Ferent , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2010, p. 7.

Henri de Lubac precisely observes the appearance and presence of this separation, isolation between man and God, brought about by this concept: "On the one hand, if the dualist or, to put it better, separatist thesis exhausted its function in the Schools, probably it is only now beginning to bear its most bitter fruits.(...) Wanting to protect the supernatural from any contamination, in fact, it exiled it outside the living spirit and social life, and the field thus remained free from the invasion of secularism.(. ..) Agreement with all is sometimes sought on the basis of an idea of nature which may suit the deist as well as the atheist: all that comes from Christ, all that must lead to Him, is so well enclosed into the shadows, that they risk disappearing forever."⁹³

Reverend Prof. Dumitru Stănilo says, emphasizing the difference in approach between Catholicism and Orthodoxy on this point, the difference in method, argumentation, and access to theological information: "But the criticism inspired [Catholic] by a scholastic intellectualist thought - which with the burning to any new-born movement affirmed with simplistic one-sidedness the unity of God, without an understanding for the real experience of Him and for the more supple and complex understanding of God, which it requires—also caused the theological defender of this experience to formulate the doctrine of God, involved in this experience, in a way that seemed to the opponents to be incompatible with the unity of God, of which they considered themselves supporters. And this deepened and extended the distance between Western theological thought - which the critics of the Hesychastic experience claimed to represent and which was accepted as such in the West - and the Eastern one. (...) Thus Saint Gregory Palamas writes two treatises on the procession of the Holy Spirit, in which he rejects Varlaam's relativism, i.e. the "dialectical" method, by which he wanted to reconcile the two positions. *Palama defended the "demonstrative" method*, stating that in the Holy Scriptures and

⁹³Henri de Lubac , *The Mystery of the Supernatural* , p. 7.

in the works of the Holy Fathers we have clear evidence for the Orthodox teaching. "94

Centuries later, we come back to the same discussion about specifying where in the argument the fallacy is, being a problem of argumentation. And this point must be precisely included in theology in order to bring about convergence.

If we were to use an argument parallel to the Catholic one, starting from the roots, we could say that *man needs a personal communion bridge, similar to the Trinity, which brings the necessity of a connection with the Being and a grace connected to the Being somehow* , which would be a much more correct argumentation of the character of grace, starting from nature and what grace brings to nature in the first place, communion with divinity.

What is grace as substance-essence? In any case, it is not something which can be measured by means, which can be related as an essence-substance to another essence-substance, and by no means something which can be exercised as an essence-substance or starting from to this approach. One cannot circumscribe the domain and work of grace in a category of attributes of nature, which are then generalized by bringing grace into that circumscription. That is why in Orthodoxy there is not even this discussion about nature, supernature and grace related to them, being an improper one. Catholicism circumscribes the grace of human nature as a hidden premise in their thesis, which is a fundamental error of the Catholic thesis.

When Catholicism affirms "pure nature is..., *therefore grace is ...*", at that moment grace is transformed into substance-essence, brought into a circumscription at the level of nature and misrep-

⁹⁴Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama* , Philokalia , Vol. 7, p. 243, p. 246.

resented as essence-nature. Regardless of the discussion of the natural and the supernatural, a circumscription is still being made in the realm of nature. Because grace is measured as nature, substance-essence and work, relative only to the natural. At most, for human nature, the information of the uncreated/created character can be seen deductively for grace, if it had a work that would bring a possibility of consequence of the type "grace is for nature a communion bridge with a being, so it would be necessary to be related to Being and uncreated," information which is corroborated with the deity's account of Himself, which shows with certainty that grace is related to Being and uncreated.

The union in essence seen in the Trinity is in the foundation and model of the bond between divinity and man, which assumes a communion bond in another essence, in an uncreated energy, in a different union, but which can be and is a bond with Living being. This can be considered the authentic thread-level premise to build a thesis from the thread, by no means from the completeness of the thread.

The thesis of grace starts from within, and is also grounded in baptism, because baptism marks something for nature, in relation to Being. Baptism brings something to the being, which it did not have before. And this something is an existential condition and not an existential symbol. This something is defining for man, brought by God, given, being equal to a communion bridge.

Catholic grace is a spiritual matter that fulfills only a spiritual, declarative, supernatural function, which only she knows - this spiritual matter proposed by Catholicism is a complete mystery. Very abstract is this concept of spiritual matter external to the substance of the soul, which brings a spiritual function known only to it. Catholicism's logic for grace is: nature is complete, and grace brings no natural function, but only a function called supernatural, so it is matter and not of God. But how was it decided that

grace brings nothing, starting from divinity or creating wrong informational premises at the level of nature? It is very difficult to logically link together the notions of substance-essence, nature-nature, completeness, supernatural function, necessity, and the nature of the substance-essence of grace, as Catholicism tries to do. And this broken by God. That is, nature is also complete in substance, and the supernatural function of grace, being one outside of nature, brings a lack of necessity in the work of grace towards nature, so the nature of the substance of grace is a material one. Hard to follow and accept as correct and logical this proposal. And it is impossible to accept that God really gave all this logic as a harric thesis and that this logic is an inspired one.

What should be, for Catholicism, the informational premises for such a proposition, and what is the thread of information on which it should build its thesis? Following the correct thread of thesis construction should show us whether this thesis can be constructed in this way. It is difficult to conceive a theological argumentation strategy for this thesis, as it is impossible to think of any theology of accidents, deduction, necessity, debates and arguments. And that logic of this could contain real or through this indirect logic starting from threads and completeness can be reached, can actually reach the nature of information about grace, using Catholic premises. And certainly they can be supported as *de facto information of the Church*, in history. Because, basically, this is what must be achieved, the similarity and omnipresence in the body of the Church of information. To be found permanently in history. Catholicism comes with a theological study that is not found in the informational components, previously, in history. Which informationally removes it from history, as a *de facto informational status*.

Catholicism cannot include as de facto information in the history of the Church its own thesis of grace. What we try in theological

theses is to demonstrate that there is this informational and notional status for a proposition and the logic of the argument in all dimensions, informationally, in time, in the Church. An information unit in all dimensions of history. Not being de facto information of the Church, the Catholic thesis of grace cannot really belong to the Church. And it shows that, in fact, Catholicism is no longer in the Church through this thesis which belongs to it, but which cannot be of the Church.

Very important to emphasize here, because grace fulfills this theology of participation, *the information about the uncreated character must necessarily come from another, superior theology*, which necessarily shows the attribute of participation in the uncreated character. There are some great theologies here: the sharing of Himself in the Trinity, essentially as a pattern, the unity required by God, which must be like His unity in some way, the existential condition of living and God's relation to work, as an existential one - grace is an existential theology - related to Being for man. Grace is the light of God shared with man. Therefore, being light, it must be *uncreated light, related to Being* in order to be called light and divinity and to be able to bring man into a condition similar to divinity, of eternal life in light. Information about uncreated character is contained in these theologies, and nature is related to God in image and likeness.

Grace is contained in Scripture in a theology of mirroring God, and Scripture mirrors God in grace. In which it is in the mirroring, likeness, inclusion of God. Grace always receives what God also receives, precisely because of the principle existing in grace, related to God (grace is light, holiness). These theologies establish the nature of the work, its uncreated character. The theology of image and likeness also establishes about the uncreated/created character that man is god, only truly participating in divinity, in a form. Therefore, from the nature (human nature) the attribute of uncreated character cannot be built, without seeing the

need for communion and without understanding the image and likeness in the sense that man is god through participation.

Where does the existential condition and existential importance of grace come from? These are brought about only through a theology in which they are directly related to God, to Being. God explicitly says in these that grace is "personal fellowship with God" and precisely defines grace as having and to be understood in this way. Christ says: "he who does not eat and drink has no part with *Me*". As Being, not as representation. There is an information that binds grace to Being, that gives it *its uncreated character*. What grace brings is fellowship, sharing, participation in the divinity. It is a statement of a special category, made at this point. All theology emphasizes and is about these things. "*That we may all be one*", "*He who does not eat and drink has no part with Me*". "Me" in the sense of Subject and participation in the Subject (Being), not merely declarative, because this participation cannot be understood in any symbolic way. Christ states this several times.

These are theologies for man in which participation is shown not in a unity of work, because man has nothing to do in work before God, having nothing to bring to God through his own action, but in a unity linked to Being, in which man works to be clean and worthy of this communion. Grace is an elevation of man into divine existence, of which man must make himself worthy. The discussion of salvation is one of participation in the shared divine essence. What Christ tells us is that only if we participate in the divinity are we saved. To a participation with His Body, in His Spirit, in which the uncreated character is repeatedly emphasized.

We have two theological insights proposed for grace: the uncreated character (its connection with Being) and the created character (its lack of connection with Being). A question arises: how does Christ bring this information into theology? Does Christ

bring this information into theology directly? Does this information exist theologically? Did Christ give this information? Is there any way we can consider this information to exist somehow? Is there any work-Being relationship to help us find the uncreated or created character of grace? This is evident, being brought up in several places in Scripture, Christ discovering in several places such a relation to the Being.

There is in Revelation a direct explicit theology instituted of grace as a work related to God. And there is a report made in the Gospel and the Epistles between grace and the Spirit, a report that explicitly and directly brings the information about the grace-Spirit relationship. And in this reporting the uncreated character is present, in which Spirit and grace are linked, and grace is from the Spirit, in intrinsic reporting, making a connection not only formal, but linked to Being. Grace is spoken of as actually being the Spirit, from the Spirit, and in this way the uncreated character is revealed. We must also look at the level of providing theological information, how Christ proceeded when he communicated this information to the Church. As a Teacher-Theologian he issued this information in a naturally direct format so that it could be transmitted to the Church.

How does Christ provide this information, in what form? Directly, explicitly, or through intrinsic , implicit reporting? Where does Christ relate to Himself, Being, Spirit and grace, at the level of uncreated character? Does this question arise directly related to the Catholic journey to the threads, and the retrieval of this information through the threads? What is Catholicism looking for on that point and on that deductive logic related to nature, there being no such theological direction given by Christ? Does Christ make any excursion into the nature of nature to say something about grace, exclusively about nature? How can Catholicism claim legitimacy for the direction of its own theology of grace, relative

to the Christ thesis? Does Catholicism's logical theological direction for grace have anything to do with Scripture? What is the evangelical theological foundation for the directionality of grace?

If for mysteries Christ shows the existential character and existential importance in direct information, how does he show for grace the uncreated character? How can Catholicism justify the complex excursion at the level of nature, an excursion that is not made by Christ in his own thesis? From my point of view, the Catholic thesis is null and void, directly from this mode of argument which does not appear in Scripture and cannot be found in any dimension in Scripture.

A logical deduction in the Catholic argument related to created grace shows an informational incompleteness of the supernatural revelation and an existential uncertainty, left open by God, Who offered only a logical way for the recovery of a relationship between Person and person, and not a direct information, explicit. It could be called *the "charic existential uncertainty of divinity"* , Catholic and Protestant. Or *"the paradigm of the uncertainty of the relationship between man and God"*, *"the paradigm of the deduction of externality"* . The Catholic logical argument on the theme of grace places supernatural revelation in a zone of existential uncertainty, where man does not know precisely how he is with God, whether he is in external union or in union through a principle of deification, linked to Being. This leads to an unacceptable theological absurdity, as there has historically been no discussion in the Church about such an uncertainty, nor any debate on this issue, in order to be able to go logically-theologically on this deductive path.

This very thing, that man has no work to bring before God, shows that the discussion of grace is centered on the connection with the Being and is not oriented only on work or in other directions. Grace is a participation in the Godhead, first and foremost,

and thus discovered as theology. Moreover, it is shown in a theology of the unity and connection of grace with Being. That is why grace cannot be seen only through the prism of "the completeness of nature", as in Catholicism, only in works, when its primary meaning is of connection with Being, all the logic of grace coming from its primary function, of union and unity, by no means from the pseudo-logic from Catholicism, which starts from the completeness of nature.

Union in one essence with God (by this understanding union in essence as typology, in another shared essence) is actually the first work of grace, which circumscribes and determines all its attributes. Grace is for union and sharing. This is where the theology of grace starts. Eternal existence is discovered as needing and being fulfilled through connection with Being. The Trinity is united in being, in the essence of the Godhead. And humanity is united in another essence (energy, work), a shared one, and thus the unity in essence is fulfilled as a mode of union and unity, in which we all partake of God. The theology of grace cannot start from nature (human nature), but starts from the connection with the divine Being seen in the Trinity.

*THE CRITERION OF THE NECESSITY OF PRINCIPLED UNITY,
OF THE EXISTENCE OF A "SHARED UNCREATED ESSENCE",
COMING FROM THE MODEL OF INTRATRINITARIAN
UNION IN ESSENCE. THE PRINCIPLE OF UNION,
ANNOUNCED IN THE PATTERN OF UNITY OF DIVINITY
WITH HUMANITY*

"If love is essentially about God, then so is mutual reporting in which their (Persons') love is manifest , it must have *an essential basis* (...). In order to maintain the definition of love as a divine act and at the same time the definition of this act as revelation , and the divine being as one , it is necessary to see the divine being simultaneously as a unit-relationship , as a relationship within the unit . (...) Reporting is common in God , although each Person has a different position in this common act of reporting : « The true subject is a reporting of the Three, but a reporting that appears as an essence , *a reporting essential* . " " ⁹⁵ _

This is where Father Staniloae begins the theological discussion about union, in " The Holy Trinity , the structure of supreme love " . From understanding the triune unity , and its extension , and its assumption of humanity. And in the Trinity what father Staniloae sees is *the structure*, the model, the unity, which is the most important point in the discussion . From this model we understand unity , love, and the uncreated / divine character of grace as shared values that we must embrace .

to teach me with all clarity and this, that those who have deigned to deify themselves by receiving the Holy Spirit himself , do not receive Him after being , but after uncreated illumination and grace? Listen to the one who says: The aim of the hierarchy is the likeness and union, as much as possible , with God, who makes

⁹⁵Rev. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* , Vol. I, pp. 308-309.

those who follow him images of God and all - seeing mirrors and unblemished , ⁹⁶receptive of the ray of the beginning light and of the birth of God and you . "

Father N. Chițescu says for the model of union, preserved also for humanity , but also for the criterion of the need for this link harice with God: " The mysterious, theandric essence of the Church has an eternal intratrinitarian foundation . (...) An enduring foundation, in this sense , is verified by the very words of the Savior and the interpretations given to them by the Holy Fathers. And we understand this foundation not only in in the sense that the divine trinitarian relations are a model of the relations between people and the Church , but also in the sense that they are a power that produces and deepens these relations that manifest in they. (...) Here the relationship of union between the Father and the Son is both a model for the union that must occur between people, but also its internal principle , because for people to there can be one between them, it must be *in Us* , says Jesus; only raised in the divine union do they also become one . That is precisely why the union between people in the Church is so close, as it is between the Father and the Son. At the same time, between people and the Persons of the Holy Trinity, that same union according to grace, which is between the divine persons, is realized. (...) Through this the Son is united by grace as much as he is united by being with the ⁹⁷Father , having the same love towards them . "

In the same way, he mentions from Saint Simeon the New Theologian: "Commenting on these places, Saint Simeon the New Theologian exclaims : " Oh , fearful promise ! That the same glory that the Father gave to the Son, the Son also gives to us according to grace. And what 's more , that 's it *as* the Son is in the Father

⁹⁶St. Gregory Palama, *On Divine Communion* , Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, Philokalia , Vol. 7, p. 455.

⁹⁷Prof. N. Chițescu , *Dogmatic and Symbolic Theology* , Vol. 2, Renaștea Publishing House, II Edition, Cluj-Napoca, 2005, pp. 156-157.

and the *Father* in the *Son* , so *the Son* of God is in us and *we* in Him by *grace* , if we will. "98

This idea of the existence of a model of union, but also of a principle of union, in grace , is a fundamental one , omnipresent in theology, in different formulations, being necessary to mention the existence of a principle *of union* , i.e. a ***criterion of the need for haric unity*** .

What would be an unequivocal argument that could clarify the debate about grace and its uncreated/created character ? Christ is talking about an axiology . In which unity and participation according to the model of the Holy Trinity are not only the reference , but the existential axiology . The existential model adopted . That is , the triune unity is the de facto value shared by all existence . And humanity receives and is united with the Trinity in another way, in another unity and participation , in typology with the trinity , considering the way it is done, the essential - charic unity being sent to humanity in the uncreated grace , linked to God, creating a unity that is similar in work to the trinity, that can also be called union and unity between man and God , through something from God, through something from man. " The Spirit removes by grace the distance between our self and His self , believing by grace between us and the Father that relationship that He has after being with the Father and the Son . If so in the incarnate Son we became sons by grace, in the Spirit we gained the consciousness and courage of sons . "99

discussion about unity and the model of unity is opened by Christ in John 17:

"21. That all may be < one > , < as You , Father , are in Me and I in You > , so and i he knew _ Let there be one in Us , so that

98 Prof. N. Chițescu , *Dogmatic and symbolic theology* , Vol. 2, p. 157.

99Rev. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* , Vol. I, p. 297.

the world may believe that You sent Me .

22. And the glory that You gave Me, I gave it to them, so that they would be one, as We are one:

23. I in them and You in Me , that they may be filled _ _ _ in unity , and let the world know that You sent Me and that You loved them , as You loved Me."

Christ specifically points to the pattern of *Trinitarian unity* as the reference in the discussion of unity :

- has as a reference *the trinitarian unity* , explicitly specified, shown in the union between the Father, the Son and the Spirit.
- unity of humanity must be the same as that of the Trinity " as Thou ... knewest . "
- It shows that *glory* - grace is received as the most important in the discussion .
- It shows unity as being after the third " *as We are one*".
- Existence is one of likeness , not a legal one . It is his " like " , not the excuse from the parable of the talents .
- Unity is not only the central theme, but it is the essence of the whole theology - man has his ultimate meaning, he fulfills his meaning in union , in unity .
- Union, unity is for the perfection of man - " *That they also may be perfected in one another* " - perfect union is only through union in grace . _ _

Grace fulfills this unity - the discussion of grace is circumscribed to this *triune* unity , in which humanity is also received .

All this theology is about how unity is to be accomplished, about the model of unity and the principle of unity. Not so much

that there is unity, but that the unity that humanity receives must be like the trinity . The third and reference of the model of unity These are the main point in the discussion of the unity of humanity , which must receive and receives a unity as well. The likening of humanity 's unity in grace to the triune unity is the main point of these three paragraphs.

similarity is repeated in "as", " as and these " , " as we are one " , " I in you and " , " so that they too may be perfect " i t i n union " . There are 5 repetitions that show the similarity of the unit , the importance of the unit . And the need for unity in the likeness of the trinitarian unity . It is an existential announcement made by the Trinity, about existence , about how it must be fulfilled , in unity , such triune unity . On the existence of a model of unity and a principle of unity.

If Christ opens the discussion of a unity in likeness with the trinitarian unity as the primary goal of humanity , what is the means by which this unity in likeness is achieved? Unity after the image of Trinity unity ? It is grace that answers this question and which fulfills this unit . _ _ _ And the unity is in a typology identical to the triune unity - a unity and haric , in which the Being is shared more than anything in this unity . It is shared _ _ _ _ _ and with humanity , as it is shared with the Son and the Spirit . With humanity through the uncreated character of grace, and with the Son and the Spirit in the divine essence .

This is a theology of the *critterion of the need for haric unity* , in which union and unity must be fulfilled as the original trinitarian unity , for the fulfillment of the *trinitarian unity pattern* . All of the above is the statement of this criterion of the need of the haric unit for the unit . *If there is a model of unity, there must also be a criterion for meeting that model.*

If we were to summarize how the Gospel/Christ in the

Christian thesis stated the meaning of grace, we have:

- Direct information __ in implicit /intrinsic reporting (from the Spirit) .
- The criterion of the need for the similarity of the haric unit .
- Theologies/indirect information (consequences) , of the image and likeness , participation , union of man with God.

There is a consequence of intratrinitarian unity , which is seen in the Holy Trinity and which is taken up and humanity. God the Father chooses him to give birth to the Son in his own essence and to give birth to the Spirit , also in his own essence . Thus appears what we could call *the criterion of the need* for charic unity , which means real participation in the divinity and is in fact the fundamental axiom of participation and sharing , coming from the example of the Holy Trinity, but also i from the requested unit and from the existential condition of grace . God shares his own Being , above all else , in existence . _ _ _ _ _ The Trinity shows how participation is in His very Being , in the essence of Godhead . And humanity, being created , receives a participation also in an essence , also in something called divinity , also in something that is from God, through which it unites with God. God in man and man in God .

The intratrinitarian unity is extended in participation , that we may all be one in the criterion of unity in essence : in the essence of the Godhead for the Trinity and in another essence , shared _ _ _ _ _ humanity , in the uncreated energies , for humanity. Participating, sharing and sharing in the essence of the Godhead (for the Trinity) and in the essence of the uncreated shared , uncreated energies , are the foundation of the discussion of human participation. It is the elevation of union into existence , at the level of a maximum principle, which must be fulfilled in some form . How happily Father Stăniloae shows this main idea in the

discussion about the unity of man with God!

The discussion of the nature of nature becomes marginal, seeing the argument of participation in essence. Perhaps we are not talking so much in the theology of the fulfillment of nature as the existential importance of participation in essence. The participation and union spoken of is not a declarative, communional, external unity, but a grace union . God is united in essence and says of Himself that He is One, in essence, first of all, being one by a shared work. The unity that humanity receives in God is also in an essence, in a work graciously linked to Being, to God, in an uncreated energy, which can bring and can be called unity in fact, being and bringing a typology of unity, which can be called a haric unity. With something from Being, with Being. Not with the essence of the Godhead, but with something that is God's, eternal, in which God communicates Himself.

**CONSTRUCTION IN THE CATHOLIC THESIS OF A
POSITION FOR DIVINITY, TRANSFORMING THE
SIMPLICITY OF THE DIVINE BEING INTO EXISTENTIAL
ISOLATION. THE CATHOLIC SYLLOGISM OF
"ISOLATION"**

Catholicism defends in the Simple Being a broad theological position, a rigid statement, which it refuses to corroborate with other biblical information. What is called the defense of the simplicity of Being is a wrong creation of an extended position of divinity, in existence, a wide development of the dogma of the existence of Being, creating other information, besides the dogma of simplicity, attached to it, additional information used to deny Saint Gregory's thesis. It actually creates *a position of self-containment and isolation of the Being*.

The divine being is simple, but:

1. God announces His work in grace.
2. God shows in Himself a pattern of participation and calls for a unity in a principle of unity.
3. All theology is about participation, and the Trinity shows us participation in Himself, and shows us in grace participation and sharing in a principle.
4. We are shown an intrinsic relationship between divinity and grace.

This information is explicit in Scripture and constitutes a set of information adjacent to the information about the simplicity of the divinity, information that should be added to the reason and logic about Being.

What Catholicism does is postulate that, because of simplicity, there is no information about Being that is related to Being. However, Catholicism cancels other biblical informational premises and refuses to use other biblical informational premises

in argument. What Catholicism actually does at the level of argument and fallacy of argument is the *elimination of other information necessary for the construction of the argument* , equally forcing not an absolute simplicity, but an absolute severance of Being from everything else.

Catholicism and Achindin (being the same position) do not just say that Being is simple. I say much more, it adds, incorrectly, other informational premises to the dogma. I say that there is nothing else uncreated apart from Being. But the Scripture says the opposite. Achindin combats what the Scripture says and forces atheologically (purely logical, deductive, but wrong), without bringing a justification, some consequences. It alters the simplicity of Being, which is no longer just a simplicity for him, as it is incorrectly called by Achindin in his own proposal, but is a total rupture of existence, a complete existential isolation of divinity.

Achindin does not speak of a simplicity, but forces the complete exit of the divinity from existence. It forces simplicity as extra- existentiality , as a rupture in all dimensions of existence. That is, it takes the divinity out of existence, out of all connection with existence. It creates a position not simple, but of self-restraint and isolation. It distorts the dogma of simplicity and creates another, wrong dogma of Being.

It is a completely different position as a premise, but also as information. Achindin and Catholicism do not propose a "simplicity" of the divinity, but much more, they propose a removal/breaking out of the existence of the divinity. This is the consequence and understanding, and the correct interpretation of what Catholicism and Achindin propose. Achindin creates a position of divinity, a position that is in many dimensions, extrapolated from the position of "simplicity", takes the divinity out of existence, breaks it from existence, and proposes that the divinity has nothing in existence. He then concludes that there is nothing of divinity shared in existence, that everything is created, and that

everything we do in existence relates directly to Being and essence. Along with defending the position of absolute simplicity comes the relinquishment of all information about divinity and creation, and the isolation of divinity, its severance from humanity. One is not legitimately defending a position of simplicity, but constructing a position of breaking the divinity from Creation.

Martin Jugie ¹⁰⁰mentions the Catholic/Achindinist position on the position of distorted simplicity of divinity:

1. "The fundamental thesis which he [Achindin] maintains against Palama is this:
2. God is:
 - a. absolutely simple being
 - b. in which
 - c. everything is *fully identified*
 - d. with the exception of hypostatic properties : (...).
3. In him [God] there is neither a primary element nor a secondary element.
4. There is *nothing uncreated* [1] outside of him.
5. He is the first; whatever comes after Him is a creature; *there is nothing intermediate* [2] between creator and creature.

¹⁰⁰Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, in the *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, pp. 258-259, shows how Catholicism wrongly supports this theological point, through Martin Jugie : "33. In more recent times, M. Jugie showed his contempt for Palama, in art. *Palamas* from *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique* (t. XI, col. 1735). The Dominican magazine *Istina* admits (in the editorial of no. 3, 1974, p. 257) that Jugie "made the Orthodox sensibility react by the sly tone with which he pretended to show without difficulty what doctrinal inconsistencies could be imposed as dogmas by a separate Church by the Apostolic See of Rome and subject to Caesaro -imperial papacy."

6. *Nothing eternal* [3] except the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.
7. Based on this principle, he [Achindin] consequently rejects all theses of Palamas:
 - a. no uncreated light,
 - b. none at least which is not identical with the divine essence;
 - c. without uncreated gifts of the Holy Spirit, because they are multiple;
 - d. no uncreated grace, because it is an effect produced in the creature.
8. As for the object of beatitude, it is God himself, so to speak, his nature, his essence, which enters into communion with the *sanctified creature* [4] in an incomprehensible manner without undergoing the slightest change."¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹" The fundamental thesis which he maintains against Palamas is this: God is an absolutely simple being, in whom everything is really identified with the exception of the hypostatic properties: (...) , Monk . 223, fol. 19th c. In him, no primary element and secondary element. Nothing uncreated outside of him. He is the first; everything that comes after him is a creature; no intermediary between the creator and the creature. Nothing eternal except Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: (...). Ibid., fol. 18th century Basing himself upon this principle, he rejects, in consequence, all of Palamas' theses: no divine uncreated light, none at least that is not identical with the divine essence; no uncreated gifts of the Holy Spirit, since they are multiple; no uncreated grace, since it is an effect produced in the creature. As for the object of beatitude, it is God himself , that is to say, his nature, his essence, which enters into communion with the sanctified creature in an incomprehensible manner and without suffering the least change: (...) . Ibid., fols . 31v-32r. [Following the godbearing fathers , we think that the saints receive, in an unchanging way and above sense and mind and reason, the holy and blessed essence in a communion of sanctification.].", in Martin Jugie , "*The Palamite Controversy*" , translation after " Palamite (Controversy)," in : M. Vacant et al., eds., Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique ,

Father Stăniloae says: "Achindin therefore affirms that one's being can spread over others as much as one's works. If the divine being cannot spread, it is not because of its character of being, but because of its uncreated character. So nothing from God can spread to creatures as one who is uncreated." ¹⁰², and: "So, according to Achindin, approved by Nadal, we only receive from God created things. Grace itself is created. No real, direct contact can be made between us and God."¹⁰³

In fact, Achindin creates the following false information as a result of the "logical" deductions from the extended simplicity thesis: *there is nothing uncreated outside of Being, as a result of forcing not simplicity, but the complete self-containment and isolation of Being*. What additional information Achindin creates is that Being is broken from anything outside. Using the information of simplicity, he understands it as self-containment and isolation, and not as simplicity, and by logical negation, he extends it as broken from everything. Here is the problem in Achindin's reasoning, when he distorts the dogma of the simplicity of the Being of divinity, proposing a logical deduction, a negation, which actually eliminates countless information.

Father Dumitru Stăniloae says: "However, ***the falsity of the statement*** that the being cannot spread like the work, in the created order, is obvious. (...) It spreads through works, but does not dissolve or exhaust itself in any work. God does not extend himself as a being, not by being uncreated, but by being a Person or Trinity of Persons. (...) Thus *we close God in Himself, on the grounds that He*

tome XI/2 (Paris 1932), cols. 1777-1818, <https://bekkos.wordpress.com/martin-jugie-the-palamite-controversy/>.

¹⁰²Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palamas*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 262.

¹⁰³Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 264.

is uncreated , and we no longer have any possibility to meet Him, to receive something from Him in us."¹⁰⁴

Father Stăniloae precisely observes that the position of divinity in existence is distorted by Achindin and Catholicism, through syllogism, creating a self-contained and isolated position, which as a consequence generates a break in existence. It is such a theologically important position that it cannot be overlooked, being an existence-shattering statement about God, a statement created... syllogistically.

How did this position come about, where does it come from in theology, and how is it argued? It is a fundamental position in the whole discussion of Charic theology in Catholicism, a position that is in no way supported. How did Catholicism go from simplicity to self-restraint and self-isolation? Somehow, in a few lines produced by Achindin, a new dogma was created for the Trinity as well, a historically non-existent dogma, which appeared after a few lines produced by Achindin and taken over by Catholicism.

Achindin creates a divinity according to a logic that seems correct, but in fact cancels out all the information about the divinity existing in parallel in the supernatural revelation. It creates a certain kind of divinity, a position of divinity, cut off from the rest of existence, forcing self-restraint and isolation, and life only through Hypostases. Achindin makes a statement of the type: *The Trinity has only the Hypostases, we only know the Hypostases, and as a consequence, it has nothing else, having only the Hypostases in it, so (as a logical negation) everything outside of it is created.*

Where does Achindin go wrong in his thesis? In two broad points, in the assimilation of simplicity as self-restraint and isolation, and then in logical deduction, by logical negation, of what is

¹⁰⁴ Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama* , Philokalia , Vol. 7, p. 264.

between man and God. These points are seen in different consequences, because created grace brings an infinite number of negative theological consequences. What Achindin does is to:

1. It uses a logical negation relative to the divinity, for an existential plane where it cannot apply a logical negation.
2. It ignores the biblical information for the work of divinity and the information that should be present in a biblical thesis on this point related to divinity.
3. It uses logical deduction, instead of information from supernatural revelation, to obtain information about the principle between God and man, on the existential plane between divinity and man, where we cannot work with logical deduction. It uses an altered definition of the simplicity of Being, initially ignoring the works of It, retaining only the dimension of Hypotheses, to then reject any discussion of works related to being. In fact, he wants to cancel the informational premises brought by Grigorie Palama, from the biblical thesis, through a logical negation.

The phrase "really identified" (" really identified ") is an ambiguous wording. The problem is that in this expression Achindin cancels other biblical informational premises, other information about the works of God, wanting to block informationally anything that is about the work of God. Here is actually the alteration of the dogma of the divinity, the dogma is altered and a wrong position of the divinity is created in existence, not as simple Being, but as self-contained and isolated Being.

Just as we know that God's Being is simple, we also know about the existence of His works, also as biblical information. Achindin considers only the Hypostases, which he considers to be of the Being, to be related to the Being and refuses the discussion

of the works, as part of the discussion of the Being and the way the works are related to the Being. The problem brought up by Achindin is this denial at the level of Being, that whatever is outside of It is created. It brings a concept and a logical deduction to a theological problem that needs to be dealt with differently, using explicit, direct, biblical information. In this case, we cannot draw the conclusion about the "created" outside of Being, as Achindin does very simply, as we actually need informational support for this and not just a negation.

Achindin distorted the position-dogma of Being into existence. He says "simple", when in fact he understood and used a self-contained and isolated position. Achindin changes the notions and reporting to Being in the argument. By simplicity he means self-restraint and isolation. And then he deduces that there are no works and that everything is broken from divinity. Now, simplicity does not exclude work on the outside, while isolating self-containment excludes this, and it is a completely different dimension proposed for the Being. Achindin extended a dimension of Being into the wrong thing, bringing in inappropriate semantics for simplicity, confusing its meaning.

Gregory Palamas observes this alteration and says: "Therefore, understand and guard the divine simplicity, but do not abolish His natural exits, as if they were not, nor consider the unsettling and eternal light, begun, nor affirm two divinities and two divine origins of good, i.e. created and uncreated. Because only in this way would there be two proper. For being both uncreated, both the being and the work, there is no obstacle to their being one, as the ray and the sun are one light."¹⁰⁵ And he mentions the root problem, the severance of Being from works, by creating a

¹⁰⁵St. Gregory Palama, *On Divine Communion*, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Philokalia*, Vol. 7, p. 482.

distinct position, a severance that has innumerable consequences outside of Being, when we discuss grace.

Achindin 's logic is not for a simple Being, it is for a self-contained , isolated Being. In fact, Achindin's argument and conclusions made in the argument are for this dimension/position, not for simplicity. However, the self-containment and existential isolation of divinity is a completely different thesis than the thesis of simplicity. From simplicity to self-isolation is an evolution of notion, meaning, but also of position.

Achindin starts from simplicity, but in fact discusses a premised position of a self-contained Being in isolation, a position that is created falsely, rhetorically, for an argument to cancel Grigorie Palama's thesis. But to discuss this position suddenly evolved from "simplicity" is an entirely different theological discussion. Why does Achindin refuse to analyze the biblical information about grace as a work and principle and prefers a logical deduction? Because he does not understand this biblical information and forces the isolation of the Being.

Where in the history of Orthodoxy has there ever been any discussion of a self-contained and isolated Being, cut off from the outside? And what is the relationship between this Being and simplicity? Achindin actually created a new position for divinity in this exercise, a new mode of divinity existence. And then he deduces disconnected from other information, by negation, that anything outside of divinity is disconnected from creation, so it is created. First it creates this position of divinity, and then it just exposes consequences, by negation, in the wrong way.

To claim that anything outside of divinity is created, you must first show that divinity is broken from creation, which Achindin does wrong in his formulation of divinity. Achindin deduces something by negation, having already annulled in his formulation of the divinity its relation to the created. *"Divinity is broken from creation, so as a consequence, through negation, everything*

in creation is created, and nothing can be uncreated" - this would be Achindin's thesis on divinity, made on the premise of "simplicity". But this can only be by inserting before, at the level of divinity, this information, this break, which is seen in conclusions, consequences, which already existed at the level of divinity in Achindin's proposal .

But where does Achindin get this information, postulated at the level of divinity, that it is broken and isolated? Shouldn't he have supplemented here precisely through the theology of grace, which is under discussion, with direct, biblical information? Achindin makes a very subtle evolution of the attribute of simplicity into self-restraint and isolation, which goes unnoticed. Many do not see this insertion of information at the level of divinity and the wrong retrieval of it in the conclusions. And it is not noticed that a new dogma appears in the argument, of a self-contained and isolated divinity, with which one operates theologically, without having any support as a dogma and position.

In theology, a new dogma suddenly appears, in Achindin's thesis, a position that floats theologically without support, a position taken over by Catholicism . With Achindin, we have in the history of theology a new position of divinity, a position taken over by Catholicism. This information deduced by Achindin must appear from somewhere , that "everything outside of Being is created". And that is by inserting into the divinity of information, by changing simplicity into insulating self-containment. By a change of positioning of the divinity in existence.

Was there any theology in the history of the Church, before Achindin , for the position of divinity raised by him ? This is what the discussion boils down to, if there was before in the Church this discussion about divinity, about an isolated self-containment, broken from creation, from works, completely outside of it. It is an untenable position. It's obviously a failed syllogism. Distorting in this insertion the position of the divinity in existence, Catholicism

commits a double mistake, and isolates the divinity from man, but also the man from divinity.

Grigorie Palama's thesis is the sharing of an eternal principle of participation, through which man becomes god. The existence of this principle is a matter of direct information, of supernatural revelation, not of natural knowledge. Such a principle cannot be deduced and cannot be thought by deduction, starting from nature, as the Catholics propose, by different positions for divinity and for nature/nature, to deduce by syllogisms or by reflection the nature of those outside of divinity or the nature of grace.

Certainly, Achindin's deduction hides a syllogism, an error in logic, but also in approach, seen by Grigorie Palama. Unfortunately, it is not seen by many theologians and is wrongly preserved in history in Catholicism and Achindinism . What history should do is to verify every word of what Achindin said , to verify how it is supported in supernatural revelation, in deductive logic, without premises and without the possibility of bringing a deductive logic to the level of Being and its external level .

Catholicism and Achindinism say the same thing, they propose natural knowledge, logical deductions related to the Being, but also related to what is around It, completely forgetting the supernatural revelation, which is the only one that can explicitly bring such information. Catholicism and Achindinism bring theological speculations about the divinity-humanity relationship. It creates a different deity, a position of the deity in existence, without using all the existing information surrounding the deity. And they use logical negation to obtain primordial theological information, of the nature of supernatural revelation information, rather than using the construction of an argument through supernatural revelation. When they can no longer find information in supernatural revelation to continue the theological argument about grace, they change the premises and the theological position

(nature or divinity) for the argument, and then go to a deductive, indirect, natural argument.

Catholicism and Achindinism should have added to the thesis of the simplicity of the divinity *revealed information* and arrived at a correct information by adding revealed information. Not to use logical deduction on something that does not admit of logical deduction, assuming (actually creating) wrong positions for the deity. We are discussing an existential thesis where we cannot use logical negation. Logical negation does not exist in the existential plane, between divinity and humanity, where there is only supernatural revelation, the only authentic thesis that can provide information on the subject.

Catholicism and Achintinism use logical deduction on a supra-existential thesis, linking multiple dimensions in existence, of divinity and creation. This is unacceptable. Catholicism does not use biblical information, supernatural revelation, but logical deduction, syllogisms, starting from nature, assimilating human and nature reasoning. We do not link divinity and humanity in an existential plane by logical deduction, being something impossible to do. The difference between the simplicity of Being and the Catholic/Achindinist position of Being as broken from existence and isolated is an abysmal one. And it is precisely at the point that Catholicism and Achintinism propose a distinct position, but destroy and ignore the biblical information for the authentic position of the deity in existence. Because they did not understand how to continue the argument about grace using biblical information.

Achindin invisibly introduces this information of the created into the divinity's position of self-restraint and isolation. To everyone it appears to be "defense of the dogma of simplicity", it appears to be this, but it is not, and then this information is "extracted" as a seeming consequence of "defense of the dogma of simplicity" when it is only a consequence of the dogma of self-isolation and simplicity.

The break from creation, the created, is introduced by Achindin under the eyes of the entire theology, in a syllogistic inattention to defend a position of simplicity, wrong defense, which previously distorts the position into another position. All theology must unravel this very point, how the information about "created" appears at the level of the divinity position. It does not appear explicitly, as direct information from supernatural revelation, it appears by distorting the position of divinity, syllogistically. So it is with the assumption of the gratuity of grace at the level of nature, in a similar error.

Father Stăniloae says: "We hope that such statements from the Catholic side are a beginning for an integral positive understanding of the doctrine of Saint Gregory Palamas, contributing to this and an effort from the Orthodox theology, to shed light on a concept of God that is superior to which reduces Him to a too simplistically thought essence or to an essence that disregards His works, concerned only with His unity, and not understanding that God is present in the works as a triune unity of persons, which is something other than the simplistically thought unity of the philosophers ." ¹⁰⁶

Similarly, he says: " *Achindin condemns God to the impossibility of manifestation due to the fact that he is uncreated.* This betrays the essentialist, impersonalist view of God. Only such a mentality could affirm that since God is uncreated, He is so strong in His essence that He cannot manifest Himself, understanding manifestation as a flow. For Achindin, the uncreated equated to freezing. God of Achindin and Varlaam, or the scholastic God is a rigid substance, more frozen than any stone, therefore a dead substance, the substance of a simplistic rationalist philosophy. The God of

¹⁰⁶Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palamas*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 267.

the Bible, of the Fathers, of the faithful people, affirmed by Palamas, is the personal God, alive, free to manifest His interest and His love."¹⁰⁷

Father Ștefan Buchiu says: "This explains the categorical refusal of Saint Grigorie Palama to fall into the trap of scholastic rationalism, which tried without success to decipher the boundless mystery of God with only the power of reason. *Find out with the methods of definition, analysis and division and please teach us who do not know*, said Saint Gregory, alluding to the purely philosophical and psychological methods of scholastic theology."¹⁰⁸

What is worse is that the whole of Catholicism supports an abysmal theological error, falling as a whole into a syllogism not so difficult to observe, observed in the light of the Spirit, by Grigorie Palama, by Orthodoxy, but not observed by an entire confession, condemned by Orthodoxy, in Achindin, but preserved as legitimate by Catholicism. The existence of such a syllogism in Catholic theology brings Catholic theology into an area where critical mistakes are seen, which cancel out the possibility of Catholic theology being correct as a whole. Such errors present elsewhere in Catholicism invalidate an entire theology, but also highlight the orthodox historical reference, which fully observed the correct argumentation for the theme. All the major divergent points in Catholicism have such errors, syllogisms, or by altering notions or by altering the argument, or by refusing the informational unity, a list can be made of the typologies of errors found in Catholicism.

"Grigory Palama was one of the most blasphemed Eastern figures by Catholic historians. The reason is that his doctrine has always been rejected by Catholic theology, either because it was influenced by the simplifying scholastic rationalism, or because the

¹⁰⁷ *Philokalia*, Vol. 7, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, footnote 391, p. 476.

¹⁰⁸ Rev. Prof. Dr. Ștefan Buchiu, Deacon. Dr. Cristian Tufan, *Research methods in Dogmatic Theology*, Sigma Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009, p. 124.

opposition to the Palamite doctrine , inaugurated by Barlaam perhaps with too little reflection, strengthened Catholic theology in its scholastic attitude intellectualist towards Palama. (...) This was another reason why Saint Gregory was considered by the Orthodox Church as the defender of Orthodox teaching, which, in opposition to scholastic intellectualism, grounds the experience of the encounter with God of the praying believer." ¹⁰⁹It is St. Gregory Palamas who points out the complete break of Catholic theology from God, at a point which has so many theological implications that it completely cancels out an entire theology. Because uncreated/created grace is a paradigm shift of man vis-à-vis God, it is a problem related to the deification of man, to man's position in existence, through God. It is a theological point that completely cancels the entire Catholic theology, put in a situation of recovery of the entire Orthodox experience, following this point.

¹⁰⁹Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *The life and writings of Saint Gregory Palamas* , Philokalia , Vol. 7, pp. 258-259.

3. THE SECOND STEP OF THE ARGUMENT: BUILDING THE ARGUMENT

HOW ARE THE ORTHODOX AND CATHOLIC ARGUMENTS FOR THE THEOLOGY OF UNCREATED GRACE CONSTRUCTED?

I. How is the argument built in Orthodoxy about grace? Below I add the orthodox logical argument for grace, the key information and the steps taken. I will follow step by step the argument made by Grigorie Palama, being the reference theology for this point. It is very interesting that all orthodox theologians who follow and build this thesis follow all these points, more or less in this order. I mention them briefly, in a structured way, so that I can easily grasp the major points related to the discussion of grace.

Direct information and intrinsic reporting.

In the Gospel the term grace is used, but also the Spirit and from the Spirit. Christ does not send grace, but the Spirit or from the Spirit, even if the work is by grace. The Spirit works by grace. Reporting is intrinsic, wonderful. God does not break the work of His grace, even though He is above man, and moreover He says that He is there. Man does not unite with an energy, but with God Himself. In baptism we do not receive an energy broken from God, but God Himself, in us. In us dwells not an energy broken from God, but a God, in a form that we can carry.

Some biblical references for this, but also a mention of Saint Gregory Palamas for this:

- "I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh" (Joel 3, 1),
- " And saying these things, he breathed on them and

- said to them: Receive the Holy Spirit; (Jn. 20, 22)",
- "And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness" (Lk . 4, 1),
 - "They have forsaken Me, the fountain of living water" (Jer. 2, 13),
 - "I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh" (Joel 3, 1),
 - "For the words of grace that came out of His mouth" (Lk . 4, 22),
 - Martyr Stephen "being filled with the Holy Spirit, saw the glory of God" (Fp. 7, 55-77),
 - At the baptism of Christ and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Him,
 - Baptism is "Of water and of the Spirit" (Mt. 3, 11; Lk . 3, 16; Jn. 31-33),
 - "I baptized you with water, but He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit." (Mark 1, 8).

"Thus, when Palamas refers to the spirit that descends at the Baptism of Christ (Jn. 1, 33), he notes that this is not the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit - as Akindin believes - but His entire grace and His work."¹¹⁰

1. *Grace is uncreated*, being energy from the divine being. He always remains inseparable from the divine being.

2. Grace is related to the subject - it is *unipostated*. "It comes from the divine Being, and remains united with it in an inseparable manner" ¹¹¹.

3. *The source of grace* is the divine being.

4. There is a *synergy* of God's grace with man.

¹¹⁰Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 19.

¹¹¹Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 22.

There are important indirect-consequence information and theologies in the discussion about grace that are foundational for the discussion about the presence of the theological information about grace at the level of nature, the human being. They bring and show the necessity of the existence of a haric work .

5. *The theology of union* in a shared essence, communion seen from the perspective of divinity, which unites man with Himself in something of Himself. The union in one essence is a necessary one. Union in light, in something that is like God, in a shared light is the being of these unions. Man is light, *through the light* that comes from God. And this light is also called light and divinity, being glued to God, shown by God, first in Himself. "Cabasila notes that Christ as the Son of God frees people from their slavery to sin and makes them sons of God in a charismatic way , because he communes with them not only his body and blood, but also his Spirit" ¹¹². "The palm binds the charismatic adoption of believers both to God the Father and to Christ... Through the uncreated grace of Baptism, Christ spiritually reborn men and becomes their Father by grace." ¹¹³

6. *Theology of participation* . It is a theology seen from the perspective of man, who joins and participates in a glorious union with God. To be able to truly call connection and participation in the divinity, union with God, the participation must have something of God, God Himself in the work through which one participates: "When we say that we participate in something, Palama observes, it means that we have a certain part of that something in which we participate. If we do not have a particular part, but participate in the whole participated, then we cannot say that we participate in it, but that we have it... Therefore, when the Fathers of

¹¹²Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...* , p. 61.

¹¹³Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...* , p. 66.

the Church speak about the participation of God, this participation should not be understood either by being or by hypostasis, but only by uncreated grace and energy."¹¹⁴

7. *The theology of the image* of God fulfilled in man through grace: "According to Palama, the grace of God in man is that divine appropriation of him *according to the image*, which keeps man in renewal, and at the same time leads him safely to likeness" ¹¹⁵. Man does not fulfill himself as the image of God, without having a divine personal presence in himself - grace, as uncreated energy.

8. *Grace, communion bridge*. "Divine grace, being a natural characteristic of God, becomes in a charismatic way within the Church a characteristic of created man as well, and thus only through this uncreated attribute of God is the direct communion of created man with the uncreated God possible. The only way man can commune with God's divinity, says Palama, is to commune with His uncreated energies" ¹¹⁶.

9. *Grace – conscious, felt experience*. "According to Palamas, *the who learned by experience, only he saw the energies of the Spirit*. Thus, we can rightfully claim that theology within the Church constitutes the expression of spiritual experience, which man acquires from the revealed presence of God through His uncreated energies."¹¹⁷

10. *Grace is the arvuna of light acquired perfect in eternity*. "Consequently, the experience of uncreated grace, which the one

¹¹⁴Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 98.

¹¹⁵Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 41.

¹¹⁶Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 103.

¹¹⁷Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 108.

who participates in it in the Church acquires, constitutes the experience of the Kingdom of Heaven itself. The uncreated and eternal kingdom of God, which will appear with the second coming of Christ, will become fully participated, according to Palamas, only by those who had its arvuna in the present life" ¹¹⁸.

All the above theologies bring two directions for argument. The first is of *intrinsic reporting to the work* and the second of the *necessity of a shared work*, in order to fulfill the existential act of union with God, but also of transporting information, through different theologies. Grace is a *divino-centric theology*, in which grace is always seen as informational, linked to divinity, and all these theologies show how the information about grace flows in these theologies at the level of nature, as a necessity for the fulfillment of man through God. The nature of grace-related information is God-centric, work-related and not wire-related. The work brings information about itself, not human nature brings information about the work. How is the correct way of deducing this information seen in Orthodoxy? Starting from divine-centric theologies: participation, self-sharing, Trinitarian sharing given to humanity, in uncreated grace. That is, from what God has in Himself and shows us in Himself, also given to man in another shared essence, called uncreated energy.

Information from the haracic testimony of Orthodox asceticism. There are innumerable testimonies about the experience of light in Orthodox theology, not added here due to the limited scope of the work.

II. How is the logical argument in Catholicism about grace constructed for the created-uncreated grace thesis? Below, I reproduce the key information, premise for the argument, steps followed in

¹¹⁸Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 110.

the argument, gaps and problems in the argument.

1. *Two fundamental premises are used as informational premises:*
 - a. Grace is a gift.
 - b. Grace is absolutely free.
 - c. *It is not used in deduction the information about grace as a communion bridge, glue between man and God, as importance in the consequences and in the transport of information about grace from divinity to nature. Likewise, there is no discussion of direct information, of intrinsic reporting, omnipresent in all patristic and orthodox theologies.*
 - d. The information about grace from the theologies of union, participation, and image and likeness, the theologies that actually carry the information and clearly highlight the need for this work, *is not used to build the logical argument* . These theologies are mentioned as existing, but without being informationally related to grace, which is incorrect.
 - e. *No experimental information is used to build the argument.*

2. *How and at what points is the Catholic argument wrongly constructed for the Catholic created grace thesis ?*
 1. *Informationally* an argument is constructed without all informational premises, missing the direct information and the theologies of grace that bring consequences to it, the indirect information/consequences. The discussion of grace ends up being one about the conditions of work, about nature, about nature, and not about grace itself and its direct theologies. That is, it is not about what grace brings, divino-centric , about the theologies that carry this information about the nature of grace, but about what can

be said about grace, starting from nature. The Catholic thesis on grace is a discussion of a topic, but off topic and outside of the full information brought to that topic.

2. *These points of departure (absolute gratuitousness and nature)* are emphasized in exactly this way in the Catholic Encyclopedia for the subject of *pure nature* : " Although no Catholic theologian would argue that such a situation exists, a large number of them would insist that only by formulating such a notion of a pure nature as a genuine possibility, *the absolute gratuitousness of man's supernatural elevation can be clearly understood and defended* . Because, *once one can say precisely what belongs to nature* , then the theologian is in a *position to determine what grace is* , and thus what must be affirmed as the undeserved gift of God" ¹¹⁹. This starting position in the construction of the Catholic thesis is a wrong one, because it *is not nature that generates and carries the information about the grace connection with the Being of God* (obvious thing, grace being a divino-centric theology). If the Catholic mode of argument wants to start from creation, in order to deductively bring information about the Creator, that is, a natural argument, to deduce from creation information that should be primary in supernatural revelation, then this is a wrong way to build an argument. If the discussion begins with the "belonging" to na-

¹¹⁹ Text in the original (eng.): "While no Catholic theologian would maintain that any such state ever actually existed, a very large number have insisted that only by formulating the notion of pure nature as a genuine possibility can the absolute gratuity of the SUPERNATURAL ELEVATION OF MAN be clearly understood and defended. *For, once it can be ascertained what precisely belongs to nature* , then the theologian is in a position to determine what GRACE is and, therefore, what must be affirmed as God's unknown gift." (New Catholic Encyclopedia , Second Edition, Vol 11, Gale Publishing, p. 901).

ture, the discussion is already circumscribed in relation interests and intersubstances , and grace is circumscribed to nature, as essence, being seen only as an external work to complete nature - that is, this discussion already brings hidden premises in - an incorrect relationship between nature and grace. Even so, the discussion of what belongs to nature is wrong in Catholicism, which cancels out information about nature from other theologies - is nature the only point where there is information about the haric connection with Being? This desire to depart from nature for something that is information that comes from divinity is certainly a path that shows the impossibility of finding the correct deductive path, the correct theologies of transporting this information from divinity to nature and starting back, wrong, of deduction, but also the high possibility of mistakes in the process. And it shows that the theological point at which the information about the nature of grace is communicated in revelation and the theologies touched by this information has not been precisely identified.

3. *The gratuitousness of grace is considered absolute.* Can gratuitousness and nature, severed from divinity, really be a starting point for constructing the thesis for grace? Excluded. This is obvious, due to the way in which the thesis of grace must be constructed, being a divine-centric one , and due to the complete lack of information about grace from gratuity. Gratuitousness has too little of the necessary information about grace as an informational premise. *Gratuitousness is a condition of sharing the work, it does not bring information about the nature and other attributes of the work* . Catholicism does not construct a legitimate thesis, because it does not gather all the information necessary for the thesis and does not fully analyze it in all directions. *Catholicism defends a position of the absolute gratuitousness of grace, transformed into the absolute futility of grace* which it

posits as the only informational premise for the grace connection with Being. And he extends it incorrectly starting from nature. Which immediately rules out the Catholic thesis as a correct one, starting directly from the starting point of the logical argument on grace, which must be a divine-centric theology with information flowing into divine-centric theologies . Defending this position, he constructs countless theories derived from it. Can this really be a way to obtain primordial information about grace? Not.

4. It is obvious that the theology of grace is already historically discovered in all patristic writings and the Church, being already present in them. There is an informational unity of the Church on this subject, which must be considered, in the context of which theology must be developed. Why does Catholicism have so much difficulty penetrating this mystery, when in fact it should be considered both obvious and present as an informational status already existing in the Church? How is information present as a universal informational status in the Church? Why is this information not noticed by Catholicism or refused to be integrated? Why does Catholicism go in the other direction of the argument about grace, starting from nature? Due to scholasticism and the defense of the position of absolute gratuity, which lead Catholic theology to an annulment position of the information about grace, but also of the construction using a scholastic, dialectical logic, of a theology of grace on fabricated, wrong informational premises. Catholicism uses a scholastic logic for grace, and by no means a patristic theology. Some terms and some notions that appear in Catholic theology of grace are from the realm of scholasticism.

5. It should absolutely, as the primary rationale of the evangelical logical argument for grace, that the primary

sources and the primary tradition of the Church have information as informational status, as terms and notions, but also reports, for the correct identification and expression of this theology. Catholicism only by this *argument of the necessity of the existence already in the Church of information* and by producing another logical direction and notions, is already outside of any possibility of being in harmony with what is in the Church related to grace. Catholicism has left the *informational-notional status of the Church*, in the historical unity necessary for any theological thesis, on this theology bringing and producing reports, notions, outside of what is in the Church. For grace, it should and is obligatory to work only with what is in the Church - with a foundation in Christ, in the Gospel, more than enough for a theology of grace, the Christic grace thesis having to be an immediate foundation for a thesis of grace. *Christ is the first Teacher-Theologian of grace*. And in Him we should find the way and information for grace, notions, terms, relationships, existential condition, existential importance for grace. He deals comprehensively with the issue of grace. The discussion about *habit, accident, supernatural, nature* is an informational deviation from what should be found in this theology, through the prism of unity with the historical information of the Church. At the level of informational unity, Catholicism fails to unify this own proposition with what is already in the Church, removing the Catholic thesis from the possibility of being of the Church. What Catholicism proposes are not the theologies and logic of the Church, coming out of its informational-notional status. And in contrast, what Grigorie Palama does is to correctly follow the information from the Church, in an argument in informational unity.

6. *Absolute gratuity cannot be a single* and absolute informational foundation for the discussion of grace, as it is in

Catholicism. Grace is not a given that can be circumscribed as theology, only a unique property of gratuitousness. Catholicism makes a fallacy of argument on many dimensions. It replaces (ignores) the fundamental theologies of grace in the Church, of union, participation and image, i.e. correct information that can be extracted, as consequences, but also intrinsic reporting, and ignores all information about grace, in a logic starting from to the wire. That is, it replaces the theologies that carry the information about the haric connection with the Being of God, not using them. And it moves the discussion from the theologies that carry this information directly or as a consequence to an argument that does not have this information in any form and from which it erroneously deduces all kinds of conclusions, having to postulate countless assumptions and hypotheses, entering into theological speculation. Catholicism logically develops a theory, it by no means builds theologically on the basis of theological information from the Church. The theology of grace is built on primary, biblical and patristic information. In this way, *Catholicism has no fundamental information about grace, in the informational premise of absolute gratuity* , but still manages to bring countless information in different directions. What is present at the level of nature, as information carried from the divinity, in a theology, to be found in the separation between nature and the supernatural ? In this separation between nature and the supernatural an information is falsely created, ignoring the information that already comes from certain theologies. And this new misproduced information cancels out the information from existing theologies and introduces a false one, wrongly recovered at the level of nature. Which obviously shows that along the way assumptions, hypotheses, information produced somehow, through different mechanisms - or through hidden premises, or otherwise, by

adopting notions that bring hidden information and incorrect reports, have been added. How can you start from absolute gratuity and determine the character to be created or not to be created? You can't, actually. What Catholicism does is add hidden informational premises, added and hidden in various notions introduced along the way, that escape the view. But which obviously reappear in consequences after the introduction of some premises-hidden information. That is why, in Catholicism, all present logic about grace, about gratuity, habit, accident, supernatural should be completely abandoned and one should return to the primary logic and terminology of the Church. What is now in Catholicism is obviously an incorrect foundation for a logical argument for grace. The information about "created grace" does not come from gratuitousness and it does not come from a position of simplicity. It comes from its non-transparent creation somewhere in the Catholic discourse on nature and the position of simplicity.

7. It is a very important point in theology that should have brought the theological convergence for grace. And that is the testimony of Christian asceticism - which is one of knowledge, of recapitulation. Which directly brings the theological information from the theology of grace into experience. All who experience grace profess the theology of grace. I testify to the presence of God (not representative presence), I testify to grace as a communion bridge, I testify to grace as eternal light, I testify to grace as eternity, as union. Why does Orthodoxy have a theological convergence on this issue? Because innumerable experiential testimonies clearly show and propose experiencing the information of grace. God is in grace. All who live grace testify to this. I confess grace as a presence, as a consciousness, as connected with God. That is why all of them build a divine-centric

theology , in which they understand the unity of the Trinity and see man united in a typology of identical union, in an uncreated, shared energy. All these understand that they are united with God and they also understand the nature of this union. It is the first testimony of asceticism. This is actually the theology of grace, which unites with the theology of Scripture and the Holy Fathers. All those who experience grace see how their image is fulfilled through Christ, through the light of God. I see grace as an existential connection to the *One who is* .

8. *Gratuitousness is related to the conditions under which the deity shares the work. It is not related to the nature of the work itself*, because gratuity is not theologically related to the nature (dimensions) of the work of grace. It is impossible to start from the *conditions of the giving of the work* and then, using nature, *to deduce consequences related to the nature of the work of grace* . And this without having a bridge for the information about the haric connection with the Being of God. *The argumentation error is that at the thread level one goes from the conditions of granting the work (free) to the nature of the work (uncreated/created character), in different consequences wrongly deduced by incorrect interrelationship between the two properties* . When one reaches the level of nature, as an informational premise, the nature of the work is annulled, when the dissection and separation into natural and supernatural begins, postulating, directly proposing that nature does not need grace. *That is, an information of the nature of grace, the created or uncreated character, is annulled. Separating the natural from the supernatural and postulating that nature is one way and the other actually brings about the nullification of character and the false creation of an information about created/uncreated – it brings about the loss of that information*. In this way, the conditions of sharing the work are mixed with the nature of the work,

and on a wrong deductive path, one tries to determine the nature of the work only by the conditions of its award. The mistake made is that, by postulating absolute gratuity, one wrongly infers as a consequence a lack of necessity of grace, when, in fact, the information and therefore the nature of the work is canceled beforehand. And this by creating an anthropology of man, separated from God. Gratuitousness is wrongly extended into an anthropology of brokenness and forces a definitive break with God in all dimensions, and grace.

9. *An attempt is made through the thread to make an agreement between the conditions of awarding the work and the nature of the work.* But a fundamental question arises: *Why is there a need in Catholicism for the discussion of natures and the deduction by natures, at the level of natures?* Why does this complex yarn-related excursion occur, why was yarn brought into such extensive analysis in this logic? Doesn't the work, the grace, already have this information about both the conditions of the bestowal and its nature, directly, explicitly, and linked together? Isn't grace, by itself, already present as complete, primary, biblical information? Does it need this deduction by a third theology, by consequences at the level of nature? Aren't these given directly as information related to work and divinity? Obviously they are given that way. And they can only be seen in this way. If the existential condition for grace directly from Christ is shown, then the relationship to the Creator is also shown directly. If Christ says that grace is an existential condition (mystery), necessarily there is a relationship of completeness for the attributes of grace, of obligation to also exist this information on the character of grace, related to the Being. And then why is there a need in Catholicism for the indirect logical deduction by nature, of the nature of grace and of property connected with nature? Because it was not

understood, in Catholicism, how the information related to the nature of grace comes into theology. In theology this information is already present, in huge visibility. Everything in theology is about the *union*, the *deification* of man and the self-sharing of the Spirit, in grace. It is a theology of huge visibility, where information about the nature of the work is present both directly and consequentially. And deification and union can only be for an uncreated grace. Catholicism has fallen into the scholastic trap, believing that by reasoning about matter/nature one can obtain information about grace. And he introduced and connected gratuitousness with nature, and then by nature he obtained consequences of the nature of grace.

10. *Why is the discussion about pure nature, nature and supernatural needed in Catholicism?* To have the possibility to informationally link the conditions of the work to the nature of the work. And, instead of seeing this information directly in the relevant biblical theologies and in the direct divino-centric information, it starts in reverse, in an impossible way (because for a millennium no one in Catholicism has succeeded in correctly placing the theology of grace in this way), in which the gratuity, the conditions of the grant, bring consequences in nature, which are then transformed into consequences at the level of the nature of the work of grace, in a logic that is very difficult to follow. Is this what God left for grace? It is not only out of the question, but it is also impossible to put such a theology on paper. That is why Catholicism has failed for over a millennium to settle this theology, because this reasoning between the condition of work, nature, supernatural, the consequent deduction of grace is so complicated to follow that it cannot be logically written down on paper. Being fully susceptible of error and mistake, and being an argument in

incompleteness and uncertainty. In no way can Catholicism rule where it wants. It does not have the necessary informational premises nor the relational support to be able to deduce anything from grace (without other links to God, in which the information flows into these relations, which are not used by Catholicism).

11. *Catholicism turns the discussion from the conditions of grace into a discussion about the nature of grace, through nature, in a wrong way.* It departs from the conditions of sharing the work, from the absolute gratuity, which in essence transforms the absolute condition into a problem of nature and into consequences about nature. And then it recovers, by consequences to nature, information about the nature of grace. The moment gratuitousness is mistakenly assumed at the level of nature and converted into consequences in nature, the properties of the uncreated nature of grace (original information about the nature of grace) are annulled. Then, the altered information about the nature of grace is wrongly recovered as a consequence, having previously been canceled in the thread-level conversion between the conditions of the work and the nature of the work. Believing that it has recovered something informational, Catholicism has recovered something destroyed in the transformation of absolute gratuitousness into consequences at the level of nature.

12. *Why this complicated logic for an account of the nature of grace?* Because scholasticism opens up this way of thinking about nature and the supernatural . Someone in Catholicism, being deeply influenced by scholasticism, believed that the logic of grace could be assimilated and deduced scholastically, being deeply affected by this logical reasoning which is one related to nature-matter, to the created . It circumscribed the discussion of grace to the discussion of

matter. Only such circumscription can bring about such logic. Because he assimilated the grace of a nature and made an inter-substance relation between nature and grace. That is why the discussion about nature and the supernatural , related to grace, started from the hypothesis that grace is a gift, so as a hidden premise it is a kind of spiritual matter, and inter-substance reporting can be done. He then tried to link gratuity to nature and the supernatural . And here he managed, without realizing it, to cancel information about the nature of grace. Because a scholastic logic was approached, instead of a theological one. The problem is that an entire cult has gone in this direction, not realizing the complete ignorance of the right way about grace.

13. *In short, in the grace thesis, Catholicism departs from the sharing condition of the work of grace and uses nature to retrieve information about the nature of the work .* Which is obviously a wrong theological method. And this conversion between the conditions of the work and the nature of the work made at the level of the thread cancels out at the beginning of the argument the correct informational premises about the nature of the work, by introducing wrong premises, which it wrongly recovers in conclusions about the nature of grace, from the consequences starting from the threads. This is *the Gordian knot of Catholic grace theology* , this wrong way of recovering information about grace, indirectly, starting from gratuitousness, through nature, indirectly canceling information about grace and introducing false premises when proposing a settlement and separation at the level of nature in nature and supernatural.

14. *For a millennium Catholicism has had a flawed argument for the theology of grace .* Which leads him theologically to an annulment of God. And he does not have the power to get out of this complex logic. Actually impossible to

crack. It must be highlighted that the view of the theologian Grigorie Palama, correct for this problem, in all dimensions, directly from its rise, in a historical thesis of grace, of divinity, of the correct understanding of divinity brings an important consequence to the whole of Catholic theology: Catholic theology it cannot really encompass the Christian experience.

4. *THE THIRD STEP OF THE ARGUMENT:* THEOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES

THE CONNECTION OF GRACE WITH THE HYPOSTASES OF THE TRINITY

Saint Gregory Palamas calls the divine light "enipostatic", that is, the energies are not separated from the divine persons and cannot be thought apart from them. For us, grace, divine light is participation in divine life: "This means that saving and deifying grace is the very divine life that truly belongs to the hypostases of the Trinity, and which also *gives itself to the human hypostases in the unity of the body of Christ* ." ¹²⁰Therefore, the participation, the connection of man with God is an existential condition of him, shown in this way.

About what grace is like, as a notion related to the *subject* , Dimitrie Tselenghidis says, using the thesis of Saint Gregory Palamas: "According to Saint Gregory Palamas, divine grace does not constitute a being, nor does it exist *by itself* , that is, *in its own hypostasis* . It is not *self-hypostatized* , but enipostated . And we say that it is enipostated , because *it is not considered to be itself, but in the hypostasis of another* . It comes from the divine Being, remaining united with It in an inseparable manner, as it remains, as Philotei specifies Kokinos , the heat in the fire and in those warmed by it. As Iosif Kalotheos observes , grace exists in God in an enipostated form , not as an accident, but naturally, as an essential energy, that is, of his uncreated Being... Saint Gregory Palamas is the one who finally defines *divine grace as that work of God that descends in a human-loving manner for the salvation of those who merit union with*

¹²⁰Translated by Constantin Făgețean, *Life and sufferings of the one among the saints Grigorie Palama, Archbishop of Thessalonica* , p. 92.

Christ." ¹²¹"Thus, on the one hand the being is whole in each work, but on the other hand it remains as an infinite source that can always manifest itself whole in other and other ways and works. On the one hand, the being is therefore whole in each work, on the other hand, it does not exhaust itself in that work, remaining as a source capable of other and other ways of manifesting itself in other and other works."¹²²

That is why this concept brought by Saint Gregory Palamas, so important for theology, appeared, to link the work to the subject and to show the subject in the work. It is a concept that shows the need to emphasize this theological point. Between man and God is a connection that we call communion and in which man participates as much as possible, and God also participates by sharing Himself with man. We are not just discussing grace broken by the Self of divinity, but the nature of the human-God connection and what is changing in this connection. God shares himself and gives to man something that makes man like God, adding man to divinity, and by this understanding that man also receives in eternity a type of existence that God has, linked to God, a deification through what he receives from God, through what comes out of God's Being, a work we call uncreated energy.

The deification of man is an existential reality, not a syllogism. Deification is an existential state seen and felt, fully assumed through Christian asceticism, it is a perfect living in the light. The Christian exercise is of an assumed existential reality and is not broken from it. Asceticism is a common path, not an isolated path of some mystics, some ascetics. Nature, person, personal communion, and existential reality, these are the dimensions that grace works in human nature to strengthen. In the personal dimension

¹²¹Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 22.

¹²²Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palamas*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 265.

it brings communion and connection into presence. As an existential reality, it brings an existential dimension to man.

We are not talking about grace broken by God. The relationship is not so much between grace and man, but between God and man. Grace is not related to man, but God is discussed, first of all, from the point of view of the communion relationship. The right relation is between God and man, as between Subject and subject, not between grace and man. Grace does not exist as a self-contained entity in this discussion of communion, with a self-conscious, self-serving work as a subject of discussion. In grace, God is in communion with us.

God in His power , God in His light shared with man , God who shares himself continuously . Christ speaks not so much of grace as of the Spirit, from the Spirit. We do not commune with an energy, but with a Person, and what we call uncreated energy is the Person Himself sharing in this way, not sharing being, not sharing essence, but sharing by work. God in grace, God in His power and light - this is the correct wording of grace. Theology encompasses a relationship between grace and man. More specifically, it would be the God-man relationship and the communion and sharing that takes place in grace. Grace exists as a visible presence in theology, being something present, above the human being. But it does not exist as an independent reality, as a subject and consciousness with its own self. Therefore, the lack of active subject character per se takes the grace out of a discussion of its own as a self-contained entity in a subject-subject relationship. There is no relationship between grace, as a created subject, in theology, which has its own identity, and creation. The relationship is between God and creation . *"Divine grace, as an uncreated natural attribute and energy of God, is " deofince " with Him. That is why, according to Philotei , grace is shared Kokinos , God is participated, whole as the Worker, and, according to Palamas, God whole is present to the partakers of His grace*

in undivided form."¹²³

Grace is a way, a link between man and God, it is not a distinct (Catholic) subject interposed between man and God. Grace is not a god interposed between God and man, it is not an interposed object of deity, and it is not a level of representative deity, between Being and man. Grace thought in this way is a wall between God and man, which definitively separates man from God. And it moves the whole discussion of God and man into something created. Created grace brings everything into the discussion of creation in something that is created. By forcing the discussion of nature, Catholicism turns nature into an isolated creation, cut off from God. The discussion of grace is always about God and man and grace, which is God's self-giving.

Grace is not a gift in the rigid, circumscribed sense of the term. But *it is a giving - it is the bridge of union in "That they may all be one"*. It is a continuous action of participation in what God is. Giving is a continuous participation and not a broken act of Being. Grace is a gift and not a gift given once and for all. Grace is continuous participation in what God is: eternity, infinity, existence in light, existence in full purity and identity, these being the attributes of God shared in grace. Grace brings and is God in us, and is not an isolated subject working alone. It is a participation seen as giving, continuing, as a gift, being participation, historically called a gift, to be understood by humanity. Grace cannot be seen as a singular, isolated, broken, one-time gift, but is a giving and participation. It is a continuous work of communion and not an isolated act of communion, a singular act of receiving the "gift and grace". Therefore, the term gift is one that must be seen in participation - as an act, as a continuous link between Being and man.

¹²³Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 99.

Catholic created grace is a work-object that claims to bring God. But grace, only uncreated, only naturally connected with Being, is of a Person. Only through the Person is grace communion (between persons), otherwise it is not mirroring, but only delegation, representation of God, there being nothing personal of Him.

Man remains, in Catholicism, closed next to an object, next to *a created idol*, next to a *spiritual matter*, which should represent God. Communion with God fulfilled in an object is no longer communion, but a subject-object relationship. Communion is always a subject-subject relationship and can never be a subject-object relationship. And an object cannot bring about or fulfill this relationship and theology. As a work, Catholic grace again cannot be a personal presence. Even fulfilling a function, a work, grace unbound by Being is only a work-object, but not a personal communion. How can Catholicism invoke a subject character in this case? He can not.

**CATHOLIC CREATED GRACE BECOMES A *SPIRITUAL MATTER*
THAT IS CALLED DIVINITY, *WITHOUT A PRINCIPLE OF*
*CONNECTION WITH DIVINITY***

A big issue raised by the discussion of grace is the divinity of man and the nature of divinity, participation in divinity, in created grace, Catholic. The divinity of man is only through a principle between man and God, which can bring about something that allows for the name and connection of man with Being. Uncreated grace, being related to Being, is such a principle. And it is shown this way by the Gospel, directly in the Christian thesis, in an intrinsic relationship, in which the being and the work are one, that is, there is a link with the Being, intrinsic between the Being and the work, a link that can neither be broken, nor disregarded, nor think differently. The only way to be like God, eternally, is to be touched by God Himself.

Father Stăniloae says: "Of course, admitting this, Catholic theology should also admit that God works not only through acts, through which he creates and sustains in existence the things and phenomena created, but also through acts through which he enters into direct communication with the creature, on the one hand as finite creatures can receive Him, on the other hand, giving Himself whole in these acts. All Scripture speaks of this direct connection with God himself. Otherwise, how would God lead the creature to deification, which Catholic theologians are now talking about, when they declare it a *created deification* ." ¹²⁴

Saint Gregory Palamas says the same: "And if, according to the great Dionysius, "deification is likeness and union with God", how can we admit that deification is *natural imitation* ? We need similarity in order to be in harmony with that union, first of which

¹²⁴Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama* , Philokalia , Vol. 7, p. 266.

deification is accomplished. For without union, likeness is not sufficient for deification. And the likeness we need is that which comes to us from the work and keeping of the divine commandments, which is not done only by natural imitation, but by the power of the Spirit."¹²⁵

The concept brought by the Catholics, of *deification through imitation, through a symbolic, external principle*, is one that has no patristic foundation, it is a concept that proposes an explanation of the external link, a term that denotes a new, non-biblical relationship, without biblical foundation, a report to explain exteriority, through an analogy with "nature", imitation. It gives a new meaning to the biblical deification, it creates a new, non-biblical deification, a symbolic deification.

The Catholic paradigm shift, by externalizing grace and severing it from Being, also brings a new concept for deification, deification by imitation. Several concepts appear that need to be explained, concepts of the exteriority of grace, concepts that somehow float theologically, without any biblical, patristic support, in the informational unity of the Church. Because any broken theology of a created grace ends up being an unsustainable theology that not only cancels a work of grace, but actually changes the existential meaning of grace. Catholic created grace is equally a change in paradigm, but also a change in the work of grace. What Grigorie Palama says in "without union" is the same idea that grace, separated from Being, is something without theological meaning.

Father N. Chițescu says, explaining these consequences: "The Catholic doctrine about the being of the Church is also reflected in the way it conceives the characteristics of the Church. 1. Unity is considered not so much as a symphonic unity in spirit,

¹²⁵St. Gregory Palama, *About the Divine Communion*, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 451.

but as an external uniformity. (...) 2. Holiness is seen more as morality and social activism and less as a participation in divine life (...) 3. Catholicism is interpreted spatially, translating with universality (...) 4. Apostolicity is an attribute that is barely noticeable in the physiognomy of the Catholic Church (...) it degrades the prestige of the other Apostles, subordinating them to Peter."¹²⁶

Likewise, father N. Chițescu says for this separation of man from God: "All these expressions and others like them [about the Church and its connection with Christ], as beautiful as they are, have an equivocal meaning in Catholic writing, being more rather exaggerated expressions for a much poorer reality. They are struck to the heart by the Catholic teaching about the created character of the sanctifying grace given to people in the Church. This makes a discontinuity actually exist between God and the Church , the Church remaining irremediably closed in the created order." ¹²⁷Father N. Chițescu notices this collapse in creation of the Church, in Catholicism. This uncreated rupture desacralizes the Church and turns it into a created symbol, without much use.

A question related to grace is this: How did God create the world, and especially in the Person-person, God-man relationship? Can man touch God? Is God Participable? How did God plan creation? In participation, in sharing? In fact, real participation is discussed throughout the issue of grace. Does God say he is participably real? Yes. Because it is He who opens the discussion about union and unity, about the Spirit, about grace, about participation. The talk of unity in essence, unity in participation, in sharing is the fundamental thesis of existence. The Holy Trinity discovers it in Himself, and humanity receives it through Christ and the Spirit, in a unity discovered and achieved by sharing Himself with humanity. Moreover, the whole discussion of grace is about the means of participation. God first reveals that all theology is about

¹²⁶Prof. N. Chițescu , *Dogmatic and symbolic theology* , Vol. 2, p. 181.

¹²⁷ Prof. N. Chițescu , *Dogmatic and symbolic theology* , Vol. 2, p. 180.

participation, and then He shows participation Himself. How He participates, in grace, in something that is of Himself. The discussion of participation begins with God and is fulfilled by man through what God shares, through what comes out of God, through something to which God makes an intrinsic relation. He opens up the fundamental theological discussion of participation and touch. God is tangible, not in essence, but in uncreated energies, which embrace man and bring him into participation. As real participation.

This is rich theological information on the nature of grace. The whole theology is of participation. It is the connection of grace with Being, in which we are face to face with God. God shares himself in the Holy Trinity, and, likewise, with humanity (through the uncreated energies), himself, from himself, being the same in all. The same God in participation. *That we may all be one.* For the Trinity, essentially. For humanity, in the uncreated energies. The discussion of participation, opened by the divinity and shown in Himself in the form of the shared essence, brings this argument of the inheritance of the nature of participation, in a similar way to the divine. What the essence has, the essence shared with humanity has - God, who is also in sharing with humanity. And participation in the uncreated energies is modeled on intratrinitarian participation. The uncreated energies are participation naturally linked to Being, they are a work that comes out of God. Humanity does not receive another typology of participation, but receives another nature of participation, according to its condition of creation. And the participative unity in the essence of the Godhead or in the uncreated energies is the same in the Trinity and in humanity. Man participates in the divinity just as the divinity participates in Himself. But in another essence, in an indirect work, through grace, which is naturally linked to the Being.

Catholic created grace is legally an authority, a contract,

and not a work of Being, although such justifications are attempted for it. Unfortunately, Catholic created grace is only a legal contract between God and man, a created presence, which merely certifies a state and reality, which is not seen, but which is only juridically and theoretically present. It is a contractual grace . The problem is that created Catholic grace no longer brings participation and denies the need for participation, it denies what is in participation, as being and having a necessary content for being. Being needs no participation. The participation is contractual, unnecessary, unrelated to the Being, with the role of representation only, in no way to bring anything to the participation. With a role of formal validation of the presence of the divinity, without bringing anything special from it. And man becomes a contractual being, receives a contract through which he fulfills the absolute existential transaction, of eternity.

Catholic created grace has no principle that brings man union and divinity in a real way. These are not supported in any way, remaining an external grace, but not being supported by any theology or information, except the Catholic declaration of his bringing of deification and union. *Created grace generates a different thesis of salvation than that through Christ-God , of a salvation through creation-matter and not through God Himself , grace being broken by God.*

God sends Himself as presence, in all dimensions. On the Son of God, pure and true. On the Spirit, pure and true God. Created grace would break the work of the Son and make it useless, broken from the work of the Spirit, only it would also be a partial, representative sharing of God. The Body and Blood can no longer be Christ's, if grace is created, it would be a symbol of God. Created grace breaks the connection with divinity, in all dimensions: the plan of salvation, the necessity of salvation through Christ, the coming of Christ as salvation for humanity, and the coming of grace. And it breaks the Trinity from God, the Trinity being next

to man, but breaking from Being through a work-spiritual matter shared with man. Why?

If there is participation, then there is also something that man receives in participation and that changes the being, that brings him something from God and has a sense of transformation, of fulfillment in this nature-archetypal relationship, in which participation is uniquely seen. Participation is not seen outside of the nature-archetype relationship, and in this relationship participation leads the face of man to the archetype, the face receiving from the archetype what it does not have, what is not perfected, strengthened. Created grace negates the need for participation related to Being and participation related to Being. This is the problem of created grace. Created grace is inferred in isolation, outside of the thread-chip-resemblance relationship. That is, created grace removes and cancels out the theology of participation naturally bound to Being.

Catholicism is on a completely wrong deductive path, an extremely complicated one that is hardly observable to be detected as a theological error. Hence the difficulty in unraveling this deductive fallacy. Because every wrong theological proposition has and is a deductive error, which can be observed, either in the premises (using altered information), or in logic, in the argument, using fallacies of argumentation and a wrong way of argumentation, logical syncopes or in conclusions . The whole deductive path of the Catholic argument is wrong.

The maximum criterion of anthropology is according to the triune *unity* , *the harmonic unity* and the *fulfillment of man* . The maximum thesis of existence is the uncreated character of grace, its connection with Being and implicitly the real participation in the Godhead, through grace, through its uncreated energies. Man is received into unity with the Trinity.

Unorthodox theology obtusely sees a panic of salvation and links grace to the temporary panic in which they live by accentuating sin, to the crisis of despair in the face of eternity. Now, if we look at grace from the time of eternity, not from the time of perpetuity, grace does not solve a crisis, but is a union and unity with God. In eternity, grace is no longer a crisis of salvation, as Catholicism and Protestantism propose. Grace does not solve the temporal human crisis in the face of eternity, but it solves the eternal problem of connection with Being. It is very interesting that if we give up this threshold of temporality and analyze grace exclusively through the lens of its eternity, of the work in eternity, ignoring everything that is temporal, then we are left with a grace that fulfills the union between man and God, according to the model of the triune unity.

Unorthodox theology cannot create out of grace a solution to its own theological infirmities and misunderstandings. Where grace is the "solution" to everything. Grace is not the solution, but man through God. The man who receives God. Grace helps and moves man into an eternity, in unity with God. Catholics and Protestants have created from grace the solution to all theological problems that are "solved" by grace, which solves everything. Now, God does not make himself the object and subject in existence, as Protestantism proposes. But He makes us, through Himself, perfect subjects of unity with Himself. God does not create passive objects in existence, in man, but creates a subject that He can keep near Himself, united with Himself, in eternity. God potentiates by his own work his creation, his own subject of creation.

Grace is not the solution to the despair of salvation, but the ontology of eternal unity. He brings an eternity, does not remove a panic of salvation. If we pass the moment of entering eternity, what remains of grace? It remains exactly what God is, provided God exists. Eternity, light, unity, holiness, uncreated character, transcendence. This is grace in its nature. It carries God in his

maximum dimensions. And these are dominant in the discussion of grace. Grace brings these first into the human being, as part of the foretaste of eternity. Grace is our taking into God, for eternity. It is for the fulfillment of eternity in man. It is not a legal maxim of eternity. It is a state of eternity.

The uncreated/created character of grace is the main point of discussion about how man is to God in eternity. Is it like the Trinity? Is man in trinity unity, also received by us? Do we start the discussion of grace here or where do we start it? Do we start from the historical panic and despair of salvation and the fall? What dominates eternity, the fall or the trinity? What problem does grace solve, the eternity that it carries and brings to man, or the shortness of time, man's fall from God?

Proposing the "uncreated/created character of grace" as fundamental existential information, as deduced indirectly, in complex logical and deductive exercises, is absurd (like Catholicism and Protestantism in the pure nature/ supernature discourse). A vital piece of information of our existence cannot be given and recovered, seen to be recovered through an indirect and deeply ambiguous exercise such as the Catholic one. It would be a lack of full communication from the deity for this information. In which the purpose of all, unity is announced to us. We are shown in the Self-Trinity the nature of unity, the triune unity. We are shown the connection with the Being of God as the thesis of existence, one of the great values of existence. The work of grace is shown to us in Scripture as the work of God Himself, being assimilated to the Presence, the Being, the connection of grace with the Being. We are actually shown so much as a model, as an example, as an existential archetype, both divine and for humanity. And then are we to ignore the proposition of unity and its means, and deduce something wrong, apart from God, in a created grace? It's like turning your gaze away from the divinity's highest claims about existence and looking only at the historical obsession with a fallen

state, which in some denominations becomes a pathology, instead of being a fair, balanced assumption alongside the rest of theologians .

Does God theologically announce the existence of a bond between man and God? And how is this connection? Is it shown to be like the Self or does it show us a different one? Does God offer Himself as a model, as an analogy, as an example of participation and unity? Obvious. Eternal existence is of a pattern, after a pattern of eternity, in which eternity subsists in principle, the eternity of love. Eternity is one of the greatest results of love. In which you give yourself as a being. We are made in the image and likeness of God, by grace. The uncreated character of grace becomes part of the existential unity. It springs from love, which is uncreated. This is what God is showing us . From God does not spring a theory of existence, it springs a maximum interpenetration and perilousness of all existence, in Himself.

The information about the uncreated character of grace is absolutely before our eyes, everyone, in Scripture, in countless guises, but it is overlooked, not even by Orthodoxy. Grace brings God, shows us God.

You must be love, a fulfillment of image and likeness, in grace, with the help of grace. Grace becomes the thesis and means of salvation. Salvation is the fulfillment of the unity and bond of grace with the Being of God. It is not the thesis of a psychological threshold jumped by theology, which legally declares fulfillment and psychological liberation from a chore. Protestant salvation does not solve any existential problem, it is only a psychological comfort using an apologetic rhetoric, but it is not an existential settlement. Eternal existence does not lie in eternal debts, but lies in eternal states.

Salvation is our reception into unity by uncreated grace.

For all to be one is a call to unity, through grace, through what comes out of Being, through the sharing that Being makes, assuming the image, assuming the likeness, assuming and being love like Love. Salvation is actually shown by God in a science of existence, in which the settlement of man, perfected in existence, like God, is the meaning of his existence.

Salvation is not the blaming of humanity, nor the settling of a debt for which man cannot participate in union with God. The discussion of salvation itself cannot take on dominantly legal connotations, but must take on a communion and likeness connotation. Participation in godhood becomes a compatibility-likeness issue, not a transactional-legal issue. God tells us in *the law of love*, in the law of *likeness*, in the law of *deification*, to be like Him, He does not ask us to find excuses and a way out of the "legal situation of sin".

Protestant salvation repeats exactly the parable of the one who buried the talent, the only talent received, and who presents himself before the master with an *existential excuse*: that he had nothing to do, that grace has already solved the problem of salvation and that Protestantism no longer has to be presents with nothing for salvation, that he no longer has any obligation in existence. Existential obligation, seen in *the model of existential obligation* (the parable of the talents) excludes any possibility of having a salvation that conceptually cancels the notion of existential obligation relative to what you are and relative to what you have received. Grace is precisely the talent and the talents, but also the fair in which it must be multiplied. Grace is not an existential excuse, it is a received talent, a talent of light, which demands its multiplication, to be received in the master's garden, and not expelled from it.

Grace is the greatest talent given to man. If grace is a talent, received from God Himself, not from the things of this world, but brought out of Himself by God, the talent of light, what answer

will Protestantism give to God for burying the talent received from the hand of God? And what excuse will he be able to make, for talent completely ignored? That the talent received was considered by the Protestants even directly the reward for ... and not the gift entrusted to be multiplied? That they confused the reward with the obligation of existence? That they got confused and understood the obligation as already the final payment from God? That God shows us grace as a talent and that they understood it as payment for... ? Grace must be multiplied in the land of the law of love, in order to bear tens of fruits, not to be used as an excuse, to be presented right before the one who gave it as the *talent of the existential excuse* , in which the gift received is used through rhetoric to the existential excuse, right in front of the one who gave it.

How great will be the anger of the master in front of those who with great power throw away the talent received as a gift and consider it to be their existential excuse , when those who were supposed to multiply the talent place it before Christ to say that they have already paid for eternity by... nothing. Because they brought nothing, and they disregarded even what they received, and they go before Christ with nothing, not even with the talent received. They go considering that Christ threw away the greatest value of existence, the light of God, the gift and talent of light given to everyone by God, without anyone having any obligation to him. There is a parable especially given for the excuse of the talents not working received—Protestantism is fully placed to explain why the talents do not work.

If Protestants still use grace in a legal spirit, to consider that a debt has been paid by him, being in this case a payment, therefore a talent, then why do they not consider grace in the same spirit of justice, in which the talent must be returned to the who gave, multiplied, and not disregarded? What is the righteousness of Protestantism in the face of existential talent, the light of God? What justice does Protestantism invoke, that of eternal absolution-

excuse through the talent received from Christ, or that of the multiplication of talents, according to divine justice, and of the primordial talent, of the greatest of talents, the talent of light? Which righteousness is correct, the Protestant excuse for not working the talents, or the righteousness of multiplying the talents of eternity?

Does not Christ repeat that grace is a talent in the obligation of sharing, without which we have no part of eternity? Does not Christ repeat that grace is the existential talent in the obligation of baptism, of being born again, in which everyone is entrusted with the talent of eternal life? Is not grace this talent of the other world, one received from the hand of God, who will require it to shine tenfold and softened, through the fulfillment of all the things of the law? How will the Protestants run at the end of the age with their empty lamps when they have gathered nothing of the talents and light of this world? Having no mystery, having nothing of the light and blaspheming the light of God in Orthodoxy? Blaspheming the very light of God? How will they come before God, theologically deceived, in which they have been convinced by rhetoric that the talent of light is the very final reward? How will they be ashamed before God, when they say that they have confused the reward with the obligation?

Who can Protestantism answer to Christ that he did not understand the Gospel, when the Gospel says in innumerable parables that talents must be multiplied? And especially the greatest of talents, the light of God? Can anyone dispute that light is the greatest talent of which Christ speaks? Is any of God's gifts a greater talent than this? Can any scripture be used to excuse one's failure to multiply the talents of light? Can anyone in Protestantism believe that this possibility exists?

Does not Christ repeat it ten times, in all the parables about the fruitfulness? Is not fruitfulness the main theme of Christ, in which whatever is received must bear fruit? Shouldn't sown wheat

sprout and produce 30, 60, or 100 seeds? Wasn't the fig tree supposed to bear fruit? Shouldn't the talents be multiplied? Does not the tree bear fruit from the seed and gather all into its branches? Aren't all the parables in Scripture about participation and the measure of participation-bearing? Shouldn't everyone in existence bear fruit from the seed God left in them? Is not grace the seed and talent given by God, which must bear perfect fruit and bring forth all the talents it can produce in the soul? Isn't everything in existence meant to bear fruit in God? Is not the obligation of bearing, as a theme, the counterargument of the "lack of necessity of facts"? And what happens to those who make excuses? Is not the Protestant theology of salvation by "grace" the greatest excuse before God for unfruitfulness, for ignoring the talent of light? When does grace bring us the very power of germination, the full power of bearing fruit, the power of being image and likeness? When is grace the power to bear fruit? When grace is the water and the earth and the light of the soul? Who will be able to excuse himself before God when he is told that he received talent and power, and that he confused them- /considered to be even a reward? Does anyone get rewarded in existence without work? Is there any such concept brought by Christ, of any payment without work?

The lack of the uncreated character of grace brings about the impossibility of being able to say that we are all one in God. But how, if it is not a charic unity, but only declarative, external, through imitation? Are we united only declaratively with God, only by assuming a created, external work? And how can this exterior unity be called compared to the haric, participatory unity? Unity with God is one that God shows, primarily in Himself. God created us all so that we can be graciously, naturally connected to God's Being. And this participation in grace changes us in existence, brings us all into an existential unity. Ignored by Catholicism, which separates us all from one another in our eternal existence, each remaining a being isolated

from the other, outside the model of the Holy Trinity. Humanity receives the same unity of the Holy Trinity, but in a different way, through the self-sharing of the Trinity, in grace. But who defines, for Catholicism, the model of union with divinity in this case? I mean, what does union mean for a created grace?

In created grace, Catholic theology also loses the Subject-subject relationship, but also unity. We are not just talking about a theoretical textual unity between man and God, but about an interpenetration between man and God, in which the Holy Spirit rests in man, in the perfect man, God is in presence there, not in representation. That is, the Holy Spirit is over that man in an eternal, resting experience of God in man, and man in God, man is the same in God as the Trinity is in Himself. Because the shadowing and resting of the Holy Spirit over man is the greatest gift brought by God to man, in which man is somehow with God just as the Trinity is in Himself. Man is adumbrated by God and is together with God eternally, but according to the will of the Holy Trinity, of unity made according to the image of the unity of the Trinity and not according to a built image or an imagined, representative image. As the Trinity is united in essence, so man is united in another essence of participation and sharing of Himself to man, in which man is with God as the Trinity is in Himself.

Why would God make spiritual matter outside of Himself to embody as Himself? As an idol, making an idol, a representation to be called as Self? What is a matter-object outside of God that does what God does? Broken spiritual matter, without a principle by which it is bound to God? Why should man receive an object of worship, created grace, a spiritual matter, in which man worships God, not being connected to God? How does Catholicism relate the spiritual matter called grace to God, in what theology? First of all there is no theological support in Catholicism for this connection, to transfer attributes from divinity to spiritual matter.

So Catholicism worships a *theological idol*. What is the support in Catholicism for the transfer of attributes from divinity to the matter of grace?

In order to be able to support the Catholic thesis of created grace, you need something theologically, an additional theology, which allows all this transfer between God and grace, as a relationship, as a connecting principle between Being and spiritual matter. However, this theology does not exist either biblically, nor in Catholic theology, nor in patristics. Catholicism has a theology of a spiritual, external matter, a theology that *is supposed* to transfer attributes from God, to represent God, but it does not have a theology of the transmission and binding of these attributes to God. Catholic created grace is holiness, but how? If it is outside of God, is it holiness because it is declared so by Catholicism, or because there is a principle? What is spiritual matter apart from God? Catholicism affirms that the attributes of grace are decreed, but it has no theology of the connection between spiritual matter severed from divinity and divinity.

Such matter not connected in any way to Being, without a connecting principle, matter which is called divinity, is nothing but an idol. If it is outside of God, one cannot, by decree, obtain this transfer, only by affirming the existence in Scripture, given by God, of a spiritual matter. There had to be a theology of connection between matter and the Being, the Being not being able to affirm the existence of another principle of the Godhead, external to Sieşi (not making this affirmation anywhere). And if this is claimed in Catholicism, an explanation would be required. All that God is is also grace, in Scripture, in a continuous transfer of attributes, and in an intrinsically created link between grace and Being. The biblical thesis can only be supported for an uncreated grace.

A great problem with the external spiritual matter of grace is that in Catholicism all trace of a model of unity between divinity

and humanity is lost. Catholicism is united with God *through what model of unity*? What kind of unity is it, what kind of model of unity, and what can Catholics call their unity? It would be a unity without a prior existential reference model, unrelated to the Trinity. An outdoor unit. A declared, formal unity through a matter. The model of unity between Being and man is also distorted, and there is a need for this discussion about the model of unity.

The Trinity has a pattern of unity by essence and by perichoresis-participation. And how is the unity between God and man according to Catholics? How are Catholics united with God, when they are outside of Him? A new biblical theology is needed to show how this outward grace brings about a union and what the pattern of unity is in this case. A theology of the Catholic model of unity. It is a void, a leap, an abyss of theological information and logic at this point, where Catholic created grace is not biblically related to God in any way, except as a statement. If you have spiritual matter outside of Being, you still have to somehow bind it to Being. Not just declaratively, not just declaring from Scripture attributes on matter.

It seems like an unsolvable paradox in Catholicism. How can the created be a principle of unity with the uncreated, with Being? Catholicism reaches a maximum theological impossibility, a theological deadlock in which it claims that created grace, a spiritual matter brings union with the uncreated, with Being. The created becomes in itself a principle of union and a principle of divinity with the uncreated.

Where in this human-spiritual-matter-divinity framework is the union achieved, in Catholicism, at what point, and how, and in what theology is this discovered? Catholicism only declares a deification and union, but does not explain in this case what they are. Being apart from God, he must fully explain what this spiritual matter is to man, and to what extent it bears God. What is the relationship between spiritual matter and divinity, to what extent,

and by what principle does divinity bear in matter This principle of bearing divinity is not explained, it is only implicitly assumed by Catholicism, which forgets to explain the foundation of the theory/study, the inheritance of attributes and of the work from the divinity. Catholicism has an unrelated, theologically unsupported theory, a postulate on a spiritual matter outside of the Godhead. Catholicism speaks of a divinity existing outside of Being, but can say nothing more about it.

A situation appears that is impossible to explain theologically, incomprehensible. It comes to complete nonsense in which the whole theology must be explained by a principle of the transfer of attributes between the Being and its exterior, but also the meaning of the attributes, but separated from the Being. It is a section of theology that should be built completely from scratch, not just a novelty, but that has no biblical, patristic, or idea support in any dimension. No one has raised this issue in history, but it exists in the Catholic thesis as an open theological issue.

Grace, in Catholicism, deification without any contribution, of itself, assumed, cancels the act and the responsibility of the act. That is, man is eternal, a priori, by himself, as he is in his nature. Man no longer needs salvation and updating. If it is no longer connected to God, it is completely different from something belonging to God, it is God .

Why does grace still exist, if it is created? Being only an idol, the crown of holiness brought to man should be removed, man honoring matter and not God. Man divinizes himself and not God in a created grace. The saints can no longer be honest, being representatives and not bearers of God. Do we still honor God through a spiritual matter? The very term God-bearer is disembodied, being transformed into a representative of God, completely changing the relationship with the saints. It comes to a situation where Catholicism ends up with a theology of only spiritual matter, from which God is broken, and all that is needed for salvation is

outside of Being, it is only spiritual, created matter that provides salvation.

Catholicism does not really need God, but the created, saving spiritual matter. Very difficult to accept theologically this logic and break between God-Being and the Catholic spiritual matter of grace. A created grace changes the relationship between Subject and subject. The subject leaves the created subject with a matter to use that reminds them of the Subject. Created grace becomes a projection of God into matter, which, according to Catholicism, projects itself into matter, to communicate Him, to represent Him. That is, created grace becomes a kind of representation of God, in matter. Unity with God acquires a representative, external, formal dimension. The paradigm of existence changes from haric unity to external, representative unity.

Who brings this primary information to the Church about grace? Primary truth and primary relationships? Basically, supernatural revelation. That is, God himself, through Christ. Christ is the Teacher - Theologian - Revelation, showing the truth on which the whole Christian thesis is built. Seeing Christ in His dimension as the Teacher-Theologian-Revelation, which brings a theological thesis written in a specific way, with reports, definitions, principles, axioms, axiology is the starting point in the Haric thesis. For grace, Christ makes a very clear and complete informational exercise. It mentions the existential condition, existential importance, and intrinsic relationship between grace and God. Christ brings definitions and directly states the information we need about grace.

Man is god through God and receives the greatest gift, not that of the Trinity, not the essence of the Godhead, but the energy springing from God, which enriches the image and likeness.

NEO -ARIANISM, CONSEQUENCE OF CREATED GRACE

Catholic Arianism, consequence of created grace. If grace is not fundamentally linked to Being, man's divinity is denied. Is there a difference between Christian Arianism and Catholic Human Arianism? In which man is without God, in which man is cut off from God, is he out of real participation in the divinity?

Catholicism is Arianism , it is another form of Arianism, human, Catholic, not serious, but of equal gravity to Christian Arianism , in which Christ was considered a creature. Catholicism transforms man into a deified creature , which is also a kind of Arianism.

If Arianism affected Christ and was related to His deity, which is the foundation of the Church, another foundation of the Church, the deification of the Church through Christ and the Holy Spirit, through uncreated grace, is denied by Catholicism and is a Catholic human Arianism, equal to Arianism christian _ This is another Arianism of history, *Catholic human Arianism* , in which the creature, the being, in the image and likeness of God is broken by God. Catholic human Arianism is just as serious, because it separates man from God, just as Christ was separated from divinity. Because it separates humanity from divinity and does not understand the divinity of humanity. Participation in eternal existence is not understood.

Just as Arianism did not understand the divinity of Christ, Catholicism does not understand human divinity through uncreated grace. Catholicism is an Arianism-type heresy, an error as serious as Arianism, which separated Christ from God, from divinity, and here, humanity is also separated from divinity.

Dimitrios Tselenghidis, using Saint Gregory's thesis, says: "Furthermore, by accepting the created appropriation of divine

grace , the anti- Palamites resemble - according to Palamas and Joseph Kalothetos - Arius and Eunomius, because they *effectively deny the uncreated character of the Godhead* and at the same time bring blasphemy, says Palamas , and against the Holy Spirit, who dwells in the saints.... So when Barlaam - and Western scholastic theology in general - maintains on the one hand that divine grace is created, and on the other hand identifies the uncreated light and glory uncreated with the divine nature, he essentially denies, according to Palamas, the uncreated character of the divine nature, *thus ending in the non-existence of God* . Those who deny uncreated divine grace *are essentially denying God Himself* , even as they claim to accept His Being."¹²⁸

Catholicism is Arianism in another form, raising a theological issue related, like Arianism, to the work of nature, the nature of nature, and deification. If Christ is man and God, man is *also man and god, by grace* . Arianism is recapitulated in identical Catholicism, denying the divinity of man and his real participation, through grace, in the divinity. Because a textual divinity, deduced in imagination, through an object, through something external, is only an imagination in which Catholicism creates an existential reality that is only Catholic, in which grace is only hypothetical, by no means real, a grace divorced from divinity.

If one proposes a rapprochement with Catholicism, let him think of Catholicism as an Arianism. As Saints Gregory Palamas and Mark of Ephesus say. The approach to Catholics is only an emotional-historical one, by no means a theological one, here the distance is much greater than with the historical heresies.

Catholic human Arianism is a capital problem of Catholicism in the theology of created grace, because it denies the real relationship between man and God, just as Arius did in Christ. It

¹²⁸Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, pp. 24-25.

is a problem directly related to the meaning of life, existence, the meaning of man, participation, a fundamental theological problem. The denial of the divinity emerging from the being of God and the denial of real participation in this divinity by man is the denial of the divinity itself, of the entire correct form of eternal life, of the existence of light in the form in which it is. It is a denial of divinity in the form in which it is shared, as charic participation (uncreated energy). It is a denial of life in light, of light in the form in which it is shared, through real grace union with God.

The Catholic proposition of created grace is an existential Arianism, in which humanity is cut off from eternal light in its true form. That is, eternal existence is not understood, in the light of God. Which is as serious as the misunderstanding of salvation, of God, of divinity, of participation, of the deification of man. A human Arianism in which man does not understand and has no part of divinity. It could be called a *human Arianism of existence*, in which divinity in communion, eternity, salvation is not understood. Because the experience of being in the light is not attained. It is a misunderstanding of the human condition in existence.

The Catholic, created grace divinity, the imitation, is completely different from *the uncreated, Orthodox grace divinity*, the Catholic one being a false divinity, having nothing of the real divinity of uncreated grace. Catholicism remains with a created deity, which has only a theoretical work, with a theory that does not include information from experience, with a theory of a deity. It remains with a spiritual matter which is artificially called, by one denomination, deity. Is there anything that can be called deification, participation, sharing in the Catholic created work? Such a thing is excluded, being in no way related to God except through a complex Catholic theory. Catholic created grace ends up being a matter like any other matter, a spiritual matter, a creation that is a *symbolic divinity*, which does not really bring man into the light

of God.

The problem with Catholic created divinity is that it is not real participation in the light of God. Divinity actually takes you into the light of God, into a state that God shares. Man is and lives taborically in the light of God, as a reality, an eternal existential state. Catholic created divinity does not lead you to this state, but is only a theoretical creation, a theory of the presence of God with man, without being supported by an existential state that is brought about, which is divinity. Godhead is light. God is light. A shared light and not a theoretical light. A divine light that is shared through the work of uncreated grace.

This is the testimony of the entire Church, of participation in the divine light - the Eastern Church has as its fundamental testimony the participation in the divine light. And from here he builds the discourse about the divinity, through the sight of God and the divine light that comes out of Him, in which He is. And it is called uncreated energy, uncreated work, a glorious work that comes out of Being to take into God all who unite with God. Catholics do not know grace as a communion bridge that brings God to man. I do not know and do not understand the importance of these theologies of communion and the work of grace, which by their importance theologically guide man to the correct understanding of grace. If he had experienced grace, he would have had a guide in its experience.

It is something that must be emphasized in analyzing the experience of taboric light . The Tabor discovery is not one in which a light appears for all to see that did not exist before this experience. The light that comes out of Christ in Tabor is not one that appears then and is seen at that moment. It is an eternal light, light which is in Christ and which is then only revealed. *The Tabor is a discovery of a light that exists, that is, and that is only then seen in its power by the Apostles. The apostles do not receive something*

new, but receive and see what exists, *what is in each of us, the baptized: divine light* . Tabor does not discover what is outside, separated from us and time, *it discovers what is inside us, permanently, it discovers a state that is, in which we are* .

Tabor makes a major statement: *we are all in faith in the light we see and multiply in asceticism* . Christ shows us what is in us, permanently - the divine light, which we see fully in Him. Tabor is the discovery of light in each of us, which in Tabor we only become aware of as an initial discovery and which in the Church we receive as a conscious, felt reality, seeing and living Tabor eternally.

More than anything, grace brings communion. Whoever lives grace lives it as a burning in love. In which you see and know the Person. Grace is love, it is a connection of man to God, in love, and of God to man. Grace is a mutual embrace of man with God and of man by God. In grace is seen the infinite love of God. And this can only be personal, in participation and presence, not in representation.

har cannot be called communion, it is only a meeting with a representative of God. It becomes representative, extrinsic work, and not intrinsic, personal.

The Catholic theology of grace brings about and is a distortion of the relations between Being and person, between God and man, changing the communion naturally linked to the Being and personal with communion through representation. It brings a nonsense of a desired personal reporting, but through a representative, through an object, God being in the object, in the symbol. The object of grace, in Catholicism, is desired to be God Himself, and whatever. And if Catholicism assumes that the object is animate, then it creates a new god, a new nature, a new nature and ends up in creationism, where there is another creation, a gracious god for everyone.

Human Catholic Arianism is a major heresy of Catholicism. Grigorie Palama's reaction is so strong on this subject, precisely because of its seriousness. The theologian of light, understanding the dimension of the problem, treats it extensively, in all its dimensions and consequences, understanding what it means to not understand the divine light. Divine light and its work in man means the understanding of communion with God in light, until perfection. That is, the complete understanding of what man is and how man reaches God. Of the ladder to God in the light. Of the meaning of life. At this point man's life begins, in the light of God, which opens God to man. The man in the light unites with God not symbolically-representatively, as Catholicism proposes, but by actually participating in the divinity, as Grigorie Palama and Simeon the New Theologian testify, an experience of unmistakable power.

The problem that Mark of Ephesus and Gregory Palamas pointed out as a dogmatic problem, using the reference to Arianism, is the presence of a form of Arianism. Which, like the Arian proposition, affects, is related to the deity. Mark of Ephesus and Gregory Palamas mentioned this similarity with Arianism not only to signal the seriousness of the problem, but to signal the nature of the problem, which is in the same area, the divinity in essence or the divinity in communion, in the charic work, in the uncreated energies.

Saint Mark of Ephesus says "flee from your enemies. What the Arian heretics were, the papists are the same". If the divinity is by representation, as in Catholicism, then nothing of the work of light has any importance, being some work, apart from God. Theology is an understanding of an existential reality understood and assumed, that is why there is a need for theoretical theology, but also for visionary theology, which should be united. Saint Mark also says: *"...If the Latins do not deviate from the right faith, we are*

doing wrong to have distanced ourselves from them. But if they deviate, especially in the theologizing about the Holy Spirit - whose blasphemy is the greatest danger - then they are heretics, and we distanced ourselves from them as heretics."

Catholicism denies the concept of real, shared deity, and denies both the concept and the experience of it. Catholics do not understand in any dimension what the divinity shared with man is. I do not understand anything that Christ has brought, nor do I see it. I know neither theologically nor experientially about Tabor. I don't understand what God is and what God is like in communion. Which is itself a break from the experience of divinity. They do not understand and do not have access to this experience.

Representative divinity, externally, Catholic, is completely different from divinity in participation, through uncreated grace, from Orthodoxy, in grace-subject. And it is not and cannot be called deity. It is an improper name, not being able to be assimilated in any way to Being, to participation, related to the existence of Being, related to any attribute in itself of Being. Nothing of Being can be found in representative grace, not having and not being related to Being except by the Catholic desire to have this property. Through this theology, Catholicism confirms the inaccessibility of experience and the invalidity of its own theology. Of an entire theology that fails to correctly identify the main point – communion with God.

Denial of deity in any form is Arianism. For it is denied God Himself, in essence, or in His sharing of Himself, in the uncreated energies. It's the same problem, in different manifestations. It is the denial of what God is and how He is, of His work through uncreated or communion grace.

Catholicism is a far greater break from Christianity than Arianism. Because the Arian split was on a single theological point. Catholicism affects the whole of theology and dogmatics in its own

proposal. Catholicism is at a much greater distance from Christianity than Arianism, being in a way an Arian break in countless main dogmatic and liturgical points. It is a generalized Arianism, in which everything that was in the Body of the One Church has been radically altered. It is a generalized Arianism throughout the Catholic community, broken and then diseased over time. Where were the Arians theologically? But where are the Catholics? I am in a far greater and far worse fall than those. Because, in fact, Catholicism has multiplied Arianism in countless dimensions. Why is Grigorie Palama's thesis of paramount importance here? Because this shows the need for reassuming the entire Orthodox theology for the West.

5. HOW SHOULD A THEOLOGY OF GRACE BE CONSTRUCTED?

What information is given for grace in Scripture? What is the direction of Scripture to present and expound the work of grace, how does Scripture inform grace? How does Christ communicate about grace, how does he organize this information? Where is the grace information visible? And most importantly, where is the information about the created and uncreated character exposed? Before we take a tour of how to build a theology of grace, we need to ask these questions. Orthodoxy has precisely pursued these questions in its own argumentation, answering them all historically correctly. *Saint Gregory Palamas' thesis* is constructed in exactly this way, tracing the main categories of information and bringing them right into the argument. By first seeing what the correct argument structure is and then working on it.

"Divine grace, being a natural and essential characteristic of God, becomes in a charismatic way, within the Church, a characteristic of created man and thus only through this uncreated attribute of God is the direct communion of created man with God the uncreated. The only way man can commune with God's divinity, says Palama, is to commune in His uncreated energies. This direct communion of man with God is also called the communion of the Holy Spirit."¹²⁹

Catholicism departs from the human subject and tries to deduce attributes of the work of the divinity, instead of departing from the divinity and ascertaining the necessity and participation of the human being in the self-sharing of the divinity. Being a work of divinity, in the demonstration of the logical argument for the uncreated or created character of the work, one cannot depart from

¹²⁹Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 103.

human nature, which always is and receives from divinity what it has, *being created in relation to dependence and with a meaning transcendent fulfilled in communion with the archetype - for this sense, human nature is not complete, needing something related to God to be able to call deification the perfect state of nature* . To postulate that the human being is perfect and needs nothing from God in grace is a wrong theological premise, a non-existent, forced information that nullifies God, starting from man. This is exactly what Grigorie Palama says, that by canceling the uncreated/created character and real participation, God himself is denied as real existence, but also as a need for fulfillment of the human being through divinity.

The attributes of grace cannot be easily found by starting from nature and deducing information related to divinity - the question arises as to whether they can somehow be deduced from here, as long as nature is dependent on divinity, created in a relationship of dependence, one incomplete, not detailed, but which gives us it is shown to be fulfilled through God. What we find in being as a given, as a state, is according to the image and likeness of Christ, of God, and in nature we find a relationship according to God. That is, man is continuously related to God as an image, but also as a participation. Man is a creation made to be god, by grace. God made an image of himself, he did not make a handful of earth. Man is God by grace, by participation. Man actually participates in divinity in uncreated grace, in His uncreated work, not through his nature, but through the relation of nature to the prototype.

Catholicism does not relate nature to archetype in the inference of the created/uncreated attribute, and it does not infer the type of nature, of completeness and perfection, by reference to the relationship between nature and archetype and necessarily by participation. This is a weak point and a conspicuous lack of information in the Catholic thesis, the information in this report is not

used, ignoring the nature-archetype report. Man is " *after the image* ", being complete, being in the completeness of the faculties, being " *the same* ", i.e. not having perfection and completeness. The relation between image and archetype is one in which the image is fulfilled by participation in the archetype, by actual participation, in which the subject receives, in participation, from the archetype. Otherwise, the face becomes archetypal in itself, if it does not receive something from the archetype, it becomes perfect creation, not needing anything from God. But how is it *according to the image* , what is the nature in which it is determined what is the nature and what is the image and the relationship between them?

The nature of participation is what is sought to be determined in the discussion of created and uncreated. It cannot be deduced from nature (human nature), but from divinity, because it is divinity that shares and it discovers how to share, and the information about sharing is one that also discovers the relationship with the participant, who only through sharing fulfills his condition . Participant-human nature has a dependent relationship with Being , with the sharing of divinity, therefore the only way to determine its nature in relation to sharing is by seeing what is received from sharing.

But it is not necessarily the nature of participation that is in the discussion of grace, but also *how participation and the connection between man and God was thought*. Because we are not trying to deduce only some theological attributes, but we are trying to deduce how man is next to God. The answer is according to the pattern of unity and life of the Holy Trinity. Which is one in essence, in participation. And humanity is also shown the meaning, the same unity, also in participation, through the Spirit, through grace, through a participation of the same typology, linked gracefully to the Being, in which the being of man really participates, through a graceful work, through energy uncreated. " *That they all may be one* " is not a theology of a generic unity, but is a theology

of a specific unity, related to uncreated character and participation. To "*That we may all be one*" should be added to fully understand, also from Scripture: *in the light of God, in the way God is, in light, in grace, but also in participation, in love, in axiology, in the Church - because the Church explains this union and unity, precisely through grace, through his uncreated character, through the model of the Holy Trinity* . The theology of unity is a theology of union in grace, not of an outward, declared communal unity. God has much more in Himself, He has an essential union, which we also receive, by grace, from Him.

All theology is of participation, and the whole Gospel is a repetition and emphasis of the act of man's participation in the Godhead. In the Holy Trinity, God shares himself with the Persons of the Trinity. In His work, in the same way, God shares himself, and humanity participates in an act graciously linked to Being, in a work that comes out of God and that also unites us in God. Love and the Gospel are a theology and testimony of man's participation in divinity and an explanation of this act. In fact, what we do as humanity is to have a position of participation in the Godhead, in some form, in eternity. And this is one through divine work. *Real participation in the divinity, in a haric work, with an uncreated energy that comes out of Being, is the fundamental point discussed about uncreated energies*. Uncreated grace shows that we are in real participation in the Godhead. Real participation in the divinity is the fundamental theological point of man's work, all the theology of light in man being about participation, and thereby about salvation.

Catholicism cancels the theology of likeness and proposes in man even an image of God. That is, man is god in himself, not needing the real participation of the divinity, but only a representative, symbolic, external participation, but which does not have to be God. Man does not need a part of God to fulfill himself. Catholicism thus creates in man a god, a perfect nature, which no

longer needs God except as a representative. The alteration made by Catholicism in the nature it considers perfect is immediately transmitted in the relationship between likeness and archetype, which is altered, the image becoming equal to the archetype, man becoming god, through the same image he had of God. There is no longer an archetype and the need for an archetype in Catholicism. And Christ no longer needs grace, he no longer needs the divine nature, and the duality of Christ's nature is annulled, that is, the divine nature is annulled, which is not necessary, the human nature being sufficient, because it has created grace. The Catholic proposal negates the importance and necessity of Christ's real divine nature in the deification of man. The great problem brought about by the perfection of creation is that Christ is perfect only through His humanity, and He needs nothing more, His human nature being above the divine nature, needing nothing of it. The divine nature of Christ becomes a secondary nature, useless in front of the human nature, complete and perfect.

In Catholic theology, in the Orthodox current in Catholicism, the Catholic *father Henri de Lubac* shows the impossibility of severing the nature of grace and the impossibility of the discussion about the supernatural, emphasizing the Orthodox position: "He was especially reproached for compromising the gratuity of grace and, consequently, that of his vision God, leaving the hypothesis of "pure nature", *pure nature*. He was also reproached for leaving no room for a real distinction between nature and grace, since, according to his statement, ***nature is unconditionally ordained to grace***." ¹³⁰

The alteration of human nature brings an alteration of the nature-archetypal relationship, but also in the incarnation of Christ, and of the relationship between His two natures which,

¹³⁰ *Presentation of Father de Lubac's Studies on the Supernatural*, Michael Figura, in the *Mystery of the Supernatural*, Henri de Lubac, Trans. Rev. Dr. Eduard Ferent, Sapientia Publishing House, Iași, 2010, p. IV.

although they are together, are no longer connected. And the human nature no longer needs and is broken from the divine nature. Catholicism brings a similar problem to Monophysitism, being an inverted, human Monophysitism, in which Christ is only human and does not need the divine nature, the human nature being perfect, there being no longer any need for the divine nature after His incarnation, therefore the incarnation not being necessary for the restoration of man . A very big problem is reached in the discussion about the natures of Christ, grace being at the same time a new additional nature to the divine one, but also to the human one, unnecessary (except as legal supernatural), but present, and the work of each nature is distorted and of the relationship between them. The distortion of the human nature affects the relationship of the natures in Christ, touching very late historically a subject historically closed in the fullness of the Church, of the natures in Christ.

In Christ, in the Catholic created grace, we come to have only one important nature, the human one, and which is perfect, it needs nothing, grace being another nature, broken from man and outside of it, the grace nature (created deification) being in a way a third nature in Christ. In Christ, according to Catholicism, three natures are gathered, of which only the human one is important, being perfect. A serious problem is reached, from the category of those related to the nature of Christ, in this case reopening this discussion, by reevaluating the nature of Christ and by adding one more nature, that of grace, which is the third nature of Christ , being broken by God. It is a very serious problem, which can be called Catholic triphysitism through created grace - the problem is that Christ remains with three threads, a kind of *triphysitism* , of which only the human one matters. Created grace completely throws the discussion of Christ's natures out of balance. Unfortunately, Catholic sentences of this type, like that of *created grace* , which start out using false informational premises, end up distorting theology and major theological issues.

How is creation actually thought? As an autonomous act, by itself, or as an act connected with Being, in which all are gathered into unity by the uncreated character of grace? Creation and the Church are thought of as a gathering of all in God. Therefore, all theology is of the connection of grace with Being, of the gathering of creation in God, the Trinity in Being, and we in grace, in the uncreated/created character of grace.

" *The starting point of man's participation in the grace of the Holy Spirit* is therefore established before eternity in the Person of God the Word, Who is also his prototype *according to the image ...* The spiritual experience of the Church regarding man's participation in divine grace is based on this fullness uncreated." ¹³¹The existence of this nature-archetypal relationship and the ontological creation of man compels a discussion of the dependence of human nature, the type of dependence, the way in which dependence manifests itself. It is a dependent relationship, human nature is created in a dependent relationship, not an independent relationship, and this forces one to see and regard human nature as dependent and imperfect in relation to a shown perfection. Image and likeness is a discussion of model and perfection, ratio and relationship in which man is created.

Does grace have the same substance-essence or nature as human nature, and can it be evaluated in relation to or in consequence of human nature? Being two different substance-essences ¹³², nature can relate unidirectionally to grace, by which it receives over nature, and as added to nature. The hidden, sneaky false premise is that grace would be of the same nature, substance-essence, and could be evaluated through the prism of nature, that it is a spiritual

¹³¹Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 102.

¹³²We cannot really talk about grace as a substance, but for the exercise of understanding I use this terminology.

matter. Now, this is an absurdity, knowing of grace only what it brings to nature as work, but nothing as nature-essence. We cannot say what grace is, not being able to say that it is a substance-essence. And if we understand nothing of the essence of grace, how can we infer anything of the kind of essence, when we do not know its nature, but use a false premise, hidden by Catholicism, that the essence would be of the same nature, comparable and circumscribed to nature? Catholicism uses an argumentative fallacy in the logic of inferring the characteristics of grace, by adding premises and by the presence of a conclusion logically unrelated to the main claim. The relationship between grace and nature, in Catholicism, is like between two substances and regarding the nature of substance. Now, no report can be made from the thread, which has nothing in it as a work to indicate something about the substance and nature of grace.

The thesis, starting from nature, for grace would be: human nature is in union and communion in grace, so grace is necessary to be linked to God, in a way that having something from God, to be linked to Being in a kind of, in principle. Now, here there can be no hypostasis, no essence of divinity. And the Scripture shows how it is from Being, continually coming out, we call this work uncreated energy. This is the correct way to build the grace thesis, starting from the threads, seeing grace in its nature as a communion bridge and not in reporting as a substance, where we cannot draw any conclusions about its nature, but at most we can discuss the possibilities.

Does it really make sense to discuss the principle of the human-God connection by comparing substances, essences and works? Does this method of Catholic demonstration seem a theological one, by indirect consequences difficult to observe, a natural method, in this case? Does this demonstration seem to be the primary and correct way to close the discussion of grace? Is the Catholic informational path about grace correct, deductive, only by "necessity"

and indirect inferences, in a complex thread-related exercise? Is there any such approach for other theology in the history of the Church? Or does the deity explicitly provide this information? What kind of information and how is the method of deriving this information in Catholicism – indirect, as a consequence, through complex logic, or is the information already explicitly present elsewhere? We come to a fundamental question for grace: how is this information set forth in revelation? Implicit, explicit, intrinsic, extrinsic, as a consequence, in additional-indirect theologies? How is it historically present? The answer is very clear: this information is a primordial theological one, because the human-God connection is one of the main theologies of supernatural revelation. How does this information appear and where? In the theology of image and likeness, in participation, in the theology of unity in sharing, but also directly, explicitly. Because this information ties all these theologies together. Isn't this way a complete fall into a rationalist darkness of the west, a darkness that fails to see something obvious, historically present before the whole Church?

Can we accept that in Catholicism this information appears and is inferred indirectly, assume that this is the only way it can appear? That it appears as a consequence, deductively, indirectly, that it does not exist explicitly elsewhere, in another format, in other theologies with visibility? All theologies should contain this information, and the image, and the likeness, and the participation, and the sharing, and the unity. Because this information links these theologies. Can we accept the lack of this information as a high visibility, major information in Scripture in a clear, clean format, and can we accept an obscure way of reaching and indirect, incorrect deduction of characteristics for grace? Obviously not. Information about the nature of the work is visible, with great visibility, and must be built in several clear ways, being present in countless theologies and direct reports, which allow immediate access to this information.

The theology of grace is not a theology of an abstract concept, it is a theology of light, of the illumination of the human being, of the fulfillment of man in the light. It is a theology of raising the human being into the light, into a conscious experience, in which man, like God himself, enters and remains conscious in the light, in inner camp illumination. Grace is a theology of light. Of man's being in light. Of raising man in the same condition of living, as god through shared light. God in grace, in which man, like God, says *I am light through the light of God*, not being able to say this except as a conscious experience, but also as a gracious work in which he is next to the real God. Theology brings us all closer to God. We are all next to the divine being, through its light. Near the Trinity. And the human being and the communion are those raised by the light, in the light, in another way of living.

Since it is important to bring Orthodox theological testimonies for the Haric thesis, to show the informational unity in this theme, I add below a short paragraph relevant to the theology of grace in *Dumitru Stăniloae's theology of uncreated Grace and the doctrine of deification*:

"The doctrine of divine grace remains, in addition to the other essential differences between Christian denominations , one of the most controversial issues. If in our country Palamism conquered the spirit and especially the Orthodox life almost with the authority of a dogma , in the West it became the center of theoretical concerns . What the Westerners don't want to understand is that the doctrine of God's uncreated Grace in the East is not a "theory" that you can accept or not, or that depends on a certain logic, and that could be overturned through a more exact, more rigorous logic . Divine uncreated Grace is a reality, a fact, that works, that leaves traces, traces that are in the domain of experience. We do not mean to say by this that the doctrine in question would not fit into the canons of the most rigorous theological logic. On the contrary. And it can only be so, because what is real, by the very fact that it is

real, will logically justify its recognition of existence, and will present itself as such.

The doctrine of divine Grace in the East is closely connected, logically and actually speaking, with the purpose of incarnation and the ultimate destiny of the creature, with deification. Deification resolves the crisis, the great crisis in which man would remain forever unconsolated and unfulfilled, and which would make God himself responsible for an ontologically misconceived situation.

Deification can only be conceived as participation through uncreated Grace in Godhead. A created energy cannot confer a participation in something uncreated. Participating in the Godhead does not mean sharing in the essence. In His essence, God remains incommunicable. Man does not absorb himself in essence, so he does not become God in himself, which would present the danger of polytheism or pantheism. He participates in the uncreated energies of God, energies in which though God is whole. These energies deify in Grace."

" The Roman Catholic West has stuck to an intellectualism that closes any perspective of reconsideration in the sense of an authentic and working spirituality. The concept of created Grace is as poor as it is useless, because it basically solves nothing. Grace cannot be merely a created effect resulting from God's work on man. Between «Grace» and «created» there is a notional incompatibility. I can't stand by."

Saint Gregory Palamas says the same: "Therefore, everyone who ranks with the Massalians and calls those who consider this deifying grace of God, uncreated, unborn and unipostatic , ditesti (worshippers of two gods) , should know that he is against his saints God and removes himself from the group of those who are saved, if he does not repent. (...) Everyone who maintains that the perfect union with God is accomplished only by imitation and by natural initiation, without the divine grace of the Spirit, as between those who have the same habits and love one another, and the divine grace

of God I consider it a skill of the rational nature, acquired only through imitation, but not enlightenment beyond nature and mystery, and a divine work seen unseen by the worthy and understood incomprehensible, let him know that he fell into the error of the Masalians without realizing it . For the deified would necessarily be a god by nature if the deification was done through a natural power and would be contained within the boundaries of nature."¹³³

Obligation to deduce information of a direct nature and from participation. If the nature of nature does not come from participation, participation is useless. God is not necessary to man, who is by himself and who no longer receives anything from God in participation. The present state of man is that of eternal fullness. That is, all the theology of eternal happiness in the light, the fulfillment of man in unimaginable happiness, is nullified because man already has everything in him. It is not only complete, it is also eternal. And everything that Christ said that he will be multiplied, multiplied and multiplied, and as happiness, is canceled, man already has absolutely everything in a condition that cannot and will not undergo changes. Participation will bring nothing more, because man already has everything in him and can receive nothing more. If nature is evaluated outside of participation, the theology of image and likeness is annulled, becoming one of the divinity of man, with nothing of God. And the image and the likeness is only talk without content, man having the full image of God in him, but no real participation in anything of God.

Created grace brings a bizarre consequence, man ends up being an autonomous creature, completely independent, without need of God. Because participation is completely eliminated. Man comes to exist by himself and not by God, because he is in himself, he is no longer bound to God, being an independent self, a self with something else attached to him, a fully independent subject,

¹³³St. Gregory Palama, *Aghioritic Volume, Trans.* Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Philokalia* , Vol. 7, p. 490.

a self that arrogantly positions itself in front of him God, a self that stands before God in an equality with this self, by a completely independent self that needs nothing outside of anyone to exist. An arrogant self, without God, bound to God only formally, by a contract.

And in this point of the theology of grace, the existence of an orthodox current in Catholicism can be observed, which supports the orthodox position as a whole, and in particular the necessity of the existence of a principle of deification, in this form of separation between the work and the Being, but also through a connection between work and Being: "In recent times, especially after the strong affirmation of the doctrine of uncreated energies by Vladimir Lossky, and after the publication of J. Meyendorff's study, not only orthodox theologians have capitalized on many levels the doctrine of uncreated energies, but even among Catholic theologians have a positive attitude toward this doctrine." "Istina" magazine, in the editorial of the cited issue, says: "For certain Catholic theologians, Palamism offers even today the basic principle of a neo-scholastic theology, so sought after." Such an attitude, which finds sympathy among the best-known Catholic theologians, was remarkably synthesized by Father Halleux, who accepts Meyendorff's thesis as an indisputable and authoritative point of departure. Thus he says: "The thesis that the patristic doctrine of the deification of the Christian involves the Palamite distinction between the essence and the divine energies imposes itself more and more as evidence" (p. 259)."¹³⁴

The problem of the created and the uncreated is a complex one, and it is one at the level of the problematization of deity, image and likeness, transference and the nature of participation, that it is difficult to grasp and explain without following the correct

¹³⁴Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 260.

thread of the logic of the argument. What is observed in Catholicism is that it does not correctly use the theological information from the One Church, which is an omnipresent one for deity in participation, for work through uncreated grace, and chooses an obscure path, in which, not understanding how human nature is through God in participation, it postulates and it misconstrues the thesis of participation - it cannot be constructed from the ground, separated from participation, but is always constructed starting from divinity, image, likeness and relation of divinity to the work. Exactly how it is built in Church One. The Catholic thesis is constructed by ignoring direct and indirect theological information, through wrong premises.

6. CONCLUSIONS. THE IMPACT OF SAINT GREGORY PALAMAS' THESIS ON CATHOLICISM

Briefly, what are the two positions, that of Orthodoxy, of St. Gregory Palamas, and the Catholic - Achindinist one, regarding the uncreated/created character of grace?

| Orthodoxy, Saint Gregory Palamas | Catholicism, Achindin |
|---|---|
| Position: <i>There is a principle connected with Being, which brings about this sharing of Self, by grace.</i> | Position: <i>Being is simple, and can have nothing outside of it, it is broken and isolated from Creation, everything outside of Being is created.</i> |
| | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Support:</p> <p>Biblical and patristic information for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existence of God's works. 2. Intrinsic reporting, direct information, biblical information. 3. The trinitarian union pattern, and the trinitarian union pattern with humanity. 4. Theologies of participation, anthropology (image and likeness), union. 5. The necessity of the existence of a principle for deification and union. 6. The Haric Orthodox thesis is a direct, positive thesis that uses biblical information and builds only within these limits, of the given biblical information. | <p>Support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creating a position of divinity, broken from creation. 2. Logical deduction, indirect, in nature, a natural argument for uncreated grace, by creating a position of nature, broken by God. 3. Ignoring biblical and patristic information. 4. Use of marginal biblical and patristic references unrelated to the contexts being discussed. 5. The Catholic grace thesis is a deductive, indirect thesis that assumes that there is no information about grace in Scripture, and deductively constructs support for its inference in nature. |
|--|--|

Where do problems arise in the Catholic theology of created grace? He proposes a theory of a created grace, of a spiritual matter. But it comes to a very big dilemma, where some major consequences arise.

1. *At the Argument Level:* Uses a natural argument for a supernatural revelation issue. It does not use the biblical information for uncreated/created character.
2. *At the principle level of the divinity external to the Being:* It does not have a principle by which the spiritual matter of the created grace

transfers from God the deification and the union, in which to bind the spiritual matter of the grace to the divinity. It does not explain what deification and union mean in this case, for something that is outside of God.

3. *At the level of consequences of a deity external to the Being:* Call god something outside of the deity, without linking that principle of the deity to God in any way. It has a matter external to the godhead, also called god. That is, in polytheism.
4. *On the level of experience and presence in theology of the experience of light:* Deification and union in Catholicism is not an experience, that is, there is no theology of light and the elevation of the human being. Once this theology of created grace, of breaking with God, is proposed, the theology of light disappears from Catholic theology, the theology of the experience of grace and God disappears. Somehow the whole Catholic theology is darkened, which no longer sees God, no longer mentions anything about God. Deification and union in Catholicism remain only theological statements, unsupported by the experience necessary for it, by a mystical theology of light.

If the grace is created (unbound by Being), it has the following level consequences:

The act of sharing in the work:

- It is one unrelated to Being.
- It is not a real communion with God.
- It does not take on any of the divine attributes.
- It is an endowment with another faculty, by no means with a divine communion.

At the energy level:

- It ends up being an independent subject, that is, a god, a consciousness outside of God, which is god in itself.
- It brings polytheism, the creation of a god for each, in the personal grace external to the godhead, which each receives.

At the level of salvation:

- Salvation is by God's creation, not by God's being, by participation, and salvation is a state created, not a state of participation and sharing, by God's being.
- Salvation is a state of creation, with nothing of God in it.
- Salvation is through a spiritual matter and not through Being.

At the level of communion between God and man:

- There is no longer a bond of Being, a principle of connection between man and God.
- Man is complete apart from God.
- Man does not and cannot attain the image and likeness of God.
- Man is not God in grace, having nothing of God.
- The deification of man no longer exists, not being and having nothing that can be called deity.
- It annuls the concept of divine existence shared with man, being a creation that only represents divinity.

Every dogmatic thesis has a historical answer of the Holy Spirit. Saint Gregory Palamas' thesis is the historical answer of the Holy Spirit to this problem. Catholicism does not have a theology in the Holy Spirit on the thesis of grace, but a worldly syllogism. *In short, I am not the Church.* However, Filioque, primacy, grace, Orthodoxy has the correct historical landmarks. That is, the answer of the Spirit. *Orthodoxy is the Church.*

The 8th and 9th Synods of Patriarch Photius and Archbishop Grigorie Palamas are the historical responses of the Spirit. And Metropolitan Mark of Ephesus is the Moses of Orthodoxy, sent to Catholics for correction. The Catholic disaster after Ferrara-Florence is very interesting - history does not lie. Ferrara is the absolute downfall of Catholicism, according to the history of Pa-

triarch Photia, Archbishop Grigorie Palama, but also of Metropolitan Mark of Ephesus, after the historical confrontations between Orthodoxy and Catholicism for the correction of Catholicism.

In Lyon, Catholicism accepted the thesis of Patriarch Photius, canceling its own synod of Toledo. *The 8th Ecumenical Orthodox Synod is accepted by Catholics indirectly, in Lyon.* Patriarch Photius is confirmed by Catholics in Lyon. If in this current thesis Catholics also accept Grigorie Palama's thesis, then they have accepted the entire Orthodox theology, i.e. the 9 Ecumenical Councils. This thesis wants to be a complement to the thesis of Saint Gregory Palamas, from the point of view of the argumentation strategy, so that the thesis of the Saint can be followed and assumed more easily, but also to see the errors present in the Catholic thesis.

I believe that the current thesis brings enough clues, directions of analysis for the acceptance of the thesis of St. Gregory Palamas, in order to achieve a historical point in which Catholicism returns to Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy should support this thesis, being the capital thesis of the return of Catholics to Orthodoxy, being the critical point where Catholicism confirms an entire Orthodox theological history. Orthodoxy must not have a trace of doubt: Catholics must return to Orthodoxy as long as the 9 Ecumenical Councils will be recognized and de facto assumed by them. That is, I recognize the entire historical Orthodox theological act.

Catholicism, at this point of the connection of grace with Being, proves its entire theology as one that needs a reassurance, lacking the capital information on which theology is built: the uncreated/created character of grace. For this point alone Catholic theology cannot be considered, being a wrong construction. Such theology shows an irreparable internal corruption that fails to grasp the essential act of salvation through God, through grace union.

III. HOW ARE *GRACE* AND *COMMUNION* IN DENOMINATIONS?

1. THE EXPERIENCE OF GRACE IN THE CHURCH

INTRODUCTION

"Those of you who are possessed by the longing to be part of the glorious, *divine and luminous appearance of our Savior Jesus Christ* ; those who want to receive in the *feeling of the heart the fire above the heavens* ; those who strive to reach reconciliation with God by seeking and feeling; those who have left everything of the world to find and agonize over the hidden treasure in the kingdom of your hearts; those of you who want to light the candle of souls from here with light and you have renounced everything here; those who *in knowledge and seek to know and receive the Kingdom of Heaven within you* - come let me show you the science of peaceful or heavenly living, or rather, the method that leads its worker, without toil and without much sweat, to the harbor of dispassion ."¹³⁵

How powerful is the path shown by the ascetic Nicephorus from Solitude, who proposes to all those who follow the path shown by him, the camp meeting with Christ, the ignition with the divine light, the feeling and living of the Kingdom of God, inside everyone! And all this, in an experience of the Christian exercise of meeting God. Orthodox asceticism is the little exercise to prepare man for meeting God. And the proposal is one made at the beginning of his work, precisely to show the finality of the path of the Christian exercise: the encounter with Christ, the camp, the acquisition of the Kingdom of God, in His light. How relevant it is to begin such a

¹³⁵Trans. Stăniloae Dumitru , *Philokalia* , Vol. 7, p. 15.

discourse with the camp experience, a symbol of the whole discovery of the essence of the enlightenment of the human being and eternity, through the light of God. This is the call of Orthodoxy over the ages to the Taboric discovery, which Orthodoxy recapitulates and shares with the entire Church. The call is an agenda of the whole of Orthodox mysticism and experience, made with great power as the dominant Orthodox experience. Orthodoxy continually calls believers and Christianity to this experience of Tabor.

Charic witness and communion are the point where Christian denominations each bring a distinct typology of communion. The non-Orthodox denominations cannot bring much in the way of testimony, there being no "communions" and no "like communions" to have a difficult exercise to explore the options. There is genuine communion and illegitimate supernatural. On close examination, the denominations fail to bring a typology outside of these dimensions. And the theological discussion becomes not useless, but volatile in the face of the lack of the supernatural properly understood. Confessions cannot fabricate factual testimony, because history has a theological imprint of testimony that is impossible to falsify. What the confessions declare about the witness of grace and communion must be seen through the lens of the argument of the historical witness, of the typology of communion left in history.

What are the main points in the discussion of the witness of grace and communion that any argument should follow?

1. Grace is a *felt, conscious experience* – the testimonies of the cults should be compared for this testimony.
2. Grace is this *Tabor continually recapitulated* by us, in the Church, and should be found as a continuous testimony of Tabor.

3. What is not grace is within a *limit of external manifestations* , which have nothing of the authentic typology of grace.
4. *The mysticism of demonic error* , of deception, is related to this area of mystical experience.

I have tried in this chapter to bring a testimony from several Saints of the Church, as it is about an experience for which it is more necessary to see its testimony than a detailed explanation of this experience. It is more important, in understanding the experience of grace, to see what it is like, than to make broad discussions about an experience which should be largely self-explanatory, but also self-confessing, when it is in its fullness and perfection.

What should be looked for in the witness of grace? What is the dominant testimony of Scripture concerning grace? *The Church is light from the Light of God*. The testimony of light, as it is in all Orthodox experience, is a typology not found in other confessions. God is Light, and in Tabor he shows us the countless dimensions of this experience. Christ changes before us, but he also brings us the same change. And man meets Christ in His grace. Man finds in this experience the light of God in himself. The experience of inner illumination, of the light of God, of seeing Christ, is the dominant experience of the Church. The mysteries, the prayer, everything in the Church puts us on the path to perfection, to full union with God.

Interdenominational religious experience and differences must be articulated so that any cult can understand them. It must be discovered what grace itself is, what is the work, its authentic testimony to those who do not really have its experience or to those who have replaced it with a pseudo -grace . In every cult we find a strong anchoring in " *grace*" and "*specific*" , cultic gifts, especially where grace is not grace , but something else. The experience of

grace is precisely shown in Orthodox mysticism, with countless references that reproduce cultic grace differences and punctuate them precisely.

Grace is different as a testimony in Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Protestantism. It is understood and confessed in an entirely different form in every denomination. However, in each separate denomination, it has a unitary identity in its manifestations, being a specific denomination.

Asceticism is the ladder to God. In which God is with strength for all who with strength climb the ladder. And at the end of the ladder is Tabor, where you really meet Christ and His light, and Christ and Tabor dwell in you, in an eternal illumination, in which man says, like God, *"I am light, through the light of God"* and *"I am in eternal light through God"*, in the same divine light that Christ shows to everyone and that man sees spiritually, feels, not only consciously, but as an inner sun, a sun brought from God in himself, for eternity. Tabor is what man obtains in himself, for eternity. A Tabor aware, felt, seen like the apostles.

The Christian experience should be able to express itself only through the experience and witness of grace. The experience of grace is one of such great, unmistakable power that it alone leads you to the Christian dogmas and discovers them all cleanly, integrally, being in complete unity with them. That is why the Apostle Paul, in view of grace, of light, discovers for the whole Church the things of grace, love, kindness and gentleness. Not just as an act of revelation, but also as a personal act of knowledge.

Grace is and brings a theology in itself and is a revelation of God, of knowledge. Grace is not only a gift, it is also a theology, a knowledge. It is conscious communion with God. It is knowledge and information about God, as shown by the Apostles and all the great theologians of the Church, who did not make theological theories, but saw and experienced both grace and theology. *Grace is knowledge and guidance.* And those who know grace

know the things of it, like the Apostle Paul, and they know the testimony of grace. That "*appeared to the Holy Spirit and to us*", in which grace is felt, realized, a testimony of God's presence, a living, present testimony. A consciousness of God beside you. Therefore, grace is knowledge more than anything, and communion. It is the sight of the spiritual, knowledge of them, understanding of them, understanding of God, attainment of perfection and communion with God.

Catholicism cannot express *anything* about grace, because it has nothing of knowledge, in grace. He does not recapitulate with the same force as the Apostle the theology of grace. In Catholicism, grace is a theory, a theological study, and not an experiential testimony. Catholicism cannot contain anything theological about grace, putting everything wrong about it, formulating theological studies, by no means a unitary testimony of the knowledge of grace. What Catholicism proposes about grace is an irrelevant theological theory, completely outside and broken from any possibility of being related to existential reality.

Grace, in Catholicism, does not encompass an existential reality. It cannot, it is not, it has nothing to do with reality, being a theological illusion, not a reality. How is this possible? Theology really comes into grace. Grace not only illuminates the consciousness (only unseen), but guides and sensibly opens the consciousness to knowledge – effecting theological convergence. Hence the innumerable errors produced, all out of guidance. Guidance is a very powerful act that does not lead to error, but leads to unity, convergence. Catholicism has nothing of the guidance of the Spirit, and is completely apart from anything that can be called guidance.

Grace is not an obscure experience, so that we can discuss the experience of grace marginally and without a typology. It is a powerful act of communion between God and man, accompanied by full infor-

mation. It cannot be treated as purely theologically revealed information, only historically, in Scripture. Catholicism does not have this experience of grace and in its proposed theory of grace postulates that there is no such experience either. And it proposes a theory, but not a revealed and omnipresent theology as the experience of the Church.

Why can Simeon the New Theologian and Gregory Palamas explain and explain all the dimensions of this experience starting from the self-sharing of divinity and participation? Because in grace one sees all this theology and theological information, seen directly and in communion with God. Grace is another view of revelation, revelation is contained in this experience, which is contained in revelation, in an initial given. In grace it is seen that God is in that light. This is information that is also seen in experience.

Why do Catholics not bring any phenomenological information about grace, about experience? Because I am outside of this experience and do not know how to build this thesis in this way. The West does not have this experience of divine light and does not understand it. He doesn't know what grace is, he doesn't know what communion is, for an extremely long time. And he fails to build this communion thesis. It has no theologians of light who understand Charic theology from experience. Communion is related to grace, and grace testifies to communion. Grace is the foundation of communion, and understanding grace comes from experiencing it. Why does the East construct the dual thesis, in experience but also in revelation? Precisely because of the experimental foundation that it implicitly has, as a starting point, and in which this theology moves in the East.

The difference between Sunset and Sunrise is primarily in the accessibility of this experience. The West does not have this experience, and the East has it omnipresent and works only in it. This is where the discussion of theological differences about grace begins – different experience is the root of different theological

approach. The West has no communion with God, and the East has communion and can comprehend it correctly and in a theology of grace. The West builds theological studies, being out of communion. The West today has nothing of the Christian witness, of what it should be.

Where do Western and Eastern theologies of grace break? In the informational premises, in the completely different foundation of experience between communities, which brings a ubiquitous information. And then, in the methodology of argumentation, in which the west tries to deduce as a consequence an attribute related to the Being, starting not from the divinity, but from the human being, and the East uses both the relation of the divinity to its own work and the consequences of the work in participation and sharing, but also the consequences at the level of human nature.

The entire theology proposed by any confession on the theology of grace is irrelevant, as long as it does not include an existential reality, not only accessible, but omnipresent as testimony. Theories of grace all break down precisely at this point where they come up with propositions "*about*" grace, but fail to articulate what grace is and how it works, and to relate this correctly informationally as a conscious, felt experience. The problem with Catholicism and Protestantism is that they have theories of grace that do not encompass and are not connected to an existential reality. They do not bring a point of connection between theory and experience.

Catholic grace is an intangible theoretical proposition. Protestant grace is something external to nature, something carnal, desired to be grace, a work of the body and not of the soul. Orthodox grace is inner Tabor illumination, it is the sight of God, it is the opening of heaven before the one who has it, it is an entrance into another world, into the Kingdom of God, a ray of light, it is a completely different testimony from the Catholic (non-existent)

and towards the Protestant, external, natural, carnal. It is a testimony and recapitulation of the experience of the Apostle, and of Tabor.

Catholic theological statements about grace are hypothetical and conjectural. There is no trace of validation in existential reality in any of the propositions of Catholicism. A factual theology, encompassing existential reality, must be supported by experimental information. And to have a bridge to existential reality. Precisely because we are talking about faith, about life, about a communion, from which the information about the communion in grace must be and is omnipresent in the community that has this communion. Factual information is and must be identical to revealed information, which is also factual information, but in a primary form. The same information from revelation must be recapitulated and found as factual information from experience.

Revealed knowledge and direct knowledge in communion (recapitulation of revelation) must be one. The revealed knowledge, revealed by Christ, and the direct knowledge in communion, in what man sees in God, when he unites with Him, are one. Therefore, the information from direct knowledge must always be identical and unitary with the revealed information. Direct knowledge in communion is a fundamental component of knowledge, because the act of communion with God is not an agnostic act or only in revealed knowledge, it is also an act of direct knowledge (even if it cannot be fully expressed), in which you know this reality originally contained in revelation, as the main form of recognition of knowledge. Direct knowledge must always confirm revelation, and it is a testimony that always explores revelation in all its dimensions. The theology of grace is not only Pauline, but is continuously explored by the Church. Pauline grace is an omnipresence in communion, by no means a historical mysticism in revelation.

Catholicism arrives at the theoretical exploration of some texts, by no means of an experience, it arrives with a theological theory, by no means with a direct knowledge, recapitulation, which are in unity and in completeness-identity. And obviously, the lack of this dimension of direct knowledge normally results in the characterization of the Catholic proposal as a theory. Catholicism is debating a theological theory and not an existential reality – it does not know what Christianity is, as the light of God. Something that cannot be accepted in a theology that is about existence and that is always related to reality. Saint John Chrysostom says, in Homily I to the Gospel according to Matthew: " We should not have needed the Holy Scriptures, but to have such a pure life that the *grace of the Spirit* would have *held the place of the Holy Scriptures* in our souls. And as the Holy Scriptures are written with ink, so our hearts should have been written with the Holy Spirit."¹³⁶

Reading the Catholic formula, "grace is not accessible", found in the Catholic Catechism, I understood how the Catholic thesis is constructed, starting from and using only the text of Scripture, isolated from other information. Having no experiential information to guide the authentic understanding of light, Catholicism postulates purely rational, theoretical grace, unable to anchor and tie this notion to reality. And because they do not have the experimental information to confirm the revelation, and not knowing how to use it, what it is and how it is, Catholicism starts from the human (created) nature/being, instead of looking both in the human being, in the work, and in the divinity, in the divine Being, uncreated (in relation to the work), as this work is. Grace in Catholicism is an abstract, general concept, a theory created based on the information of Scripture.

¹³⁶Saint John the Golden Mouth, *Homily I on the Gospel according to Matthew*, in Saint Iustin Popovici, *Dogmatics of the Orthodox Church*, Vol. I, p. 40.

Catholicism commits one of the greatest possible mistakes in theology - the denial of divine light as experience. That is, the denial of everything related to the light, of conscious asceticism, of the mysteries, of everything that is in the light. Of eternity. Of what God is - light felt, light participated in, spiritual light, light of nature, light of soul, light which angels see and live in, and in which man, like the angels, participates in an identical experience. Therefore, *carnal angel*, as the Church of the Saints calls it, refers exactly to this experience of rising into the light, a conscious experience, of raising man to the angelic condition. The denial of light as conscious experience and as supernatural is part of the purpose of present man and not an inaccessible supernatural or supernatural, cut off from man. It is a testimony to the inaccessibility of the experience of grace in Catholicism.

Catholicism does not know God's light, God in His light, does not understand what God and divinity are. This is the theological conclusion from the Catholic proposal - Catholicism is outside the experience of God and does not understand the theological exposition of this experience. He does not understand what shared divinity is and cannot experience this reality. The most serious point in any theology is the impossibility of comprehending and expressing the experience of God, of sharing God in light. That is, communion with God. Catholicism cannot theologially express what communion with God is, as an experience at its highest point, in its being, the divine light. Catholic theology is in total darkness regarding the high point of theology, the light of God.

Have Catholics lost grace? Yes. Because I don't find it as an experience, as a felt reality. Catholic grace is only a theory. Grace now opens eternity to those who have it. If I do not know grace, it means that I know nothing of eternal life, the light of God, eternity in light. I do not know the experience of eternity. I do not understand and do not see salvation. Catholicism does not theo-

logically see the high point, the assumption of eternity as an experience. And from this to draw the theological information about grace and eternity. Grace reveals eternity to man and moves man into eternity. Preparation and all are eternity, binding man to eternity. Complete after Judgment. And the perfect are from now on in that state of grace, of eternity.

Grace is eternal. It is salvation that is powerfully seen in its fullness. Catholicism does not have grace as a conscious, felt experience. It does not have grace as the main theological information, from the experience of eternity, of light. In Catholicism, mysticism and asceticism are non-existent. Because I don't reach the other world. The dogma, as with grasping the existential state, shows that there is no eternal state in Catholicism, that is known, Catholicism does not know the existential reality of eternity, in the light, although the light is an existential reality in itself.

Tabor discovers eternity, not just a light – an existential condition in which we will all be. The theological identity contained in the existential state experienced by Catholicism is wrong. Catholicism, in the theology of grace, makes a great claim of its own that it does not know that existential reality of eternity, of light. That he does not understand the camp experience. And that theology that is a reflection of one's own experience cannot correctly testify to an existential state that exists, but includes an annulment, a limitation, a lack of witness to that state. If they had lived and experienced grace, Catholicism would have had a different testimony and theology.

Revelation cannot be separated from existential reality and everything that is in revelation must be found in reality, but also vice versa, it must be able to be reconstituted, being an expression of the encompassing of existential reality in a primordial form. Normally, you should also be able to start from the Christian experience in reconstituting knowledge and revelation. This is a

Christian axiom of knowledge, that God is the same in both revelation and personal knowledge. Why do we have Revelation? Because the difficulty of integrating community knowledge into experience is an abysmal one, just by itself. Revelation is not the only knowledge, but God Himself is knowledge in Himself, and from God comes knowledge, in experience, because God is continually testifying Himself, just as in revelation. And humanity receives the same shared revelation directly from God. Revelation remains as a starting point, summarized by knowledge and information from knowledge, coming from those to whom God has given such knowledge for the Church. That is why Grigorie Palama manages to cover this thesis of light in a completeness impossible to match through such knowledge - not only through inspiration, but also through vision, through asceticism, through gift, through the access of this experience. Grigorie Palama does not only create a logical argument, but brings a testimony of a complete knowledge, in all dimensions, in which he unites all the information about light, about divinity, about accessibility, explaining the existence of light, its accessibility, its uncreated character, participation, that is, all that is essential between man and God, man's actual participation in the Godhead as the arvuna of eternal life. Basically, this is one of the maximum points to be explained in theology, how man eternally participates in divinity, in the light of God, and this experience.

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE CHURCH IS THE EXPERIENCE OF TABOR, OF THE TRANSFIGURATION, OF THE CHANGE AND ENLIGHTENMENT OF MAN THROUGH CHRIST

Saint Joseph the Hesychast , at the beginning of his monastic life, offers a fervent prayer to God: "*Lord, as You changed Your Face before Your Disciples, change Your Face and in my soul!*" *Stop the passions, calm my heart. Give prayer to the one who prays and control my*

unruly mind. And while he was thus praying with pain, there came from the little church a "breath", a thin wind, full of good smell. Then his soul was filled with joy, enlightenment and divine love, and from within him the Prayer began to flow incessantly with such ease that he thought: "This is Heaven, I don't need another Heaven." And he saw the Prayer being said inside him with a mathematical precision, exactly like a clock. And, the wonderful thing was that the prayer was performed by itself, without any effort on his part."¹³⁷

The Orthodox testimony is not that of the miracles, of the prophecies, which are present, but which are after this testimony of the illumination of the whole Church . *It is of Tabor, of inner illumination.* The Transfiguration of man, through Christ, recapitulates Tabor in himself. The Christian confesses an inner Tabor, an inner illumination. What to see in Tabor? The entire discovery of the Trinity, of the Church, of God's light, but also of the image that we receive through Christ, and the inner illumination that brings us the Trinity of Tabor in that light. The light of God continually recapitulates the Tabor, in which the Trinity is in that light and reveals itself to man.

Orthodoxy's argument about the witness of grace is much more than a succession of events called "miracles, prophecies, dreams, visions" which, if not properly verified, can appear to be from God. The argument of Orthodoxy is the experience of Tabor, it is the dominant testimony of the Church, in its entirety. The church must, first of all, witness the light of God, not just a "grace" . The experience of the Church is one of integral, taboric enlightenment . The Church is a continuous light, from the light of God. How many pages, works, treatises, centuries of testimony of the Divine light Orthodoxy brings! Orthodox mysticism becomes one of

¹³⁷ Archim . Efreim Filotheitul , Starețul *meu Iosif Hesibastul* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2010, p. 41.

the experience of divine light, presented in a wide theological richness.

pious Joseph the Hesychast says: "That evening Father Joseph remained in his little cave and began to say the Prayer of the Mind. Suddenly, around midnight, his little cell was filled with a brilliant light, which was not at all like that of the day. This light grew so much that the Abbot felt that he was coming out of himself and that he no longer had a body. (...) And the days passed without that joy diminishing or that wonderful fact being erased from his memory. Later, when the Abbot was asked what he was thinking in those moments, he answered that when the mind is enslaved by contemplation, it becomes empty of thoughts, because, being engulfed by the radiance of divine Grace, it no longer thinks about anything of its own. Then he only felt that he was in a thrice-blissful state."¹³⁸

The testimony of the light is as inner illumination and continuous presence in the visions: "Then he entered his little church and threw himself with tears before the icon of the Mother of God. And as he was praying, he suddenly felt within him a comfort and was filled with light - as always happens at the beginning of a vision - and his heart was filled with the love of God and went out of his mind. Then he had the following vision which he himself relates: *I was suddenly surrounded by an unspeakable light, and before me I saw an endless expanse. (...) I was so overwhelmed by that wonderful sight that I could not tell if I was in a church or in Heaven or before the throne of God. My whole feeling, my whole being was filled with that glory and Light, which was uncreated and above all brightness and subtlety. At that moment I saw before me the wonderful dome of that great church. From her, as the sun emanates light, all glory and majesty ra-*

¹³⁸ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 84-85.

*diated. Only then did I see that there were two large icons in the pediment, one on the right and one on the left of the Holy Doors, of our Lord Jesus Christ and of His Blessed Mother. (...) Then what shall I say, the scoundrel and more unworthy than all men? Suddenly so much brightness came out from her holy icon and the Mother of God appeared in natural size and so beautiful, holding in her arms the Savior of the world, our Lord Jesus, full of Grace and majesty, that seeing such brightness, thousands times brighter than the sun (...). "*¹³⁹

In another vision, the abbot confesses: "Once, when his heart was in danger of bursting with pain, he went back to his little church and began to pray with many tears to the Mother of God (...) At one point he tired and sat down in the pew. Suddenly her icon in the lampshade glowed and her face became life-size. Now he was no longer an icon, but a living face. The Mother of God appeared to him in life size. (...) Then the heavenly Child approached him and caressed his face, and he kissed his hand, which seemed alive. His soul was so filled with the love of God and the Light that he could no longer stand on his feet and fell to the ground. (...) He testified that such visions are the living and feeling of another life, bought by those who do not know them. And he also said that no matter how hard the one who had such visions tried to describe what he felt, he would never be able to make others understand, but would only make a partial description." ¹⁴⁰"God granted the Abbot the great honor of seeing the uncreated Light. When he spoke to us about the uncreated Light, he could not find words to reveal to us, to show us what God is, what this uncreated Light is and that Glory of the Triune God. The glory of God, the Light of God is His uncreated energy. (...)"¹⁴¹

¹³⁹ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 199-202.

¹⁴⁰ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 202-203.

¹⁴¹ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 288.

Saint Sava Vatopedinul testifies during a night of prayer of the Tabor experience: "It was about the second watch of the night, as it seems to me. (...) Nevertheless, Sava had his eyes and mind raised to Heaven. Suddenly he saw how the sky opened - at that moment the place where Sava was became uncovered - and an unspeakable and abundant light, of a strong brightness, began to pour out and descend to the earth. Immediately the whole cave was filled with light. Then this light enlightened the great man's eyes, to prepare him thereby for higher and greater things. (...) In the end, he becomes, together with Peter and the Sons of Thunder, who once ascended Mount Tabor together with Christ, partaker above nature of the sea and the first Lights That *enlighten all men who come into the world*. (...) But having fallen to the ground (...) he is transformed entirely by the beauty of the glory and the delight of the Light that was revealed in an unspeakable way and is changed with the wonderful change of the right hand of the Most High. (...) "*Waking up*" , therefore, and Sava, to use the same word again, saw above nature and in part, the mystery of the future age, as Saint Athanasius the Great says. He saw the most sweet Jesus shining with indescribable beauty and the sweet light of His divine glory, which came out of His holy Body taken from Mary, as the same Theologian says. He saw the mystery with those supernatural eyes, which the creative power of the Spirit changed into worthy eyes, so that he could see the manifestation of the Word. With such eyes he saw what cannot be seen by natural eyes and cannot reach the hearts of men."¹⁴²

The life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul has countless such moments in which the same experience is recapitulated identically, in a continuous testimony of Tabor, of inner illumination, through Christ: "The wonderful Sava struggled together with some of these seers of God, to the extent of others close, he surpassed some, thus becoming a partaker, in large part, of that grace and appearance.

¹⁴²Saint Filothea Kokinos , *Life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul cel bubun for Christ* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2010, pp. 107-109.

Once, the Saint wanted to show me this mystery, that is, the fact that he had also made himself worthy to "suffer" what the Apostle Peter and the Sons of Thunder had also "suffered". It was the royal feast of the Transfiguration. (...) While I was sitting in the pew next to the psalmists who were singing all the songs of the feast, Sava, who was sitting next to me, pressing his lips to my ear, said to me: - He who strives to reach evangelical perfection, my beloved, he must mysteriously arrive at this very secret of the Transfiguration. Amazed by his words, I suddenly turned my eyes towards his holy face, in order to better discern what he said. He repeated the same words to me, while his countenance was so glorified, and filled with immeasurable joy and brightness, as if he had at that moment been a partaker of the sight and Transfiguration of the Master, which had once been accomplished on Mount Tabor."¹⁴³

In the lives of many saints we find the same testimony of the Transfiguration : " The commemoration of the Saint was celebrated on September 28 with an all-night vigil. At one of these vigils the Abbot was seen in a camp light, raised from the ground and transfigured." ¹⁴⁴"The vigil was attended by two Orthodox Lebanese, a priest and a young man, and he, at that moment, was sitting in a pew on the left side. At one point the cleric turned to say something to the young man and saw the Abbot bathed in light and raised from the ground about twenty-five to thirty centimeters. The uncovered parts of his body, i.e. his hands and head, radiated light, a very strong light. (...) The question that arises is how of all the parents who were present, only three saw him? There were twenty-five people at the vigil, but the Abbot *changed his face only before the three* ." ¹⁴⁵"I cannot describe the blessing I have received. When the time of Holy Communion came, the Abbot approached with great piety and broken heart to partake of the Blessed Sacrament. (...) Amazed

¹⁴³Saint Filothea Kokinos , *The Life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul the Fool for Christ* , pp. 111-112.

¹⁴⁴Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 233.

¹⁴⁵Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Reverend Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 290.

I noticed how his face changed with divine guise and became bright. It radiated a soft, strong light."¹⁴⁶

Saint Sava Vatopedin testifies again to the same divine light, when he is abandoned by his powers: "Having so much need in those deserts for the Kingdom of God, the great needy once arrived in a completely dry place. (...) Slowly -slowly his bodily powers began to leave him and, after a while, he fell to the ground almost dead. (...) But behold, the Angel sent by God also came, who stood beside him full of brightness. (...) An indescribable smell descended with it. An indescribable coolness and light enlivened the poor man lying on the ground, suddenly spreading throughout that place. (...) Before the Angel could finish the news, suddenly a divine light brighter than the one before poured over that place. Within this light Christ the King Himself appeared again, as before. That unspeakable radiance and delight that emanated from there, that unquenchable desire, above all desire, truly the end of desires, everything was immediately made for the needy: and food, and health, and freedom from all sorrow, and the fulfillment of every kind of desire. lack."¹⁴⁷

"For example, in one of his epistles he writes: "Enlightenment is followed by the end of prayer and frequent contemplation, the cessation of the senses, the stillness and complete stillness of the limbs, the union of God and man in one." He describes this union of man with God more thoroughly as follows: "When Grace works, then immediately the door opens and it reaches the gate of Heaven and prayer rises like a pillar or like a flame. (...) And when man is filled with Grace, he is also filled with enlightenment and an unspeakable joy. Then, no longer able to control the fire of love, the senses cease and he is rapt in contemplation. So far are the movements of man's will, Beyond this he no longer has dominion over

¹⁴⁶Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Reverend Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 618.

¹⁴⁷Saint Filothea Kokinos , *The Life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul the Fool for Christ* , pp. 117-119.

himself, nor does he know himself, because he has united with fire, being completely changed, becoming god by grace. This is the divine union, after which the walls collapse and then man breathes another air, that of contemplation, free, full of the fragrance of Heaven. (...) The abbot, although he had the gift of storytelling, nevertheless when he got to talking about holy enlightenment, about states of Grace and about heavenly contemplations, he was sad, because the poor language did not help him to express his unspeakable feelings .”¹⁴⁸

The testimony of Tabor must be repeated in all dimensions of the Church. The light in which Christ was enveloped is found in all the experiences of the mentioned Saints, Joseph the Hesychast , Paisius the Aghiorite, Sava Vatopedinul , the anonymous Hesychast , Grigorie Palama. This is the testimony that I sought as omnipresence in the Church, for the testimony of communion . God is light and the testimony of this divine light is a testimony that shows God as presence and brings God to us in discovery. The Church is a recapitulation of Tabor, it is a continuous Tabor recapitulated by the community, in the Mysteries and Christian asceticism.

The Reverend Paisie the Aghiorite says about the divine light: "At Katunakia , the Abbot also had divine experiences: "One night, he said, while I was saying the Prayer, I felt a great joy inside me. I continued to say the Prayer and suddenly my cell was filled with light. It was white with a slight blue tinge. My heart was beating sweetly. I prayed until the sun came up. That light that remained in my cell until morning was very strong, stronger even than sunlight. It was losing its luster in front of her. I could see the sun, and its light seemed to me pale, dull, like the light of the moon when the moon is full. I saw that light for a long time. After that, when she disappeared and the grace diminished, then I felt no more comfort and joy. (...)» The light that the Abbot saw he did not call

¹⁴⁸ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 288-289.

uncreated, although there was no doubt that it was uncreated light. Moreover, he did not describe it, but only added: "*It can be seen both with closed eyes and with open eyes, and at night in darkness and during sunny days.*" "¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁹Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Reverend Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 185-186.

**GRACE, REAL EXPERIENCE, FELT, REALIZED.
ELEVATION OF NATURE AND INNER
TRANSFORMATION INTO GRACE**

"The abbot [Joseph the Hesychast], in great temptations, knew the Grace of God in a felt way."¹⁵⁰

Archim . Ephrem the Philothite

pious Joseph Hesychast raised all his disciples in a felt, conscious experience of grace, in the camp discovery of Christ, in the discovery of the light of God. This *shows the clear path of asceticism, in Orthodoxy*, which if followed, even not to the perfection of the Pious, but also to a lesser extent, brings this conscious felt experience of divine light. God's. And his disciples, climbing a little on the ladder to God, on the first steps of the prayer hours, get to see and live this experience. They reach this experience because they are on the few steps of feeling the light. And the others do not reach this experience because they do not step on the ladder of prayer.

I don't know how much I can emphasize the importance of this testimony of Venerable Joseph and his community, as a clear typology of reaching God through asceticism, reproduced by an entire community. It is not an isolated case of touching and seeing this experience, only by a single ascetic, to be assimilated to a mysticism difficult to reproduce, but it is a clear example of Christian asceticism of a community, done right, that easily leads you to God . In fact, what Venerable Joseph the Hesychast shows us is a *clear path of Christian asceticism that leads you to God* . It is a testimony to the pure existence of this path.

¹⁵⁰ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 121.

author of the work "*Spiritual View*", the *anonymous Hesychast*, makes a short apology for the work of grace in the soul, showing and recapitulating the testimony of the Apostle about grace: "Thinking then and searching in yourself, how the Grace of God works in your soul the immaterial and divine work and as your heart receives comfort from this work, you are filled with deep godliness and find your rest. Thinking then of the joy that the face of your heart experiences within itself from the spiritual joy that has been abundantly poured out upon it by the Grace of God, you begin to shed endless tears and find your rest. Thinking then of the joy felt, which the face of your body experiences from the inner joy of the Divine Grace, which has flooded your heart, you are seized with sweet piety and find your rest. Contemplating then the goodness of your Lord, you are filled with sweet piety and find your rest."¹⁵¹

Grigorie Palama shows the power of this experience, an experience that brings you, discovers God as a person, in the light and shows grace as an authentic experience in which you understand and see God: "The feeling of participating in divine grace, as an experience of the uncreated, remains in essentially incomprehensible to the untried, according to Palama. Therefore, no description of it can express it for them... Because whoever seeks knowledge outside *of the experience of participation*, even when he believes the words of the tried, takes an idol of the truth instead of the truth and is led to conceit... That is, participation in God's grace, while it affords the surest and fullest way of knowing God, does not also exhaust its incomprehensible character..."¹⁵²

The work of grace in man is clear, strong, unmistakable, of a special purity, consistent in history and in all its testimony; it is noticed and recognized easily by its workers, after the grace is revealed

¹⁵¹ Anonymous Hesychast, *Spiritual view*, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Constantin Coman, Byzantine Publishing House, 1999, p. 92.

¹⁵² Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and Freedom in the Patristic Tradition...*, p. 107.

cleanly, in the conscience and soul of the needy, something that happens quickly, after he begins to work the grace. Grace is a conscious, felt, aware, full and continuous work, and it has nothing to do with the exaggerated Protestant and Catholic pseudo-charic manifestations, it has no form of those. Grace is, first of all, a power of the soul and mind, it continues, it works in the full consciousness of the one who works it, to strengthen it.

Grace is a peace that embraces the whole mind and soul and enlightens the conscience, in peace and tranquility, helping man. Grace does not speak. And *the peace of the Holy Spirit* is an abyss that overwhelms all the senses, incomprehensible in human words, found in Orthodoxy, but not found elsewhere, neither Protestants nor Catholics.

The main work of grace is the transcendent elevation of human nature in union with God, its preparation for eternity, the education of man for eternity in light, and by no means the instantiation of miracles and gifts on earth. Everyone prepares himself in the light and by the light, for the kingdom of light, by being good, by the work of kindness, humility, love, which are transcendent and are the main work of grace in the soul, together with the education of obedience to God and other virtues of the soul, which are the transcendent body of the works of grace.

The mind, in the light, is no longer scattered, it has another landmark, the light, and another power that embraces it and holds it differently, over everything in front of it. The mind in grace is enlightened and alone master of it, no longer enslaved by matter and temporality. It becomes its own master, having power in itself, and is no longer subject to the flesh, nor swayed by spirits. Moreover, he unites with the good, in the light, and receives from it as much as he can work; but also vision for all that lies ahead, as far as man can carry the light, supporting man in all that lies ahead. The light sustains the mind, even if it does not perceive all of the light until after much trial. That is why light must be worked and earned

for all the help given to man in its entirety.

Without light, man is scattered in the world and in all its things. Light gathers man in a transcendent direction; but it must be worked on, constantly. "Once prayer has come, it will illumine the soul and heart and mind with the bright and shining rays that spring sensibly from the name of Christ. And if the mind is enlightened, then man distinguishes what is useful for the soul from what is harmful. And as he who walks at night with a light sees the way and does not go astray, so also he who illuminates his mind with the true light of Christ distinguishes the true and right way that leads to Christ from the deceptive and wandering way that- it leads him to destruction and to the devil." ¹⁵³"For, in fact, God shows Himself to the mind in the heart, at first purifying the one who loves Him, as John the Ladder says, like a fire, then filling his mind with brilliance like a light and giving him divine form." ¹⁵⁴

St. Gregory Palamas says: "Thus both the mind and the body receive the same light, each according to itself, but above the senses and the mind. *The visible appearance of God and the union above the mind*, of which Dionysius speaks, do not differ at all." ¹⁵⁵He also says about the divine light: "This light differs so much from the light of knowledge, that the light of knowledge is like a candlestick that illuminates a dark place, and this mysterious light is like the lamp that lights the day, that is, the sun." ¹⁵⁶

A limit of daily prayer must be exceeded in order to have an increase, and to have the light of God in us: "For if one prays as I have said for half an hour, and the work of the grace of the prayer of the heart remains almost half hour that day, or at most a whole

¹⁵³ Anonymous Hesychast, *Spiritual View*, p. 21.

¹⁵⁴ Philokalia, Vol. 7, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, p. 18.

¹⁵⁵ Saint Gregory Palama, *About the Holy Light*, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 351.

¹⁵⁶ Saint Gregory Palama, *About the Holy Light*, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Life and writings of Saint Gregory Palama*, Philokalia, Vol. 7, p. 343.

day, but no more. For, like iron, when it is taken out of the fire by the smith, it is reddened and burns like fire, but if it remains longer outside the fire, it begins little by little to lose its burning power, returning to its coldness and appearance before, so also man, when he says the prayer with strength and brokenness from the heart, is ignited by the work of the Holy Spirit and causes the living water of divine meanings to spring from the heart; but as soon as prayer ceases, so does the source of divine meanings."¹⁵⁷

The coming of grace is seen by those who acquire spiritual feeling. That is, that vision, that dimension of the soul that lives and learns the light of God, which is revealed in the time of the needy: "In addition to this piety, another grace surrounds and examines him, that is, together with the tears, another consolation comes to him divine, which cannot be seen with the physical eyes, but can be seen very clearly with the eyes of the mind as it descends smoothly from heaven, like the dew on his head, like the dew of the prophet Gideon. And from the head it pours over the whole body and spreads its fragrance, sanctifying it. That's why the Scripture says: "Blessed is God who pours His Grace on His priests like the ointment that descends on the head, on the edge of his garments". For this reason his body becomes light and is filled with all spiritual comfort and sweetness."¹⁵⁸

Grace is also a feeling state of the soul. It is a state of raising the soul, in which the soul, through this light, is different, has a different power, has a different dimension of work through the light of God. It is a state of power, of knowledge, of spiritual feeling, of spiritual joy, of spiritual sight. It is a state in so many dimensions, a state contained precisely, exactly, in the typology, in all the Orthodox testimonies, which bring a typology of this state, a unitary, unique typology. What all the saints from whom I have quoted in

¹⁵⁷ Anonymous Hesychast , *Spiritual View* , p. 26.

¹⁵⁸ Anonymous Hesychast , *Spiritual View* , p. 24.

this part say, saints who precisely contained this testimony, is in each case a repetition of the typology of the work of grace, expressed not systematically, because grace is an experience, but emotional, in sensitive mystical excursions, as everyone in front of grace can only exclaim the joy and love they feel, repeating the testimony of the Apostle.

Hesychast says: "And this spiritual pleasure, which is secretly tasted within man, can be known in this way: (...) At the same time together with this pure and unfeigned piety is felt within him and the Grace of the Holy Spirit, which is a consolation and a delight both to the soul and to the heart of man. Because, when the Grace of the Holy Spirit touches the pure heart, not only the soul is comforted, but the heart is wonderfully sweetened from within, in an incomprehensible and mysterious way (...). And the soul feels the sweetness of the Grace of the Holy Spirit in this way: when the Grace of the Holy Spirit touches the soul, then the entire Holy Scripture is shown to the soul, like a tree with leaves dripping with honey, whose roots are watered by the boundless sweetness of Christ and whose branches drip into the soul from all sides that unspeakable sweetness. And the heart feels this sweetness of the Grace of the Holy Spirit in this way: when someone understands that the Grace of the Holy Spirit dwells in his heart, then he feels in the center of his being, that is, in the depth of his being, a divine joy and a spiritual consolation."¹⁵⁹

The book is called by the author "*Spiritual view*", precisely to show in detail how the body and soul feel grace, an experience not only known, but explained in detail by the whole Church. Orthodoxy continuously emphasizes the transformation of man into grace, grace not only as immediate, but as an eternal state in which man reaches, a state of deification, emphasizing both grace as a state and grace as a process of transformation of man through God. The image of God in man is not a seal that is acquired forever through

¹⁵⁹ Anonymous Hesychast, *Spiritual View*, pp. 115-116.

baptism, but is renewed over time, with growth in likeness, grace working an ever-increasing likeness to God in man. Grace increases man in likeness, it is not just a descending event in the life of the believer.

What is the context in which grace works? Energy, grace, light are given by God in the context of man's communion with God. *What is the meaning of the presence of grace and its work in man?* Grace, energy, is a work of God and helps man in several dimensions : It gives man something that comes from God. God sees and knows all and shares His and man's, Divine *sight* (*knowledge*) , Divine *power* , Divine *joy* , *a state of peace, communion with all and all, in God.*

How is grace acquired? Grace is the expression of a state of communion with God, in truth and sinlessness . Grace is acquired through baptism. Grace is actualized through: Sacraments, Communion, Confession, Repentance, Prayer, the fulfillment of God's will, in the Church community, in which energy and grace are worked correctly. *Grace is lost through: Giving up faith* or assuming a wrong faith, *Sins, Moving away from grace communion* (of services, prayer), *Disobedience and disobedience* to God's will, breaking communion with Him.

Gaining grace in the Church. To enter the Kingdom of God, we must have communion with grace in the Church. The church is a correct framework for the work of grace, of communion. That is why there is so much emphasis on " *Church* " and " *go to Church* ". Because , in this framework, we easily work those of grace and communion. *The Perfection of Grace* - Grace can be acquired in great wealth as a result of the full work of communion. Perfection in grace is the result of a profound transformation of the being, but also of a special effort and asceticism. *The deification of man* - It is understood both by sharing in the Holy Mysteries and by being perfected in grace. Man can acquire full communion with God, which is also

another state, of deification, in which man is fully next to God, and the Holy Spirit is with that man permanently, what we call the *indwelling of the Holy Spirit over man* . The deification of man is in fact the perfection of human nature, in the divine logic of the Gospel, the fullness of human nature in grace, but also full communion with God. The theology of deification exists only in Orthodoxy. In Protestantism and Catholicism there is no testimony that has substance to the deification of man.

Sight (knowledge) and divine power. The sight and power that God has are also given to those who are close to Him, for participation in those of the world, in the Spirit of Light. God sees and knows all things and imparts knowledge and sight to man as well. *The knowledge in grace* given to the saints is in all dimensions that God considers useful to man. They are *gifts, charisms or works of grace, of sight (knowledge)* commonly found in many saints, works that have a lot of meaning for people, such as the knowledge of things that were before in time (the gift of foresight), the knowledge of those that will be in time (prophecy), knowing the spirit of a man (spiritual knowledge of man), knowing thoughts (seeing thoughts), but also others. What happens in this case is that through the light, those who have these gifts see what is useful and *help* those for whom they receive the sight in the light. These *are seen* in the light, in a revelation of grace, or in the consciousness or before the soul.

The grace of the Holy Spirit *does not speak* , but *discover to the conscience* and the soul about all that is useful. Grace is peace and works in man's conscience, clean, in peace, before the soul. All Scripture testifies to the *peace of grace* and the grace of revelation *in the consciousness or sight of the soul* , which are the main mechanisms of communion between soul and light.

Ascension for the acquisition of light. To reach full communion with the light, the sight and power of grace, the path that all those full of grace have traveled is that of the asceticism of Saint John the Baptist and of Christ, the asceticism accompanied by

prayer, love and humility, without from whom we cannot receive the light and gifts of the Holy Spirit. There is no other way to know the light than this, shown in two fundamental examples, in Christ and John the Baptist. In asceticism, man assumes another way of living, in the light, which has eternity, God, love and light as the main coordinates, not the survival and joy of the earth.

Eternity is the logic of light. In order to receive the spiritual gifts, the person must, first of all, be especially clean, because the person is in fullness next to the divine consciousness (if we can say so), the light in itself being nothing but God at work, the saints being permanently next to This. The acquisition of the gifts of grace, during the apostolic period, at baptism, was, as the Epistles testify, a strong testimony, necessary at that time to the whole world, to those who knew nothing about God, to the pagans, who needed this strong testimony of grace. The Protestant cult uses this temporary testimony and extends it wrongly and illegitimately as the implicit and unique way to acquire the gifts and totally disregards the way of asceticism, shown by Christ and John the Baptist, but also that of acquiring grace in the Church, through all the to the Church.

The special gifts for helping the community given by God are not the ones that we need to look at in particular (prophecy), because grace is a work of each of us, each is helped by grace, the work of grace for each of us is both above soul, mind, as well as over the body. Grace is a power to every man, which helps him; communion with grace must be kept by each of us.

Grace brings goodness, love, love into the soul, which are works that must be understood differently than what we call joy and merriment; because grace brings a different feeling of these, which are different, pure and full, compared to the ordinary state of joy and cheerfulness of man. Grace brings to the mind assembly, peace, the transcendence of salvation and helps it in its works, even if man does not see this at first. Grace brings peace and tranquility to the

soul, through which the mind also receives the tranquility to see all that is before it. Grace brings power to the body, energy helping the body and healing it.

Grace is seen and misunderstood only in his great works, helping the whole community (prophecy, miracles, Mysteries); his main work is with each individual believer, whom he helps in everything he does, even if he, at the beginning, does not work the grace as it should and does not see it, does not feel it, nor is he aware of it. The gifts of grace are those mentioned in the Gospel, which have the meaning of helping, healing, as, for example, the multiplication of loaves. There are other gifts of grace which, in fact, are more than that, being an exercise of the entire divine authority over both spirit and matter. Resurrection is an act by which the body is restored and the spirit is restored to the body. It is done by God's bestowal of this authority on man. Only God and those with consideration from Him have authority over the return of the spirit to the body, that is, the resurrection. There are no resurrections from the dead in Protestantism, nor in Catholicism (after separation, and those mentioned, far too rarely, are debatable).

Grace is an expression of man's communion with God and has meaning, it works only in the context of this communion which it concretizes under the conditions of theological truth. Christ shows the gift given to humanity and the elevation of the human being, and the state in which man must be with God. This is in fact the theology of the elevation of the human being, which is found purely in this discovery as inner illumination, as a gift, not in overflowing gifts, like Protestant theology. The theology of the elevation of human nature must identically be found in mysticism in this form. We find it in many saints: Venerable Paisius the Aghiorite, Venerable Joseph the Hesychast, Venerable Sava the Vapopedin, Saint Arsenius the Cappadocian, who also show this testimony in their lives in front of others, a discovery left by God as a discovery according to the Taboric model, present unitarily in

Orthodox mysticism , but not in Protestantism nor in Catholicism.

Saint Gregory the Sinait says in the *very useful Chapters in acrostic* : "Prayer is to beginners like a fire of joy, bursting from the heart; to the perfect, as a sweet-smelling working light. (...) Prayer is God, Who works all in all, because one is the work of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Who works all in Christ Jesus."¹⁶⁰

When the Holy Spirit is fully upon man, he experiences an overwhelming peace , which overwhelms all the senses, the peace of Christ and living in the fullness of the Holy Spirit. We have testimonies for this from Saint Arsenius the Great , but also from Saint Siluan the Athonite . In this state, grace is what Saint Seraphim of Sarov and Saint Sava Vatopedinu mention, that is, taboric inner light, like that which Christ revealed to His disciples. Protestantism and Catholicism lack this testimony of the perfection of grace and the inner, taboric discovery of light.

In the fullness of gifts, grace is like in the life of Saint Arsenius the Cappadocian , who had the fullness of all of them. This experience of the fullness of the gifts of Saint Arsenius the Cappadocian is not found in either Protestantism or Catholicism . In the life of Saint Arsenius, all the great miracles of Christ can be found, he being glorified by God in his life, by showing everyone around the light that was in the saint, his face shining with light during the service at which the bishops were also present, just as Christ shone on Tabor, the Saint truly following Christ, recapitulating the great power of the gifts and the Tabor revelation of light.

Saint Gregory Palamas says about the work of energy: (...) "only those can unite with the divine light and see it, who, purifying themselves by keeping the commandments and devoting their minds to pure and material prayer , will receive the supernatural

¹⁶⁰St. Gregory Sinait , *Very useful heads in acrostic* , in *Philokalia* , Vol. 7, Trans. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, p. 163.

power of of the divine vision » .«Through this grace the mind comes to enjoy the divine radiance, acquiring an angelic and divine form... This vision... is union and deification accomplished through the grace of God in a mysterious and hidden way»" ¹⁶¹.

Grace is an existential reality. Theology must emphasize its dimension of existential reality, of felt, conscious, conscious reality. This is difficult, because few work, few work Christian asceticism, and few reach this state of conscious feeling, of union with God—the right Christian asceticism, which brings this experience into reality. Interesting how all mysticism has a unitary testimony as a typology of felt work, and theology fails to fully grasp this information precisely because of its lack of experiential understanding. Hence the difficulty of doing theology outside of this conscious experience, of an unmistakable power, which is in itself another dimension of existence, another dimension for human nature, contained and described by this experience, which remains reserved for those who fulfill more much Christian asceticism. The apostle Paul is the one who begins the discussion about this experience, as a foundation of the Christian experience.

Those who construct the theology of light start from this way of looking at things, where they are in this state, and describe it both experientially and theologically as much as possible. In fact, this is the only way to do the theology of grace, only in this experience and by no means outside of it. That is why all theologies outside of experience stumble into an abstract concept, not being in experience, not understanding the existential reality called grace. Those who live this experience bring two types of information related to it. The first is of Scripture, and the second of

¹⁶¹ *The life and sufferings of the one among the saints of our Father Gregory Palamas, Archbishop of Thessalonica* , p. 67.

one's own experience, which shows all the valences of this experience. Experience brings the same information as Scripture. That is why the theology of light is a theology of an experience, of those who are in power in this way, and who come to comprehend it unitarily, as a presentation in their own theology. That is why the holy theologians of the light confess in unity all that all the saints see about the light and in the light.

Among the charisms brought by grace, we find the following testimony in the life of St. Joseph the Hesychast : "Nun Theodora was very spiritually "related" to Abbot Joseph. He himself writes in one of his epistles that he feels even her breath. While he was in the Holy Mountain and praying, suddenly the distance disappeared, because Grace knows no place and time, and he felt her near him, while she was in the world."¹⁶²

"I don't remember," he says, "how I started the vigil, but I know very well that I didn't get to say the Name of Christ a few times and my heart was filled with love for God. And this love increased so much that I could no longer continue the prayer, but marveled at its outpouring. I wanted to hug and kiss all the people and the whole building. At the same time I was thinking so humbly that I felt I was lower than all the construction. But the fullness and flame of my love was directed to Christ, Whom I felt to be present, but could not see Him, and fall at His most pure feet, and ask Him how He inflames hearts so much, and yet remains hidden and unknown? Then I had the inner conviction that this is the Grace of the Holy Spirit and this is the Kingdom of Heaven, which our Lord says is within us. "Let me stay like this, Lord, I said to myself, and I don't need anything else."¹⁶³

¹⁶² Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 101.

¹⁶³ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 210-212.

The state of the body in grace. Grace is also obtained through bodily asceticism; grace raises the soul above the body, subjecting the body to the soul, man living "in the spirit", although he is in the body, his whole reason being the soul, reducing the feeling and condition of the body, the soul being above the body, although he is in it, the body remaining a vessel and temple of soul and light . Orthodox mysticism is of the pure experience of grace, in which the body is pneumatized (sanctified) and completely submitted to the soul, and brought to peace, to tranquility. Protestant and Catholic mysticism brings innumerable experiences of manifestations of "grace" in the body, stigmata, body heats, hot hands, sweating, bodily ecstasies , and various other imaginings and sensations in the body, being a misleading direction of grace-in-the-body mysticism

¹⁶⁴

pious Joseph Hesychast testifies: "(...) He only said the Prayer [of Jesus] a few times, and immediately his mind was carried away in contemplation. (...) And bowing his head to his chest, he began to enjoy the sweetness that came from the prayer that had been given to him. Suddenly he was caught up in contemplation, being completely apart from himself... He was no longer surrounded by walls and rocks. And this was happening without his will, in an unspoken peace, in a light that poured forth abundantly, in a boundless breadth. No body. And only this thought in his mind: not to return to the body, but to remain there forever ."¹⁶⁵

Likewise, he testifies to the divine love brought and found in these experiences: "... And as I sat and prayed with my mind (...) My mind was enchanted by that voice and I began to go towards the place from where it was heard . As we advanced, we suddenly

¹⁶⁴ Similar experiences, in which "*stigmas, powers, paranormal manifestations, writing in several languages*" can be found , are also in other illegitimate experiences, such as that of the Romanian Eleonora Zugun , known as the "devil girl", which confirms how her powers came from the devil

¹⁶⁵ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 41.

saw a tall and wonderful palace, the magnificence of which overwhelmed the mind. At his gate stood the Mother of God holding the Sweetest Jesus in her arms like a Baby. Everything was snow-white and glittering. Approaching her, I bowed with much love. And she hugged me like a mother hugs her baby and said something to me. I can't forget the love she showed me, just like a real Mother. (...) Then I left there, after which I came to my senses. (...) Day and night this was my thought. Therefore, as I was completely enslaved that night by divine love, I went down to give thanks [to the Mother of God]. ¹⁶⁶Correct views, which leave the same feeling in the soul, of divine love.

The pious one confesses: "I was sitting here by my window, kneeling on the mat, saying the Prayer. Suddenly, as I kept my mind in the work of prayer, in which Divine Grace works with its divine illumination, the Light spread everywhere, and my mind began to expand and enlarge so much that everything became luminous and I could see how everything they became bright, and I could see the whole extent of this place, from Katunakia to the monasteries below, and even to Daphni . I could also see behind me; nothing was hidden or unknown to me. That light was not like that of the sun or like the artificial one, which is made by people, but it was a white, immaterial Light , which was not only external, like the natural one, which allows it to be seen by the physical eyes. That light is also in man and he feels it like his own breath. This becomes his food and breath, freeing him from his natural weight and transforming him so much that he does not know why he has body and weight or any limitation. (...) When the human mind is purified and enlightened, besides having its own light, it sees, without the addition of Grace, as the Fathers say. Then he also receives the illumination of divine Grace, so that it can remain forever in him. Then Grace enraptures the mind in contemplations and visions, as only it knows."¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁶ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 47.

¹⁶⁷ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 241.

In the life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul we find the work of grace, in the illumination brought to him. The life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul is a continuous testimony of the experience of taboric illumination, of a light that continuously descends, illuminates the Saint and raises him in a power and contemplation. Saint Sava testifies about the resurrection in grace: "The man of God was lying on the ground, wounded, as I said (...). An abundant outpouring of light descended from the sky. "What brilliance and what unspeakable sweetness was that light!", he himself would later say. First it enlightened and sweetened in an unspeakable manner the ruling mind. Then he healed all his senses and parts of his body one by one, so that not a trace of the wound remained. He clothed his body with a power superior to the first and raised him from the dead. This resurrection was so unusual and so full of glory, that by that brilliance beyond the realms he was given from now on arvuna future inheritances and of Grace."¹⁶⁸

Grace must be worked through the Church's settlements, through the sacraments, which are established for grace communion; but also through more prayer, in order to acquire its fullness (the perfect settlement of grace in man) and spiritual feeling. The foundation of grace is truth. Therefore, any prayer, if it is not in truth, has no legitimacy in grace and does not bring grace. Grace is obtained in the Church, in the Mysteries, through prayers, through the consecrated prayers, the Psalter, the prayer of the mind, all-night prayers, or given by God. There is no other way of grace than asceticism and effort (in the Church), but in truth and purity. In Protestantism, the supposed spiritual gifts are instantiated quickly in the lives of the faithful, without visible asceticism, they simply *appear and pour* into the one who works "miracles", without the ascetic

¹⁶⁸Saint Filothea Kokinos, *Viața Sfântului Sava Vatopedinul cel bubun for Christ*, Trans. Ștefan Nuțescu, Evangelismos Publishing House, Bucharest, 2010, p. 83.

effort fully found in the Orthodox experience, but also in his example Christ, who for many years prayed -at night, in long prayers, saying Himself that " *I sanctify myself for you* ", this being , in fact , the model and the only way of perfecting grace.

pious Joseph Hesychast testifies about the asceticism he did: "(...) he suffered harshly, because he had full knowledge of war. (...) He fasted very hard and kept vigil all night. Eat dry bread and drink a little water. When he reached the limit of his strength, Grace would strengthen him, and thus he continued his fearful struggle again." ¹⁶⁹"The abbot imposed on us a minimum limit of eight hours of vigil, of which six hours you had to pray alone. Beyond the limit of these eight hours each could choose, if he wished, to watch more or to sleep." ¹⁷⁰

The prayer was said: "At your vigil pray for eight hours, while we pray for ten or twelve hours.(...) Imagine what spiritual wealth these titans of the spirit have gained", Twelve hours of prayer every day!" ¹⁷¹"Saying the Prayer with our mouths all day, our soul felt such joy that it cannot be described. Many times so much Grace came from the prayer spoken with the mouth, that the one praying felt an unspeakable divine love, and the mind was rapt in contemplation." ¹⁷²"Thus the essence of our Abbot's teaching was persistence in prayer." ¹⁷³

Gifts and charisms are a functional, secondary aspect of the possession of grace. The main gift of grace is the communion with God and the sight of Him, which is transcendent and which is the only thing that really remains in eternity, other gifts being used during history, as the saints say (Saint Jacob Tsalikis).

¹⁶⁹ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 44.

¹⁷⁰ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 44.

¹⁷¹ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 225.

¹⁷² Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 268-269.

¹⁷³ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 274.

Man is different in grace. We are not talking about a man raised by grace , but about other powers of the soul , which transform the man so much, into an angelic purity and perfection, that he is a carnal angel (as the whole Church honors the saints), with a perfect mind, capable to carry the power and works of grace. But for this elevation and transformation of nature, man must have humility, experience and a great mastery, in order to be able to work and keep the light and not fall with the evil spirits, through pride, tempted by them.

The strengthening of nature by grace is so great, powerful, evident in all the works of grace given to man, that man lives in power and sight, in another paradigm of life, in the kingdom of light, of grace, of purity. Not only of the gifts, but of the helping light, even from here on earth; but few rise to this height of living in grace, and of the rich or perfect gift of grace. This paradigm shift of life, in the light, is the meaning of living on earth, the full entry into the light, from here, in the eternal and full communion with the Creator, as the saints testify to that garment of light and spiritual gifts.

"Unless one is baptized in water and in the Spirit, he will not be able to enter the Kingdom of God" (Jn. 3, 5) - Christ says that grace exists as an existential dimension from which man is broken, and which is acquired through the Spirit . If there is grace in man before the birth of the Spirit and of water, if there is another work of grace of calling, of drawing to this state, it is not assimilated to the state of grace. The grace of baptism is quite different from the call of God. And God separates these works and sets as a limit the grace of baptism, as an existential condition that man does not have implicitly. Otherwise the baptism would be void.

Grace is perfected, learned in helplessness. Because then it is easy to see what is the energy and what is the body. That's why vigils and fasts weaken the body , and the work of grace is easily seen, no

longer perceived as the body's own work or power. When you can no longer physically, and you shouldn't be able to, you can , but by grace, which raises you from weakness, by strength, but by another kind of strength, which is learned in weakness, as Christ said: " *my power is made perfect in weakness* ". This is the state in which divine power is learned, in helplessness, in which you can clearly distinguish between grace-light and body-matter.

venerable Joseph Hesychast says: "When Grace examines a man, it makes him a god, but when he departs from it, man is prone to receive any heresy, any deception, any error; it is ready even for hell. Everything rests on the Grace of God. But Grace also demands something from man in order to dwell in him. Ask for his good intention, his will and his struggle, With the help of Grace man becomes an Angel, but without his help he goes astray and becomes a demon." ¹⁷⁴"The abbot tried every kind of hardship, trying to learn how man can attract God's mercy. But not without order, perseverance and purpose... Throughout the year, the Abbot did several "forties", that is, he did not fast only during Great Lent, but also during other periods of the year. And when the fast was over, he also had a divine vision." ¹⁷⁵

The pious Paisie Aghiorit says: "The harshness of his need was sweetened by a fact unknown to the Abbot until then: the search for divine grace. "When my batteries were completely empty (powers were exhausted), the Abbot said, I experienced the following: one night, while I was praying standing, I felt something coming down from above and embracing me entirely. I felt joy, and my eyes had become like two fountains, from which tears flowed continuously. I was seeing and experiencing grace. Until then, I had felt

¹⁷⁴ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 48.

¹⁷⁵ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 112.

moved many times, but this was the first time such a thing had happened to me. This fact gave me such spiritual power that it strengthened and sustained me for almost ten years, until, at Sinai, I also experienced such higher states». ¹⁷⁶

"And because there is this lack, that's why various scams follow. For it is absolutely necessary that the Grace of God, after the poor beginner has tasted him well at first, should withdraw to temper him and make him a tried fighter for Christ. Without these temptations no one has reached perfection." ¹⁷⁷

We must learn to perfect the work of light , which is the true power of the soul. And power is not acquired all at once, through instantiation , as the Protestants propose, and it does not mean the miracle and the extraordinary protestant media grace , but the meaning is contemplation and personal perfection. Powerlessness is a path of light and perfection, which all the saints have followed in history, in order to understand the power of the body and that of light, and to transform man, from the carnal, into the fully enlightened, the body becoming a vessel of the soul and of light. Helplessness itself is a state of contemplation and learning of the power of grace, gradually assumed, as distinct from any physical power. There is neither in Protestantism nor in Catholicism this mystique of impotence for the right assumption of the power of grace.

Grace is judged by grace and in grace , by those who are experienced workers of it. *Light from Light, true God from true God* . Each experience is correctly identified within itself and not without . Those who have no grace continuity or tradition cannot find or correctly identify the way of grace, having no benchmark for it; hence the various proposals of new cults and confessions about illegitimate understandings of grace.

¹⁷⁶Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisie the Aghior* , p. 84.

¹⁷⁷ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 194.

Grace is a completely different paradigm of existence compared to what we are used to, therefore logic and reason have a limit in the experience of grace, they cannot fully encompass its work; from a point, only spiritual sight and feeling help to understand, through experience, this new dimension of human existence and the way to live in grace. That is why the mysticism of deception and the authentic revelation are accessible only to those who have seen and lived all this (ascetics and saints), they recognize the typologies of easy deception and all the mistakes into which man is drawn, for his fall, man being in constant struggle with the evil spirits, the experience of the spirits being clarified and easily explained by them.

Grace is fire that burns the conscience what was not perfected in cleanliness, bringing and giving a new way of life, angelic, in complete cleanliness. He cannot instantiate himself at once (as the Protestants believe), pour out upon anyone, at any time, because in full awareness the conscience cannot bear its own sight, that burning before the grace of the unclean conscience of the unworthy.

Grace is a conscious, felt, aware experience. Only Orthodox theology correctly articulates all these dimensions of a real, felt, logical, inner, progressive, communion, elevation, power, learned over time work, of a transformation of man into grace, through his entry into another paradigm of the way to live, in light, in grace. *The simple formulation of the argument of feeling grace* is of man's conscious inner possession of it and felt, in the fullness of the manifestations of Scripture, of the elevation of human nature and not merely declared.

Catholicism does not have a theology of assumed conscious, felt and aware grace, but has a theoretical theology of the presence of grace, found in the Sacraments, which is quite different from the conscious, assumed presence of energy, which shows that in Catholicism the presence is not known real of grace in man. This consequence is a disqualification of the Catholic theology of grace, which is not one of conscious, felt and aware grace, the only one

possible otherwise, not only of the sacraments , but also of real feeling and awareness by man. Protestant theology uses a theology of inferring grace from outward manifestations of the body and pseudomiracles , which is also not a theology of conscious, felt, and aware inward grace. Moreover, it is a grace pseudo -theology derived from and acquired from " spiritual communion" (Protestants) , which it considers grace in itself, Protestants not understanding all aspects of this dimension of deceptive communion.

The deification of man in grace. Much can be said about the deification of man in grace, but I think that showing more precisely in the Orthodox testimony how this is seen is more important than bringing a debate on the point. Deification is also a testimony that must be brought, at least in the Orthodox testimony. Since in the life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul it seemed to me that there is a fragment that shows this in several dimensions, I have added it below. Deification makes us sons of God, brings us into the fullness of grace, image, light, state of grace. The testimony below I think brings all these dimensions, that's why I used it as an example.

“As I said, the great man descended into the deep abyss held by the immaterial hands of his Guardian Angel. After placing his feet on the ground, he raised his hands and eyes to heaven, deepening in prayer.

How fearful are the mysteries of Christ! He remained thus for forty days, without food, without water, on his feet, without sitting down or sleeping. It resembled a statue carved from inanimate matter. (...)

« After that, he told us, it seemed to me that in some way I did not understand, I was kidnapped from the abyss and I climbed above the heavens. There I saw a light pouring out. But how can one describe the unspeakable brilliance of that light? It resembled an endless cloud that stretched out to completely cover that sky

above the heavens. She seemed to flood and illuminate everything with the magnificence of her unearthly brilliance.

At that moment I saw sweet Jesus standing above that endless light. What unspeakable peace and glory were there! The Lord was surrounded by thousands of thousands and myriads of myriads of angelic bands who served Him, as the great Prophet Daniel says. Then there poured out again from there, like a river, a fountain of endless light, much brighter than the first. Although those Angels were bright, yet this light that poured forth far surpassed them in brightness.

I never tired of looking at the sweet Jesus and that unspeakable radiance of light that emanated from Him. It was all sweetness, just as they say, all desire, all unspeakable beauty, immortality, joy, indescribable delight. That is why I was no longer satisfied, but on the contrary, my desire for Him increased and drew me incessantly to the things above, as someone said. How, then, could I have parted from that unspeakable glory, even if the discovery had been prolonged into the endless ages, and not only in these few days of our life, in which some Fathers, after occupying themselves with various carnal works and lived afterwards in a long state of prayer and fasting, did they succeed, in carnal spending, to acquire in a supernatural way the things above the common nature? I could see them. »

While Sava was in this state, a pillar of fire appeared and a stream of rays from that divine light fell upon him. Only then did he realize he was on the ground. Together with the light, the Angel came down to interpret his vision, just as the divine Gabriel did with Daniel. He stopped next to Sava, who was also full of light, nothing short of angelic radiance. Christ, how much glory and grace you give to man!

"Sava, my friend, much has your name been glorified among us", said the Angel. (...) On you "*the Spirit of God rests*", as on the

Apostles, Prophets and the other bearers of the Spirit. And you, according to the Psalmist, " *did not give sleep to your eyes and to your lashes, until you found a place for the Lord and your place for God*" , until you painted *the image* as it should, so that you could enjoy the beauty and of the worthiness from the beginning.

(...) All those who have deserved to enjoy like you the beauty and the first dignity, in the same way, according to Grace, I see the Lord.

Now you have already, as you should, endowed that beauty which human nature had lost, and you have acquired the wonderful adoption in a perfect way . Therefore, my friend, from now on you will be able to see the Sun of Righteousness unhindered and in the same way, you will be able to speak to Him as boldly as a son to his father, and whatever you desire will always be done for you. (...)

As I said, for forty days, Sava was constantly in this state. The enjoyment was insatiable, and the busyness beyond words. "I had become completely enlightened", he himself said later, "from the light that had descended together with that divine Angel. It seemed to me that I was not wearing a body, or rather I was wearing it, but it was very thin, bright, light, so that it could not in any way hinder the natural purity of the mind. Better to say, it seemed to me that both of them had changed, through the Grace of the good Spirit, Who supported them both, above all things in one, as I had been told. I could understand, in an inexplicable way , with great acuity my very self, that is, this natural beauty of mind and soul, which I am unable to describe in words .¹⁷⁸

What more can be said about the testimony of life in the Holy Spirit, about the Taboric inner illumination, described in Orthodoxy in unity with the Taboric testimony?

¹⁷⁸Saint Filothea Kokinos , *The Life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul the Fool for Christ* , pp. 131-135.

COMMUNION WITH THE OTHER WORLD, WITH GOD'S SAINTS

Communion with the other world is also an important element in validating and authenticating the experience of the Church. The discovery on Tabor of Moses and Elijah, who come from the other world and speak, enter into communion with Christ, recognize Him, together with everyone from the other world, but also in the light, Christ being legitimized by the other world, but also by the authority of the old law, by the founder Moses and the prophet Elijah, Orthodoxy has it and is found neither in Catholicism nor in Protestantism. The same communion and legitimation from the other world is continuous in Orthodoxy, where the saints and Christ come from the other world and guide the faithful here on earth, and show themselves with power before them.

Saint Nil the Caves-dweller is such an example, he helped the monks of Mount Athos for many years, being present next to them, although he had passed to the Lord for a long time; Saint David the Elder, likewise, guided Abbot Jacob Tsalikis all his life; there are many saints who continuously show themselves, guide believers and communities face to face, for many years, in an authority and experience similar to that of Tabor, communion with the other world legitimates the authentic experience of faith (and cannot be outside of this legitimation), shown and proven in Scripture, in Christ, with all power.

For a faith, cult, or denomination to have legitimacy, the rest of the world must be in communion, continuously, with this world throughout the history of the cult. This communion between the two worlds is continuously witnessed in Orthodoxy, throughout its history. This communion is the expression of the communion between heaven and earth, and there can be no faith apart from this testimony of communion. Grace and all of faith are at work within this communion, and not in isolated events to legitimize personal

claims. It is the authentic communion between heaven and earth that legitimizes, together with grace and the integral work in the Church, all faith and cannot exist outside of this framework.

The Protestant exclusion of communion with the saints in heaven and of working together with them is a rupture between heaven and earth, a communion that is neither known nor accepted and has no body in Protestantism. Neither Catholics nor Protestants have this testimony of taboric communion , and Protestants do not even assume or know the existence of this world of light with which communion is obligatory, being outside the evangelical taboric experience . Without this communion , both God and the other world are missing from the act of speaking, and grace remains only a simple rhetoric of a work in the world and by no means a foundation for communion between heaven and earth.

Christianity must properly articulate the experience of demonic deception in cults. The devil is also in Christianity hidden in cults, but where? Unfortunately, all of Christianity knows it . In the confessions, however, he hides behind the name of Christ, changing the foundation of faith, knowing that it is not the name that saves you, nor the conviction, but all that must be done correctly behind the name. Spirits hide behind the name of Christ, throughout Protestantism , which brings division and rupture in Christianity. The Protestant testimony of " life in the spirit " is itself rhetoric on the text of Scripture , and there is nothing virtuous about it.

"Another time, again, I felt [the disciple of Abbot Joseph, father Haralambie] the presence of God, and the way in which it was done cannot be described in words. I was overcome by an unspeakable love and a spiritual state that I could not bear, so I collapsed to the ground. (...) Then, after it subsided (n.t. that feeling of Grace), for almost three hours the Prayer was said by itself and sweet tears flowed abundantly."¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁹ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 367.

pious Joseph Hesychast says: "And as he sat there, weeping and berating himself, suddenly his cell was filled with light. The roof opened and a young man with wings descended. He was the Angel of the Lord. "I could barely look at him, says the Abbot, because his face was like lightning! He reached into his breast and took out a beautiful, round, shining box, full of the Light of the other world. He carefully opened the box and, beckoning me to come closer, took a particle of the Bread of Life from inside with a spoon. Being under the influence of this divine appearance and Grace, I understood, without wanting to and without thinking, what was happening - because in those moments man naturally stops thinking and feeling - (...) Later testified: *"I felt so much joy and happiness then, that I can say that I have never tasted that Grace before. For a week I no longer felt the need for food or water. All work of my flesh had ceased*

.¹⁸⁰

"(...) one evening, while I was doing the Heart Prayer with inhalation and exhalation, something amazing happened to me. I experienced a state of prayer that I cannot describe in words. Suddenly my mind entered the heart and then mind, heart and prayer became one. I no longer felt where I was. Only the Prayer was said in the heart and I felt a lot of sweetness and an unspeakable happiness. I don't know how long that state lasted. (...) From this state of Grace, the Abbot told me, the rapture of the mind begins, that is, the mind is raptured in contemplation. (...) During this divine state, space and time are annulled, and the world and the whole creature "goes out". It even stops biological functions such as sleep, hunger or thirst. (...) Sometimes I stayed even forty-eight hours without sleep, when I learned this divine prayer."¹⁸¹

The abbot gives a short spiritual epilogue in the last days of his life: "My son, I feel all Heaven inside me. Grace is very great!

¹⁸⁰ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 116.

¹⁸¹ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , pp. 367-369.

The prayer goes on for hours, and I don't see any passion that moves anymore. A true blessing from God! I feel no war, no thoughts, no inner turmoil. All these are not the joys of now, but the fruits of the labors of youth. Then they were accomplished, and now come the heavenly rewards."¹⁸²

¹⁸² Archim . Ephrem the Philothite , *My Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 410.

2. WORK PSEUDOGRACE IN UNORTHODOX CONFESSIONS

Without asceticism, Catholicism circumscribes the theology of grace to its own lack of information, of validating this experience, and forces this experience (rather lack of experience) to be only rational, purely theoretical. Catholicism proposes all kinds of theories starting from misunderstood terms and not from the existential realities covered by them. The point of proof of the invalidity of the Catholic and Protestant theses about grace is the lack of union of the theological proposal about grace with existential reality, there being no point of union between them.

The theology of grace is built in two identical, parallel, united dimensions, being one. The theoretical theology of grace from the information of the text is one direction. Phenomenological theology of grace, from experiential information is another direction. Phenomenological theology must identically bring the same theological information from the information of the text of Scripture. The text of Scripture is an encapsulation of an existential reality, an experience, not only repeatable, but archetypal of the Church. That is why this must be a ubiquitous information of the Church. Orthodox theology is constructed in both directions at the same time, each dimension bringing exactly the same theological information. And orthodox theology combines the phenomenological argument with the textual argument, using both, which are basically the same thesis. The thesis of Scripture is the translation of the thesis of existence in a primary form and not a mythicized sacred text, divorced from existential reality. Therefore, experience will always bring not just a recapitulation, but an identical informational confirmation of the text of Scripture.

The bodily manifestations of Protestantism are inconsistent with the meaning of grace and its testimony in the Gospel, grace

sustaining and giving strength to the body , and not causing dysfunctions of its body , loss of consciousness, fainting, uncontrolled exits, as Protestantism fully testifies about " manifestations in the body ". Also, grace strengthens the mind and raises it to another power, bringing clarity and lucidity, somehow a state of hyper-awareness and vision , and not loss of knowledge, as in Protestantism. Grace itself is energy and power that supports the body, soul, and mind, and does not cause blackouts, fainting, and the like.

Protestants use a wrong way of " finding grace " and God's presence . If you fainted or if you had a manifestation in the body, they conclude that " it was grace ", illogically wrong, creating the wrong pattern of logic: " if you faint it is grace ". Grace is not seen from the testimony of the body , but from the gathering of the mind and first at the level of the mind, which holds the human consciousness in it, and the soul is easier over the body, in grace. The mind gains strength and is gathered, enlightened, strengthened to enlightenment in grace. The gathering of the mind and the enlightenment of the mind is not a syllogism but an experience. This typology of the work of grace in the mind, in the conscience, is not professed by Protestants; they support what all those troubled by spirits continually testify , fainting, falls and other states of this type, dysfunctions of body and consciousness, this being in Orthodoxy the typology of those troubled by spirits.

The theological information from grace phenomenology is in several dimensions, being a clear theological information: grace is a felt, conscious experience with innumerable works, as in Scripture. Grace is inner camp light. A complete interior lighting. This is the main phenomenological information coming as the full experience of an existential reality. The Catholic thesis has none of this information. The Protestant thesis likewise has none of this information. And I don't use them in theology. The Catholic and Protestant theses remain only theories about grace, completely separated from an authentic phenomenology, from a typology of a

correct experience that brings the same theological information as that of Scripture - and in the fundamental points.

Tabor is recapitulated by each of us – Tabor is in us. This is the mystery of Christianity. Everyone has the Tabor in him, when the light is powerfully lit by the divine fire, by faith, by grace, by God. We are permanently with Christ on Tabor, as Peter asked and as Christ really gives each of us His light, the Tabor, when we are all worthy to go up with Christ and the Apostles on the Tabor of faith, where they are all those worthy of Christ.

Tabor is Christ's gift to humanity. In Tabor we also see ourselves in the light that Christ gives us. The great mystery of Tabor, felt by all who climb it with Christ, is seeing and receiving Tabor in them. Tabor becomes a personal experience, a gift brought to everyone by Christ, not just an evangelical Christian experience. God brings us all into His light, revealed to all on Tabor. The tabor, as the charic experience, the light and the state of man in the light - not as a state of bestowal with various external manifestations, but as an existential state in another human condition - is what is completely missing from Charic Catholic and Protestant theology. They have no point of connection with existential reality, remaining only as haric theoretical theses, decoupled from an ambivalence of a theology, of the phenomenon with which it should be united.

Why does Catholic theology remain only one of the charic mystery, which is only theoretical and intangible? Because there really is no grace in Catholicism, there is no real experience of grace. Catholicism has no informational benchmark to validate this experience, which remains inaccessible to it, intangible as information. And this is a point by which the whole of Catholic theology is invalidated, unable to reach the existential reality of the Godhead. Because in Catholicism Christian asceticism is not understood, how it brings grace and what grace is in manifestation. Grace is the divinity attained by every man. Catholicism does not

touch this experience. Catholicism does not touch God, it does not reach God. It does not have a testimony of God. He does not experience God, but only has a theoretical theology of Him. And Protestantism has not the slightest idea of the genuine phenomenology of grace, as the experience of another world and another dimension, of the human being in this light. What Protestantism invokes in a few bodily manifestations is none of the genuine soulful manifestations of grace. Grace is a different phenomenology and a different experience than the Protestant one, which is eminently external, in the body. And Protestantism is left with a theory of grace, disconnected from an authentic existential reality.

The theology of grace is not built only through the text of Scripture, but is a dual theology, accompanied by a phenomenology with an information that must be identical to that of Scripture, with an experience and manifestation identical to that of Scripture. In the eventual phenomenology invoked by Catholicism and Protestantism, it is observed that the invoked manifestations are only external, bodily, natural manifestations that are not a work of inner illumination. And the various occasional manifestations of the pseudo-legitimate supernatural have nothing to do with genuine grace.

Christ shone in light before the disciples. This is the testimony inherited by the Church , in its entirety. And the testimonies of Saints Seraphim of Sarov , Venerable Paisius the Aghiorite, Venerable Joseph the Hesychast , Saint Arsenius the Cappadocian and all the Orthodox saints are the ones that show that *identity of the taboric experience in Orthodoxy* . The authentic testimony of grace is the testimony of the taboric experience . Tabor is recapitulated by every community that is close to God. Tabor is the essence of the Christian experience, and it is seen with great power in Orthodoxy. And the Mysteries and all the other communions remain a

personal camp , in which the same divine light is witnessed differently.

The lack of these testimonies in other communities is one that shows that they do not have the Tabor experience and that they legitimize themselves not through Christ, who is in Tabor, but through bodily manifestations. The Tabor testimony in the fullness of its understanding, as a view of the divine light, of Christ, of the inner light, of the presence of Christ, of the Spirit and of the Father, of man's entry into the light, of man's fulfillment of the divine word "*God is light* " and "*man is light through God*" is the authentic Orthodox testimony. Which is not present in Catholicism and Protestantism. The theology of light is actually what we need to see as the theology of grace, calling all that experience we touch upon when discussing grace as light. Catholicism and Protestantism have nothing of the theology of light, there being no trace of such theology, these cults not having and not being able to say the foundation of faith: *God is light and the cult confesses that it is light through the Creator, as a fundamental theological testimony*. We, as cults and testimony, cannot testify other than God testifies. And our historical testimony must say the same thing, only one thing, cry out with great power: *we are light and we testify to God's light!*

What Protestantism and Catholicism do not understand is that the theology of grace is also grounded in phenomenology. In God Himself, in the presence. God is light, it is an experience first. The theology of grace is a theology of presence, not of outward bodily manifestations. A theology of a communion that can be found and recapitulated by everyone at any time. And confessed. The theology of grace also comes from Tabor - Tabor itself is another theology of grace, discovered by Christ as a phenomenology received by everyone, which must be found and confessed in the Church. The theology of grace is in each of us and can be found authentically in anyone who has this experience. Of grace. And

each one testifies to himself the few fundamental information of this experience of inner camp light, of presence, continuous, felt, aware. The lack of this witness and the phenomenology present in theology cancels the Catholic and Protestant theses, as being only purely theoretical theologies. God is found in grace. Grace brings God. Catholicism and Protestantism fail to find God in experience, nor in theology, which should be one of presence and not of theory. Catholicism and Protestantism remain only with theoretical propositions about grace, with theories of grace, being broken by God.

There is a complete break between theory and phenomenology in Catholic and Protestant arguments. This is not only the weak point, but the nullifying point of the Charic, Catholic and Protestant theory. Researching the propositions about grace in Catholicism and various Protestant denominations I noticed that there is no connection to a phenomenology – theoretical theology is completely disconnected from phenomenological information. Comparatively, Orthodoxy has a discourse strongly focused on the testimony of great saints who testify to its light and experience, bringing from them information and identity between phenomenology, theology and Scripture. Catholicism today brings nothing from phenomenology. And the Protestantism that it brings (parallel to the Charic Catholic theology that does not use this information) is from an external phenomenology, which has nothing to do with the data of Scripture.

Orthodoxy brings a theology of grace as one of an existential reality continually recapitulated by worship and which continually recapitulates grace information. And the theologians of light, Gregory Palamas, Simeon the New Theologian and all the saints who testify to the light with power bring the same informational unitary testimony. Catholicism brings a theoretical Charismatic theology. Protestantism, too. And the break from existential reality, from God, and the lack of recapitulation and identification,

but also the impossibility of building this theology from the information coming from experience is one that cancels the Catholic and Protestant theses. The theological information coming from existential reality, from the recapitulation of Tabor, is omnipresent in Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy continually recapitulates this unitary experience with what the saints testify and which St. Gregory Palamas expresses in the theology of grace.

The gifts of grace are meant to help others, but also to elevate one's own humanity. The axiological meaning of grace is to lift man into another paradigm of life, not the wealth of miracles and the instantiation of gifts, which are for helping others and not for one's own person. Therefore, any *pseudograce*, totally oriented outside the being and without any trace of inner work, instantiated in "miracles" and the body, is not grace (as is the Catholic one, but also the Protestant one). *Within the soul is the meaning of grace*, the interior work being the main direction of the works of grace.

charic thesis is annulled by the wrong charic orientation of the Protestant testimony: the Protestant pseudo-grace is eminently an external one. Protestants cannot work and create grace by inward work, because there is nothing in the world that can approach the soul and unite with it but grace. Protestants declare the work of a scriptural grace, but they testify, and one sees in the testimony of worship *an outward pseudo-grace, without an inward work* - which does not exist in the testimony. In the innumerable Protestant books about the work of the spirit, it is not possible to find the form of a testimony of grace, with an inner work of perfection, nor the axiological meaning of grace, of lifting, completeness, helping man, seeing the divine light (witness absent in full), but only *the Protestant meaning of grace is found, legitimizing the Protestant experience, with external works*, which is in itself a completely different orientation of this accumulation of manifestations called grace by Protestants and forms a unitary testimony of Protestant pseudo-grace.

grace and inner work remain only the prerogative of those who truly work on them , of Orthodoxy . And others have *external pseudograce* , with manifestations outside the body, external, and through voices, being worked unitarily by them , and they will never be able to instantiate the real manifestations of grace, which will not be found either in history or in Protestant life (at like the Catholic one), but not in other religions either. Protestant and Catholic grace is a continuous experience, centered around the instantiation of miracles, for the justification of the presence of grace and not for the testimony of a personal communion, in grace, with God.

CATHOLICISM DOES NOT HAVE AN EXPERIENCE OF GRACE

Grace in Catholicism and Protestantism is not a theology of a state discovered in its full breadth and meaning. It is a theology of momentary, physical, external manifestations, not a state of soul, body, mind, and a discovery and communion with another world, with eternity, with God. Grace in Catholicism and Protestantism does not explain all its dimensions, being a purely material experience and of this world, carnal, an experience that does not have the power to lift man into communion.

Among the theses of a conscious experience is the Pauline one. The Pauline wonder before grace *is before the conscious experience of it* and not before dry rhetoric about an abstract concept. The apostle Paul did not work with rhetoric and speeches, but worked in a light, which was permanent in him and from which he saw the tithing of love, goodness and all that is in nature. The thesis of a conscious experience brings a piece of information that all who testify to the experience bring: God is personally present in grace, as presence. And the information is also found in the in-

trinsic reporting, as a work connected with the Being , in the Gospel.

The Reverend Paisie Aghiorit testifies to the lack of this experience of grace in Catholicism, spiritually seeing the lack of their mysteries: "The abbot also narrated the following incident: "Once a priest came to the hermitage. (...) This was a Catholic priest and as I found out later, his name was Boniface .(...)» Although he saw him with long hair, a beard and a shaven head, the Abbot was not deceived by them. Divine grace revealed within him that he who appeared to be a priest had no priesthood."¹⁸³

THE PROTESTANT PRESUMPTION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The Protestant presumption of the Holy Spirit is the assumption that Protestants continually use that the voices they hear, not *validated in any way* , are of the Holy Spirit and that all the work of Protestant spirits is of the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to validate this Protestant assumption, they created a theology of voices that they assume are the Holy Spirit (arguments for proving the identity of Protestant spirits are detailed below).

The Orthodox testimony fully validates the opposite, through a testimony that has completely different characteristics, which legitimizes it in a real way as being authentic, but also proves the Protestant one to be the opposite and illegitimate, the Protestant voices not being of the Holy Spirit, but of spirits the darkness Protestants themselves should begin to properly validate the spirits that speak to their community and compel them to worship the Trinity, God, confess their belief in the Trinity and be shown to them.

¹⁸³Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisius the Aghior* , pp. 170-171.

The alleged spirit (*spirits considered holy*) Protestant , unfortunately , is only a voice hidden somewhere, near the believers, that *speaks* , but does not show itself, not having in Protestant history.

The model of collaboration and the relationship in communion, cooperation and collaboration between the Orthodox saints with the Holy Spirit (orthodox) and the Protestant " prophet " pastors with the Protestant spirits are completely different : possession , dictation and enslavement of the pastor, in the case of the Protestant movement and the wayward consultative, in full freedom, in the case of the apostolic Holy Spirit, the Spirit leaves the freedom of choice, this being a constant of the man-God relationship in Orthodoxy .

Grace is an energy that is in man, in communion , and that must be actualized; the whole discussion of grace starts from its work in man , and not from the external instantiation of miracles (energy acquired and preserved through the truth of baptism). The theology of grace starts from the state of man in grace, and not from the outward manifestations of gifts , because, basically, man must be perfect in behavior and not " justify " the existence of a grace . Grace is peace: " *My peace I give unto you,*" says Christ. Anything outside of peace, quiet, gentleness, personal gathering is not grace. Protestants are outside this peace of mind dimension of grace.

The too great work of " gifts of grace" presented in Protestantism, without the personal component of progress in grace, shows that this component does not exist, it being unknown to them. The man in grace is, in Protestantism , the one who works the alleged gifts of grace , but also the voices of Protestant spirits. Protestants do not actually have grace , and all their rhetoric is to justify their own manifestations as grace. The practice of Protestant " *grace* " is , in fact , a sum of pseudomiracles , psychosomatic manifestations, listening to voices considered " *spirit* ". All this is disconnected from the real communion with the light, from the contemplation of the prayer of the heart, from the presence of the Trinity,

from all that is grace and in grace.

The practical Protestant level of grace has been artificially created from all kinds of outward manifestations, and the Holy Spirit has been replaced by other spirits, to whom Protestants obey, who do not have the Orthodox identity and legitimacy of the Holy Spirit. Certainly, there cannot be two holy spirits, because the Orthodox Holy Spirit is a different spirit than the Protestant spirit, in work, communication and communion .

Protestant practice is different from Protestant theology. Protestant practice does not confirm theology nor its principles, being disconnected from them, those existing for legitimization and not as practice and use. Orthodoxy is legitimized by the entire testimony of the Church's life , not only by prophecies and gifts, which are in the Church, but are alongside the entire historical experience of the Church.

Apart from Protestants, there is no community that legitimizes itself entirely by " prophecies and gifts ". Protestants remain the only ones who can and do fulfill Christ's word about the *prophets* who legitimize themselves in this way. The unity between the word of Christ and the Protestant experience is total, there being no other community, confession or Christian movement or other cult that can fulfill this word. Protestants only have the institution of so - called prophets and false gifts, there being no personal testimony of grace, therefore they are the only ones who fulfill the word of Christ, the only thing they can use to legitimize them is " *prophecies and gifts* " (specifically Protestants).

In Orthodoxy, the Holy Spirit works through clear revelations and through man's conscience. The grace of the Holy Spirit does not speak, it reveals to the conscience, it guides, it reveals to the mind and soul. Grace, in Orthodoxy, is peace and light, and the

work and testimony of the Apostle Paul are identical . The relationship between man and the Holy Spirit is one of working together and not of possession. All the Orthodox history of the joint work of man with the Holy Spirit is the same, scriptural , in which " *the appearance of the Holy Spirit and us* " is worked in a way in which the Holy Spirit shows the apostles and all those in the light all useful (saints and Christians), and they, in complete freedom , but using their own conscience and logic for each situation, participate and work , not being blind executors of the discoveries. Communion, contemplation, sight, perfect joy, great works of grace (prayer of the heart) are results of perfect communion. The Orthodox Holy Spirit continually brings the believer closer to Christ, through the prayer of the heart and through the Sacraments.

In Protestantism, there are *voices* that are called the Holy Spirit, voices that have their own personality, they speak to pastors and *prophets* , and they dictate, step by step, what to do, and they have different, denominational identities . They are somehow *controlled* by their spirit, which dictates everything to them step by step . The Protestant testimony is that their spirit is *unpredictable* (see the quotations in previous chapters for the Protestant testimony). For this testimony, I have added some passages for the behavior of the so - called Protestant spirit, known in Orthodoxy as a deceiving spirit (since the patristics of the Church) which Protestants have adopted as their holy spirit, which guides them in its entirety.

In the communion with the said Protestant holy spirit, there are no great testimonies of works of grace (prayer of the heart), of communion with God, contemplation, vision (as they are confessed in Orthodoxy), but there are unclear figures, everything being ambiguous. The Protestant spirit called holy does not bring the believer closer to Christ (*not bearing the name of Christ in the soul of the believer*) and does not consider this continuous communion with Christ Himself, through the prayer of the mind, as important.

In Catholicism, all of grace tries to be as in Orthodoxy , so is

the being of the Spirit, as far as the theological aspect is concerned. But we do not find communion and orthodox works in the Catholic saints, communion, contemplation, vision, the great gifts of communion not being present, finding another mysticism, of the so-called manifestations of grace in the body and of the so-called *visions*, which have a specific bizarre of deception, being easily recognized by Orthodox mysticism. At the level of the Catholic community, you do not find the specific charic witness of the sacraments, prayer, communion (of lifting up the believer and strongly confessed by him). Instead, in Catholicism, we find piety towards the Church, but also service towards others, which, however, do not replace and are not authentic testimony of grace. Mysticism in Catholicism does not have a testimony of grace, which should always be a strong one and not one that is hard to find.

Orthodox communion in grace is:

- Grace is a working energy, with a transcendent, but also temporal meaning of the work.
- The Holy Spirit is received at baptism. In Taine it updates.
- It is lost through great sins, far from communion.
- Grace is in man, and its main work is personal, on each one, of lifting in grace, in light, of preparation for the Kingdom of God, for eternity, with transcendent meaning.
- Grace helps man in all his works, being a power in itself of help and communion.
- Grace is a permanent joy of man's communion with God, the permanent witness of grace being in joy.

Protestant communion in grace:

- Grace is invoked as authority, and not as working energy,

- not knowing the being, the correct working body of the energy, the Protestants not having the experience of the energy and not knowing how to correctly articulate its experience.
- Grace is much invoked in the presence of *gifts and charisms*, and all Protestant work is oriented around the charisms, considered the main works of grace, in contrast to the Orthodox work of grace, centered around the perfection of man.
 - Grace is not confessed as joy, this testimony being rare, although it is the first thing that brings it to man.
 - Grace has no transcendent meaning, being used for "argument", for justifying the legitimacy of confessions.
 - grace has no associated ascetic process.
 - There are no great manifestations of grace (such as the prayer of the heart, its descent into the Mysteries). The main problem of Protestant grace is that it comes from the work of the so-called Protestant holy spirit, who appears and "speaks" to Protestants, which is totally contrary to the way the Holy Spirit works, who does not speak, but freely reveals to the conscience and uplifts the human being.
 - Protestant grace is not assimilated to an inner energy worked consciously, but only to external manifestations, not being a continuous presence in the believer.
 - In Protestantism, the being of the Holy Spirit is *the voice(s)*, and grace is the work that comes from these and all the works of spirits.

Catholic Communion in Grace:

- The theology of grace in Catholicism has different points than Orthodox theology.
- Catholicism asserts as a fundamental point of the charic thesis that it is an intangible experience.

- practical witness of grace in Catholicism does not exist, it being practically impossible to find in Catholic life testimonies from believers about the personal work of grace, which should be at the level of the whole community.
- The work of grace in Catholicism is only theologically focused and only around the Liturgy , not around its continuous updating by each believer, there being no (felt, conscious) personal practice of the work of grace by each believer in prayer.
- In Catholicism , there is no such testimony of grace at the level of the entire community, as it is in Orthodoxy , finding , instead , pseudomiracles , so - called visions, dreams, often accompanied by a bizarre content, specific to demonic deceptions.
- The Catholic community does not confess in its entirety the work of grace, as the Orthodox community does, in mysteries, communion, revelations from God .

The spirit(s) of the Protestant movement is a different spirit than the Spirit of the Orthodox Church, to the great pain of the Protestant faithful. Protestantism is illegitimate in itself , because it speaks of Christ , but without His person, because the Holy Spirit is not Christ, although communion is made through Him, and the Holy Spirit does not replace Christ, who must be real and present alongside community. Finding a spirit that they called holy, not knowing what it is and who it is or, better said, being found and attracted (as they also do , in turn , according to the same typology) by a spirit that they -enthroned as a saint, Protestants worship not God, but another spirit, whom they enthroned in God's place.

Theology is also the vision , and the theology of the work of the spirits, and it should be done by those who fully understand and see the spirits and their work, like the Apostle Paul, who says, seeing the " *struggle of the spirits* " and confirming it , that the body and matter are not the problem ours , but the spirits, spiritually seeing all

these, both the light and the spirits, in the fullness of their works . *Theology is also an expression of the Spirit or the spirits working in the community.* Because each community (Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox) has a distinct model of communion, each with certain spirits that work differently.

The testimonies of Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox communion are completely distinct , disjoint, having no common points between them neither in the presence of God, nor in the tabor light, nor in contemplation, nor in holiness, nor in the haric manifestations and historical testimonies. Although they bear the name of Christian testimonies, they are each in a completely different direction. The spirits of the community can also be seen from the testimony of the community.

THE PROTESTANT MODEL OF COMMUNION

Protestantism instituted a new type of communion, called Christian , with a specific level of practice, trying a justification in Christianity, which " works " with these powers, these gifts, but it has nothing to do with Christianity , because it works love and communion and not gifts. The communion instantiated by Protestantism with these " spirits " is based on completely different premises compared to the Orthodox one, it has other parameters, a different context, it unfolds in a completely different way, we can call it an anti- Orthodox mysticism , being completely at the opposite pole of the Orthodox one, existing other spirits, other practices, other manifestations, although Protestants want to use the same identification of " Christianity " , of name, of identity and for their communion.

Christianity is not just about prophecy, as Protestantism claims. Christianity means Christ. Christ is the main point of Christianity. Christianity does not mean communion with Protestant spirits. The Holy Spirit is the one who unites man with Christ, through his grace. The goal of Christianity is Christ, not gifts. Protestantism has not reached Christ, it only instantiates certain *gifts* , *miracles* , and Jesus remains somewhere in the text, in the speech, and that's it. Protestantism has a rhetoric of Jesus, but it does not have Jesus. Christ does not exist in Protestantism as a person and communion, but there is this level of spirits, of communion with spirits (which are real) that " give legitimacy " to Protestantism, in a special gravity, few understanding what these spirits are, their being, their work theirs, few looking as a whole at the " *fruits* " of the spirits and at the evolution of Protestantism in general. Communion with spirits has replaced communion with Christ , unfortunately, considering that these spirits are, in a way , Christ.

Protestantism is a work of spirits, of those professed by Protestantism. Unfortunately , these spirits are not the orthodox spirit

of light. The statement must be made to draw attention clearly to this phenomenon, because , in essence , it is about the life of an entire community being led by spirits in this way; these spirits dictate to the Protestant community what to do in every thing (see the references and examples of Protestant spirits dictating to the community in the chapter on Protestant testimony). The Orthodox casuistry of the mystic " *power of the devil* ", of " deception " , but also that of the power of God, and the whole millennial witness of the Church confirm this conclusion.

Those who believe that the phenomenon of " Protestant prophetism " is only in Protestantism are mistaken . This is a general phenomenon, a general casuistry in which, by working with spirits, " powers and discoveries " are obtained, being also found in other cults and confessions , but also in history (in idolatry, idols, oracles, magic). Unfortunately , the one who receives these powers also becomes their servant, forever, and has their share as well. Protestant prophetism is found in all their confessions, but also in other cults and religious manifestations , because , in fact , it does not need an identity. Black magic, white magic, witchcraft and all kinds of spirit calling practices are in the same phenomenology of " *invocations* " and communion, in one way or another, with these spirits and overnight powers that some seek and they receive , not knowing their origin.

Orthodoxy has a whole theology of negative communion with spirits, of deception, of all the phenomenology and casuistries connected with it. In Protestantism we find all this orthodox casuistry reproduced as an " authentic experience of the spirit " , something of particular gravity. In Catholicism we find part of the mystique of deception , by no means at the level of gravity in Protestantism, but still in a direction serious enough to produce a serious distortion of the work of Christianity and a deviation of it from communion with God.

Protestantism has neither the right experience nor the legitimate mysticism of grace. Nor does it have the mystique of deception, it only speaks, from time to time, of "guarding demons", these not appearing as temptation, as discovery, being only on paper, only as potential, never being seen, even if they are in the face of the faithful, in the shadow of the voices, receiving that aura of "the holiness of Protestant spirits".

Protestant spirits discover something about people, but not what is in their mind and consciousness, which are not accessible to them. That is why the Protestant prophets say "of men", but they do not say what is in men, the Protestant prophets can only guess a few things. *It is a work of discovery (by Protestant spirits) of those about men, incomplete*. Protestant spirits do not know all and everything and are forced to assume. But the Spirit of God sees and knows them all, pure, and those in man.

In Protestant mysticism, you don't find those of man, but you find the past, historical "about man", about his work. *The specificity of Protestant discoveries is that they are limited and partial, in a large limitation of partial and confused knowledge, especially of the past*. All Protestant spirits work in secret and none of them show themselves, they are constantly in the shadows, speaking to the community, but they never reveal themselves on the face and do not reveal their identity, always asking to be followed (typology also found in Catholic saints).

I have found no mention in either Protestantism or Catholicism *of the all-night prayers* that Christ taught us to do as a way of sanctification. Neither Protestantism nor Catholicism follows this path, it is not present in their mysticism. Instead, they are the foundation and foundation of communion and the acquisition of grace in Orthodoxy, according to the practical model of Christ.

Protestantism claims to acquire grace suddenly, suddenly, by immediate arrival, by overflow, without preparation, trying to copy the apostolic experiences of grace (given by God initially to the

Church , but having other manifestations compared to Protestant ones, which, however, do not replace the path of soul education, of asceticism in grace). When Protestant grace comes, it comes suddenly, without asceticism, without prayer, without request, without being like the grace of Christ, asked for in long nights of prayer. The pretended Protestant grace is not evangelical, nor like Christ's, nor does it follow the biblical path of educating the soul in grace, in continuous, Christlike, evangelical asceticism. Because it is not grace.

The facts show a total difference between the cultic experiences and, moreover, the fact that the Protestant experience is found in orthodox deception also shows the work of Protestantism. This is not a point of intercultural polemic , but a painful finding of a state of fact, of which Protestantism is not aware, being completely absorbed by the pseudo -appearance of legitimacy of the Protestant phenomenon, not having , instead , the legitimate, authentic experience of the phenomenon of grace, not understanding him and considering his practice as authentic. But the refusal of the Protestants to see the authentic experience is also to be condemned, since there is always the historical testimony of all the cults available to everyone .

The Protestant model of communion is actually proselytizing, fainting, prophecies, strange talks, but also countless *personal testimonies* of manifestations of Protestant *outpourings of grace*, and that's about it. And this has nothing to do with eternity , it is neither a model sustainable in eternity nor an eternal model of the work of grace on man. It is completely different from the Orthodox witness, centered around the glorification of God and the sacrifice, which is offered continuously, around prayers and communion , and in the Church , but also personally. Everything the Orthodox believer does is a preparation exactly for what will be, uncoupled from these, because those in eternity will not be different from those here, but they will be complete, as all Orthodox mysticism and all discoveries show us.

Protestant communion with God does not exist in fact, it has other spirits at its base, it is not sustainable and it is not a model of the future. The Kingdom of God cannot look like a Protestant meeting house, where everyone prophesies, faints, is " *possessed* " by the spirit , speaks " in tongues " (especially since in the Kingdom of God , we will all understand each other through His light) and various other manifestations take place.

Protestants uniformly testify to all kinds of *supposed manifestations of the Spirit* , in which they feel the *strong outpouring* of a spirit, in all kinds of manifestations that appear suddenly, often after baptism, which they consider descents of the Spirit, grace and manifestation of God. But in none of these written testimonies have I seen any Protestant question whether the spirit he received, the spirit which manifests itself so powerfully in him, is from God or something else. All Protestants use the same presumption that their spirits (because they are different and innumerable, they professing different Protestant truths) are the same as the Apostolic and Orthodox Holy Spirit. I would point out to them that their spirits ***profess different pseudo -truths (theologies)***. (the statements from the cult being, in fact, the truth of the spirit of the cult), which clearly qualifies them as lying, deceiving spirits, the Holy Spirit testifying unitarily, one truth.

The kingdom of God will be a joy in glorifying Him, a place where everyone, in his mind and in himself, sits together with the whole community and glorifies God, just as in the Orthodox Church, which shows in it the beauty of things to come, for so that everyone understands a little of the beauty and joy of those who will be, like the Orthodox Church. The Protestant community is not a sustainable model for the future, disqualifying itself from going this way in the future (the Church being the forerunner of a state of full communion, preparation for a communion and entrance into eternity, on the same model of communion present with God) .

Protestants do not really have a testimony of communion with God, which cannot be found historically, but only the specifically Protestant testimony of the "Protestant work of gifts," which is quite different from communion with God. In the Protestants you find only the Protestant gifts, and that's about it. By no means the whole testimony of the taboric light, which is to be found historically in the whole community, found entirely in Orthodoxy. Protestants do not have the historical testimony of the taboric light, but only the testimony of the "Protestant work of the outward Protestant gifts", which completely opposes the historical orthodox testimony of the taboric light to the supposed Protestant gifts in the body.

Protestant spirits *do not support and do not testify to a theological identity, but they testify and support a way, the Protestant one*, but also everything related to it. It is an observation of substance, which shows that the Protestant spirits are not concerned with the identity of the community, with the truth as a whole, with the unitary historical assumption of truth as identity - with a truth in unity and historical identity. But they are concerned with keeping a path different from the Orthodox one, but also from the Catholic one. The Protestant way has only one property, that it is neither Orthodox nor Catholic, it does not have an identity in itself, being a sum of statements different from the Orthodox and Catholic ones. This clearly shows the Protestant community's positioning in communion, but also the unimportance of theological identity, which Protestant "*spirits*" do not assume. Protestant spirits are spirits of an antithetical theological path.

Protestant spirits are not interested in the true and unique identity of those about God, they are not interested in assuming a clear, unique, unitary identity, they are not interested in communion in a single identity (be it Protestant). Protestant spirits enter the supposed communion with God (with them, in fact) only on one criterion, that of the name of Christ, but also on the criterion of

assuming the opposite of Orthodox and Catholic identity. Now, this is precisely the point where the *inconsistency of Protestant spirits* with the testimony of Scripture is seen; Protestant spirits are not interested in identity-based communion, and the apostolic Holy Spirit clearly and unequivocally brings truth-based identity and communion as the foundation of communion as seen in Scripture.

Protestant spirits hide behind the name of Christ, which they use everywhere, but they completely distort the essence of communion, identity, truth, replacing them with their own "truth"; thus, it eliminates the real communion with God, replacing it with another communion, protestant, with other spirits. This is a subtle but substantial theological aspect, in which the *identity of the Protestant spirits is clearly seen in the fact* that they refuse to assume a unitary but also historical identity of God, completely excluding themselves by this from any possibility of being considered the Holy Spirit.

Spirits that do not glorify God are not only not of God, but are against Him, only the spirits of darkness do so, and prove themselves to be dark spirits, by this testimony required by the Apostle John as binding on spirits, and not for believers, of the confession and glorification of God in the Trinity. There is no such testimony of the glorification of God by the Protestant voices, nor by the Catholic voices, a total lack of testimony, historical, a matter of great gravity to the whole cult, which has not noticed that these voices are not from God, in the entirety of their historical testimony.

If you look in the historical Catholic and Protestant testimonies (saints, communion) you will see that there are voices that dictate to the faithful, step by step, what to do and praise them for obeying them, but they do not glorify God; the testimony is historical, unitary for both Protestants and Catholics, i.e. a common point of fall for both communities, which cannot be disputed. *Protestant spirits and voices do not even pronounce God's name.*

Glorifying God is the most important statement that spirits can and must make , and it clearly shows their identity. This is what the Apostle John says when he talks about " spirits that testify about Christ ". Analyzing the content (in time) of the messages of the " voices " , it is not glorifying God , but it is " following the commands of the voices " , which do not speak about God , but only urge to be followed. The content of the messages of the voices (found in the Protestant and Catholic testimonies) is not theological , but only functional, the voices refraining from the theology (of truth) and the confession of God and do not testify to the theology of the cult.

of Protestant voices can be easily done , from which it is clearly seen that they are totally illegitimate, with a masked, deceptive identity, they attract and urge Protestants to follow them, but they do not discover God. Any discovery from *Protestant voices* is to be followed , and not to discover God.

The unified content of the messages of the *voices* (Protestant and Catholic) clearly shows us what they want, what they are after, but also their masked identity. Protestant voices do not pronounce the name of God, and one can find countless common features for this Protestant dialogue with voices, historically; these voices continually say " *come after us and follow us* " , meaning exactly what Christ said to beware of , " do not follow them , for they will seek to follow you " , according to those who listen to these voices , that is, after the Protestants. Protestant voices cannot tell the truth about God , but the only thing they will do is to " attract " , through various " appearances of good " ; but Christ plainly says " go ye not after them , " after those who say " Christ is here , " just as the Protestants do, listening to these voices.

When you have so many Protestant testimonies you can easily draw a pertinent, reasoned, but also correct conclusion based on them: the Protestant voices are of the spirits of darkness, who use all kinds of facades to fish out the Protestant believers. It is the only pertinent conclusion that can be drawn from the entire historical

Protestant testimony of voices.

Protestants have not historically verified the content of the speech, the message of these " *voices* ", nor the meaning of their speech. A cetera is the first and most important point to check in spirit mysticism and faith: *whose spirit do you worship and whose spirit do you serve* . Protestant spirits do not speak about God, about theology, but they always speak about the *result* , to be listened to and followed in their way, and all believers to be brought to the way of these spirits. Christ says " do not follow them " , knowing clearly that *they* (those whom Christ speaks of) are , in fact , following other spirits , and not God.

Orthodox mysticism , spirits show themselves and glorify God, guide people in trouble and help them, to their face. God Himself reveals himself tabernaculally . In Protestants and Catholics , spirits come and whisper to believers, not showing themselves, not saying who they are (the voices) , asking to be followed. This finding is frightening, but real, and found in both Protestant and Catholic testimonies. In all Protestant and Catholic testimonies (discoveries, "saints") the spirits and voices do not say who they are or show their identity in any way, the identity of the Protestant and Catholic voices being wrongly assumed and implied by the faithful, but not stated nor proved by the spirits who continually call the faithful after them.

never assume an identity when they speak and do not say what spirits they are, and all they ask is to be followed, but they do not ask for the glory of the living God. They always hide their identity, do not declare it, constantly whispering to the Protestant faithful " follow me " . But Christ says " do not go after them " , after those who listen to voices and believe everything they receive from these voices without identity. Protestant and Catholic spirits are spirits without identity, who do not support their identity by glorifying God (as the Apostle John asks), by fully revealing what is about them - because they are spirits of evil, which cannot take off

their mask of lies to be seen in their reality. Protestants listen to Protestant voices , and Protestant mysticism is the mysticism of voices , and not of the Taboric view in the light of God, like the Orthodox one . This thing is immediately verified, comparing the Protestant historical testimony with the Orthodox one, the Protestant one, of the voices, with the Orthodox one, of the Taboric discovery of God.

In eternity , the main work is the glorification of God and communion , and what we do now in the Church is to practice communion, as we do in the Orthodox Church. The Kingdom of Heaven is by no means a total paradigm shift of life, it is , in a way , a fullness of what was worked here. Protestants do not know and are not interested in " what is after", they are only excited " that they are saved", not having and not knowing what the Kingdom of God, revealed in the whole Orthodox mysticism, looks like and is like.

THE CLARITY BROUGHT BY THE HOLY SPIRIT CANNOT BE FOUND IN THE THEOLOGY AND PROPHECIES OF ANY OTHER DENOMINATION

*Why is the precision and accuracy of light (discovery , knowledge, understanding) lacking in Protestantism? Protestantism is an example of disorganization of theological information and theological diffraction. **Only the (true) light has precision and accuracy, knowing exactly and precisely what is happening and when (example in this sense being the biblical number 666, discovered two thousand years before), but above all because only He knows God's will and His servants, and evil spirits have no access to it.***

Lacking precision and accuracy in teaching and prophecy—clarity in guidance—Protestantism shows itself to be entirely outside the experience of God. As, moreover, absolutely all aspects of the life of the

Protestant movement, all being left under the sign of relativism , being open points, by no means clear, precise, constantly evolving, continuously modified and disputed even by Protestants. The Holy Spirit must be linked to a certain property of theological information, a property that must be visible. Of clarity, correctness and precision. In unity, in time, in history. Truth is also clarity of information, in all its dimensions.

The unfulfilled Protestant prophecies throughout time are another proof of a few things, listed below. A prophecy that does not come true clearly shows that the one who prophesied is a false prophet and it was not the grace of God that revealed the prophecy to him. Protestantism has a rich experience of unfulfilled prophecies, which have as their conclusion the real lack of light that correctly and accurately knows future things.

Prophecies have always had, in Scripture , as content tangible human deeds in history. Protestant prophecies , after many failures and attempts, began to contain the abstract and esoteric " coming of Christ in spirit ", already operating in another dimension , not in that of existential reality, an example being the advent prophecies of Hellen White. There are countless unfulfilled prophecies throughout Protestantism that disqualify Protestantism altogether in its desired prophetic side in time. In fact, Protestantism does not have a single fulfilled prophecy in the entire history of the movement.

The books added to the bibliography on orthodox prophecies fulfilled throughout the history of the Church, in their entirety, are all in real history and do not need implausible explanations, such as Hellen White's about the historical coming in the spirit, on the clouds, of Christ. Moreover, Orthodox prophecies are made by each saint and for the whole Church; the fact that the Church continuously receives announcements from God about everything that is before it shows the care that God Himself takes to the Orthodox Church, in his light .

Unfortunately , we do not find such books in Protestantism and in Catholicism, which confirm this institution of prophets given and prophecies given to the Church, clearly and correctly, by God, as Protestants, as a whole, strongly affirm about prophets and prophecies protestant. The institution of the prophets, in Protestantism, could not articulate in 500 years even its own destiny as God's community. Now, if God was with them, with power, as the Protestants assert, would he not have known everything about them, as the Orthodox Church continually knows everything about her? Protestant prophets prophesy " *in the spirit* ," about what? All the prophets prophesy to the people about their life with God, for the help of the people, for wisdom , for rebuke, for benefit.

A concrete example of Orthodox prophecy is the one in which St. Seraphim of Sarov revealed to St. John of Kronstadt all the years of the beginning of the 20th century, with significance for Russia and , moreover, all those of the universal paneresis that is to come (this discovery can also be found online). But also many others , found in large numbers in the bibliography attached at the end of the book.

Protestant relativism, in all manifestations of the grace life , but also of the understanding of Scripture, and the presence of countless confessions exclude the precision and accuracy of the work of grace at all levels , especially at the level of the understanding of Scripture, never clearly and completely understood, but also at the level of every Protestant manifestation of of grace, all works in Protestantism can take any form , but never a clear, precise one. The clarity brought about by the guidance of the Spirit does not exist in Protestantism, nor in Catholicism. Protestant and Catholic grace is not personal, living, permanently present with the believer, in joy, presence, discoveries, like the Orthodox one. It is only of miracles and " gifts ", of those manifestations, " outpourings " considered grace, from which a grace is created , they not knowing what grace is.

Theological clarity is the seal of the Spirit. Spirit guides in clarity. In unity. In historical unit. In something that can be called the de facto informational status of the Church - a unity of the Church in its information. And clarity should be seen in many dimensions, in all dimensions of the argument. That's why highlighting the approach at the level of argument structure for each thesis is very important, quickly discovering how information is altered and how it is correctly taken up in arguments.

3. VALIDATING THE EXPERIENCE OF COMMUNION AND GRACE

There are some big points where the communion experience is really validated. First of all , in the pure confession of the work of grace. This must always be complete, confessed as a gathering of the mind, with prayer that works itself in the heart , taboric inner light. The mysteries are confessed as gathering, as wealth of grace, of healing light of the human being. And in the presence of the gifts of the Holy Spirit (in their proper form). Then, in the real communion, which is that in which Christ is seen pure, in the light, taboric . All those of the other world are pure, united in testimony, before the pure one, in the light, and the other world reveals itself fully to the one who is (in a way) also in the other world, being a carnal angel. Both testimonies are the foundation of the authenticity of the communion, which starts from them and builds on them, being *supernaturally legitimate* . And these are accompanied by the validation of the experience through the glorification of God and his camp view, but also through the correct research of the experience.

Illegitimate mysticism does not have these, but it has innumerable other external manifestations, bodily and pseudo -visions , pseudo-testimonies , the unreal experience of grace and communion, having nothing to do with them in itself, being *supernaturally illegitimate* .

All spiritual gifts stand in themselves according to this testimony of the elevation of human nature and are a useful work that grace gives to man. The clear witness of grace is that of the elevation of human nature and the pure encounter with God, which can only be fully articulated in authentic witness; the rest of the testimonies remain somewhere, in an area of confused, external testimonies , in legitimizing events, and have nothing to do with these clean testimonies. It is the full testimony of the elevation of human nature

and real authentic communion with the other world that gives legitimacy to the community's experience of communion. The Catholic experience of grace is constructed outside of these legitimate dimensions . It is legitimized by a certain way of asceticism, events called miracles, by supposed gifts, by voices, by pseudo -visions . The Catholic testimony is a totally external testimony of supposed Catholic grace. There is in no way a full testimony of the raising of human nature in grace, which should itself be the primary and fundamental testimony of communion.

In the books of Catholic saints (from the appended bibliography), nothing is found about such a thing, which is normal when there is no grace in reality. However, there are illegitimate supernatural elements, clearly misleading pseudo -visions , with a content that is not bizarre , but without meaning, without identity, without understanding where the supernatural comes from, without the pseudo -vision being in any way linked to God, being artificially linked to This through the misunderstanding of the supernatural in the vision. All Catholic views are entirely lacking in authenticity, on the same grounds as Protestant ones, being illegitimate. There is a complete lack of any trace of validation of the experience of spirits, in a major gravity and error, millennial, Catholic but also Protestant, in which the faithful received and accepted this experience in its entirety, without a minimum of verification of it. All these experiences, pseudo- proofs , pseudo -miracles are devoid of real validation, usually done at the time of their occurrence, or of a communion validation made somewhere in time. Nor is there any clean testimony of communion with heaven.

All Catholic testimonies are fabrications that you don't understand, they have no clarity, they are vague, ambiguous, you never know what was there, in total opposition to the Tabor discovery where Christ, Elijah and Moses were face to face with the apostles, just as, throughout Orthodox history, happens in similar discoveries (see the clarity of the discoveries of Venerables Paisius the Aghios

and Joseph the Hesychast). There are no such unitary testimonies in Catholicism, but they are fully present in Orthodoxy. The typology of discovery in Catholicism is vague, confusing, ambiguous, never knowing clearly what was there, vagueness that, in a millennial totality, was not validated in any way (as somehow legitimate) by other elements that were clear , purely discovered, there being no such thing neither in Catholicism nor in Protestantism. Catholicism and Protestantism prove not to be anchored in the nature of communion with heaven.

It is the full, face-to-face presence of God that gives legitimacy to communion, a powerful presence of divinity in all its dimensions. Those perfected in grace are face to face, taboric , with Christ God, as the Venerable Paisius testifies. The experience of the Holy Spirit, of deification, must be complete, confessed cleanly, as Saint Siluan testifies. The experience of discovering and seeing the Holy Trinity in pure discoveries must be as Saint Alexander of Svir testifies, pure, full. God reveals himself fully to all the saints, cleanly, naturally, in a clarity of revelations and a historical unity of them. There is no such clean testimony, the real sign of purity and perfection , neither in Catholicism nor in Protestantism. You can easily find this testimony in Orthodoxy in the Reverend Paisius the Aghios and Joseph the Hesychast , but also in all the mentioned great saints. This is the pure testimony to be found in communion. Of the face-to-face vision of God, full, historic, unitary, followed by innumerable gifts.

pious Joseph Hesychast testifies: "Once, after I woke up from my sleep, I washed myself and, standing up, I began to make the usual canon with the string of methane in front of the window facing the sea. After making enough strings, I suddenly saw three luminous persons coming towards me. The cell was filled with light and an unspeakable smell. My spiritual feeling convinced me that it was Christ accompanied by two Angels. Then I fell to the ground

and my soul embraced the feet of Christ. I felt such joy and gladness...a heavenly state that cannot be described.”¹⁸⁴

The lack of clarity in the testimony of the saints in Catholicism, but also the permanence of this typology and the legitimization through pseudo-experiences and not through full experiences of camp communion, show the entire illegitimacy of the Catholic harric testimony, over the millennia. The typology of the testimony is easily seen in the cultic testimonies, but attention must be paid to the clean identification of those in them, because we are dealing with clear, historical typologies, which cannot be hidden or covered by the less precise or embellished accounts of the writers church

The fact that you don't find the big, full, legitimate testimonies, neither in the Catholic nor in the Protestant one, but also the fact that they are legitimized by a dubious, illegitimate supernatural, constantly with the same characteristics (it tries to simulate the supernatural, but fails to raises to the height of the legitimate) shows the problem of the typology of the Catholic and Protestant supernatural. Cults fail to correctly testify to a legitimate supernatural and remain permanently at the level of the deceptive supernatural, with pseudo-visions and external testimonies, with legitimizing events (called miracles) and various other ecstasies and manifestations unrelated to the fullness of grace and they remain only in the doubt zone of the supernatural. Moreover, by the presence of many illegitimate elements, the testimonies of the cults are revealed to be deception and a constant typology of deception, wrong mysticism in the totality of the testimonies mentioned in both communities.

testimonies of the gifts from the saints (Catholic, Orthodox) must be validated after this primary legitimation, without which you cannot really validate the full legitimacy of the testimony and communion. Moreover, if elements of illegitimacy and deceptive

¹⁸⁴ Archim . Ephrem the Philothite, *my Abbot Joseph the Hesychast*, p. 172-173.

visions appear, coupled with a lack of full testimony, they are a clear indication of deception and misunderstood supernatural experience.

DEMONIC DECEPTION . THE MYSTICISM OF DEMONIC HALLUCINATIONS

God, but also dark spirits to a very small extent, "do" things that have power over matter and spirit. God has vision and power over all creation, but also authority over life. Dark spirits have a very small, limited vision and power, both over the spirit and the body, and only under certain conditions, being permitted, the evil spirits being deprived of light and unable to do much.

God's knowledge is permanent, historical, past and future, seeing everything and everything. And His power is the same, everywhere and over everything. And only He has the authority over life. The knowledge that evil spirits have comes from what they see, they know people and times and have great experience, by which they partly divine the future, knowing and seeing the will and work of God for every man. In matter, they can only act where there is distance from God, sin and where they are permitted.

Cheating. We must formulate and bring a definition of deception (falling by lying, in Christian mysticism). Deception has a clear purpose, the fall of the believer by maintaining an image of authenticity, it is an instantiation of a lie of the demons presented as truth, assumed by the believer, being in fact distorted truth. It comes dressed in a form with apparent legitimacy, but in which there are enough errors and mistakes in form that it renders the entire substance of the proposal as wrong.

Deception (the lie in its work by evil spirits) will always present itself as the truth, and will with great power simulate the truth,

being as far as possible a truth believed by all the inexperienced, but a distorted one, with an apparent form of legitimacy , but with a background of fall and destruction. It is aimed at those who have no experience and who receive miracles very easily, revelations, voices, angels appearing, believers easily believing them and not asking what spirits they are. Believers of other cults do not do an investigation, a validation of these spirits, as Orthodox mystics do with any spirit that claims to come from God. There is a mandatory requirement in Orthodoxy, *of research and validation of the spirits, who are asked and asked to confess their faith and worship God, but also to make the sign of the cross, this being known as a pure invocation of the Trinity, demons not being able to he does*

Orthodoxy constantly urges great attention to this phenomenon of deception, present in all religions, which is the foundation of countless religions: below), and for the visions which your soul has, which seem to be from God, but you do not know whether they are really from God or from demons, and for this reason your mind has great strife and doubt, thinking -let that vision not be from demons. to God and they were given to him for his good.”¹⁸⁵

Below we find some examples of demonic deception , but also of the works of demons, so that everyone can understand how the spirits work, but also the " knowledge and prophecies" that they bring.

JOÃO DE DEUS (called John of God or João Teixeira de Faria) – is a medium born in 1942, contemporary, healer from Brazil, who states that he is helped by 35 entities, spirits that enter his body, talk to him, " *heal* " and show him how to heal other people and what diseases others have. Among these " *entities* " he lists (to give authenticity and legitimacy to the phenomenon) the Catholic Saint Rita, Saint Ignatius of Loyola and other " *groups of angels and evolved*

¹⁸⁵ Anonymous Hesychast , *Spiritual View* , p. 161.

entities that help facilitate healing and guide those present in the room " (cf. infoinsider.ro).

Unfortunately , this is exactly the typology of working with evil spirits, which *possess* the one who *heals or prophesies without grace* , the medium confessing fatigue and exhaustion after the spirits *work* in him. With the help of these *spirits* he sees diseases, can cure them by operations, or the spirits *lift up* diseases. The medium has *the power* to see physically in the sick person's body where the disease is, from the spirits, and can operate with precision.

This typology, in which the possessed *hears things* from spirits, being more or less aware of them , is present everywhere, in the whole mysticism of deception. The deluded work with these spirits but do not realize their nature, being entirely convinced that they are good, having no reference point to which to compare with other experience. The mention of Catholic saints is made only to *legitimize the* prophet and the healer, who acquired, over time, an aura of a great saint in life.

This typology of the spirit that "*speaks* ", that "*is* ". *in* " the possessed or the one who by "*spirits* " sees and works is omnipresent throughout the demonic deception. We find exactly this typology everywhere where sorcerers, black magic, spirit conjurers and all kinds of spirit conjurers appear, gurus; in various cults that have "*powers* " (limited) and such prophets, gifted, endowed. Behind them you find , in fact , invocations of spirits, ready to "*help*" the ignorant. After they *receive their gift* , they create a debt to the spirits, which they will later demand.

Sorcerers and all who work in this limited way appear as *prophets , healers* , because they show others these *pseudo -gifts* of knowledge (limited), they know in the past those of man from evil spirits, they do not know the future (not having the light), but they guess, after the bad settlement of man, some things from his future ; they also have little power over matter , but also over the connections they themselves make to people, in body and soul, through

illnesses or unfulfillments that they can *raise* , *giving the impression of healings and solutions* to situations.

Between a pastor " prophet " and an illegitimate prophet there is no difference in the testimony of power (but only in theological testimony), they having the same " gifts " and " works", the same knowledge in the past, the same " powers ", *their limits being identical* , the healings, the testimony about sorcerers " *with spirits* " , who hear the " *spirit* " (called holy by Protestant pastors) being unitary in both cases.

An example of demonic deception is revealed to the faithful by the pious Joseph Hesychast . The pious is known for his ascetic experience, his spiritual vision, his struggle with evil spirits and the deceptions that come from them, he easily recognizes illegitimate experiences and reveals them to everyone, knowing the phenomenology:

, while he was at the monastery, some came and said to him:

– In Drama there is a nunnery that *prophesies and solves any problem*.

- I will go to see her, said the Abbot .

This nun used to *talk* with the Mother of God , who told her everything in advance, even the people who would come to her. And so it attracted a lot of people.

So the Abbot went to her and asked her:

– How did you receive this Grace ?

- It is from God, from the Holy Spirit.

– And do you know people's thoughts?

- Yes.

– I will put a thought in my heart and if you will know it, then it is good. If not, move .

The abbot put in his mind a blasphemy against the devil, because he realized that the devil was saying them to him.

- Now tell me what you think!

But she was silent. He could not speak.

- Speaks!

But she could not utter a word.

- If you will repent and *stop prophesying with the help of the devil* , I will mark you with the sign of the cross and you will be healed.

Then the nun made a sign that she received and the Abbot marked her with the sign of the cross. As soon as his mouth was untied, the Abbot said to him -:

- You are deceived, because you *have too much egoism and arrogance* . Remember your sins and stop doing what you have done so far . "186

As in this incident, you find in many cults so - called prop-hets (who actually work with demons) who claim to speak with the deities of the cult and receive revelations from them; in fact , their discoveries are received from demons.

About the works of demons we find many examples in the book " Demons and their works", where many incidents are presented that show us how demons " *help*" Christians to move away from God. Another incident added below is relevant to the typology of the devil's work, in which the *limits of the sorcerers' powers* and their work with the devil are seen. These are the limited knowledge, so - called help that I give to people, the consequences of the work of demons on people, the duties that the one who works with the devil does, but also the distance from God, from His grace, by receiving *the* devil's help. By driving away God's grace, but at the same time creating a great debt to the devil, people get *out* of trouble; you see many who, overnight, give up their vices, fornication, drinking,

¹⁸⁶Archimandrite Ephrem the Philotheite , *my Abbot Joseph the Hesychast* , p. 107.

through this kind of help. Personally, I have heard countless experiences like: " *I converted to confession... and overnight I gave up drinking and all sins* ", or " *I converted to confession... and overnight I felt a great power in me and since then I am no longer cold even in winter and I no longer get tired* ", so many, repeated in the same way, in which at the moment of entering a confession a great inner " power" appears or disappears in a blink all the vices or all the problems , just like in the case below. These types of "inner powers" are identically professed, in the same words, by sorcerers.

" *Wizard Virginia*

During the years of Leo the Wise (886-912), someone in Constantinople, disregarding the sanctity of the sacrament of marriage, began to live in debauchery and debauchery. His wife, a God-fearing woman, was melting with sadness. However, trying to bring her man back on the right path, she reached the *sorcerer Virginie* . When he visited him, there were many people around him. *Everyone received an answer to the problem they had and left* . When it was his turn, he sat down and began to reveal his pain:

– My husband indulged in sin. He roams all places of fornication and spends our fortune on actresses and harlots. I have come to you because I have learned that you have saved many. Help me if you can, and I will repay you as best I can.

- Don't worry at all, he answered. I will make him stop looking at another woman. I can give it even to the dead. I can also entrust it to an evil spirit. Choose, what do you want me to do with all this?

– I don't want anything, just for him to return to me as a good and faithful husband.

- That's why you can be sure! Now go home and prepare for me a candle, water, oil, torch, a girdle, and fire. I will visit you on

Wednesday.

The sorcerer, informed by the devil, who knows the past, showed her, before leaving, the sins she had committed in her youth, and thus entrusted her to his power. The woman left in fear, but with the hope that she would regain her husband's love. Wednesday, Virginie came to her house. He asked for oil and water. He put them in the candle. He took the torch, lit the candle and placed it in front of the icons. He did all of them with feigned piety. Finally he took the girdle, whispered something, made four knots and gave it to the woman to put on.

- Give me now, he said to him, a gold coin, so that I can distribute it to the poor for the salvation of your soul.

The woman gave it to him willingly and promised to give him other money if he would help her with her problem. Indeed, her then-husband ended the illicit affairs. He loved only his wife and took care of the needs of the house. But not much time passed and the woman began to be attacked by demons. The evil spirit demanded its reward, since she sought it first. He appeared to her in her sleep, sometimes as an old Arab, who called her to debauchery, sometimes as a black and shameless dog, who kissed her on the mouth. Restless, she wondered why these things were happening to her. How come you have such bad and disgusting dreams? How could the devil have such audacity towards her? Over time, the situation worsened. The unfortunate woman escaped one misfortune and fell into another. He dreamed that he was filled with shameless desires and that he ate frogs, snakes and other disgusting reptiles. She never slept peacefully. He never awoke without disturbance, fear, and disgust. (...) So, the poor woman visited Epiphanie (the disciple of the pious Andrei) and told him in detail the misfortune that had befallen her. That one went to the pious Andrei.

- Explain to me, Father, what did the candle and the belt with four knots mean? What happened to the water, the oil and the torch? And why did the devil use these means, and the sorcerer, to

possess this woman?

- Since you ask me, I will explain everything to you, answered the pious man. *The devil has a habit of first driving away the grace of God from men* , and then entering into them unimpeded. Divine grace does not depart because it is afraid of the devil, but because it is sick and disgusted by the stench of sin. The devil does not lead man to sin tyrannically. But it tempts him, plants evil desires and thoughts in him. If man obeys the satanic call and falls into sin, the devil acquires rights over him and divine grace is fled. That's what happened to this poor woman. (...) Thus , the sorcerer Virgine used the candle instead of the collimvitra , the water instead of the holy water of Baptism, the oil instead of the holy myrrh, the torch and the fire instead of the candles that burn in the hour of the Mystery. As for the man's knots, there the devil was " tied". And he ordered the woman to put it on to have the devil continuously wrapped around her middle (...).

- But how did the sorcerer know the sins he had committed in his youth ?

- Don't you know, replied the pious one, that demons follow all Christians (*and know all theirs*)? That is why they know their deeds and reveal them to their tools, sorcerers. (...) Finally, the pious man ordered him to destroy the things the sorcerer had used. And indeed, as soon as the four-knotted girdle burned and broke the candle, the woman was freed from the ¹⁸⁷*demonic possession* .

The question arises, why does the devil run to break believers from Orthodox baptism, into other baptisms, Protestant, Catholic, or of another kind? Not for the same reason as above, not to be "hindered" in the work? Why are Orthodox believers drawn into "other", "better" baptisms? Not to be cut off from the grace of God, banished by such sacrileges?

The easiest way in which the devil deceives Christians is with

¹⁸⁷*Demons and their works* , Egumenita Publishing House , 2007.

the name of Christ Himself, behind which anyone can put anything, as Protestantism does, so long as they do not put Christ Himself. The chief work of the devil is deception, to tear man from true communion. However, the greatest deception is to deceive Christians with the name of Christ: false prophets who say *Lord, Lord* express exactly this reality, in which the devil hides and deceives Christians with the name of Christ. Protestants are directed against Christians and not others, Christians being their first target. Hence the innumerable faces of Protestantism, none with the true face of Christ, each with a different face, it does not matter which, as long as it is not the true one .

This means the words of Christ: "*false prophets shall come* ," a few words that encompass *the theology of deception* . At some point in time , there will be many who will come and legitimize themselves with the prophets, invoking the authority of Christ; but behind them will be lies and the father of lies. Protestants fulfill all this statement, they appear in time and legitimize themselves with " prophecies and gifts of the spirit " , because their gifts are their legitimization (see the Protestant bibliography), and behind this phenomenon is the father of lies. If Christ Himself announced this, from the beginning of Christianity, being a universal announcement valid in the time and history of Christianity, made by God Himself, then the announced dimension of this phenomenon, for Christianity, must certainly be large and must we consider it. God Himself announced the devil's struggle and fall through deception and carelessness, drawing our attention to this.

Protestantism legitimizes itself exactly as in this phrase: through prophecies and gifts. Through the so - called work of the Holy Spirit, *but the Protestant one* , which has a Protestant specificity and is absolutely different in content from the Orthodox one, not being able to be likened or compared, having a different source, content, manifestation, history, results, having completely different purpose in the being of the Protestant and Orthodox communities.

Protestantism and Catholicism have no practice of the mysticism of deception in the experience of communities, and receive with great ease all that , through lack of experience, they do not see as deception. A matter of particular gravity, because a large part of the mysticism of the Orthodox Church is about fighting spirits and deception, and examples of deception and guarding are everywhere in the Church. But these are missing in Catholicism and Protestantism .

Protestantism has a mysticism of voices , spirits (*considered the Holy Spirit*) , and not of seeing light and contemplation, voices present and heard throughout the Protestant movement. Protestants and Catholics are torn by the omnipresence of the temptation of spirits, by the continuous struggle of man with the devil, the father of lies, who *runs like a roaring lion*, as the Apostle Paul said, to kill the souls of Christians. They do not have this continual struggle with temptation and continual falling into deception, they have only *miracles* , talk of the devil, but no experience of him at all. The mysticism of Catholicism, as well as the Protestant one, are very much of the flesh, of the sensations in the body, also due to the intense cultivation of imagination, autosuggestion and the emotional commemoration of events.

The problem of grace is not a purely theoretical one, on the text, but also one of the testimony of his work, of his instantiation in Christian communities, the only one that legitimizes the discourse about grace. Protestantism has only a theory created to give an appearance of legitimacy and theological character to a practice that can be called Orthodox anti -Christianity , in which everything that is in Orthodoxy is completely reversed. Protestant believers, unfortunately, see only the name of Christ, and do not care whether God or the devil (who does his best to give an appearance of God's presence) is behind Protestantism.

Protestantism is seen in its fruits , according to Christ's words:

" *by their fruits you will know them* ". Protestantism is itself a " complete novelty " in Christianity, in which everything that Orthodoxy has taught for two thousand years as wrong and demonic deception, Protestantism uses as the truth and mysticism of God. There being no points in common with Orthodoxy other than the text of Scripture, not even this being the same (Protestantism having specific confessional translations, substantially different from the Orthodox ones), Protestantism has someone else as its God than the Orthodox Christ and the Orthodox light, through the communion they have with other spirits.

Orthodoxy and Protestantism are two totally opposite approaches to Christianity, opposite in truth and practice. Orthodoxy , through its teaching , has complete unity in its entire historical context, and Protestantism is in continuous division. Many believers stop at Protestant Christian rhetoric , which they consider legitimate, although they do not understand that it is not covered by the person of Christ, which would give it authenticity, truthfulness. The Protestant Christ is completely different from the Orthodox one, who reveals himself in Orthodoxy in a completely different way, communicates differently, has a different testimony of light. The legitimacy of worship is not given by rhetoric, but by presence. This must be the genuine one, and not the demonic deception. Who ever conversed with an orthodox hermit, a worker of grace, full of grace and light, such as the hermit Proclus No one knows what the difference between testimony and knowledge of grace, work between his discoveries and the Protestant ones, which are completely different.

Protestant prophets are so widespread, but they do not know whose spirit they serve, being completely absorbed by the spirits that " *speak* " to them, failing to prophesy the future, but knowing the past, like the pythonic spirits of Scripture, who knew the past and only guessed the future, seeing the settlement of man.

Holy Spirit does not speak in hidden voices , as all Protestant

mystics report, in the Protestant mysticism of voices. From Him comes the divine work, energy, light that shows, discovers to the mind, consciousness, through sight , everything it needs to know. The Holy Spirit shows directly to the human conscience, the mind, through light, in what we call spiritual vision, discovery in the soul, this being another term, but also another work than the Protestant voices, grace being able to work in the human nature together with it, something that the spirits evil cannot do it. The speaking of the Holy Spirit in its meaning in Scripture is quite different from the voices found in Protestantism, it is quite another usual typology of work, but not of the hidden mystical voices, proposed by Protestantism as the de facto work through voices, of the so-called holy spirit of Protestantism. The way information enters man (*in body and soul*), in grace, is not auditory. Evil spirits can enter a person only by speaking and through the body (and not through the conscience), hence the integrality of the Protestant experience through voices , through the body and through deceptive dreams, similar to the Catholic one.

Every Protestant theologian enters Protestant " *mysticism* " , at the beginning of his career, into the Protestant experience of " spirits and voices", completely unprepared, without any trace of knowledge of the phenomenon of deception, which is insignificant, disregarded and marginal in Protestantism. And they all quickly come to gifts , prophecies, hearing *the voice of the spirit*, as seen in the previous testimonies.

" *The hair of the Holy Spirit and us* " means work through conscience and spiritual vision , and not through voices. Voice and hearing are a necessity of matter, used only by those who are only in matter. Conscience is the soul's, and in front of it , the Holy Spirit places all his. Protestant mysticism is in a totally wrong direction of the experience of the spirit , not even understanding the basic work, of discovery in consciousness , but assuming the voices . The apostolic work " *appeared to the Holy Spirit and to us* " is replaced by

the multitude of voices, in Protestantism. These seem legitimate, credible (*the devil posing as an angel of light and in truth itself*), that is why they are adopted with great ease by Protestants; but the voices are the spirits who create pseudo-truth, false righteousness and deception, who "help" anyone in Protestantism to do good, while the helper is out of true communion with the light, guaranteeing and certifying by miracles that this way of the voices is right, making good, but in a way without light, showing everyone the good and the prophecies, but not Christ, who remains "in the heart", but not in the presence.

If there are so many prophecies and miracles in Protestantism, the immediate question would be: where is Christ? Because, in the face of such overwhelming Protestant supposed evidence, we should have Christ right before us. And it is natural, this does not happen, and the Protestant experience of Christ is one of not His, and not of the person; what remains in Protestantism is the experience of the voices of the spirit, of Protestant spirits and not of Christ. Protestantism experiences voices, and not Christ. And the experience of the authentic Spirit is directly related to the experience of Christ. The Holy Spirit discovers Christ and the entire Trinity and does not discover Himself in isolation. In Protestantism, the experience of the (Protestant) spirit is severed and isolated from the experience of Christ, in a major discovery error, which proves the falseness of the Protestant discoveries, in which the Protestant spirit does not discover the Trinity.

Things must be clearly articulated: Protestantism is an untruth well placed behind the name of Christ, with a legitimizing rhetoric, but having, in its background and work, a new Christianity, of division, and a mysticism of voices. Each Protestant denomination has its own voices and its own mystique of voices. They are all bound by their own voices, among which, from time to time, a new voice appears, breaking a new confession, a Sola Scriptura voice, inspired, claimed to be God's. But, in fact, whose voice is it?

God does not only belong to the saints, in them we see not only the entire work of gifts , but also full communion with Him. Grace is seen in the testimony, the experience of the entire Christian community . The greatest deception in Christianity is when satan tries to take the image of Christ, many believing that he is Christ; in reality, behind His so-called declared face are other spirits. This is the testimony of a pretended authenticity which , in fact , works those of the lie, the believers being led and exhorted by the father of division and the lie. In Christianity, satan is hidden behind many denominations, the Protestants being completely convinced of the presence of Christ, being absorbed in a euphoria of Christ, the rhetoric of " *Jesus in your heart* " , forgetting the essential, to check if Christ is there , if it is genuine and no one else is using His name.

Protestantism, in its entirety, is an untruth pretending to be truth. The argument for this is one of logic , and not of interfaith polemics. In Protestantism , all denominations are different in teaching, in smaller or larger differences, but having a common fund of principles , but with different fund and form. Now, if all the confessions are different from each other, there being , in fact , only one truth, then all, except one, are in untruth. Considering how many denominations there are , it is very difficult to find the only possible denomination in truth. Protestantism is a collection of untruths presented as truth. No one has ever been able to find the official Protestant version of the truth, the conclusion being that it does not exist, and all confessions are untruths. There is no truth by rotation, in Protestantism, to be able to say that , in turn , each denomination is in the truth.

The truth of existence, of life and of the gospel, the state of truth of things is unique and cannot have multiple instances. Truth is not a partial state of things, it is a total sum of truths, it is an identity, and whatever is outside this state of truth is untruth and a lie, the Spirit of Truth enunciating this total way of assuming truth , and not partial. *The identity of the communion and the Church is by*

assuming the identity of the Truth, of God , assumed by the group of those united with Him , it is one and *there cannot be more instantiated identities of the Truth, in more Churches* . This is it *the logical argument of untruth in Protestantism*.

Demons show only hallucinations to man, because they do not see in time nor in space, as the sight of God is, therefore, the mysticism of hallucinations, demonic visions replaces the pure divine vision, although they try to copy it in illegitimate mysticism. While a saint sees all, from anywhere, from other countries, from other times, from the soul, pure, in fullness, demons cannot reveal these things to *sorcerers* and those possessed or deceived by spirits , but they can tell them all from past, I can *heal* , I can do many things which, for the ignorant, are true *miracles* , being in themselves supernatural, but not from God. The phenomenology of deception is difficult to see, with demons falsely hiding their stuff behind facades of Christian legitimacy, many Christians being inexperienced, not knowing how to recognize them, and very easily following and falling into other ways (bearing the name of Christ).

This is the real problem with unorthodox Christian denominations: they are only facades for deception, in which, easily, due to a pretended legitimacy, the demon takes the form of light (*he pretends to be an angel of light and impersonates - if we can say so - the Holy Spirit*) . It hides behind the name of Christ , but it changes the substance of communion with Christ so much that , although the form seems legitimate to the ignorant, the substance is totally different from the legitimate one, which would ensure communion with Christ.

Protestantism is a form without substance, because it is the substance that counts, and it has been extracted in time without the Protestants seeing it, having only the name of Christ, nothing else of the fulfillment of the law and communion with the True Spirit. All that is in Protestantism is a form that uses the name of Christ,

not having Christ, but something else (*someone else*) in His place, a serious form of turning against Christ Himself, because Protestants , in essence , do not have the Body and His blood, they have no priesthood, they have nothing of the Orthodox and Catholic background of these works.

Protestantism has in the entirety of its testimony, in discovery (visions, dreams, voices) a great limitation, a limit that falls into the illegitimate supernatural. And this limit shows the Protestant experience as illegitimate.

Unfortunately , Protestants don't cross themselves before " *talking to the spirit* " , the cross having its role of actually invoking God and driving away spirits. Protestant explanations related to the *cross* and not using it is completely outside its usefulness, for guarding and defending, for invoking God. That is why Protestantism abolished the cross, in all its use and symbolism, *the cross* being the invoker of God and his power, and the demons not bearing its presence. Why drive away spirits with the sign of the cross?

Protestants do not test the spirits before speaking with them, considering them all " angels of light, supposed to be the Holy Spirit " , having only the experience of the Holy Spirit in their entirety. Protestants take whatever they receive from any spirits as *revelation* , and use it as such .

In Orthodox asceticism, a large part of the lives of the saints is not the miracles, but this ongoing struggle with evil spirits, with deception, which is part of spiritual progress and which in Protestantism and Catholicism is missing. This lack shows that Protestants and Catholics receive everything that appears from spirits as a miracle and fully assume deception in the body of the community as revelation. This leads to the way the community works , where the undiscovered deception reaches the body of the community as a *revelation* , but it is something else entirely, and it leads the whole community down a completely wrong path. This in itself is the *meaning of deception, that by a single event, a whole group falls from communion*

with God, assuming it to be from God, but he is an illegitimate one.

Just like the real communion with God, in the Catholic and Protestant *deceptive revelations and visions* , there appear, from time to time, various discoveries with a bizarre content, which do not fit into the typology of revelations and visions , nor communion with God. Bearers of grace and those who have fought, in Orthodox patristics and asceticism, with demons , but also hermits, know them well, from experience, as demonic discoveries.

The pious Paisie the Aghiorite shows us how he encountered such a temptation, which comes to every believer when he prays: "I had not even had time to sit down on the chair to continue my Prayer, when suddenly my cell was filled with a strong light. Then the roof disappeared, and the light could be seen reaching up to the sky. At the top of the lamppost was *what looked like the face of a blond young man who looked like Christ* . Only half a face was visible , as well as a luminous inscription "Glory to God in the highest".(...) At that very moment I looked down to see where I was walking, wanting to change my position to see that face in its entirety, but at the same time I thought: "And who am I, unworthy, that I should see Christ?" Then in an instant that light and Christ-likeness disappeared, and the ceiling was in its place. (...) Starting from this incident, the Abbot said about the visions: « *This is how deception begins* . If the Lord had not helped me to realize that that vision was diabolical, the enemy would have started to show me the enemy(...)». That is why we *must not receive visions easily* , even if they are from God. And He rejoices in this, because in this way we show humility and consideration, things which He requires of us. God knows how to show us and teach us what He wants."¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁸Hieromonah Isaac, *Life of the Pious Paisie the Aghiorite* , p. 133.

CATHOLIC PIOUS MYSTICISM, AN EXAMPLE OF MISTAKEN MYSTICISM

In Catholicism we see countless examples of living that seeks to be pious, dedicated, in service, with an emphasis on service and mission. The problem is that neither mission nor service are the main features in the Christian life, but communion with God and the work of grace. And all should spring from communion with God, in His grace.

The humility of the heart, the feeling of love, come only after a little prayer, after the coming of grace; the tears and humility of the soul are the result of a little time spent in prayer, in grace, and they are seen quickly, they do not require external commemorations. The practice of frequent meditation, from Catholicism, on emotional events, to acquire humility of the soul is wrong, it does not cultivate the pure feeling through grace, as is normal. Catholicism uses, instead of the work of grace, excessive meditation at various significant moments in the life of Christ. This is not wrong in itself, but it can very easily lead to deception. But the serious thing is that it substitutes the work of grace, which should be the main work of the Christian. In grace are all, and the soul finds all, and humility of heart, and right feeling, and tears, and right meditation of Christ, given by grace itself.

Exaggerated Catholic meditation on Christian events has in itself a problem of mysticism - this goes against the purity of the mind, which must be guarded by the imagination, and not sensitized by external means which, exaggerated, by deception, can turn into a mystic of deception, as happens in Catholicism. All orthodox asceticism says that the mind must be free from imaginations, from meditations of any kind, the only meditation permitted being realism and the presence of death. Catholicism violates the mysticism of the One Church, which believers themselves should obey. The soul is not sensitized by imaginings and imagination, but by prayer,

in which it acquires pure sensibility. Grace quickly sensitizes the believer's heart.

Here is an observation of a French Catholic theologian on mystical phenomena in Catholicism: "Even nowadays a Catholic theologian, unconditional defender of the path chosen by Teresa, convinced that her mystical experiences are genuine, is forced to admit that at least some moments in her life it can be easily interpreted in terms other than those of the theological language. "Ecstatic emotions are sometimes accompanied by phenomena of levitation, catalepsy, loss of sensory capabilities, which at the level of the body reflect an offering of divine gifts transmitted to the soul. But these unusual phenomena can be life-threatening; usually they leave negative consequences on health, even if sometimes they can become beneficial. Some pathological manifestations can be added to them. Tereza often said that she felt a noise in her head. It is clear that you cannot become a mystic due to a neuropathy, although a genuine mystical experience can also coexist with some neuropathological conditions. »" ¹⁸⁹The Russian theologian Andrei Kuraev quotes from the Catholic theologian Renault S., who brings an internal confirmation of the illegitimacy of spiritual experiences and their misunderstanding in Catholicism. The theologian further adds: "The mystical and prayer experience of the East shows that the induction of prayer in another part of the body than in the heart is the result of a delusion. Catholic erotomania is connected, it seems, with an artificial excitement and inflammation of the lower part of the heart." ¹⁹⁰

The Russian Orthodox theologian, analyzing the differences between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, embarks on a detailed analysis of mysticism, exactly in the same direction as the present text, this being a fundamental one for a comparative discussion, which

¹⁸⁹Devil. Andrei Kuraev , *The Challenges of Ecumenism* , p. 130.

¹⁹⁰Devil. Andrei Kuraev , *The Challenges of Ecumenism* , p. 131.

cannot be absent from such a discussion related to grace and communion . It is fundamentally a genuine discussion of communion. The theologian concludes, after going through several experiences of this kind in detail, in order to highlight a typology of mysticism: "But could Catholics agree that those forms of spiritual neediness in the spirit of which whole generations of spiritual fathers were educated carry in they the danger of a delusion? *Union with contemporary Catholicism would become possible only after a critical evaluation of its past.* " ¹⁹¹And the critical discussion must highlight one very precise thing: the typologies of mysticism present in Christianity and the fitting of each experience into them. Both Catholicism and Protestantism bear relevant witness to a typology of deception.

Grace is a whole world, and God's enfolding of the whole world in Himself. Grace opens and is a gate to an existential state, in which God includes everyone in Himself. Neither Catholics nor Protestants being able to get there, he shows that:

- They do not reach the existential dimension of eternity.
- I don't know how to get there.
- They don't know how to articulate the other dimension of reality and dismiss it out of rhetoric.

About the wrong practice of meditation, about the deception from Catholicism as a result of it, deacon Andrei Kuraev says: "And in theology proper, and in mysticism, and in music, many things presented in the West as being of a spiritual and graceful order are appreciated in Emerged as emotional-affective manifestations, quintessentially human confections... Not only the stern Ignatie (Briancianinov) noticed the relative splendor in the peak manifestations of Western mysticism, but also the same Losev would write *about the obvious and principled deception of this experience (it is about the Catholic one)* . Theological textbooks and

¹⁹¹Devil. Andrei Kuraev , The *Challenges of Ecumenism* , p. 152.

monographs tend to compare the various religious paths by resorting to mechanical and second-hand criteria, by comparing dogmatic formulas. *A comparison between spiritual experiences* and the practice of prayer is almost never considered."¹⁹²

THEOLOGY AND FALSE MYSTICISM IN PROTESTANTISM

Between a pastor " prophet " and illegitimate mystical prophetism (sorcerers, oracles, others) there is no difference, they have the same " *gifts* ", the same knowledge of the past, powers , *their limits being identical* , the testimony of sorcerers *with spirits* , who hear " the spirit " (*called saint by Protestants*) being unitary in both cases. Unfortunately, Protestants do not understand the two powers, God and the limited work of spirits, having no serious theory, no casuistry of them and no mysticism of deception, this being mentioned theoretically , but not existing in practice through the specific casuistry, being in this case the instantiation of the testimony biblical (found over time in many cults , not only the Christian ones and not only the Protestant one) of *pythonic spirits* , a general religious phenomenon; we find so - called *prophets* in other religions as well, similar to Protestant ones, demonic prophetism being a transcult reality , also mentioned in Scripture.

Protestants threw themselves into all the mysticism of voices , spirits, and prophecies, coming from an equally wrong mysticism, that of Catholicism, which gave them no reference to the mysticism of deception, itself totally subject to the same phenomenon of deception and inexperienced. Protestantism is the fruit of Catholic inexperience on the subject. Catholics do not have a substantial mysticism and practice of deception, but they are still anchored in a millennium of (partial) dogma , which keeps unclean spirits away from throwing Catholicism into total collapse. Catholic deception, however , creates and underpins a false mystique of a carnal grace

¹⁹²Devil. Andrei Kuraev , *The Challenges of Ecumenism* , p. 119.

and distances believers from true communion with God. The meaning of the Catholic deception is to create a totally different mysticism and casuistry , of the miracle , the trupe, different from the historical one, and through this the believers can no longer see the grace , the light nor the work, and they can not restore the true communion with God, not working correctly in obedience to God and communion with Him.

Cheating always has a well-defined purpose and meaning. For Catholics it is separation from grace by creating this wrong mystique and breaking communion with the One Church. For Protestants it is the sensationalism of miracles and prophecies, surrogate manifestations of Protestant pseudo - grace , which replaced genuine and correct mysticism .

The way of creating Protestant and Catholic mysticism , but also their way of working, shows that they are each directed in a different direction, but both away from the light, from the same spirit, through people who take " discoveries and voices of spirits " as revelation. Each of these mystics has an identical typology of discoveries , which unitarily point the two cults in a clear direction, devoid of grace and the correct work of grace.

The evangelist Luke says "*many will come in my name saying that it is I and that the time has come, do not go after them* ". The only ones who came in time are the Protestants. There are no other Christians but them, *come* to the great pain of Christianity. Even if they look away and don't look around to see that there is no one else but them for this word, the word is about them. And Christ says ***don't go after them***. It is hard to receive this word when you have lived a lifetime in the wrong identity and position. But the wisdom is to understand your position and correct it, otherwise you remain in error. Apart from Protestants , there are no others who fulfill this word.

Related to the experience of Catholic holiness, in a large community , such as the Catholic one , we should find a much

richer testimony of holiness than the Orthodox one. A statistical analysis of canonizations, of the typology of canonization, of the moments of canonization would certainly bring light to the history of Catholic canonizations, compared to Orthodox ones. It would be useful to have such a comparative study, to see, with data, the typology of canonizations , but also the typology of motivations for canonization, being a comparative indicator, with data, of the differences between the canonizations of the Catholic and Orthodox communities .

There is a historical problem of holiness in the Catholic community . Holiness must be a constant phenomenon in history, with a permanent, rich and full confession. A testimony of communion with God. Catholic testimonies are far less than Orthodox ones , but also different. The few Catholic saints, after the Schism, all have different experiences that nullify their desired ascetic and mystical practice , something easily noticed by Orthodox mysticism; they all have this mark of doubt and deception or canonization based on service and piety.

It is impossible to make a comparative analysis, for the last two centuries, between the experience of Catholic and Orthodox holiness ; I have not found Catholic testimonies amenable to a comparison, because the reasons for Catholic canonization are oriented especially to social life, service, few miracles (natural events, in fact) and not to the perfection of grace and communion with God. This shows that the whole Catholic community fails to prove the witness of communion, as considerably does the smaller Orthodox community (see bibliography).

Orthodox mysticism can be articulated even only through the testimonies of the last centuries, which have the advantage of being current, explained perhaps more clearly, fully, with all the details necessary to understand this, in the continuation of the experience of the Church. Much of the mentioned Orthodox bibliog-

raphy is for the lives of Orthodox saints from the last centuries, precisely to show in full the actuality and the present, living testimony of the Church. I have not found anything similar in the Catholic experience. The Protestant testimony of holiness is completely missing, being replaced by the "outpourings of grace" and the mysticism of voices assumed by all Protestants.

The problem of Protestantism is not only in the countless theological differences, but at the root, in the spirit(s) that is the basis of Protestantism, which is different from that of Orthodoxy. The spirits of Protestantism keep the world busy with false theological problems, and they work unhindered, throwing out all sorts of theories that orthodox theology struggles with, Protestant believers not paying attention to their pattern of appearance. The real fight, as the Apostle Paul says, is against spirits, and not against theories. The problem with Protestantism is in the being of spirits, which are the basis of Protestantism, and not just in theology.

The articulation of the problem of spirits and their work needs to be formulated more clearly. Dark spirits, in communion and working with them, alter the human consciousness, disturb it and possess it, and man does not understand this. Or by sins, or by maintaining permanent contact with the spirits, with their works, with sorcery, with magic of any kind, with any kind of invocations. The same type of consciousness-altering happens when you read books where spirits have a major contribution or sorcery books or deal with anything else produced and inspired by spirits.

Entering such a context of the spirits of darkness strongly alters human consciousness and many end up no longer having a logical, rational process, being completely absorbed by obsessions, remaining with their mind stuck in them. Demonic possession also manifests itself at the level of consciousness. Communion with light is one way, and communion with spirits quite another, and each has a clear, opposite, real, distinct work.

Why do many get lost quickly and can no longer get out of

this Protestant context? For the reason mentioned above, because any approach to this type of spirits has the same fate, the fall of man. Engaging in the Protestant phenomenon quickly brings about the fall, through proximity to the spirits of darkness, which completely disturbs the human conscience; the man is no longer able to think, being completely disturbed and he no longer has the power to collect his mind by himself, ending up endlessly repeating everything he unconsciously receives from the spirits .

All the work of light and dark spirits is seen through the grace and energy of God, it is experimental, found in Orthodoxy, explained in many books, and is not a new theory that has appeared. Those who have the experience of grace clearly see the work of light, because grace is easily felt; and these all immediately feel the disturbances of the unclean spirits which greatly disturb the souls, the conscience, the mind, and the whole being. This is the orthodox testimony of the unseen feeling and work of spirits.

Coming close to unclean spirits, sorcerers, magic and other forms of invocation brings a great disturbance to man's consciousness. This is how sorcerers and magic work on people, by strongly disturbing the conscience, but also the soul, and all those who do not have the strength (grace) to face such things are immediately disturbed and fall before the works of demons, if they are far from the Church. In the Church, on the other hand, in any battle with demons, Christians receive help and revelation from God, they are supported in this battle step by step, in order to win and get out of it. That is why the holy mysteries and the closeness to the Church keep man in the light and stop this disturbance brought continuously by spirits to the soul and conscience.

Approaching anything unclean, possessed, or any place where spirits are at work is dangerous, because, without realizing it, he who approaches them enters the disturbance of evil spirits, who "fish" by disturbance, and not by light . For example, I tried to read books over time that contained all kinds of defamatory theories

about Christianity, with many anti-Christian assumptions, and I quickly got sick of it. The same happened to me in the case of some books that presented black magic and witchcraft and many other so-called Christian books, which I browsed to learn about those phenomena. I went to a so-called *prophet* to see the phenomenon for myself. The prophet " *talked* " in the garden with Christ every day. And he had many "discoveries".

Once it enters a person, this disorder hardly comes out. If man remains in this context, the disturbance remains permanently with him and in him, as Protestants testify about listening to inner voices. Those who stay close to the Church understand and see this. There are books and things that do not make sense to approach, and the Church teaches this, precisely in the spirit of guarding against this serious disturbance brought by any work of spirits . And the Orthodox Church has an explicit knowledge and theology of this. There is a commandment in the Church not to read or approach heretical books.

The work of the light, but also that of the spirits, cannot be understood only from the text, but are experimental, and the orthodox practice has explained them both correctly. Only he who sees the light with power knows what energy is and can explain it in its fullness; and likewise he who fully knows the work of spirits can fully explain it. In Orthodoxy there is this fullness of explanations. Unfortunately, it is completely lacking in Catholics and Protestants, the few mentions of deception and the work of demons being a few phrases found in books to remind them of the existence of demons, not in any way a clear, real, applied explanation, a casuistry and a real typology to explain the phenomena, they massively confuse the spirits with each other.

In their attempt to propose a mystique (deceptive, in fact), Protestants do all kinds of exercises, some of them more surprising. One of the proposed tests is to test "spirit-possessed" Christians only

by their confession of Jesus; and by this it is concluded that the spirits are of God. Unfortunately, even in the Gospel, the demons testify that Christ is the Son of God, therefore the test proposed by the Protestants is not valid, moreover, it is naive and inexperienced. Protestants do not understand that spirits say almost anything and do anything as long as they do not obey the Creator, worship Him and glorify Him, Protestants not seeing and not knowing spirits in their entire history. I have not found this valid test in any Protestant book, all of them have naivety about demons, theories about possible deception. Demons are powers and not everyone can fight them and talk about them, and their experience is a powerful one, as the Apostle Paul mentions. To talk so easily in theoretical advice strongly shows the lack of experience of this struggle.

*The only correct way to test the spirits is by glorifying and worshipping the Creator, which must be done loudly, powerfully, every time **by the spirits**. And believers must praise the Creator at all times and ask the spirits to do the same.* The correct test is the confession made by the spirits (and not by the believers, as the Protestants wrongly practice, violating the teaching of the Apostle John) that they obey God, the confession of the truth and an act of worship and glory to God. Here one sees the total lack of Protestant experience in mysticism, but also the total fall of Protestants into deception and embracing it as a genuine experience of "spirit." This test is well known and clear in Orthodox mysticism.

Knowing the truth and declaring it can be done by anyone, but assuming the truth is done only by those from God. The testimony of the Apostle John is exactly in this sense, of full acceptance of God: the Apostle John says that whoever does not accept Christ as Lord and God, he is not from God. The apostle John does not refer, in the text he said for the verification of spirits, only to the formal declaration of the spirits about the divinity of Christ, a declaration that does not entail the consequence that "the spirit is from God". Any spirit is from God only if it assumes God and through

testimony, confession, but also through life, glorifying Him and submitting to Him, and not just declaratively. This is the correct meaning of the Apostle John's words, because the simple confession of the truth, which anyone can do, is not an assumption and a communion in itself with God. Evil spirits know the theological truth and declare it, but they do not fulfill it and are not in communion with it; therefore the truth confessed outside of communion and submission is not "to be of God." This is the Apostle's intention for this confession and verification. The confession requested by the Apostle of the spirits is in all dimensions of the *confession*, that is, both declarative, and glorification of God, and submission to God, and full assumption of God. The apostle says, in fact, that "he who does not obey and confess Christ as Lord and God" has nothing to do with God.

This must be done with power and in front of the spirits and not the believers, as Orthodox theology and mysticism requires and does (see the example from the Orthodox testimony added in a previous chapter), and the spirits are obliged to testify and the belief in the Trinity, and to glorify the Trinity, but also to worship the Trinity, all of which are the correct dimensions of the "full confession" of God.

Protestant theology does not compel spirits to worship the Trinity, but wrongly infers that if man and not spirit confesses Christ as God, then "the spirit" (in man) that speaks is from God. This difference in the understanding of this passage, but also the historical testimony on its correct application shows the clear difference between Orthodoxy and Protestantism regarding the correct communion with the Holy Spirit and the Orthodox guarding against dark spirits, found as a temptation in Orthodoxy, but never observed in Protestantism (because the correct validation of the spirits is not found in any of their testimonies). After all, can't the spirits in Protestants confess themselves?

In all the Protestant books I have read I have not found a

single testimony where any Protestant has set any spirit to glorify God, worship Him, and profess faith in God, although spirits are omnipresent in Protestantism. In all the Orthodox books read, however, there is this triple verification against spirits, that correct validation that they are from God.

This is one of the failing points of the entire Protestant movement, the fact that it does not properly validate the experience of spirits, which it considers (whatever they are) to be from God. And this not on the basis of the testimony brought by the spirits (a testimony that does not exist in any book when the spirits appear, they only command, dictating to the Protestants what to do, and they immediately obey them), but on the basis of the testimony of the Protestants that "all the spirits that I speak of God, I am from God." And their testimony in the books shows that they have a rich experience of spirits appearing everywhere, speaking to the entire Protestant community. Protestant written history easily, clearly proves this argument of Protestants not properly validating spirits, of the omnipresence of spirits in Protestantism, but also of Protestant obedience to them. What's worse is that every Protestant dialogue with spirits never has this validation required by Christ Himself, Protestants easily converse with any spirit that speaks anything to them and all that remains of the validation is just the Protestant theory of validation of spirits....

Confession and acceptance of Christ are evidenced by glorifying God and worshiping, but also affirming faith in the Trinity, which the spirits must do. Otherwise, the alleged confession is not in itself the proof of faith, but only talk about God that any spirit can do, and it is not what the Apostle John teaches us and requires.

Protestants do not have the experience of spirits, but they are deeply caught up in their mysticism. They have no training for this, all they say is only theories and no experience acquired over time, of working and fighting with spirits, face to face, after which all the work of deceiving spirits can be seen. There is no deceiving

work of the devil in any Protestant book. There are only few theories and logical advice, conclusions about how to theoretically guard against demons, based on Scripture, disconnected from experience, only the theory of guarding, in a naivete of the Protestant theoretical fight against spirits. The Protestant books on the " *work of the Spirit* " are, in fact, textbooks on " *working with spirits* " and communion with them. (See the added bibliography for Protestant testimony.)

The being of the Holy Spirit testified by the Gospel is completely different from the being of Protestant (considered holy) spirits. All Protestantism does not work with the Holy Spirit testified to by the Gospel, but works and is in communion with other spirits, but not with the Holy Spirit. And this is not only not Christianity, it is anti-Christianity, because both the Spirit and Christ are missing from the work. Not working with the Spirit of Light is working for the spirits of untruth. In ignorance, but still the work of untruth and fall.

A whole community, not having the experience of spirits, sees only one spirit (*spirits*), who speaks to them and to whom they have listened in full for hundreds of years, not knowing its identity, not validating it, a spirit that is completely different from the Orthodox Spirit , a difference they don't see and don't understand. It is unacceptable to stand by and observe this, keeping silent and saying nothing.

The Holy Spirit is the one who unites and holds together the Church, and the head of the Church is Christ. Orthodoxy is built in time, under obedience to God, *given* in time, step by step, as Christ taught us, "The *Holy Spirit will show you everything*" , not at once, but in time. The conclusion of *unity through the Holy Spirit from the unity of the Church* is not found in Protestantism , which thus excludes the work of the Holy Spirit from its historical testimony, through the lack of unity of the Protestant community; through the lack of unity , in Protestantism, we find that the Holy

Spirit is not historically present in the Protestant community . You must stay in the Church because unclean spirits cannot bear the grace of the Church, and man understands when he has temptations. All the services of the Church are useful to keep the spirits away.

Protestantism, in his work, is, in fact, sectarianism, proselytizing and breaking from the orthodox Christian community, without any scruples. Protestant proselytizing manuals say so, and Protestants work in organized *proselytizing groups* . There are also manuals for " *Protestant missionary work* ", which list anti-Orthodox and anti- traditional church strategies of deparochialization , destruction and break from traditional Christianity in the name of Protestant love. Looking at the big picture of Protestantism, with division, ruptures, proselytizing, breaking of the Christian community, several questions arise in everyone's consciousness. Perhaps this can be called " *the community of Christ* "? Does it have anything to do with what Christ said? Can the Protestant movement be a model for the future in grace?

An entire movement does not know what communion with the Holy Spirit is. Unfortunately, Protestantism is caught in a mystical pseudo-legitimacy, which is contradicting itself in every direction. Protestantism considers that through the example of voices and bodily manifestations it "proves God", as a presence, in the so-called charic manifestations . A clear argument for the presence of the divinity must be made quite differently, and in principle should not be made only through gifts. Communion with God must be shown as a communion, with a wide framework of manifestations in which the real presence of the divinity, taboric, must be the maximum point of discovery.

Communion with divinity is communion with a whole other world. With the divinity, with the angels, with all those who are in the other world, fully aware and helping us from there. We forget this dimension of a full awareness of the other world, which

is next to us. A testimony of a conscious, full communion with another world should be the full testimony of communion, because in itself a communion is verified and not just a legitimization by gifts.

The problem with the so-called Protestant gifts is that they do not bring the conscious presence of the divinity, but are only used as a logic to infer a presence, the divinity never being present nor witnessed in these experiences. The Protestant cultic testimony is never of divinity. Protestantism in its fullness has no real testimony of the divinity, but only supposed, inferred testimonies, in which it infers that some things are of the divinity. And this level of logic, inferring the presence of divinity, is clearly a big fallacy, where an entire community does not have a presence of divinity, but merely assumes, by wrong conclusions, that a divinity is present.

There is no theology of direct accessibility and presence of divinity in Protestantism. Protestantism cannot reach divinity and cannot explain how divinity is reached. The cultic testimony found confirms this. Protestantism does not have a testimony of a personal communion with the divinity, like Saints Paisius the Aghios and Joseph the Hesychast, but all the Orthodox Saints also testify to it, in a false simulation and assumption of a communion only through a few supposed external evidences. Communion with the divinity clearly brings a clear, real, conscious presence to the communicator, a constant presence throughout life. Protestantism does not have a testimony of the presence, of a consciousness, of a divinity with which to have a real dialogue. God as a personal presence does not appear in Protestantism, it is only logically inferred that He would be present.

Protestantism does not have a theology of divinity by sight, it does not see God, it does not know what He is like, it cannot bring Him to believers. Seeing God is a major part of any legitimate theology, and it does not exist in Protestantism. Seeing God

as theology and testimony is a constant of history, showing the presence of divinity in worship.

The sight of God disappeared in Catholicism after the schism, when the new Catholic saints and pseudo -miracles appeared . In Protestantism, Catholic pseudo -miracles have been taken over as the norm by the whole community, which legitimizes itself in exactly this way, also through pseudo -miracles , as in Catholicism.

The vision of God and the theology of vision remained clear and pure only in the One, Orthodox Church. And it disappeared in everything that broke from the One Church. There is no such actual, present theology, which is grounded in the present testimony of worship except in Orthodoxy. The theology of sight is the theology of taboric communion with God, clearly shown in Scripture, in which man is face to face with God, fully conscious, in a historical constant. Why is Tabor not recapitulated except in Orthodoxy? Because only Orthodoxy can bring Tabor to believers.

Why is the being of the Protestant spirit different from that of the Orthodox Holy Spirit, testified by the Gospel? The main work of the Holy Spirit is to unite man with God and raise him in this union, in personal perfection and contemplation towards God, the only one that transcends into eternity, the perfection of man and eternal life being the main objectives of communion in the Holy Spirit. The work of the Protestant spirit is oriented around the instantiation of miracles and proselytizing, the " *attraction and proselytizing actions* " for the confession of new followers. The Protestant spirit does not take care of the personal perfection of man, it does not show God in contemplation, Protestant trances being fainting and states of loss of consciousness, not states of hyper -consciousness , such as the Orthodox ones, in which the conscience feels and sees in grace. Protestant trance, fainting, and loss of consciousness, as a work of Protestant pseudo -grace, are absolutely other works than the enlightenment of consciousness through closeness to God, His

sight and creation in contemplation, testified by Orthodoxy.

The work of the Protestant spirit, because it is a spirit that works in Protestantism, is continuous, of definitive separation and opposition to traditional works, having an aversion to them, to the cross and to the prayer of the heart (*this aversion being specific to separated spirits by God*). The Protestant spirit easily breaks families in the name of Jesus. He was not seen, like the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ, that being his historical form of revelation to the Church; in Protestantism, he disappears into history and speaks to the community from the shadows, through *voices*. Instead, in Orthodoxy, the Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Spirit are shown continuously, in the same way as at the baptism of Christ and as at the Descent of the Holy Spirit, in an evangelical continuity and real presence before the faithful. The features of the Protestant spirit are not consistent with the evangelical testimony. The Spirit called holy by Protestants and who works on them is completely different from the Orthodox Holy Spirit, having a different identity in the entirety of its manifestations and works.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Protestant and Catholic grace is always a work outside of man, of this time, instantiating itself much in miracles, so - called visions and speaking with spirits. However, grace is in itself an inner work of transformation, and not necessarily an act of legitimizing faith. Neither in Catholicism, nor in Protestantism, there is a clean explanation of the work of grace in man (which , in fact, does not exist in them); anything that is not truly grace has no ability to rest upon the soul or work with it.

The witness of grace must not be sought deep in the life of the Church, it must be full, a visible phenomenon, and be found immediately in the life of the whole Church. If the witness of grace becomes a difficult or impossible exercise to identify it , as in Catholicism, then it does not exist, and the Catholic pseudo -witness of grace is something else than grace. But also the Protestant hyper - wealth confessed by them, which abounds in voices, prophets, miracles and charisms , as they are not found even in the apostolic age, is exaggerated and shows that man can, by exaggeration, create an appearance of wealth of " *instances of miracles* ", forcing the note into too much haric protestant. The Protestants surpassed the apostolic period by the presence of charisms and gifts of Protestant grace, they being in another age, greater than that and richer than the apostolic one, all the books written by them proving this (little of these testimonies of " Protestant grace " can be found in the bibliography).

The Orthodox testimony of grace is not in the spirit of instantiating miracles, but in the spirit of communion with God and , within this, all the light is seen, but also God, in contemplation and various forms of help; this shows a different framework and context of the work compared to the Protestant and the Catholic. It is a testimony of contemplation, not of outward justification by

signs. A testimony to the contemplation of light. The mystery of the light in the saints is that the light shows them all clearly, the light knowing them all, and they share with others what they see in the light. And the light is from God. The light shows them all the faith, pure, on the face, and all its mysteries.

Grace is another state of consciousness and work with God. He who is in grace, in light, is fully near God and knows the truth, by sight and revelation from God Himself, being, in a way, near His being. Therefore, light and grace can testify in the saints only one truth, one faith, *one lord, one faith, one baptism* . And the other faiths that profess themselves, " inspirationally ," invoking grace everywhere as authority, do not have this evidence of grace as full, perfect communion with God.

The entire Protestant testimony of grace is an exercise of grace, on the text of Scripture , and not a testimony of prayer, which shows that Protestants:

1. I do not know the true, practical way of acquiring grace.
2. I do not know what grace itself is, nor its work.
3. not have the experience of the methodology and asceticism involved in grace.
4. They have no notions of the gradual works of grace that show themselves in man, step by step, systematically testified to by Orthodox mysticism.
5. They have no knowledge of the effects of grace upon the mind, body, and soul.
6. not understand grace, because they have not felt and seen neither the Body nor the Blood of Christ in grace.
7. I do not know the contemplation of God.
8. not have a theology of grace, of an energy, but only of the outpouring of Protestant pseudo -gifts .

What remains in Protestantism is the persuasion of grace or

grace through persuasion. Protestants have grace by conviction, that grace which , if they think they have it, then they have it, and you cannot tell them that grace is not obtained by force from God, through the text of Scripture. Protestant grace is a simple rhetorical exercise on the text, with nothing in common with the divine vision and divine power that those in grace truly display. The witness of pseudo -grace is unitary in Protestantism as a whole , Protestants all working grace in form in the same way by conviction.

The legitimacy of grace declared by each cult is not by arguing it from Scripture , but by proving it from communion, in which God and His presence legitimize grace. Protestant fainting, their shouting and speaking in tongues as evidence of Protestant grace, is not communion and has nothing to do with communion with God. There is not this testimony brought by the angels of God, in the Scripture, full of grace, that they would cry out, they would faint and that they would speak in tongues, the angels receiving the same divine light, being also in this experience.

Grace is not read , but lived, as Grigorie Palama also says. Grace is an experience, and not just a rational understanding that substitutes for the experience of it. Many confuse reading about grace with the experience of energy, not understanding it and summing it up only theoretically, in the Mysteries of the Church, thinking that the Mysteries mean a hidden work. Grace is seen by those who stay very close to it, both in the Sacraments and in prayer, in all its forms, as all the Orthodox saints testify. Therefore, many know theoretically about grace, but do not have the experience of it, and there is a theology *of grace* , and not of *experimental grace communion* .

His grace and fullness must be sought in the whole being of the Church , not only in miracles:

1. First of all, in the axiological orientation towards community prayer .
2. In the community unit in time .
3. In the engagement of each believer, in the community, in the work of grace as the first duty and work.
4. In keeping from sin, for keeping grace.
5. In the testimony of the richness of grace in those who work more grace .
6. In view of all things from God and the power of grace over matter from God, and in all the gifts of grace.
7. In the mysteries of the Church, which are all felt in a real way, and in the Body and Blood of Christ .
8. In the fullness of grace, those who live fully in the Holy Spirit , God Himself being with them .

God Himself reveals Himself to the entire working Church, to each one individually, in full communion with all those who work grace, and He does not instantiate Himself in isolation, in miracles. Although Protestants try to check all these conditions to create a level of legitimacy in grace, the testimony of the Protestant community is undeniably different from that of the Orthodox community. All the rhetoric of Protestant grace has nothing to do with the sight of light and all in the light, it has nothing to do with the power of grace , continually invoking miracles , the so -called prophets and charismatics . Protestantism is of the moment, of the miracle, and not of continuous grace.

The miracle, which can be a help from God that he gives to everyone, according to his justice, because he is merciful to everyone and just, is not a certainty of the continuity of the work of grace in

the community. God and light are not a punctual presence, instantiated in a moment of time, in a cult (in miracles). Light is a continuous reality throughout the cult, not pretended, but actually present and on a clear, known, historical typology.

The presence of light, as it is articulated in Protestantism, only in punctual instantiations , in innumerable alleged miracles and overflowing gifts invoked everywhere, is illegitimate , because grace has no break in it nor flashy appearances, but is continuous, powerful, in those who have it, both in believers and in saints. The invoked presence of grace and God through instantiation , and not through continuity, is an error , because God is not of the moment , but of continuity.

Grace, in Protestantism, is not articulated correctly, scripturally , according to the testimony of Scripture, and its experience in worship is not historical, scriptural and legitimate. Grace in Scripture is light, sight, power, but it is also seen in other works, the result of power, that come together with the power of grace. Grace, in Orthodoxy, is articulated as seeing everything, the saints see all the useful things, wherever they are, and can help wherever they are needed and by their power .

Alleged grace, in Protestantism, is a continuous instantiation of miracles, so - called works of grace, speaking in tongues, and the like . In fact , Protestantism creates a Protestant grace, which is not grace , but is merely a suite of physical manifestations alongside implausibly produced alleged prophecies and many other manifestations that are created to give the impression of a level of grace that does not exist in reality.

Protestants have created a complex methodology of creating and invoking grace, through all kinds of physical manifestations, through the so - called level of prophecies in the spirit , in which the so - called Protestant prophets prophesy in the spirit , in -another, abstract dimension, without even knowing exactly what I prophesy, a level of grace that has no utility , no help for man, no progress and

no desired and expected finality, that of man's communion with Christ.

pseudo -grace has a structural problem in justifying God's presence, because it is considered sufficient as evidence of God's presence. God is not revealed as a presence in Protestant pseudo -grace, Himself, personally, but grace is considered in itself a presence of God, reaching a conclusion of the type: the energy and not the Person itself is sufficient to prove the communion and the Person . Hence the conclusion that Protestant grace is not grace and does not really ensure reaching God by grace. Protestant grace and manifestations are not for the presence of God , but for the inference of presence. Protestant grace does not bring the living, present God to believers, but they indirectly infer God from the presence of pseudo -manifestations harice , in an illogical syllogism, *it is grace (external manifestations), therefore it is God (logically deduced)* , in which the logical deduction brings the "Person", and not the very living presence of the person shows its presence . Protestant pseudo -grace logically demonstrates God, it does not bring His personal presence into experience. The historical testimony of Protestant pseudo -grace is precisely in this logic and direction, in a total disqualification of any idea of the authenticity of Protestant grace. God's personal presence is in grace, but not necessarily as an authentic presence. Therefore, only the authentic experience of grace can bring with it the person (as the whole authentic Orthodox experience of grace confirms this), and the Protestant pseudo -grace experience is stuck in the logic of the logically deduced presence of God, and by no means of His real presence, in grace

Following the Protestant way of grace, the Protestant believers , after 500 years , are exactly in the same place where they started, that is, in the Scriptures. No way to reach perfection and the sight of God. In 500 years it was expected that the Protestants would have reached what Christ calls perfection, the fullness of the Holy Spirit, with the testimony of the fullness of grace and gifts (rich testimony

, by the way, in Orthodoxy). The perfection of grace is not an abstract required by Christ , it is a necessity of the community and a real presence in the body of the Christian community . The perfection and fullness of grace is found in many Orthodox saints. An important debate preserved for the differences between cults is related to grace, its meaning, the meaning of communion, manifestation.

Catholic saints, like Protestant mysticism, do not testify to spiritual progress and communion , but only instantiate miracles. They do not profess communion with God, contemplation, prayer of the heart, the camp light of perfection, divine sight and power, like the orthodox saints. Instead , they have all the characteristics of the Catholic saints, testimonies in the flesh, visions with a clear illegitimacy, which prove the deception, being in a typology of fine deception, in which there are so many things put for *legitimacy* that fall apart when they are put in the great context of holiness and legitimacy of visions and contemplation. Some Catholic saints die after such revelations with effects in the body, they become particularly seriously ill and die shortly after.

Grace is an energy that is continually earned and does not appear suddenly together with all gifts, not being understood the divine logic according to which they are given to each, or for faith, or for perfection, or for benefit, all being considered to be received exclusively as evidence of *faith* , as they were professed to be received apostolically. Grace is directly related to our transformation, to our education for eternity . Grace is the one who guides the Way (in asceticism, prayer), in the transformation of each into an eternal being . That is why the way of grace is one of asceticism and prayer and not of acquiring it all at once. Man becomes perfect through asceticism and prayer, over time, and not all at once.

The gifts are received through asceticism and prayer (progress, in a way of growing man in communion) and exceptionally (apostolic) for faith, for the initial witness , necessary for the Church

. All professed Protestant gifts always come by *faith* . None through asceticism, as Christ and John the Baptist show us, by their example , but also as they explicitly teach, as a common way of grace, as a norm for the Church. Christ teaches the acquisition of grace through asceticism as a common way, and not through faith, as it is in the original apostolic community. Christ and John the Baptist establish a norm for the Church, the Christian typology of acquiring grace being the norm for the Church: asceticism is the norm for acquiring grace. And this norm completely excludes the Protestant theology and practice of acquiring through the sudden *outpouring* of an alleged grace.

Protestants chose from Scripture the passage that used them more for grace and expanded it as easy to imitate (mimic), rejecting the example of Christ, choosing grace by faith, instantiated , easy to imitate, to imitate in pseudo -gifts and harical works . It is easier to feign speaking in tongues as grace and charisma than to spend nights and years in prayer to perfect yourself in the light. Asceticism, which means a process of perfection, in time, under God's guidance, of learning one's place in existence, in the power of God's light, is replaced in Protestantism with the charic event , of legitimizing a divine presence, but not an event , existential state, in which grace may bring you to an eternal state.

Protestant and Catholic grace are only theoretical, not understood by them in manifestation. Spiritual progress is not to be found in Protestant or Catholic mysticism. It does not understand the asceticism and maturing of the soul, done for the acquisition of grace. It is not understood exactly what is in grace. It is not understood how grace discovers, step by step, his works, how he shows them cleanly before the one who sees them, and then supports him to do them.

Grace shows man everything, gentleness, goodness, contentment, cleanliness, undisturbedness, demons and thoughts. All these are not mere words, but are seen in grace otherwise, perfect, as their

perfect and complete work, with the help of light; the light showing the right form and the right substance of the works, which are far from what we consider their perfection, are like the prayer of the heart (*which grace alone works in the heart*) , and these above having perfection and fullness in grace.

Grace gives man faith and sight of God, in his soul and in his conscience. Grace teaches man the virtues and right works of the soul. Cleanliness and virtue are an important work of grace in man. Grace gives peace to the soul, but more than that, a peace and patience of grace . Grace gathers the mind, lifts the mind, as the saints say, after emptying it into enlightenment, and lifts the soul above the body, gives strength to the soul. In the full light, man is somehow also in the other world, but also in matter, seeing clearly both those of light and those of matter.

Grace, in Catholicism, is not professed by each individual believer and does not seem to be for each believer. In Protestantism , instead , grace brings manifestations to each believer, from the spirits of the Protestant communion. The problem of mistaken mysticism, in both cases, Protestantism and Catholicism , is identical, but in different levels of severity. In Catholicism, grace in the saints is the instantiation of miracles and other works considered deceptions by Orthodoxy (condemned in the Orthodox community and Orthodox mysticism). In Protestantism, however, the whole Protestant experience of the whole community is a deception of the spirits, the voices heard continuously and the discoveries of a so - called dark Christ, in the corners of the rooms, seen by many Protestants, who call the Protestants into various denominations, being discoveries, miracles and testimonies protestants of the grace and presence of Christ.

The Protestant charic typology is identical to the Orthodox typology of deception, being a quantitative recapitulation, at the level of the entire cult , of the entire Orthodox mysticism for decep-

tion. The Orthodox experience in the book *Of Demons and Deception* fully shows this experience in Protestantism, which is unmistakable. We also recognize the complete difference between Protestant and Catholic experiences and the Orthodox experience of grace. The Orthodox experience is, first of all, through the sight of light and tabernacled communion with God, in continuity, in the persons of the saints, light that helps in various forms, gifts that have no limit or only limited forms, being in all things of life, on body, matter, knowledge, experience of the Spirit and life beyond the body, access to everything in the world, a divine knowledge and vision, gifts that are much more than the forms usually found in Scripture.

IV. GOD IS LIGHT

"God is light"

(1 John 1, 5)

One cannot close the discussion about grace without a fundamental theological statement that grace carries within itself: *God is light and grace is light from God. Grace bears the name of divinity, the name of Him, light from Light, which shows it as the principle of man's union with God.*

Grace is a reality felt in Christian asceticism. The experience of grace cannot be fought with theoretical studies not anchored in experience. And it must be united with any theological proposition about reality. The theology of grace must be united with what we call observable reality, light, grace, experience of God, and information in experience. Catholicism is left with a theory outside of an observable reality, and Protestantism does not even understand what grace is about, to bring any discussion suitable for dialogue here. Grace is the light of God imparted to man. It is light, like God. But a different kind of light, which man can also receive. And grace must be understood precisely as an experience, both of God and of His sharing, but also of man's entry into his eternal condition, into the light. Man is light and becomes light, through the light of God. This statement is the foundation of Orthodoxy. Catholicism does not understand this foundation.

Grace is as an experience the most important point of the Christian life. And his experience must be assimilated and coincide with the experience of God's light shown by the Apostle. What we find in "God is light", we must identically find in the experience of grace, which is light from God shared with man, in all dimensions of man's union with God. Grace is an experience of light.

And the only Christian asceticism that professes to be light is the Orthodox one. The Catholic one is non-existent in this dimension. And the Protestant one is only carnal, with derisive bodily manifestations in front of the discussion about grace as light. This Orthodox theological directionality shows that Orthodoxy is not only on the right theological path, but is in its very being, in the theological core, which is the light of God in communion. There is no other theological core than the being of God and his sharing of Himself, which must be found in all dimensions of theological discussion. And grace must primarily include light as the directionality of the witness of his experience. What is seen in the Orthodox testimony is grace as light. What is seen in Protestant and Catholic testimony are bodily manifestations and voices - a specific level of mysticism very isolated and cut off from the experience of light. Light exists mystically only in Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is the only bearer of God's light.

Why is it that Catholicism has no theological power and the only thing it can do is alter theologically? Because human pride thinks it can better place divine things. Catholicism broke because it actually refused equality and obedience, and repeated pride and brokenness. He preferred theological and community isolation, which brought his downfall. Catholicism is a fall through pride. In which the worldly thought that worldly wisdom could overwrite the divine. Why so many alterations in Catholic theology, because Catholicism today is a collection of theological alterations? Because he was forsaken by God in history and remained alone in a path broken from the community. Where is this rupture seen historically? To schism? Before? You can see exactly where theology begins to break informationally from the theological unity, which should be found in the Church. Because the fundamental argument for unity is the theological convergence brought about by the work of the Spirit – the clarity of theological information, brought about by the Holy Spirit in unity. Spirit theologians say the same

thing. When the Spirit leaves theologians and theology, then theological deviation occurs and the community takes different paths. It's an interesting fact I've noticed about theological convergence. Even if the theologians do not know each other, they are in different times and do not have access to the same information, and they do not know each other's theologies, yet they are somehow united, not only by dogmatic background, but by similar approaches to different problems. Because seeing the Christian logical argument is an act of guidance done by the Spirit, who guides the theologian. Therefore, in history, where there are points of theological divergence and rupture, there is also a desertion of the Spirit. And Catholicism, somewhere in time, leaves this theological convergence.

Why does Catholicism today have no power to confess Christianity? Why is Catholicism today a socialized and not sacred Christianity? Because there is nothing sacred anymore. Today Catholicism is a Christian social ethic and not a sacred Christianity. It is a ritualistic and not a sacred Christianity.

There is no theologian of the experience of light in the West. Grigorie Palama, much blamed by Catholics, is in the East at the head of a line of theologians who confess the light and who create theological works about the light. And all the West does is create theological analysis, but not testify to an experience - God in light. The Western theological style accuses itself, through the fundamental lack in theology of what is most important in the discussion, the equal existence of a theological experience that confirms the entire proposed theology, but which is also dominant, in a theology that should be of experience and can be tested.

Does the Catholic return make sense? What good is a whole West without God's light? What is the use of the West to continue on a path in which it cannot reveal the light of God to believers? Of what use is a path outside the light to any believer?

What is the use of the current path to the West, broken by the light of God? The face of the Spirit and the sight of divine light are historical in the East. Therefore, the East sees the light of God, has a theology of light, has an asceticism that brings light and confesses God in light.

The theology of the East is the theology of light. It truly shares with believers that they live in God's light and know heaven, God and His light. And Orthodox asceticism shows grace as a reality accessible with a little personal effort on this path. He who knows how to tread this path reaches and sees the light of God. And live in the light. Catholicism misses exactly this theological point, the theology of light. The theology of communion, of the encounter with God, the light being the encounter with Him.

Christianity is the way of light. The way of eternity. The way of knowledge. The way in which you correctly assume your existence. That is why Catholicism must reassume *the Way*. Christianity of light. Christianity of blissful, eternal existence. Catholicism must return to the light of God. To be able to guide and turn the whole sunset into the light of God. Catholicism has a duty to recover all that it has lost historically, including the loss of the flock to Protestantism, and this by reassuming. The recovery of the Protestant error must be understood and made by the recovery of the personal error made by Catholicism. When he brings his personal example of correction, Protestantism will also change its option and return to the one Church. And then we will all be One.

How will the union of Christianity and Christian unity be made? Through the personal example of each one. Catholicism will recover the historical exit from the First Church, through re-assumption. And it will also show Protestantism Christ, the way, in the One Church. That's what Father Paisie Aghioritul also said, that only by personal example, by following each other in the return, the union will be achieved. Perhaps *the solution to ecumenism*

and Christian unity is the Catholic return. As a prime example of return. There must be a beginning for such a thing. By recovering the wrong events in history. Made by Catholics, those who initiated the exit from the Church. The Catholic return must begin. And the Christian desire for unity will be fulfilled today. Which Catholicism can fulfill, as a duty of repentance before the historical exit from the Church. Catholic theologians must begin the discussion of returning to the One Church. Having full theological support in the One Church for this.

How do we all come into the light of God? Wearing a face illuminated by the Holy Spirit, a face that receives an identity that it carries for eternity. An enlightened image of eternity, seen in a sanctified identity in a sanctified theological image, borne by all through baptism. Bearing this holy image is the essence of the Christian life. And Christianity has one face, one identity, one light of the Spirit over all. The Spirit illuminates eternity for all, in a way in which we receive an eternal identity, we receive an eternal image, an image of light, a divine image, we are all in the image of Christ and we receive from Christ the view of existence in the uniqueness of its assumption.

The meaning of theology is bearing the image of Christ, appropriating the image of God in man. Catholicism must repress the light of God, to be eternally in the light of God. Grace is an observable reality in asceticism and not an incomprehensible mystical act. This is the thesis of Scripture.

God is light. Theology is of light and the enlightenment of man. Everything in theology is about being like God, with God. And Protestantism does not have a theology of the appropriation of light, but a theology of the declarative assumption of eternity. Protestantism is not about God. Protestantism is not an existential theology of the state, where you assume existence, it is a declarative theology where you talk about everything but assume nothing.

God tells us to appropriate what He is: light and eternity. Let us appropriate His image, become like Him, be united with Him forever. Theology springs from and is an understanding of man's living in the light. Orthodoxy is a theology of light.

Not being a theology of light, Protestantism is not a theology of existence, in a state laid down for man by the Creator, like that of the Creator. And there remains only a theology that does not understand the fundamental existential theological point of Scripture: God is light, and eternal existence is about living in the light. And that the Scripture shows as the maximum point the sight of God in the light, in which the whole theology gathers.

Scripture is a temple of light, revealing light in all its works, revealing man's living in light. Moses is enlightened and light, when he comes down from the mountain before the people. Christ reveals himself in the light before the apostles. Moses and Christ discover ***light as the mystery and meaning of existence, near God.***

Existence is about light, about the eternal state in which man is placed by the Creator. The mystery of light is shared with man in the Mysteries of the Church. The same light and the same Mystery. In the same power of Tabor. The light that God imparts is the mystery of eternity. And theology is about understanding and embracing this mystery. Baptism is man's entry into the light. Communion and confession are man's entry into the light. It's all about assuming existence in the light. The sacraments are a theology of an existential state shown as binding by Christ.

Protestantism annulled the two foundations of existence: the light of God and its assumption in the Mysteries. Protestantism is not about the light of God. It is not about God, nor is it about eternal existence. Protestantism is about a path that does not understand God as light. It is a way that is not of God, that does not bring the existential reality of light to every believer.

C devout Protestants will never be eternally in the light of

God. Next to God. What the Protestants have lost is eternity. They have lost the light of God both theologically and as an existential reality. Protestants have lost everything in theology. They lost the eternal mystery, the light of God. Protestantism is a way lost from the light of God. The Christian path must lead you from here into the light of God.

Protestantism has theologically lost the meaning of existence, the condition imparted to man by God. His Light. Scripture is a text that, in its foundation, includes the maximum existential act. Existence in love, in eternity, in light. In God, by the light of God. By assuming them in baptism, in the mysteries, in the sanctified identity, which receives from God His communion, His eternity. And the scripture is an act of discovery not of salvation as a passage, but of the eternal existential state in the light and the reception of the divine light now, for eternity. Scripture is a theological understanding of the meaning of existence, living in the light of God. In what God has in Himself and which was also given to man.

Orthodoxy is a theology of light. Of sharing with God and eternal existence in His light. It is a theology that understands what God is, what Christian asceticism is, and how to reach God. Therefore, Protestants must assume the light of God in Orthodoxy. The first testimony that a cult must bring is that "*God is light and the confession is light from the Light of God*". There is no denomination outside of Orthodoxy that strongly confesses God as light, in light and shows Christian asceticism as the path of light. Orthodoxy has a theology as fulfillment of light, as seeing light, as knowledge of God as light, in light. Orthodoxy is the only one that knows and confesses God as light.

Protestant grace is not light. Catholic grace is a theoretical

study. Protestant and Catholic grace do not bring God as light, as an experience of light, to the whole worship. Theology must be of the light, and any theology that is not of the light is not theology. It does not have and does not spring from God as light, as the primary experience of seeing, of knowing God. Catholicism and Protestantism should understand and assume that " *God is light*" is a starting point in the discussion of grace, where the experience of God's light is brought to man and becomes a way of being, just like God's . And man, through God, says "*I am light from the light of God, I am god through God, I am eternal in God through His light*" , shared and given to the human condition. And by this to return to the light of God, to Orthodoxy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. General bibliography

1. *The Holy and Divine Gospel* , Publishing House of the Biblical and Orthodox Mission Institute, Bucharest, 2010
2. *The Bible or Holy Scripture* , Publishing House of the Biblical and Mission Institute of the Romanian Orthodox Church, Bucharest, 2006
3. *Psalter of the Prophet and King David* , Doxologia Publishing House, Iasi, 2010
4. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Bucharest, *Catechism of the Catholic Church* , Part One, Bookstore Publisher Vatican , 1993
5. Constantin Făgețean, Trans., *The life and needs of the one among the saints of our Father Grigorie Palama, Archbishop of Thessalonica* , , Egunenita Publishing House , Galați, 2006
6. Dan Sandu, *Prof. Conf., The Holy Spirit and the life of the Church* , Course notes, Iasi, 2018
7. Dimitrios Tselenghidis, *Grace and freedom in the patristic tradition of the 14th century* , Doxologia Publishing House, Iasi, 2015
8. Dragoș Bălan, Pr., *Grace and freedom in the salvation of man* , Reintregirea Publishing House, Alba Iulia, 2012
9. Dumitru Stăniloae, Rev. Prof., *Life and teaching of Saint Gregory Palama* , EIBMBOR, Bucharest, 2006
10. Dumitru Stăniloae, Pr. Prof., *Nature and grace in Byzantine theology*
11. George Hayward Joyce, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace* , Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., London, 1920
12. Henri de Lubac , *The Principle of Moral Life, On Nature and Grace* , Gutenberg Galaxy , 2020
13. Henri de Lubac , *The Mystery of the Supernatural* , Trans. Rev. Dr. Eduard Ferent , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2010
14. Henri de Lubac , *A brief catechesis on Nature & Grace* , Ignatius Press, San Francisco , 1984
15. John Meyendorff, *Saint Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Mysticism* , Bucharest, 1995
16. Jorge Mario Bergoglio , *True power is service* , SJ, Pauline Publishing House, Bucharest, 2014

17. Karl Rahner , *Fundamental Treatise of Faith, Introduction to the Concept of Christianity* , Gutenberg Galaxy Publishing , 2005
18. Lucian Turcescu, *About divine energies, according to Saint Gregory Palamas* , <https://manastirea.petru-voda.ro/2016/11/14/lucian-turcescu-despre-energiile-divine-dupa-sfantul-grigore-palamas/>
19. N. Chițescu , Isidor Todoran, I. Petreună , *Dogmatic and Symbolic Theology* , Vol. II, Renaștea Publishing House, Cluj-Napoca, 2005
20. *New Catholic Encyclopedia* , Second Edition , Vol. 6, 10, 11, Gale Publishing
21. Stephen J. Duffy, *The Graced Horizon , Nature and Grace in Modern Catholic Thought* , The Liturgical Press, Collegeville , Minnesota, 1992.
22. Ștefan Buchiu , Coord., *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* , Vol. I, Basilica Publishing House, Bucharest, 2017
23. John Cheng , *The Distinction Between God's Essence and Energy: Gregory Palamas' Idea of Ultimate Reality and Meaning* , <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/abs/10.3138/uram.21.1.56>
24. Joseph Pohle , Ph.D. _ D., *Dogmatic Theology , Volume VII, Grace , Actual and Habitual*
25. Norman Russel, *Gregory Palamas and the Making of Palamism in the Modern Age* , electronic edition , 2019
26. Ștefan Buchiu , Rev. Prof. Dr., Cristian Tufan, Deacon. Ph.D., *Research Methods in Dogmatic Theology* , Sigma Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009.

II. Orthodox bibliography for grace and communion

1. Cristian Spătărelu, Trans., *Pateric About Dreams and Visions* , Egumenita Publishing House , Galati, 2004
2. Ilie Cleopa, Archimandrite, *About dreams and visions* , Bunavestire Publishing House, Bacău, 2001
3. Ignatie Briancianinov , The Saint, *About Deception* , Anestis Publishing House , 2005, Bucharest
4. Ignatie Briancianinov , The Saint, *On the Visions of Spirits and Miracles* , Sophia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007
5. Cristian Spătărelu, Trans., *Demons and their works* , Egumenita Publishing House , 2007.

6. Ephrem Filotheitul , Archim ., *My Abbot Iosif Hesychastul* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2010
7. Anonymous Hesychast , *Spiritual View* , *Trans* . Rev. Prof. Dr. Constantin Coman, Byzantine Publishing House, 1999
8. Filothea Kokinos , The Saint, *The Life of Saint Sava Vatopedinul the Fool for Christ* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2010
9. Filocalia , Vol. 7, *Trans*. Rev. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae, IBMOB Publishing House, Bucharest, 2013
10. Isaac, Hieromonach, *Viața Cuviosului Paisie Aghioritul* , Evangelismos Publishing House , Bucharest, 2005.

III. Protestant bibliography for grace and communion

1. AW Tozer , *Jesus is victorious!* , Perla Suferintei Publishing House, Suceava, 2008
2. AW Tozer , *Jesus: Our Man in Glory!* , Perla Suferintei Publishing House, Suceava, 2009
3. CH Mackintosh , *The Assembly of God or The Name of Jesus is Enough* , Publishing House of the Lampadar de Aur Foundation, Oradea, 2018
4. Daniel N. Matei, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* , Alfa Omega Publishing , Timișoara, 2018
5. Eddie L. Hyatt , *2000 records of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church (A Pentecostal-charismatic perspective on the history of the Church)* , Casa Cartii Publishing House, Oradea, 2010
6. Henry Scougal , *The Life of God in the Soul of Man* , Perla Suferinței Publishing House, Suceava, 2010
7. Jack Deere , Dr., *The Gift of Prophecy. Practical guide* , Succeed publishing house Publishing , Medgidia, 2010
8. James Bryan Smith, *Good and Beautiful God. In love with the God that Jesus knows* , New Hope Publishing House, Timișoara, 2014
9. James Bryan Smith, *The Good and Beautiful Life. Dressed in the character of Christ* , New Hope Publishing House, Timișoara, 2014
10. LEONE Frances Choy , *Experiences with the Holy Spirit* , 2nd Edition, Christian Book Publishing House, Bihor, 2007
11. Mike Bickle , *After God's Heart* , Succeed Publishing Publishing , Medgidia, 2013

1. RA Torrey , *The Presence and Work of the Holy Spirit* , Casa Cărții Publishing House, 2006
2. Reynard Bonnke , *Are we passionate or not* , Casa Cărții Publishing House, Oradea, 2018
3. Samuel L. Brengle , *When the Holy Spirit Comes* , Perla Suferentei Publishing House, Suceava, 2012
4. Steve Mays , *Overwhelmed by God, not trials* , Lux Mundi Publishing House , Arad, 2016
5. Trandafir Sandru , *The Work of the Holy Spirit* , Scriptum Publishing House, Oradea, 2010
6. Wachman Nee , *The Church in God's Eternal Plan* , Lampadar de Aur Publishing House, Oradea, 2017
7. Watchmen Nee , *Communion of the Holy Spirit* , Lampadar de Aur Publishing House, Oradea, 2011.

IV. **Catholic Bibliography for Grace and Communion**

1. Antonio Maria Sicari , *Portraits of Saints* , 2 (XI-XV), 3 (XVI-XVII), 4 (XIX), 5 (XX), 6 (XX-XXI), Carmelitan Publishing House , 2012
2. Alexandru Suceu , Pr., *Fericita Veronica Antal: Bloody Lily* , Serafica Publishing House, 2018
3. Archangel Campagna , *Saint Alois Orione . Giving your life by singing love* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2017
4. *The history of a soul, Saint Teresa of the baby Jesus* , Pauline Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003
5. Anton Bișoc , Pr., *The life of the great miracle worker Saint Anthony of Padua* , Serafica Publishing House, Roman, 2016
6. Bernand Sese, *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2006
7. Bonaventura, the Saint, *Life of Saint Francis of Assisi* , Serafica Publishing House, Roman, 2017
8. Eduard Ferenc , Trans., *Saint Clare of Assisi* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2009
9. Franca Zambonini , *Tereza de Calcuta* , Pauline Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003

10. Francesco Saverio Toppi , *Blessed Ieremia Stoica from Wallachia. An invitation to unity* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2013
11. Jorge Mario Bergoglio , *Open Mind, Faithful Heart* , Pauline Publishing House, Bucharest, 2014
12. M. Elzbieta Siepak , Sister, *Life and Mission of Saint Faustina* , Galaxia Gutenberg Publishing House , Târgu Lăpuș, 2008
13. Virgil Gambosa , *The Life of Saint Anthony of Padua* , Basilica del Santo Publishing House, Padua, 2012
14. Teresio Bosco , *Padre Pio. A short biography* , Sapientia Publishing House , Iasi, 2014.

