

183

Later testimonies that the Arians denied a human soul in Xt
Epiphanius: "Lucian and all the Lucianists deny that the Son of God
took a soul (psukhe); they say that he had flesh only, so that
he could naturally appropriate to the God Logos the human
suffering, thirst and hunger, weeping and weariness, sorrow and
perplexity, and everything else that comes with his presence
in the flesh." c 315 - 403, in 367 bp of Salamis, Altaner 365-68

183 f Probable that denial of human soul was latent until 362.
Known to Eustathius of Antioch and his followers but it was
not until the synod of Alexandria in 362 that they made their point
Eustathius at Nicea which he supported, exiled in 330, died 337,
Altaner 358 f.

185 Grillmeier finds a passage in Ps-Athanasius, Contra Apollinarem,
to bear signs of considerable antiquity and to be Alexandrine in origin
"Arius owns the flesh (of Christ) only as veil over the Godhead;
instead of the inner man within us, that is the soul, he says
that the Logos was present in the flesh and he ventures to attribute to
to the Godhead a susceptibility to suffering and the ascent from
the underworld."

The "inner man" was probably Arius expression, and on stoic doctrine
the implication is that the Logos was the source of vital activity
and spiritual life in Xt.

186 No direct testimony that first generation Arians denied a
human soul to Xt. Eusebius of Caesarea shows that such a position
was possible at that time. Later Arians would hardly borrow that
doctrine from their opponents, the Apollinarians, or from
orthodox Fathers that followed the Logos sarx framework

186 Eunomius (ob 394, Alt 359) in a confession of faith
presented to the Emperor Theodosius I says: "... the one Logos
did not take upon himself a man consisting of body and soul."

187 Theopaschism of Arians affirmed by Theodore of Mopsuestia,
Gregory of Nazianzus, Ps-Apollinaris

187 Eudocius, 357-359 bp of Antioch, 360-369 bp of Constantinople,
and friend of Eunomius, emphasizes in his confession of faith
that the Son became flesh, but not man, and assumed no human soul.
He became flesh so that God was revealed to us men through the
flesh as through a curtain. Not two natures, since he was no

no complete man, but God in the flesh instead of a soul; the whole is one nature by composition.

188 Grillmeier notes that this Arian doctrine was thought by Theodore of Mopsuestia (ob 428 Alt 370-73) to have been condemned at Nicea (sarkothenta, ananthropesanta). Grillmeier does not think that this implies that the matter was discussed explicitly at Nicea

189 Lucian, bp of Alexandria, 373-378, Arian

"But what need was there for a soul, for the worship of a perfect man alongside God? M M John too loudly proclaims the truth, 'The Word was made flesh.' This means that the Word was compounded with the flesh and certainly not with a soul... rather did it unite itself with a body so as to become one with it. For how else do we know Christ than as one person, one composite nature (hen prosopon, mia sunthetos phusis) (in composition) like a man of body and soul? But he also had a (human) soul, the impulses from God and from the soul would necessarily have conflicted. For each of the two is self-determining (autokineton gar touton ekateron) and strives towards different activities."

189-192 Grillmeier argues that, while Arianism commonly is conceived as a trinitarian error, its root is christological.

The Arians ask Athanasius (Or III con Ar. 27): "If he (the Logos) is very God of very God, how could he become man?"

Behind these words there stands the thought that ~~the Logos~~ a real Incarnation can take place only if the Logos enters into a substantial conjunction with the flesh and becomes its life principle.

From this it would follow that the Logos cannot be God, so the Arians (Athanasius loc cit) pursue the point: "How dare you say that the Logos shares in the Father's existence, if he has a body so as to experience all this?"

The acts of the synod of Antioch (268), if genuine, speak of a sustasis (constitutio) of Logos and sarx in Christ. Paul's opponents assert that Christ is the image of the conjunction of body and soul in a human being, the ~~only~~ only difference being that the Logos takes the place of our inner man.