

239 The insufficiency of Logos-sarx christology came ~~xxxx~~ out into the open in 362 at the synod at Alexandria, but the Fathers had little inclination to risk new turmoil by adding to the decree at Nicea.

Athanasius: "But counsel the others, who explain and think rightly, not to inquire further into each other's opinions, nor to fight about words to no useful purpose, nor to go on contending with such phrases, but to agree in the mind (phronema) of ~~pi~~ piety."

240 Basil: "But the teachings (dogmata) which are added to the Creed (the Nicene) about the Incarnation of the Lord (in the formula submitted by Epiphanius) we have neither examined nor accepted, as being too deep for our comprehension, knowing that when ~~once~~ we alter the simplicity of the Creed we shall find no end of discussion. The disputation will lead us ever on and on, and we shall disturb the souls of simpler folk by the introduction of what seems strange to them."

Eustathius of Antioch: participant at Nicea and supporter; exiled from bishopric in 330, died 337, Altaner 358 f.

Earlier style: communicatio idiomatum, The Jews crucified God the Word; John the Baptist embraced and led into the river the Word made a body. p. 244

246 The first witness to Arian denial of a soul in Christ

"Why do they (the Arians) think it so important to show that Christ took a body without a soul, fabricating such gross deceptions? So that if only they can induce some to believe this false theory, they may then attribute the changes due to the passions (pathe) to the divine pneuma and thus easily persuade them that what is changeable could not have been begotten from the divine pneuma."

248 Sharp distinction of the natures

"But the 'I am not yet ascended to my Father' was not spoken by the Logos, nor by the God who came down from heaven and lives in the bosom of the Father, nor by the wisdom which embraces all that is created, but it was uttered by a man formed of different members, who was raised from the dead and had not yet ascended to the Father."

248 Eustathius thinks of the union as the Logos dwelling in the man Christ. The soul of Christ lives with the Logos. The body is the temple, the tabernacle, the house, the garment of the Logos, in which he is concealed and through which he works as through an instrument.

E distinguishes the indwelling in Christ and in others eg prpp;hets by ~~πν~~ pointing to its fulness and permanence.

249 Though Eustathius's Christology is deficient, he cannot fairly be accused of teaching two persons in Christ or an adoptionist Christology

249 Marcellus of Ancyra

Eusebius of Caesarea's attacks against Marcellus accuse him of adoptionism because Marcellus acknowledged a human soul in Xt

250 Same charge made by Eusebius of Emesa's followers and by the Pseudo-Ignatian Letters

250 Photinus similarly attacked

From our meagre documents, Christ was a mere man though miraculously born, endowed with special power by the Father, and finally accepted as Son

250 Eusebius of Emesa c 300-359 Alt 271

From his many writings there have survived only seventeen sermons and only recently have they been discovered & authenticated

Student of Patrophilos of Scythopolis, Eusebius of Caesarea, went to Alexandria and made contact with inner Arian circle, finally at Antioch studied the theological and biblical traditions there.

251 Rejected homoousios, accepted homoiousios, defends divinity of Christ, the soul of Xt ~~was~~ never is part of the picture, Xt conceived as union of Pneuma--sarx or Dynamis-sarx

252 Maintains a divisive Xtology: to keep the divine free from the path of the flesh: "Strike a nail into a soul and I will concede that a nail can be struck into the Dynamis too."

253 Making a case against Arius and his debasement of the Logos into a suffering soul

Moving toward Antiochene elements: indwelling of the Dynamis in the flesh; taking of the flesh by the divine power.

A certain exchange of predicates is admitted: what the flesh suffers can be ascribed to the power, and what the pneuma does can be ascribed to the flesh.

Altaner 59 = pseudo-Clement

254 According to the Pseudo-Ignatian writings the Incarnation is the indwelling of the Logos in a human body, ie in a body without a human soul, and a dwelling of the Logos in a man consisting of both body and soul

255 Either Christ is a true union of Logos and sarx, as in Jn 1, 14, or else he is a mere man in whom God dwells: Verbum ^{homine} in

Pseudo-Ignatius finds his position potent in many directions: Docetism is excluded by the reality of the flesh, the strict unity of Logos and sarx combats the adoptionism of Ebion, Paul of Samosata, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Photinus, while the divinity of the Logos excludes arianism

But the decisive heresy remains: a natural unity of the Logos with the flesh is bound to degrade the Logos

256 Cyril of Jerusalem ob 386 Alt 361-363

He confessed the divinity of Christ, the Logos incarnate, without reservation. He considered homoousios foreign to S_cr and did not use it. He acknowledged Mary as Mother of God. In spite of his many titles and names Xt remains a single subject (hypokeimenon). He was a preacher and not given to deep speculation about Xt.

257 Earlier Anti-Apollinarianism and Logos-Anthropos Xtology

Epiphanius (ob 403) and Pope Damasus (366-384)

Apollinarianism brought to Antioch by the presbyter Vitalis. Epiphanius in 374 journeyed to Antioch and disputed with Vitalis

Vitalis had the Logos take the place of the nous in Christ

Epiphanius asserted that the Logos became man by assuming a body a soul and a nous, and so ensured complete salvation (an argument that goes back to the second century)

258 Damasus visited by Vitalis wrote to Paulinus of Antioch a letter (375) in which he rejects not only Apollinarianism but also adoptionism (doctrine of two sons). Xt the one Son of God took our whole Adam with body soul and reason, sins ^a alone excepted.

259 Damasus did not realize that Apollinaris aimed at accounting for the unity of Christ. He simply asserts that the Logos took body soul and nous, that having a human nous did not imply that he sinned. Cf DS 147-149

He put forth a Word-man frame-work yet clearly taught the unity of Christ.

In the autumn of 377 a synod at Rome (in which Peter of Alexandria and envoys of St Basil took part) condemned Apollinaris Vitalis and Timothy of Berytus

In a further Roman synod in 382 this condemnation of Arianism was reaffirmed DS 152-177

260 Synod at Antioch, 379, in which Meletius and Diodore of Tarsus and some 150 bishops took a position against Apollinarianism. Extracts from documents by Pope Damasus were included in the acts of the synod. This meant much for Latin Christology, as hitherto it had been taken over only by Paulinus.

261 ~~260~~ ^o Diodore of Tarsus ob ante 394 Alt 369 f.

In his lifetime regarded as a pillar of orthodoxy. A prolific writer. Wrote cosmological scientific works, doctrinal monographs, polemical-apologetic ~~wt~~ works, and especially scriptural commentaries of a historical and grammatical bent ~~wt~~ opposed to the allegorical style of Alexandria

Was condemned a century after his death as a forerunner of Nestorius by a synod at Antioch in 499. Most of his works were consigned to the flames.

Diodore probably became known when he was led by the religious policies of Julian the Apostate to defend the divinity of Xt. From the end of June 362 until March 5, 363, the Emperor was at Antioch working on a large book attacking the Galileans, which he probably published before his departure for the Persian war. Christian writers saw themselves occasioned to write against Julian right into the fifth century. Particularly he attacked the divinity of Christ, the worship of a man, and the Theitokos

262 According to Facundus of Hermiane (Alt 589 fl c. 550) Julian wrote Photinus complaining about Diodore's defence of Xt's divinity

263 Speculation: just what did Diodore concede to Julian? Some sort of distinction was made between Logos and flesh!

264 Diodore held a Logos-sarx Christology and so differs from Theodore and Nestorius

One can grant that Diodore acknowledged the soul of Xt as a physical factor, but his deficiency is the absence of the soul as a theological factor

From the fragments it appears that the tradition of the soul of Xt is neglected. His disagreement with Apollinaris is not that Apollinaris denies the soul in Xt.

Lk 2 52: Jesus, he (Diodore) says, increased both in age and wisdom. B t this cannot be said of the Word of God, because he was born perfect God of the perfect (Father), Wisdom of Wisdom, Power of Power. Therefore he himself does not increase...

But that which grew in age and wisdom was the flesh.... frag 36

265 frag. 39: But how do you have one worship. Perhaps as with the soul and body of a king? For the soul by itself is not king and the body by itself is not king. X (The two then cannot be separated in honour and are the subject of one action. But not ~~ss~~ so Christ.) But the God-Logos is king before the flesh and therefore what can be said of ~~the~~ body and soul cannot be said of the God Logos and the flesh.

frag. 17: Diodore maintained that only the flesh suffered on the cross

266 frag. 18 The cry of dereliction was not uttered by the Logos; a real dereliction did not occur in the body

frag 31-32: The title, Son of David, pertains not to the Logos but to the flesh

It is not to be denied that the majority of the fragments pertain to a Word-man frame-work, but the relative strength of the two or the process of development or change cannot be made out with any certainty.

267 But what has not been recognized is that Diodore's Christology at one time was of the Logos-sarx frame-work. Eusebius of Emesa and Diodore are instances of a divisive Christology the logos-sarx type; the former completely, the latter in part.

267 The opposition between Diodore and Apollinaris was not over the existence of a human soul in X^t but between a unitive and a divisive X^tology

Cyril of Alexandria rebukes him for speaking of a soulless flesh
269 Against Apollinaris D rejects not only the confusion of the two natures but also the substantial unity of Word and flesh ~~as~~ after the fashion of the composition of body and soul in man. ~~He~~ He does so to be able to defend the divinity of the Logos. To that extent he is correct.

Didymus of Alexandria 313?-398 Altaner ~~31~~ 324 f.

Celebrated teacher of the catechetical school at Alexandria for ~~over~~ half a century. Layman blind from age of four. Correct Nicene theologian but followed Origen on the eternity of souls and the final apokatastasis of all things, and so was condemned in the council against Origenism in ~~553~~ 543 Ds 403-411 Hence most of his writings are lost. Attributed to him Ps Basil, Adv. Eunomium, IV-V.

271f In Ps-Basil no mention of X^t's soul. But in his dispute with Arianism, Apollinarism, and docetic dualistic Manichaeism, he clearly acknowledges the teaching of the full reality of X^t's soul both in his De trinitate and the recently found In Zachariam

272 De trinitate: The Word has assumed a complete man, body, soul, nous, .. soul and body.. soul and flesh.. soul of a perfect man... The flesh is altogether holy formed by the Spirit in the Virgin... The soul of Jesus is without stain or sin.

The soul of X^t has the functions of bearing the image of the Godhead and of offering complete obedience to God

272f Argument from many points in SScr that X^t's body was not merely apparent (agst Manichaeism) and not soulless (agst Arians)

273 The In Zachariam found at Taura in 1941; has not been fully authenticated as yet but comes from Didymus' circle at least.

The soul which Jesus took is something other than the Trinity. It is by nature created to endure propatheia and the beginning of amazement. It does not share the immutability and impassibility of the Godhead. By nature it is completely subordinate to the laws of creatureliness and also in fact experienced the natural weaknesses, like fear and anguish. Christ's human spirit, of the same nature as ours (homoousios) can even be in a state of real though only incipient crisis,

274

in propatheia. This state is called propatheia because it occurs before the onset of a real pathos, passio, which leaves the soul in a state of disequilibrium and subject to sin.

The Apollinarians had insisted on Ct's sinlessness. Didymus teaches not ~~imm~~ impeccability but de fact sinless ness.

By combining propatheia and sinlessness Didymus acknowledged the humanness of Xt: ~~ixxax~~ he taught the possibility of Xt being tempted and ~~txi~~ tested.

275 The doubtful element is that he taught the eternity of souls: Xt's soul alone did not fall; it alone has always remained bound up with the Logos. This inadvertently opens the way to the Origenist account of the unity of Christ

Didymus intention however is to teach the divinity of Xt against the Arians and his humanity against Arians and Apollinarians. The topic of Xt's unity was not envisaged in the Psalm commentary.

276 A point that later caused difficulty was the Didymus acknowledge in Christ two prosopa, one human and one divine. But prosopon here has its old meaning of countenance, manner of appearing, mode de manifestation. The acceptance of two prosopa in Xt can accordingly go with an Alexandrine Christology, though in the time of Cyril the two were considered absolutely irreconcilable

276 f Peter II of Alexandria follows Didymus in teaching the true humanity of Xt

Theophilus of Alex (385-412) uncle of Cyril of Alex, defends the true humanity of Xt against Apollinaris and attacks Origen for teaching the incarnation, not of the Logos, but of Xt's eternal soul.