

between the Father and the Son by identifying them with different ideas, so that the Father was divinity itself <sup>and</sup> goodness itself while the Son was neither but divine only by participation and good only by participation.

But such aberrations had been precluded all along by the simple fact that Christianity was preached in the world mediated by meaning, and that fundamental fact found a key expression when Nicea affirmed the Son to be consubstantial with the Father and the ensuing controversies were quietened by Athanasius' clarity and simplicity: the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father merely means that what is true of the Father also is true of the Son, except that the Son is not the Father.

Frü

The Meaning of Chalcedon

If one seeks a single viewpoint from which may be seen together the various aspects of christological thought,

discernment that there emerge the many christologies that balance, complement, correct one another in the various strata of New Testament tradition and writing and, as well, in the later unfolding of Christian thought.

### The Meaning of Chalcedon

The doctrine of the council of Chalcedon was reiterated at the third council of Constantinople. Chalcedon itself reiterated the formula unionis (DS 271-273) <sup>Antiochene and Alexandrian bishops</sup> expressed their common rejection of Nestorius.

one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, only begotten of the Father, that is of the Father's substance, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, born not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things were made both those on earth and those in heaven, who for us men and for our salvation came down, took flesh, became man, suffered, rose the third day, went up to heaven, and will come to judge the living and the dead.

However, if I find the same doctrine clearly expressed at Nicea, at Ephesus, in the Formula unionis, at Chalcedon, and at the third of Constantinople, it remains that that clarity has a presupposition. It presupposes that the statements are made within the world mediated by meaning and are to be interpreted in accord with the world mediated by meaning. this series of decrees was spoken in words, the words had a meaning, the meaning claimed to be true, and true meaning corresponds to what is meant.

But what is quite clear and indeed manifest when understood within the world mediated by meaning, becomes incredibly obscure and problematic when that understanding is blocked by a failure to distinguish between the world mediated by meaning and the world of immediacy, between the cognitional operations proper to the former and those proper to the latter, between the criteria operative in the former and the criteria operative in the latter.

Against such confusions early Christian writers were not forewarned. Insensibly they crept into Christian thought as when the Stoics are blamed for Tertullian's assumption that God must be a body, or when Origen, explained the distinction  
in Platonist fashion