

Our concern with Tertullian, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Arius, Nicea, the emergence of the notion of consubstantiality has centred on the Question whether the Word, the Logos, was strictly divine.

We have now to retrace our steps to ask in what sense there was a union between the divine Word and the man, Jesus.

Aloys/

In this we shall in the main be following Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition, London and New York

I ask Bill Weiser to have it put on reserve shelf.

Three main sections

Tertullian Novatian Clement of Alexandria Origen

Logos-Sarx Christology: Arians, Athanasius, Apollinari(u)s

Logos-Anthropos Christology: Eustathius of Antioch, Eusebius of Emesa, Epiphanius, Damasus, Diodore of Tarsus, Alexandrine Christological Psychology, Cappadocian Xtology, Evagrius Ponticus, Nemesius of Emesa, The Western Contribution

Again our concern is to attend to shifts: thinkers successively try this and that mode of conception ~~in~~ in an attempt to work out a coherent account of the Christ in whom Christians believe, whom they adore, for whom they bear witness unto the martyr's death.

## Christology

<sup>2</sup> 29

### Tertullian

140 Tertullian defends the Church's tradition on the Incarnation of X<sup>t</sup> against polytheism without the church, against monarchianism within the church, and against the disruptive tendencies of Marcion and Valentinus

141 For T the deepest mystery of X<sup>t</sup>ianity is expressed in the word monarchia.. God the Father remains ruler and retains his sovereignty. But the administration of the rule is handed over to the Son.

142 Quoting Prestige: '.. the unity constitutes the triad out of its own inherent nature, not by any process of sub-division, but by reason of a  $\times$  principle of constructive integration, which the Godhead essentially possesses. In other words, his idea of unity is not mathematical but philosophical; it is an organic unity, not an abstract bare point.

142 When Tert says that the Son is a portio of the whole substance, he means ~~s~~ not a part but a share. The Father has the substantiae plenitudo which the Son shares and from which he derives

144 The tri=~~x~~personality of the one God is an unconditional presupposition for his understanding of the Incarnation

145 The Logos, the Sermo, even the Spsiritus (of Christ) is the one subject of the In~~x~~arnation

He frequently speaks of the union of the Logos with the flesh, though no one had spoken more explicitly than T on the soul of X<sup>t</sup>

He also engages in the early X<sup>t</sup>ian practice of the communicatio idiomatum, the interchange of properties: This man is God; the Logis is a man, became man.

Adv. Prax xxvii: Tert excludes the notion that The Word was made flesh means that the W~~r~~ord was changed into flesh. He does so not only because the Word is immutable but also because the result would be neither man nor God but some one thing resulting from both. He would no longer be the Word for that has been changed into flesh, and the flesh would not p~~r~~operly be flesh since it did not have its origin in flesh.

".. we observe a double quality, not confused but conjoined, Jesus in one Person God and Man. I postpone (the consideration) of Christ. And to such a degree did there remain unimpaired the proper being of each substance, that in him the Spirit carried out its own acts, that is powers and works and signs, while the flesh accomplished its own passions, hungering in company of the

devil, thirsting in company of the Samaritan woman, weeping for Lazarus, sore troubled unto death - and at length it also died." Evans p 174, 10 ff.

148 Tertullian extends the use of 'person' from the trinity to the Incarnation

148 ff Excursus on term, persona

151 Link between person and substance: Ptolomaeus conceives the aeons as ~~personae~~ *personales substantiae* outside the Godhead; Valentinus conceives them as *affectus et sensus et motus* within the Godhead

152 Praxeas will not ascribe reality or personality to the Logos. Tert proves ~~per~~ substantiality and personality. A person is a being who speaks and acts. Now God the Father and the Son speak with one another. Besides the Bible uses the plural for God (Gen I 27). There are also reports of different voices which must have uttered by different persons (Transfiguration) The different names refer to different persons. Whatever then is the substance of the Word, that I name a person.

152 f What is the philosophical content in Tert of persona. For the Stoics it was *ens physicum concretum*. It is built up from the *upokeimenon*. It is made concrete by the *koine poites* and thereby becomes a *koinos poion*. The individual being is only finally completed by the *idia poites*. Only on the basis of ~~personae~~ *idiotetes* can a being act and move. These are also described as species (*eidos*) *forma* (*morphe*) character. This ~~is~~ individuality is described as *prosopon*, *persona*.

Hence the one substance of God has three figures forms species *gradus personae*

154 Tert is not concerned to explain the unity of Christ but to exclude Praxeas' notion that the Word is the Father and the flesh is the Son

Later theology will explain the unity of Christ by the unity of the ~~personae~~ person that is both God and man

But Tert has not adverted to this solution. The Chalcedonian problem of persona and nature ~~is~~ has not yet emerged.

155 The Stoics distinguished the mixing of two substances so that a third results (kata sugkhusin, per confusionem) eg the mixture of gold and silver so that electrum results

The purely external union of two substances: iuxtaposition, parathesis

The krasis, concretio, the complete mutual penetration of fluid bodies which preserve their respective properties

The mixis, mixture, the total mutual penetration of solid bodies which retain their respective properties

156 The mixis seems also named the krasis di holon; it is the manner in which the union of body and soul in man is conceived; when Tert says that the two substances can be in one, duo in uno esse possunt, he is using the technical expression for krasis di holon; Word then and flesh or man are united in this fashion, as body and soul in man.

In later theology this will be named a natural union, and the union in Christ will be named hypostatic.

Though tertullian speaks of the one person, he does not make this unity the basis of the union of Word and flesh.

#### Novation

157 Una persona aroused little interest among Latins and Greeks for almost two centuries

Only from the end of the fourth century in the writings of Jerome and from 411 in the writings of Augustine does una persona acquire a proper Christological significance

In Novation the union in Xt is still a krasis di holon; he can use the advanced formula Verbum Dei incarnatum; and the distinction 'quo homo ex Abraham, qua Deus ante ipsum Abraham