

194 "It can probably be demonstrated quite easily that the soul of Christ plays no part in Athanasius' explanation of the economy of salvation, and that it is not even a factor in the in the inner human life of Christ."

There is the possibility that it is a physical constituent of Xt's humanity.

195 No decisive argument from the fact that Athanasius uses anthropos and its derivatives, just as there is no decisive argument from his mere use of the term sarx.

195 f M Richard, Athanase MSR 4(1947) 5-54

His main weapon is the argument from silence. The Arian texts excerpted and criticized in Or III c Ar in fact presuppose that the Logos took the place of the soul. Any modern theologian would begin by criticizing this framework, particularly where the Arian Christ is said to be neither God nor man but a middle being of unique character. Athanasius takes a different attitude. Not once in the course of his long criticism does he accuse his opponents of having forgotten the human soul of the Lord. He does not accuse them of having made Christ into a special type of being, but simply of having made him into an ordinary man. This shows that from an anthropological point of view his view of the problem is quite different from ours. He has no quarrel with his opponents here. Nor does he ever resort to the ~~exp~~ expedient of giving Christ a human soul in order to solve the great difficulties raised by the Arians. ~~So~~ he knows nothing of one. His Christ is only Logos and sarx.

Grillmeier notes that Richard's basis is limited and proposes to complete the picture

197 The Activity of the Logos in Christ's Humanity

Athanasius has the transcendent Logos fulfilling the functions of the Stoic world soul. His Logos remains transcendent and personal. But it is the source of all movement, life, order, reason. The Logos is to the universe what the rational soul is in ~~man~~ man. The rational soul is a Logos in microcosm and so a way to the Logos and to the Father.

Early works: Contra Gentes, De incarnatione

198 Athanasius position may be put as follows: Where the original itself appears with all its power, the copy, with its secondary and derived power, must at least surrender its function, even if does not give place altogether. Probably Athanasius assigned to the human soul as such a substance of its own and maintained its immortality. When he considers the being of Christ however, his attention is immediately caught by the Logos and his relationship to the body of Christ.

The fleshly nature of Christ is only a part (meros) of the great Cosmos-soma.. Now if the Logos can give life to the whole world-soma, how much more can he do so to a part... If the Logos dwells in a single body, which is so completely his as to be his own body, it must follow that he mediates ~~ix~~ life and power to it to the full. The indwelling is perfect, intrinsic, and substantial and must be, so as to effect the redemption of the body which he has inherited.

But if the Logos is shut up in the body, is not then the rest of the world ~~xxx~~ bereft of his working power and foresight/? That would be true A answers with a finite spiritual being, but despite the totality of his indwelling the Logos still maintains his transcendence.

199 If the Logos gives life and movement to the body of Xt, he must become the hegemonikon. Is he then the sole life-giving principle? Let us be content to say that ~~x~~ Athanasius so often speaks of the life-giving functions of the Logos to the flesh that he completely forgets the human soul of Xt.

Further as the Logos is the source of life, he also is the source of soteria, salvation.

199 f If the Logos is the sole motivating force in Christ, then his also will be the decisive moral and spiritual acts. Nor are they assigned to the Logos merely by the communicatio idiomatum... Athanasius obviously regards the Logos as the real personal agent in those acts which decisive for redemption, the passion and death of Christ... In his account of Gethsemani he contrasts the power and immutability of the will of the Logos with the weakness of the flesh

201 f Or III c. Ar., 26, reproduces a lengthy Arian text with four main arguments each supported by scriptural quotations.

Xt received gifts: therefore not identical with Father in substance
Inward distress and sorrow showed that Xt is not God's power
The Son advanced in wisdom: therefore not the Father's wisdom
Destitution prayer and ignorance of the day of judgement
showed that he was not the Father's own Logos.

Athanasius attributes these human weaknesses to Xt's flesh. He makes no appeal to his human soul.

203 The Death of Christ as a Separation of the Logos

205 The Body as an Instrument

206 The 'Tomus ad antiochenos' of 362

One notable occurrence was dispute between bps some affirming one hypostasis, others affirming three.

Athanasius asked the first group whether they agreed ~~ix~~ with Sabkellius and asserted that there was no real distinction between Father Son and Spirit. They expressed their horror at any such suggestion. What they intended was to affirm monotheism, that there is but one God.

Athanasius then asked the other group whether they were tritheists. At this they expressed their horror. They acknowledged only one God. But they intended ~~ix~~ by three hypostases to affirm that the Son is not identical with the Father or the Spirit, and that the Spirit is not identical with the Father or the Son.

For Athan ousia and hypostasis had the same meaning. Some stoics did draw a distinction: hypostasis is like hypokeimenon

210 hoti ou soma apsuikhon, oud anaistheton, oud anoeton eikhen ho Soter

Commonly taken to be an affirmation by Athanasius of human soul
Grillmeier suggests that it can simply mean that Xt's body was alive, perceptive, guided by reason.