



Durham E-Theses

St Athanasius of Alexandria's doctrine of grace.

Boulos, Wahib Helmy Kozman

How to cite:

Boulos, Wahib Helmy Kozman (1991) *St Athanasius of Alexandria's doctrine of grace.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1567/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

ST ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA'S DOCTRINE OF GRACE

By

**WAHIB HELMY KOZMAN BOULOS
BCS, BA, BD.**

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

P.H.D

1991

**DOCTORAL DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS
(DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY)
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM**



16 OCT 1992

ATHANASIUS CONTRA
MUNDUM



This thesis is dedicated to
His Holiness Pope SHENOUDA III,
117th Pope of Alexandria and Patriarch of the See of St. Mark,
97th successor of St. Athanasius.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

1. The Scope of the Thesis
2. The Method
3. The Athanasian Data on Grace

PART I:

GRACE IN ATHANASIUS' EARLY APOLOGETIC WORKS

1. Grace in *GENT*
2. Grace in *INC*
 - a) Grace and Creation
 - b) Grace and the Fall
 - c) Grace and Salvation
 - The Grace of the Resurrection
 - The Grace of the Divine Image
3. Conclusions

PART II:

GRACE IN ATHANASIUS' *CAR1-3*

1. Grace in *CAR1*
 - a) The Arian Doctrine of Grace
 - Arian theological/logical arguments
 - Arian biblical/exegetical arguments
 - b) Athanasius' Response to the Arian Doctrine of Grace
 - Response to theological/logical arguments
 - Response to biblical/exegetical arguments:
 - The case of Phil. 2:9f
 - The case of Ps. 44:7-8
 - The case of Hebr. 1:9.
 - c) Conclusions
2. Grace in *CAR2*
 - a) The Arian Doctrine of Grace

- b) Athanasius' Anti-Arian Doctrine of Grace
 God's grace is granted in the Son
 Divine Sonship by Grace

- c) Conclusions

3. Grace in *CAR3*

- a) Grace and the Unity of the Father and the Son:
 Athanasius' Response to the Arian Positions

The exegesis of John 14:10

The exegesis of John 17:11, 22-23

- b) Grace and the Son's Relationship with the Father
 in the Context of the Incarnation

1st theme: the grace of impassibility and immortality

2nd theme: the grace of the knowledge of God

3rd theme: the grace of authority and glory

4th theme: the Son's advance in grace and mankind

- c) Conclusions

PART III:

GRACE IN ATHANASIUS' *SER1-4*

1. Grace in *SER1*

- a) Grace and the exegesis of Am.3:14
- b) Grace and the exegesis of Tim. 5:21
- c) Grace and the Persons of the Trinity

2. Grace in *SER3*

3. Grace in *SER4*

4. Conclusions

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

FOOTNOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank most of all my supervisor the Very Reverend Dr. G. D. Dragas for his guidance, encouragement and supportive care during my study in Durham. He has been most generous with his time, stimulating with his enthusiasm for the Fathers and especially St. Athanasius. The Patristic Seminars chaired by him were informative and inspiring for my studies and opened up questions and new pathways of thought.

I have appreciated the help and guidance of Professor S. Papadopoulos, who supervised my first study in Athens and who introduced me to Fr Dragas. I am indebted to Dr. Sebastian Brock of Oxford University who kindly offered very helpful comments and suggestions. I am grateful to Dr. Robert Hayward of Durham University for his assistance in my study of the Syriac Texts.

I would like to express my thanks to the staff of the Department of Theology for their practical assistance and to the staff of the University Library, especially to those of the Palace Green Section, for their help in procuring materials.

I have been privileged to be a member of the Senior Common Room of Hatfield College for the past five years. From the Master and the college staff, I received many kindnesses. It is interesting to reflect on the fact that the Right Reverend Archibald Robertson, Lord Bishop of Exeter, a distinguished Athanasian scholar, was at one time Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall (later Hatfield college). He edited the fourth volume of the library of the Post Nicene Fathers, which contains most of the works of St

Athanasius in English translation. His work has been a valuable resource for my study.

Thanks are also due to the Reverend Theo Harman of Hatfield College for his constant fellowship and encouragement, as well as to my College flatmates Fr Methodios Samaritakis and Fr Michael Tita and to my fellow researchers and friends Dr. Nicholas Taylor, Mr. Carsten Haeske, Mr. Götz Hauser, Miss Catherine Lin, Miss Sue^{Clarke}, Miss Vicky Malandraki and Miss Anna Baker.

I have dedicated this work to His Holiness Pope Shenouda. Not only is he the successor of St. Athanasius in the Coptic Orthodox Church, but many years ago he was the Bishop and teacher in the Theological and Clerical Coptic Orthodox College in Cairo when I was reading for my first theological degree. My Church, my Patristic Centre in Cairo, my family and friends in both Egypt and Europe have been a constant source of support through their encouragement and prayers.

I had the opportunity to present some of the basic ideas contained in this work at the Eleventh International Patristic Conference at Oxford in August 1991 and get some encouraging reactions. I would like to thank participants especially Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia, Professor C. Kannengiesser, Dr. J. McGuckin for their contributions to the discussion following the reading of my paper.

The financial assistance^s of several organisations and individuals has made my study in both Greece and England possible. Particular mention should be made of the following: The Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ecclesiastical Section); The Episcopal Church of

the United States of America (Overseas Leadership Training Programme); The University of Durham, the ex-Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, the Langham Trust (SPCK), the Rev. Principal Dr James Walker of Queen's College Birmingham and last but not least the Rt Rev. Lord Bishop of Durham, Dr David Jenkins.

ABBREVIATIONS

The Works of Athanasius of Alexandria

ADEL	<i>Ad Adelphium episcopum et confessorem</i> (P.G. 26: 1071-1084)
AEGYPT	<i>Epistola Encyclica ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae</i> (P.G. 25:537-594)
AFROS	<i>Epistola ad Afros episcopos</i> (P.G. 26:1029-1048)
AMUN	<i>Epistola ad Amunem</i> (P.G. 26:1169-1176)
ANT	<i>Tomus ad Anthiochenos</i> (P.G. 26:795-810)
APOL-CON	<i>Apologia ad Imperatorem Constantinum</i> (P.G. 25:595-642)
APOL-FUG	<i>Apologia de fuga sua</i> (P.G. 25:643-680)
CAR1	<i>Contra Arianos 1</i> (P.G. 26:11-146)
CAR2	<i>Contra Arianos 2</i> (P.G. 26:145-322)
CAR3	<i>Contra Arianos 3</i> (P.G. 26:321-468)
DECR	<i>De Decretis Nicaeni Synodi</i> (P.G. 25:416-475)
DION	<i>De Sententiae Dionysii</i> (P.G. 25:479-522)
ENCY	<i>Encyclica ad episcopos epistola</i> (P.G. 25:219-240)
EPIC	<i>Ad Epictetum episcopum Corinthi</i> (P.G. 26:1049-1070)
FEST	<i>Epistoles Festales</i> (P.G. 26:1351-1444)
GENT	<i>Contra Gentes</i> (P.G. 25:3-96)
HIST.AR	<i>Historia Arianorum</i> (P.G. 25:692-796)
INC	<i>De Incarnatione</i> (P.G. 25:96-198)
JOAN et ANT	<i>Epistola ad Joannen et Antiochum presbyteros</i> (P.G. 26: 1165-1170)
MAXIM	<i>Ad Maximum philosophum</i> (P.G. 26:1085-1090)
SER1	<i>Ad Serapionem 1</i> (P.G. 26:529-608)
SER2	<i>Ad Serapionem 2</i> (P.G. 26:607-624)
SER3	<i>Ad Serapionem 3</i> (P.G. 26:623-638)
SER4	<i>Ad Serapionem 4</i> (P.G. 26:637-676)
SER5	<i>Epistola ad Serapionem de morte Arii</i> (P.G. 25:685-690)
SYN	<i>De Synodis Arimini^{in Italia} et Seleucia</i> (P.G. 26:681-794)
VIRG	<i>De Virginitate</i> (P.G. 28:252 ff.)
VITA	<i>Vita et conversatio S.P.N. Antonii</i> (P.G. 26:837-976)

Appendix:

APO1	<i>De Incarnatione DNJC Contra Apollinarem 1</i> (P.G. 26: 1093-1132)
APO2	<i>De Salutari Adventu DNJC Contra Apollinarem 2</i> (P.G. 26: 1131-1166)
CAR4	<i>Contra Arianos 4</i> (P.G. 26:467-526)
INC-CAR	<i>De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos</i> (P.G. 26:983-1028)

Journals and Series

CSCO	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JThS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies, 1899-1949</i>
JThS, NS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 1950-</i>

<i>LNPF</i>	<i>A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church</i> , ed., P. Schaff and H. Wace, New York, 1899-1900; Reprinted. ed., G. Rapids, Michigan, 1952-1974
<i>N.P.B.</i>	<i>Novae Patrum Bibliothecae. Mai.</i> Rome, 1853
<i>Opitz</i>	<i>Athanasius Werke</i> , hrsg. im Auftrage der Kirchenvater-Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 2, 1, 1-280: Die Apologien, ed., H.G. Opitz, Berlin, 1935
<i>Opitz III</i>	<i>Athanasius Werke</i> , hrsg. im Auftrage der Kirchenvater-Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 3, 1, 1-76: Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 318-328. ed., H.G. Opitz, Berlin, 1934
<i>OrChP</i>	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca</i> , 161 vols. ed., J.P. Migne, Paris, 1857-1866
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i> , ed., H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou, Paris, 1941-
<i>SJTh</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>StP</i>	<i>Studia Patristica, Papers presented to the International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford.</i>
<i>TU</i>	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur</i>
<i>ThSt</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>

Dictionaries and Lexicons

<i>Lampe, Lexicon</i>	<i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> , ed., G.W.H. Lampe, Oxford, 1961
<i>Müller, Lexicon</i>	<i>Lexicon Athanasianum</i> , ed., G. Müller, Berlin, 1952

INTRODUCTION

1 .The Scope of the Thesis

Every theologian knows that grace has been a fundamental theme of western theology in all the main stages of its development, the patristic, the mediaeval, that of the Reformation and counter-Reformation and the modern.⁽¹⁾ This is obvious in the light of the numerous studies which have been advanced, especially by western theologians from earliest times to the present. It is also clear that such an emphasis finds its roots in the New Testament and especially in the theological teaching of St Paul, where grace is at the centre of his Christian kerygma.⁽²⁾

The place, however, of the same theme in eastern theology does not seem to be as clear. It is the prevailing view that the eastern Fathers did not pursue the doctrine of grace as vigorously as their western colleagues. This view is mainly based on the fact that no eastern theologian wrote any full scale treatise on the theme of grace, nor did the East have to deal with such a controversy as that of Pelagianism which raised fundamental questions concerning grace. Though Pelagianism was officially condemned by the Third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431/3), which took place in the East and which was predominantly attended by eastern Bishops, the doctrinal debate between

Pelagians and Augustinians concerning the Christian doctrine of grace was neither explained nor discussed on that occasion.⁽³⁾

Nevertheless, special studies into the doctrine of grace as found in the writings of eastern ecclesiastical authors have been developing slowly. There is today a handful of such studies,⁽⁴⁾ which, in spite of differences in their approaches and conclusions, point to the existence of a distinctly eastern approach to this doctrine, which, becomes particularly pertinent, when it is carried into the context of modern western theology, both in its split between Roman Catholic and Protestant and in its ecumenical rapprochement and theological dialogue with the Orthodox East. To be more specific, there seems to be a consensus among the easterners not only about the universality of sin and the necessity of the divine grace, but also - indeed, distinctly so - about the "free communication" between the divine giver and the human recipient of grace. This latter point does not seem to be as prominent in western theological treatments of the theme of grace.

An important instance of a modern encounter between Western and Eastern theologies on the particular theme of grace was provided by the Faith and Order Movement in the 1930s, which led to the publication of an interesting bilateral (western - eastern) Report, entitled *The Doctrine of Grace*.⁽⁵⁾ This Report, and particularly the contributions of eastern theologians, which were included in it, shows that the doctrine of grace is equally

important for the eastern Christians as it is for their western brethren. The lack of early systematic treatises on the subject of grace by the eastern Fathers, which is probably due to the fact that they never came to be preoccupied with any great controversy concerning sin -- as happened in the West, especially in the case of Pelagianism -- does not necessarily imply that they gave a secondary place to this doctrine in their thought. The numerous references to grace which are found in their works⁽⁶⁾ point to a coherent view which has to be recovered by careful selection, analysis and systematic exposition of its components. This is a formidable task, not least because of the volume of Eastern Patristic theological literature. Yet, patient and thorough research on representative eastern theologians, as this present investigation will show, would take one quite far towards fulfilling this task. This is in fact the particular scope of the present thesis: the investigation of the doctrine of grace of such a representative eastern Father, St Athanasius of Alexandria, who is known as the "Great" and as "Canon of Orthodoxy" among the Greeks and "the Apostolic Father" among the Copts.

That the Great and Apostolic Athanasius can be considered as a representative Father of eastern patristic theology is a universally established affirmation. That there is plenty of scope for investigating his doctrine of grace is apparent from an even cursory reading of the references to grace found in his writings which are conveniently listed in Müller's *Lexicon Athanasianum*.⁽⁷⁾ Besides, Dr Dragas' essay on "Nature and Grace according to

Saint Athanasius"⁽⁸⁾ has demonstrated that such a study is most original, fruitful and highly promising and that it needs to be more thoroughly pursued by taking into consideration the precise context within which the data provided by Athanasius on the topic of grace and on other topics which are clearly related to it, actually occur.

2. The Method of the Thesis

The method employed in this investigation has been determined by the consideration that there are, in general, two basic contexts within which the notion of grace emerges in the Athanasian theological data, namely, the textual and the conceptual contexts. Although these contexts are distinct, they are, in fact, closely interdependent and thus, in order to facilitate this investigation, they have been kept together. Textual analysis and conceptual synthesis of the Athanasian data have been brought together both in the course of the investigation and in the conclusions. In all this the ultimate aim has been on the one hand the elaboration of these data in their conceptual inter-relatedness as forming a conceptual whole and on the other hand, the assessment of how far such a whole is coherent in itself and in relation to the general drift of Athanasius' theology.

Although the investigation has been extended to all the available data in the entire collection of Athanasius' works, the final presentation of it in the present thesis has been confined

only to the most representative works of Athanasius, GENT, INC, CAR1-3 and SER1-4, not only because they deal with the major theological problems which Athanasius discussed against pagans, Arians and Pneumatomachian Tropici, but also because we have in these works a preponderance of data. The data found in the rest of the works do not add any original ideas but simply confirm the points made in the former.

3. The Athanasian data on Grace

The list of references given below are all taken from J. P. Migne's edition of the works of Athanasius: *Patrologia Graeca*, vols. 25-28. Other editions especially the critical editions of particular works are taken into consideration and are noted accordingly.

For the Festal Letters we have used the Syriac version and the English translation which was included in the Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers vol. iv.⁽⁹⁾ The Coptic version and the Greek Fragments, as far as they survive, are also considered.⁽¹⁰⁾

Other texts, like the *De Virginitate* (VIRG), which do not contain many references, are also noted.⁽¹¹⁾

Number of occurrences of Χάρις in Athanasius' Works

	Book	Occurrences
1	GENT	11
2	INC	22
3	CAR1	46
4	CAR2	26
5	CAR3	50
6	FEST	47
7	SER1	16
8	SER3	05
9	SER4	05
10	VITA	17
11	ENCY	01
12	APOL-CAR	37
13	DECR	21
14	DRAC	06
15	AEGYPT	11
16	APOL-CON	09
17	APOL-FUG	02
18	SYN	12
19	ANT	03
20	AFROS	06
21	ADEL	04
22	MAXIM	01
23	AMUN	01
24	MON	01
25	EPIC	02
26	HIST.AR	06
Total		368

Appendix:

1	CAR4	06
2	INC-CAR	10
3	VIRG	01
4	S.M.D.F.	04
5	APO1	05
6	APO2	07

The Data

(1) Early Apologetic Works: GENT and INC

		P.G.			E.Π.E			THOMSON		
	Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Page	Line	Word
1	GENT	2	25	5D4	1	76	24	6	13	χάριν
2		4	25	12A8	1	84	9	12	34	χάριν
3		9	25	21A10	1	102	11	26	60	χαρίζεται
4		9	25	21A11	1	102	12	26	61	χαρίζεται
5		10	25	24A1	1	106	12	28	26	χάριν
6		12	25	25C11	1	116	8	34	12	χάριν
7		13	25	28C12	1	120	13	36	10	χάριν
8		16	25	33A2	1	126	22	42	4	χάριν
9		17	25	36B7	1	132	2	46		2κεχαρισμένα
10		17	25	36C5	1	132	11	48	10	χαριζόμενος
11		21	25	41C7	1	144	2	56	6	χάριν
1	INC	1	25	97A2	1	226	8	134	5	χάριτι
2		3	25	101B7	1	234	5	140	19	χαριζόμενος
3		3	25	101C2	1	234	13	140	26	χάριν
4		3	25	101C4	1	234	15	140	28	χάριν
5		5	25	104D1	1	238	6	144	2	ἐχαρίσατο
6		5	25	104D1	1	238	6	144	2	χάριτι
7		5	25	105A2	1	238	10	144	6	χάριτι
8		6	25	105D3	1	240	16	146	7	χάριν
9		7	25	108D5	1	244	4	150	16	χάριν
10		7	25	108D7	1	244	5	150	17	χάριν
11		8	25	109D7	1	246	18	152	34	χάριτι
12		9	25	112A10	1	246	27	154	7	χάριτι
13		10	25	113A15	1	250	13	156	20	χάριτι
14		10	25	113C15	1	252	8	158	46	χαρισάμενος
15		11	25	116B2	1	254	2	160	17	χάριτος
16		11	25	116B7	1	254	7	160	22	χάριτος
17		12	25	116D5	1	256	1	162	1	χάρις
18		21	25	132C11	1	278	5	184	5	χάριτι
19		21	25	132D2	1	280	3	184	9	χάριν
20		30	25	148C2	1	302	9	206	15	χάρις
21		31	25	149D3	1	306	10	210	30	χάριν
22		32	25	152C7	1	308	17	212	30	ἐχαρίσατο

(2) The Orations Against the Arians CAR1-3

P.G.					E.Π.Ε.			
	Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word
1	CAR1	5	26	21B9	2	40	9	χάριν
2		6	26	24A2	2	40	27	χάριτος
3		9	26	29A3	2	50	9	χάριν
4		9	26	29B11	2	52	2	χάριτι
5		16	26	45A4	2	74	6	χάριν
6		20	26	53A10	2	84	25	χάριτι
7		34	26	81B15	2	124	18	κεχάρισται
8		36	26	88A12	2	132	1	χάριν
9		37	26	88C5	2	132	19	ἐχαρίσατο
10		37	26	88C11	2	132	24	χάριν
11		37	26	89A11	2	134	9	χάριτος
12		37	26	89A12	2	134	11	χάριν
13		37	26	89B5	2	134	17	χάριν
14		38	26	89B11	2	134	22	χάριτος
15		38	26	89C3	2	136	1	χάριν
16		38	26	92B10	2	138	10	χάριν
17		40	26	93C6	2	140	26	ἐχαρίσατο
18		40	26	96A11	2	142	15	χάριν
19		40	26	96A11	2	142	16	χάριτος
20		42	26	97C10	2	146	24	ἐχαρίσατο
21		42	26	100A4	2	148	4	χάρις
22		42	26	100A5	2	148	5	χάριν
23		42	26	100A6	2	148	6	ἐχαρίσατο
24		42	26	100B6	2	148	18	χάρις
25		43	26	100C14	2	150	8	χάριν
26		43	26	101A9	2	150	19	χάρις
27		43	26	101A11	2	150	20	χάριν
28		43	26	101C1	2	152	10	ἐχαρίσατο
29		44	26	101D1	2	152	22	χάριν
30		45	26	104C4	2	154	24	ἐχαρίσατο
31		45	26	105A8	2	156	15	ἐχαρίσατο
32		45	26	105B1	2	156	21	χάριν
33		45	26	105B10	2	156	29	χάριν
34		47	26	108C3	2	160	17	χάριν
35		48	26	113A7	2	166	24	ἐχαρίσατο
36		48	26	113A8	2	168	1	χαρίσεται
37		50	26	117A4	2	172	14	χάριτος
38		50	26	117B5	2	174	2	χάριν
39		58	26	133A7	2	194	26	χάριν
40		59	26	136A3	2	198	3	χάρις
41		59	26	136A6	2	198	5	χαρίσασθαι
42		59	26	136B12	2	198	22	χάριν
43		60	26	140A2	2	204	1	ἐχαρίσατο
44		60	26	140A4	2	204	3	χάρις
45		60	26	140A5	2	204	4	χάρις
46		64	26	145B7	2	212	20	χαρίσεται

P.G.				E.Π.Ε.				
Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Work	
1	CAR2	7	26	161B11	2	236	9	χαρίσασθαι
2		18	26	184B4	2	264	4	χάριν
3		30	26	209A10	2	298	9	χάριν
4		40	26	232B8	2	326	22	χαρίζεσθαι
5		41	26	233B14	2	330	3	χάριτος
6		41	26	233C7	2	330	11	χάριν
7		42	26	236B4	2	332	2	χάρις
8		42	26	236B6	2	332	4	χάρις
9		51	26	253C9	2	356	13	χάριτι
10		54	26	261A3	2	364	18	χάριν
11		59	26	273A4	2	380	11	χάριν
12		59	26	273C5	2	382	11	χάριν
13		59	26	273C9	2	382	17	χάριν
14		61	26	277A10	2	386	10	χάριν
15		61	26	277A11	2	386	11	χάριν
16		62	26	280A8	2	388	21	χάριν
17		67	26	289A8	2	402	10	χάριν
18		67	26	289A12	2	402	13	χαρισάμενος
19		67	26	289B11	2	402	25	χάριτι
20		68	26	292C11	2	406	20	χάριν
21		72	26	300C12	2	418	4	χάριν
22		75	26	305B6	2	424	13	χάρις
23		75	26	308A6	2	426	9	χάριν
24		76	26	308C3	2	428	3	χάρις
25		76	26	308C11	2	428	10	χάριτος
26		79	26	316A5	2	436	19	χάριν
1	CAR3	2	26	325C10	3	18	22	χάριτι
2		3	26	328A8	3	20	5	χάριν
3		6	26	333A3	3	26	25	χάριν
4		10	26	344A10	3	42	4	χάριν
5		11	26	344C11	3	42	29	χάριν
6		11	26	345A2	3	44	1	χάρις
7		11	26	345A4	3	44	3	χάρις
8		11	26	345A13	3	44	10	χάριτος
9		12	26	345B15	3	44	23	χάριν
10		13	26	348C1	3	48	7	χάριν
11		13	26	349A11	3	48	25	χάρις
12		13	26	349A15	3	50	3	χάρις
13		13	26	349B2	3	50	4	χαρίζεσθαι
14		13	26	349B5	3	50	7	χάριτι
15		14	26	349C6	3	50	20	χαριζομένου
16		14	26	349C6	3	50	21	συγχαρίζεσθαι
17		17	26	360A11	3	62	7	χάριν
18		19	26	361C11	3	66	15	χάριν
19		19	26	364A2	3	66	17	χαρισάμενος
20		19	26	364A7	3	66	21	χάριν

P.G.				E.Π.Ε.				
	Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word
21	CAR3	19	26	364B9	3	68	6	χάρι τι
22		24	26	373B2	3	80	1	χάρι ν
23		25	26	376A11	3	82	4	χαρί σηται
24		25	26	376B5	3	82	11	χάρι ς
25		25	26	376B12	3	82	17	χάρι ς
26		25	26	376C5	3	82	23	χάρι ς
27		26	26	377C9	3	86	10	χάρι τι
28		32	26	392B12	3	102	19	χάρι ς
29		32	26	392B15	3	102	21	χάρι ς
30		38	26	405A8	3	118	15	χαρί σηται
31		38	26	405A11	3	118	17	χάρι ς
32		38	26	405B5	3	118	24	χάρι ς
33		38	26	405B8	3	120	1	χάρι ς
34		39	26	405C11	3	120	15	χάρι το ς
35		39	26	408A5	3	120	22	χάρι ν
36		39	26	408A14	3	120	29	χάρι ν
37		40	26	409A3	3	124	2	χαρι ζόμενος
38		41	26	412A1	3	126	6	χάρι ς
39		43	26	413A14	3	128	24	χάρι ν
40		47	26	424B11	3	142	5	χάρι ν
41		48	26	424C8	3	142	14	χάρι ν
42		51	26	429B2	3	148	22	χάρι τι
43		51	26	432A11	3	150	27	χάρι ν
44		51	26	432A13	3	150	28	χάρι ν
45		51	26	432A13	3	150	28	χάρι ς
46		51	26	432A15	3	152	2	χάρι τι
47		52	26	433A9	3	154	7	χάρι ς
48		52	26	433B7	3	154	17	χάρι τι
49		53	26	433B11	3	154	22	χάρι ς
50		55	26	437B12	3	160	7	ἐχαρί σατο

(3) The Festal Letters FEST

LNPF				Syriac				Coptic			
English Translation				NPB				CSCO			
Letter	Para-										
Year	No	graph	P	L	P	L	Word	P	L	Word	Fragment
1	329	1						5	20	πετε	2
2	330	2	1	510	11	31	14	8	3	τεχαρις	4
3	331	3	2	513	22	41	10				
4	331	3	3	513	33	41	14				
5	331	3	3	513	35	41	15				
6	331	3	3	513	47	42	4				
7	331	3	3	513	57	42	9				
8	331	3	4	514	22	43	2				
9	331	3	4	514	29	43	7				
10	331	3	4	514	15	44	8				
11	331	3	6	515	25	47	16				
12	332	4	3	516	3	50	7				
13	333	5	1	517	26	54	4				
14	333	5	2	518	4	55	1				
15	333	5	3	518	12	55	5				
16	333	5	3	518	28	55	12				
17	333	5	4	518	35	57	9				
18	334	6	1	520	8	61	8				
19	334	6	1	520	21	61	14				
20	334	6	4	520	39	63	15				
21	334	6	5	521	7	64	10				
22	334	6	5	521	23	64	17				
23	334	6	13	523	2	71	11				
24	335	7	1	523	43	73	4				
25	335	7	9	526	32	82	3				
26	335	7	10	527	9	83	2				
27	338	10	5	529	47	89	11				
28	338	10	8	531	4	93	5				
29	338	10	9	531	40	94	4				
30	339	11	1	532	32	98	12				
31	339	11	8	535	51	105	15				
32	342	14	2	542	46	126	6				
33	342	14	2	542	53	126	10				
34	347	19	5	546	57	140	11				
35	348	20	1	549	27	148	1				
36	348	20	2	549	48	148	10				
37	352	24						43	22	ετεχαρις	2
38	352	24						43	33	ετεχαρις	2
39	355	27						46	21	Ντεχαρις	4
40	355	27						47	5	Ντεχαρις	4
41	355	27						48	6	τεχαρις	5
42	356	28						51	16	Ντειχαρις	6
43	364	36						70	27	τεχαρις (Cod. 2)	
44	366	38						58	7	ετειχαρις	10

P.G.			E.Π.E.		
Vol.	Col.	Word	Vol.	P	L Word
45	367 3910 332	7 χάριτος	59	10	Ἰτεχαρις 11
46	371 43 26 1441	χάριτι 10	352 18	χάριτι 33	17 Ἰλογχαρις 13
47	371 43		35	21	τειχαρις 15

(4) Other Anti-Arian Works: ENCY, DECR, SYN, AEGYPT, AFROS.

P.G.				E.Π.E.		OPITZ			
Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Page	Line	Word
ENCY	5	25	232B10	9	202	20			χάρις
1	DECR	6	25	425C11	9	42	28	6	13 χάριν
2		6	25	428A5	9	44	7	6	18 χάριν
3		7	25	428C7	9	46	5	7	4 χάριν
4		7	25	428C10	9	46	8	7	6 χάριτι
5		9	25	432B4	9	50	25	8	29 χάρις
6		15	25	441A14	9	66	25	13	5 χάριτος
7		19	25	449B15	9	80	13	16	20 χάριν
8		22	25	456C3	9	90	11	19	7 χάριν
9		30	25	472D6	9	114	29	27	3 χάριν
10		31	25	473B10	9	116	20	27	17 κεχάρισται
11		32	25	476C7	9	120	20	28	24 χάριν
12		36			9	146	9	35	10 χάριτι
13		36			9	146	14	35	13 χάριτος
14		36			9	148	7	35	29 χάρις
15		36			9	148	28	36	4 χάριτι
16		38			9	152	29	37	4 χάριν
17		38			9	156	1	37	26 χάριν
18		38			9	156	8	37	31 χάριτος
19		40			9	158	20	38	21 χάριν
20		40			9	178	3	42	43 χάριν
21		40			9	178	5	43	1 χάριν

N.B. The last chapter available in P.G. is DECR32.

P.G.				E.Π.Ε.			OPITZ		
Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Page	Line	Word
1	SYN	10	26	700B11	10	174	12	238	30 χαριεῖται
2		13	26	704B12	10	180	1	240	24 χάριτι
3		21	26	717B10	10	200	6	247	22 χάριτι
4		21	26	717C8	10	200	16	247	29 χάρις
5		26iv	26	729C3	10	216	4	252	26χαριζόμενον
6		26ix	26	733C6	10	220	25	254	4 χάριν
7		29	26	744B14	10	234	9	258	1 χάριν
8		35	26	756B5	10	248	21	262	27 χάριν
9		45	26	773C14	10	276	10	271	4 χάριν
10		48	26	777C9	10	280	20	272	25 χάριτι
11		51	26	784A10	10	288	14	274	26 χάριν
12		51	26	784B10	10	288	24	274	33 χάριν

P.G.				E.Π.Ε.				
Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word	
1	AEGYPT	1	25	540B8	10	22	13	χάριτι
2		4	25	545B14	10	30	15	χάριν
3		4	25	548A5	10	32	6	χάριν
4		4	25	548B7	10	32	19	χάριν
5		5	25	549A9	10	34	10	χάριν
6		9	25	557B1	10	42	27	χάριν
7		10	25	560C8	10	46	20	χάριν
8		12	25	565B6	10	52	21	χάριτι
9		16	25	576C2	10	64	23	χαριζόμενος
10		19	25	584B15	10	74	8	χάριν
11		22	25	589A5	10	78	26	χάριν
1	AFROS	1	26	1029A7	10	120	11	ἐχαρίσατο
2		2	26	1032D1	10	124	18	χάρις
3		5	26	1036D5	10	130	24	χάριν
4		7	26	1041B9	10	138	16	χαρισαμένου
5		7	26	1041B15	10	138	21	χάριτος
6		10	26	1045D4	10	146	12	χάριν

(5) Historical Apologetic Works: APOL-CAR, APOL-CON, APOL-FUG.

		P.G.		E.Π.Ε.		OPITZ				
Book	ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Page	Line	Word	
1	APOL-CAR	2	25	252A8	8	36	19	88	28	χάριτι
2		4	25	256A2	8	42	22	90	30	χάριν
3		8	25	264B12	8	56	24	94	27	χάρις
4		9	25	265A12	8	60	1	95	18	χάρις
5		12	25	269B2	8	66	10	97	14	ἐχαρίζοντο
6		15	25	273B1	8	72	6	99	2	χάριν
7		15	25	273B7	8	72	11	99	6	χάριν
8		16	25	273C12	8	74	1	99	17	χάριτος
9		19	25	277D8	8	80	16	101	8	χάρις
10		37	25	312A4	8	126	14	115	13	χάριν
11		38	25	316B1	8	134	3	117	20	χάριν
12		41	25	317B14	8	136	26	118	26	χάριν
13		44	25	324B4	8	138	6			χάριν
14		44	25	324B15	8	138	14			χάριτος
15		51	25	341B16	8	160	21	132	24	χάριτος
16		52	25	344C14	8	164	8	133	30	χάριν
17		53	25	345C8	8	166	14	134	24	χάριν
18		54	25	348A15	8	166	28	135	3	χάριτος
19		54	25	348B13	8	168	9	135	11	χάριτι
20		54	25	348C7	8	168	17	135	16	χάριτος
21		57	25	352C12	8	174	21	137	14	χαρισαμένω
22		58	25	353B6	8	176	14	138	6	χάριν
23		58	25	356A14	8	178	18	138	31	κεχαρισμένα
24		59	25	357A3	8	180	14	139	14	χάριν
25		61	25	360C13	8	184	27	141	19	χάριν
26		62	25	361C6	8	188	11	142	15	χάριν
27		65	25	365C7	8	194	13	144	19	χάριν
28		66	25	368B8	8	196	14	145	14	χάριν
29		69	25	372B12	8	202	24	147	14	χάριν
30		72	25	377B3	8	210	21	151	14	χάρις
31		82	25	396B11	8	240	4	161	24	χαρίζεσθαι
32		82	25	396C6	8	240	12	161	30	χάριν
33		84	25	397C7	8	242	26	162	28	χάριτι
34		84	25	397D2	8	244	10	163	2	χάρις
35		86	25	401D4	8	250	7	165	2	χάριτος
36		88	25	408A14	8	256	21	167	5	χάριν
37		89	25	409A7	8	258	10	167	37	κεχαρισμένα
1	APOL-CON	6	25	604A11	8	274	3			χάριτι
2		7	25	604D6	8	276	6			χάριν
3		7	25	604D11	8	276	9			χάριν
4		10	25	608B7	8	280	7			χαρισάμενος
5		17	25	616D6	8	292	27			χάρις
6		19	25	620B13	8	298	12			χάρις
7		31	25	636B2	8	324	1			χάριν
8		33	25	640A10	8	330	11			ἐχαρίσατο
9		35	25	641C7	8	334	23			χάρις

		P.G.		E.Π.E.		OPITZ				
	Book	ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Page	Line	Word
1	APOL-FUG	22	25	672D1	8	378	22	83	13	χάριν
2		26	25	677A6	8	386	7	85	19	χάριν

(6) The Letters to Serapion

P.G.				E.Π.E.					
Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word		
1	SER1	4	26	537B9	4	86	23	χάριν	
2		6	26	544C2	4	94	25	χάριτος	
3		6	26	545A12	4	96	17	χαρισθέντα	
4		6	26	548A12	4	98	23	χάριτος	
5		9	26	553A5	4	106	21	χάριτι	
6		10	26	556B1	4	110	14	χάριν	
7		12	26	560C11	4	118	5	χάριν	
8		14	26	563B5	4	124	12	χάρις	
9		21	26	580C12	4	144	24	χάριν	
10		22	26	584A7	4	148	15	χάριτι	
11		30	26	600C1	4	172	12	χάρις	
12		30	26	600C3	4	172	14	χάρις	
13		30	26	600C6	4	172	16	χάρις	
14		30	26	600C9	4	172	18	χάρις	
15		30	26	600C12	4	172	21	χάριν	
16		32	26	605B3	4	180	2	χάρις	
1	SER3	1	26	625C7	4	210	14	χαρισθέντα	
2		6	26	633B6	4	220	23	χάρις	
3		6	26	633B9	4	222	1	χάριν	
4		6	26	633B11	4	222	2	χάρις	
5		6	26	636A10	4	224	1	χάριν	
1	SER4	13	26	653C11	4	254	5	χάριν	
2		13	26	656B4	4	254	27	χάριτι	
3		14	26	657A8	4	258	2	χάριτι	
4		16	26	660B2	4	260	19	ἐχαρίζετο	
5		21	26	672B10	4	278	8	χάριν	

(7) Ascetical Works

P.G.				E.Π.Ε.				
Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word	
1	VITA	2	26	844A4	11	18	23	ἐχαρίσατο
2		4	26	845A13	11	22	8	τό χαρίεν
3		5	26	849A6	11	26	10	χάρις
4		14	26	865A11	11	44	22	χάριν
5		24	26	881A2	11	64	4	χάριν
6		30	26	889A8	11	74	2	χάριν
7		38	26	900A3	11	84	22	χάρις
8		39	26	900B4	11	86	9	χάριν
9		40	26	901A10	11	88	6	χαρίσωμαι
10		41	26	904B3	11	90	11	χάριν
11		44	26	908A13	11	94	9	χάριν
12		50	26	917A2	11	104	12	χαρίεντως
13		62	26	932C6	11	122	4	ἐχαρίσατο
14		67	26	937C7	11	128	15	χάριν
15		67	26	940A3	11	128	19	χάριν
16		73	26	945A13	11	136	8	χαρίεις
17		85	26	961C1	11	154	6	χαρίεντι
1	DRAC	1	25	524A6	11	216	6	χάριν
2		1	25	524B8	11	216	20	χάριν
3		2	25	525B2	11	218	14	χάριν
4		4	25	528A9	11	220	21	χάριν
5		5	25	529A7	11	224	9	χάριν
6		10	25	533C14	11	232	14	χάριν
AMUN	1	26	1169A13	11	234	10	χάριτι	
MON	1	26	1188A11	10	312	15	χάρις	

(8) Later Works

P.G.					E.Π.E.			
	Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word
1	ADEL	1	26	1072A4	4	314	4	χάριν
2		4	26	1077A11	4	322	19	χάριν
3		6	26	1080C7	4	328	6	χάριν
4		8	26	1081B14	4	330	3	χάριν
	MAXIM	3	26	1088D6	4	340	7	χάριτος
1	ANT	2	26	797A14	10	88	9	χάριν
2		2	26	797B7	10	88	16	χάρις
3		6	26	804A5	10	94	24	χάριτι
1	HIST.AR	1	25	696A1	9	220	4	χάριν
2		23	25	720B4	9	258	20	χάριτος
3		32	25	729C3	9	274	26	χάριν
4		46	25	749C2	9	308	9	χάριν
5		58	25	764B11	9	328	23	χάριν
6		76	25	785C1	9	362	26	χάριν
								Ludwig
								p. l.
1	EPIC	12	26	1068C12	4	310	13	17 2 χάριν
2		12	26	1069A10	4	310	23	18 3 χάρις

Appendix

P.G.				E.Π.Ε.				
Book	Ch.	Vol.	Col.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word	
1	INC-CAR	1	26	985A6	3	284	6	χάριν
2		3	26	989A2	3	290	10	ἐχαρίσατο
3		3	26	989A4	3	290	11	χάριν
4		5	26	992A5	3	292	21	χαρθσηται
5		5	26	992B8	3	294	11	χάριτος
6		8	26	996B11	3	300	5	χάριν
7		8	26	996B12	3	300	6	χάριν
8		8	26	996C3	3	300	10	χάριν
9		12	26	1004B14	3	310	13	χαρίσηται
10		12	26	1004C4	3	310	14	ἐχαρίσατο
1	APO1	3	26	1069D4	12	144	14	χάριν
2		4	26	1100B1	12	148	12	χάρις
3		7	26	1105B5	12	156	27	ἐχαρίσατο
4		17	26	1125A2	12	184	26	χάρις
5		20	26	1128B3	12	190	4	χαριζόμενος
1	APO2	3	26	1137A14	12	202	18	χάριτος
2		6	26	1141C8	12	210	11	χάρις
3		6	26	1141C12	12	210	14	χάρις
4		7	26	1144A11	12	212	2	χάριτος
5		7	26	1144A12	12	212	2	χάριτος
6		13	26	1153B4	12	226	13	χάρις
7		17	26	1161C3	12	238	18	χάρις
1	M.D.F.	9	26	1268D3	12	270	16	χάριν
2		18	26	1272B14	12	276	8	χάριτι
3		18	26	1272B16	12	276	10	χάριτι
4		21	26	1273C4	12	280	4	χάριτι
1	CAR4	6	26	477A6	3	214	13	χάριν
2		7	26	477B6	3	214	23	ἐχαρίζετο
3		7	26	477B14	3	216	5	ἐχαρίσατο
4		11	26	481A6	3	220	10	χαρίζονται
5		25	26	505C6	3	256	8	χάριτι
6		25	26	508A9	3	256	23	χάρις

TU

Book	Ch.	Vol.	Page	Line	Word
VIRG	17	29	52	21	ἐχαρίσατο

PART I

1. GRACE IN *GENT*

Only one out of the eleven references to χάρις in *GENT*(1) is important for our present investigation. This is because only this reference(2) has a clear theological content, whereas the remaining ten references are found, either in the context of the adverbial phrase "for the sake of" or "on account of", (3) or in the context of fallen man's "gratitude for" and "praise to" the idol-gods of paganism, (4) or in the context of Athanasius' exposure of the falsehood of the gods of paganism. (5)

The important theological reference to grace in *GENT* occurs in chapter two, which belongs to the first part of the treatise, i.e. that part which deals with the error of paganism (chs. 2-29). (6) This error, says Athanasius, did not exist from the beginning, but was later invented by man. To explain why and how man came to invent this error, Athanasius turns first to man's creation by God and to his original condition in God's paradise, i.e. to man's true and blessed life which he enjoyed before he sinned. This theme naturally follows from the main subject-matter of *GENT*, which is set forth in the first chapter and which is specified as "the knowledge of godliness and of the truth of all things" (7) -- as opposed to the "ignorance of the unbelievers" (8) and their lies (9) -- "the evil which was not present at the beginning, but began later to be invented in the minds" (10) of human beings.

It is in expounding the theme of man's original creation in GENT2 that the reference to grace occurs. Here Athanasius equates the act of man's creation by God with God's grace. This entails the fact that man was created in God's image, or, in the words of Athanasius:

God the Creator and King of the universe, being good and supremely bountiful, made the human species according to his own image (κατ' ἰδίαν εἰκόνα) through his own Logos, our Saviour Jesus Christ.(11)

Strictly speaking, then, God's grace is identical with man's creation "in" or "according to" the image of God. To elucidate what Athanasius means by grace we need to elucidate the precise meaning of the notion of creation in or according to God's image.(12)

Before we try to determine what the image of God in man is, we need to note a very important point in the Athanasian perspective. Athanasius does not identify God's image with man, but relates man to this image; man is not meant to be the very image of God but to be *in relation to*, or *according to*, this very image. Athanasius is explicit about God's image being identical with God's very Logos, through whom man was created and who became incarnate, the Lord Jesus Christ.(13) Athanasius makes a clear distinction between the very Εἰκών of God, the Logos, and the κατ' εἰκόνα of God, the human being; though, obviously, he

relates these to one another, especially as he explains that the latter is meant to be in relation to the former, thereby granting man the possibility of being assimilated with the Divine Logos and, through the latter, with God.(14)

Given that there is a distinction between the very Image of God (the Divine Logos) and that which is made according to this image (the man), what does Athanasius understand by the latter? To answer this question is to answer the question concerning the meaning of the notion of grace for Athanasius.

Athanasius states that God made man in the image of his Logos in order that man might acquire a "likeness (ὁμοίωσιν) to God" and, thereby, "see and understand the existing things" (θεωρητῆς καὶ ἐπιστήμων τῶν ὄντων) and "have a conception (ἔννοια) and understanding (γνώσις) of God's own eternity". Assuming that this ὁμοίωσις is obviously not different from the κατ' εἰκόνα, but constitutes the dynamic realization of the ontological possibility which is represented by, or even embedded in the latter,(15) we may note that the notion of the creation of man in the image of God (i.e. the Divine Logos) is connected with human rationality and its corollary, the twin understanding of the created beings and of the eternal and uncreated God. The iconic grace, which Athanasius presents in GENT2, entails man's cognitive ability which enables him to assimilate himself with God the Creator -- on the one hand understanding and transcending the creation, and on the other hand conceiving of and

communicating with the Creator -- and, as a consequence, becoming immortal and eternal. This means that the cognitive aspect of the image has existential implications, entailing man's communication with God and his participation in the paradisaal life of the angels in heaven. Thus knowledge and life are intimately tied up together so that the one cannot be understood apart from the other. Athanasius explains this in a profound text which contains references to many of the nuances connected with the rich notion of creation in God's image and which deserves special attention:

As long as he (man) keeps this divine identity (ταυτότης) he may never be removed from his sense of God (ἡ περὶ Θεοῦ φαντασία), or depart from the common life with the saints (ἡ τῶν ἁγίων σύζησις), but, retaining the g r a c e of him who bestowed it and possessing the special power which is from the Father's Logos, he may rejoice and communicate with God, living the harmless and blessed life, which is truly immortal. For having no obstacle to the knowledge of the Divine, he continuously contemplates (θεωρεῖ) by his own purity (καθαρότης) the Image of the Father, God the Logos, in whose image he was made, and is astonished as he perceives the providence which, through him, pervades the universe, thus transcending every sensible thing and every corporeal vision (ὑπεράνω τῶν αἰσθητῶν καὶ πάσης σωματικῆς φαντασίας γινόμενος) and conjoining himself with the divine and intelligible realities in heaven (τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς θεῖα καὶ

νοητά) by the power of the mind (τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ νοῦ). Because, when the mind of men does not communicate with bodies, and there is nothing mixed with it from outside, which is derived from the desire of these bodies, but is entirely transcendent (ὅλος ἐστὶν ἄνω) and intact in itself (ἐαυτῷ συνών), as it was made in the beginning, then, leaving aside all sensible and human things (τὰ αἰσθητὰ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα), it [the mind] is exalted to heaven (ἄνω μετάρσιος γίνεται) and, seeing the Logos, it sees in him the Logos' Father, experiencing exceeding joy (ἡδόμενος) at this contemplation (θεωρία) and being renewed by its longing (πόθος) for him. This is like the case of the first created man, who was called Adam according to the Hebrew tongue, and of whom the sacred Scriptures say that in the beginning he had his mind fixed upon God with an unashamed boldness (ἀνεπαισχύντῳ παρρησίᾳ) and lived a common life with the saints in the contemplation of the intelligible realities (τῇ τῶν νοητῶν θεωρίᾳ), which he possessed in that place, which the holy Moses figuratively called paradise. Indeed the purity of the soul (ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς καθαρότης) is sufficient to reflect through herself as mirror even God, as the Lord himself said: Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.⁽¹⁶⁾

This text makes clear the cognitive as well as the existential character of Athanasius' understanding of the grace of creation in God's image. It shows that this has to do both with the knowledge of heavenly and divine realities, including especially

man's knowledge (γνῶσις) of and communication (συνομιλία) with God himself, and also with man's cohabitation (σύζησις) with the saints in paradise. This knowledge and this communication, which are free from earthly corporeal conceptions and realities, are tied up to the mind (ὁ νοῦς) and consist in man's contemplation (θεωρία) of and communication (συνομιλία) with God, which are ultimately granted to man by God on the condition of man's achievement of purity. This achievement, as Athanasius explains, entails man's resolve "to retain both the *grace* bestowed on him and the power that was given to him by the Logos of the Father".⁽¹⁷⁾ In other words, it entails man's attachment to God the Logos and the heavenly, divine and intelligent realities, as opposed to the sensible and corporeal things. The model here is Adam's condition before the fall, who had his mind fixed on God and shared in the life of the saints in paradise.

Unfortunately, however, as Athanasius goes on to explain, man did not keep his purity but turned away from his divine calling and fell into the invention of evil, sin and idolatry. Yet it seems to be clear that it is still possible for human beings to turn back to the grace of God which safeguards their original destiny. They only need to return to a state of purity within themselves by shaking off the fallacy of evil and the bondage of sin. This is what Athanasius explains in chs. 30ff. and especially in ch. 34, where he says:

For human beings are able, as they turned away from God by the activity of their mind and remodelled non-existing things into gods, likewise to rise up with the mind of the soul and return back to God. They are indeed able to return, if they cast off the stain of every desire which they put on, and wash themselves to such an extent as to cast off every alien element that came to be in their soul, and if they can demonstrate that it is only as it was made, so that they may be able to contemplate in it the Logos of the Father according to whom they came into being from the beginning. For they were made according to the image and likeness of God, as the divine Scripture indicates in saying on behalf of God: Let us make man according to our image and likeness. Hence, it is obvious that, whenever it casts off of its own accord every stain of sin that has been poured on it (from without) and only retains pure the reflection of the divine image (τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα), which becomes all the more brightened, it contemplates as though in a mirror the image of the Father, the Logos, and in him the Father, whose image the Saviour is considered to be. And if the teaching arising from the soul itself is not sufficient for seeing what is better, due to those things from outside which confuse the mind, it is again possible to acquire the knowledge concerning God through the phenomena, since creation, like letters, indicates and proclaims its own master and maker through its order and harmony.(18)

Grace, in this context, is primarily connected with man's creation "according to the image and likeness of God", i.e. it refers both to the κατ' εἰκόνα and to the καθ' ὁμοίωσιν. But, inasmuch as both the κατ' εἰκόνα and the καθ' ὁμοίωσιν are understood in relation to both God's Εἰκὼν and God himself, i.e. to the Logos and the Father, grace is also connected with the latter. It is a relational notion which includes God with his Logos, as the Giver, and man, as the receiver. No necessity is attached to this relation. What is freely given, is also freely received. Although in GENT2 freedom is not explicitly mentioned, it underlies all that is said about the Giver and the receiver and especially about the conditions which pertain to their relation. God gives out of his goodness and overflowing bounty. Man freely receives what he is expected "to keep in purity" (διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ καθαρότητος), or in a "pure soul" (καθαρότης ψυχῆς), or with a mind (νοῦς) which is not tied to, but goes beyond, what is proper to bodies and all human things (τὰ σωματικά, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα), to what belongs to the mind (τὰ νοητά), which, in turn, lead him to the vision of God. It is particularly in his discussion of the fall of man from this arrangement (chs. 3ff.), that Athanasius expounds this important factor of freedom which lies embedded in his doctrine of the grace of the image and likeness, given to man by God at his creation. Here he explicitly speaks of the "free determination" (τὸ αὐτεξούσιον) of the human soul⁽¹⁹⁾ and of its free responsibility towards God the Creator within the context of creation. As Athanasius puts it,

Knowing its own capacity for free determination (γινώσκουσα τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἐαυτῆς), the soul sees that it can use its bodily members in both ways, for the pursuit of good or evil things -- the good things being those that exist (τὰ ὄντα) and the evil ones, those that are non-existing (οὐκ ὄντα); and I say that the good things are those that exist, because they have their designs (παρδείγματα) derived from God who is (ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος θεοῦ), and I say that the evil things are non-existing, because they have been moulded, though non-existent, by the invented conceptions (ἐπινοίαις) of men's minds.(20)

Athanasius explains this point further in chs. 4ff., speaking not only in terms of the "self-determination" (τὸ αὐτεξούσιον) of the soul,(21) but also in terms of its "capacity" (τὸ δυνατόν),(22) its "volitional activity" (τὸ βούλεσθαι),(23) its "decision" (ἡ γνώμη) and "will" (ἡ βούλησις).(24)

In summing up our exposition of this single but highly significant reference to grace in GENT we cannot fail to stress its profound and far-reaching content, which, far from suggesting an abstract or supernatural notion, actually embraces in a concrete, free and dynamic way, the creaturely human being in its free co-ordination and relation to God its Creator and especially to God's εἰκὼν, his Logos. It is a notion which is both cognitive and existential. In other words, it entails both understanding and manner of life, even though the precise interconnection of these two is presupposed rather than explained.

2. Grace in *INC*

When we turn to Athanasius' references to χάρις in his *De Incarnatione*, the volume which naturally follows from and complements his previous volume of *Contra Gentes*, we find that only two of them are used adverbially, meaning "on account of" or "for the reason of".⁽¹⁾ The remaining twenty references have a clear theological meaning and are spread throughout the first three main parts of the treatise which deal with man's creation, fall and salvation in and through Christ.⁽²⁾

These three inter-related themes provide the context which determines the general meaning of grace, which, in turn, is further specified and elucidated by means of particular associations consisting of both particular topics and terms. Here we shall examine them in three groups corresponding to the first three broad themes of the *De Incarnatione*: a) Grace and Creation, b) Grace and the Fall, and c) Grace and Inhomination/Salvation.

(a) Grace and Creation:

From the general grace of creation to the additional grace of the
image

In the introductory chapter of *INC* Athanasius tells us that in his previous work (*GENT*) he wrote about the Godhead of the Logos and his involvement in Creation, initially and afterwards.

Now he is going to write about the Inhomination (ἐνανθρώπησις) of the Logos and his Divine manifestation (θεία ἐπιφάνεια), which came as a result of the former. All this, he tells us, he was able to do and will attempt to do "because of", or "with the help of God's grace" (χάριτι θεοῦ).(3) Although this reference to "grace" may be taken as being too broad and therefore deprived of particular significance, it is, on closer examination, important, because it occurs at the beginning of INC and embraces the entire teaching of both GENT and INC and their respective perspectives: the Logos at Creation and the Logos at the Inhomination/Salvation. This first and broad reference to "grace" indicates its fundamental place and over-arching significance in Athanasius' perception, as well as its strong connection with the action of the Divine Logos in Creation and in the Inhomination/Salvation.

It is in INC3, however, that we find the first references to grace which are specifically related to man's creation and remind us of the doctrine which we have already encountered in GENT2 and which is here further explained.

In creating man out of nothing, like all other beings, through his own Logos, our Lord Jesus Christ, God had had mercy (ἐλεήσας) on the human race amongst all the other earthly beings ... inasmuch as he g r a c e d them with something more (πλέον τι χαριζόμενος αὐτοῖς).(4)

This text suggests, admittedly obliquely, that in Athanasius' perception the whole of the creation, including the creation of man, is an act of grace on the part of God; yet in the case of man, there is "something more", an "additional grace" (πλέον τι). The reason for this additional grace, as Athanasius explains, is connected with the fact that God wanted human beings "to remain in existence for ever" (διαμένειν αεί); whereas, because of their creation out of nothing, they were not able to achieve this by themselves. In other words this additional grace is primarily concerned with man's acquisition of ^{God's promise of} immortality.

The question, however, that naturally arises here is, in what exactly does this additional grace consist? As Athanasius goes on to explain, it consists in the special way in which created humanity is made, including its proper functioning. It consists in the creation of humanity in the image and the likeness of God -- a point which we have already encountered in GENT. Here are Athanasius' own words:

God did not simply make human beings, like all the other irrational (ἄλογα) creatures on the earth, but created them according to his own image (κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνα), also transmitting to them the power (δύναμις) of his own Logos, so that, having, as it were, shadows of the Logos and, thereby, becoming rational (λογικοί) like him, they might remain in a state of blessedness, living the true life which truly belongs to the saints in paradise.(5)

It is made perfectly clear in this text that being in the image and likeness of God is a dynamic notion entailing man's relation to God's Logos, his reception of the Logos' power, his becoming rational (like the Logos) and his participation in true, paradisaical life. As in GENT so here the cognitive and existential aspects of the grace of creation in, or according to, the Logos are made explicit. But Athanasius adds a new element which explains in another way his other point made in GENT, namely, that no necessity is attached to this notion of grace, but that it entails man's free response to God's free gift. This element is connected with what might be called the "law of paradise" which God introduced into his relation with man through the Logos in order to secure the free grace which he gave to human beings. Here are Athanasius' words:

Knowing again that the free choice (προαίρεσις) of human beings could turn either way, he forestalled this by securing the grace which was given to them by means of a law (νόμῳ) and a place (τόπῳ). He introduced them into his own paradise and gave them a law; so that if they kept the grace (τὴν χάριν) and remained good, they would possess the life in paradise which is without sorrow, pain and care, besides their possessing of the promise of immortality in heaven; but if they transgressed and became wicked by turning away, they would come to know how to endure the natural corruption of death and would no longer live in paradise, but remain in death and corruption since they would die outside it. This is

what the divine Scripture points to in advance when it says on the part of God: 'You shall eat from every tree of the paradise; but you shall not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; on the day you eat, you shall die by death' (Gen. 2: 16-17). What else does dying by death mean but that not only dying but also remaining in the corruption of death?(6)

This profound text makes several important points which clarify Athanasius' understanding of the notion of grace granted by God to man at his creation. The first point is that the divine gift of grace is not irresistible and therefore not bound to a law of necessity. It can be accepted or rejected by man who is free to choose either way. God, on the other hand, does not deprive man of this free choice. Rather, he acts by way of guiding him so as to secure his acceptance of the grace which has such far-reaching existential implications for him. Putting it positively, for grace to be truly grace, it must be placed in a context of freedom, entailing both free dispensation and free reception of it. This means that the "Law of Paradise", which leaves it to God to decide about good and evil, is introduced in order to secure or safeguard the reception of the grace by man's free choice. The significant point that emerges here is that God's law is not in opposition to God's grace, because the purpose of the former is to secure the free reception of the latter. Indeed, as Athanasius puts it, to keep the law is to keep the grace and, therefore, we might say that grace is secured by the law! This is the case

because the law safeguards freedom by linking it with true knowledge. The connection between law and grace is a specific manifestation of the cognitive aspect of the grace of the image of God in man.

Another important point emerging from the above text is connected with the other aspect of the grace of the image of God in man which we have called existential. This is seen in the Athanasian syllogism according to which to keep the grace is to remain in paradise and, in turn, to remain in paradise is to live a life of goodness, free from sorrow, pain and care which, eventually, leads to immortality. The fact that in this context grace is the basis of the life of goodness and immortality is negatively confirmed by what Athanasius says about the implications following its rejection. These are the loss of paradise, i.e. of the common life of the saints in God's presence, and consequently, the fall into evil, death and corruption. Ultimately, of course, these implications are natural to man's creaturehood and not superimposed punishments by God. Athanasius speaks about the "inability" (the οὐχ ικανόν) of man, as far as the logic of his own generation goes (τὸν τῆς ἰδίας γενέσεως λόγον), to remain in existence for ever; or he speaks about the κατὰ φύσιν φθορὰν τὴν ἐν θανάτῳ to which man returns in rejecting God's additional grace. Being "natural" (κατὰ φύσιν), death and corruption are not evil in themselves. They appear to be evil only from the perspective of the rejection of that "additional grace" which enables man to transcend both of them.

(b) Grace and the Fall:

From the additional grace of the image to the general grace of creation

It is in INC4 that Athanasius further clarifies the above points as he discusses man's fall from the "additional grace" of God. He links the rejection of the divine commandment (ἐντολή) in paradise on the part of humanity to the latter's return to what is by nature proper to it (τὸ κατὰ φύσιν) and, therefore, to corruption. He also explains that the rejection of the commandment is ultimately the rejection of God and his Logos. He speaks of it in terms of a "turning away from the understanding of God",⁽⁷⁾ which results in the invention of evil;⁽⁸⁾ or, in terms of "an emptying of humanity from the sense of God"⁽⁹⁾ and a turning to non-existing things, which result in the emptying of humanity of eternal existence.⁽¹⁰⁾

It is this turning to non-existing things, says Athanasius, that brought man face to face with his origin out of nothing, i.e. with the very ground of his natural mortality.⁽¹¹⁾ The only way for man to escape from this predicament is the way of the special grace which God granted to him; it is the way which enables him to become assimilated to (to acquire the likeness of) the One Who Is⁽¹²⁾ and, therefore, to escape the corruption embedded in his nature and to remain incorruptible. But the likeness to God can be achieved only on the condition that the understanding of him is maintained;⁽¹³⁾ something which, in turn, is achieved by

the observance of the law. Hence Athanasius cites the statement of Wisd. 6:18 according to which "the keeping of the laws is the assurance of incorruptibility". Thus to observe the law is to understand God and to understand God is to be assimilated with him, to participate in his life, to share in his goodness and incorruptibility; it is "to become god, a son of the Most High", which Athanasius affirms, citing Ps. 81:6-7. This is precisely the meaning of the additional grace which man rejected by transgressing God's commandment.

One may stop here for a moment to think about the relation of nature to grace in the thought of Athanasius. Does he understand them as antithetical? Is grace the opposite of nature, especially when one considers that nature leads to death and grace to immortality, or that man is by nature creaturely and mortal, and by grace, divine and immortal?

In speaking about "the additional grace of the image and likeness", Athanasius implies that creation is an act of grace. This suggests that grace is not opposed to, but rather undergirds created human nature, the more so when the additional grace is compared to this nature. The fact that the additional grace does not replace, but perfects human nature, suspending, as it were, its inherent weakness, clearly suggests that there is no antithesis here. If there were an antithesis, it would be seen in man's choice. Although a natural faculty, this choice is employed against that which secures the existence of human nature, i.e. man's

choice to reject the gift of God's "additional grace", which deifies and immortalizes his creaturely and mortal human nature. Instead man chooses to accept something which is utterly deprived of real or natural existence and, as such, is evil. For Athanasius, then, human nature, like every other created nature, comes into existence by an act of grace. In contrast to other creaturely natures, human nature is offered an additional grace which can secure the everlasting existence of human nature. This is a grace upon grace, as it were, which is a special gift of God the Creator to humanity at its creation. This means that there is no opposition between nature and grace, but such an intimate interconnection that they mutually presuppose one another.

In discussing man's subjection to corruption as the result of his fall from God's grace through his rejection of God's law, Athanasius stresses the point that corruption reigned over man more decisively than it would have done according to the inherent weakness of the human nature (πλεῖον τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν),⁽¹⁴⁾ and all the more so as it was reinforced by the threat (ἀπειλή) which God pronounced against the transgression of his commandment. This leads Athanasius to elaborate the theme of man's fall, by stressing the unbridled course it took. Thus he speaks of human beings as never stopping in their transgressions, but exceeding every limit and advancing to a point beyond measure,⁽¹⁵⁾ or exceeding every lawlessness,⁽¹⁶⁾ or becoming insatiable in sinning,⁽¹⁷⁾ or committing every wicked act both singly and in common,⁽¹⁸⁾ or even performing acts which are

against nature.⁽¹⁹⁾ Thus he does not hesitate to draw the conclusion that human beings, by having literally come to be held captives (ἐκρατοῦντο) to the corruption by nature, came to lose the grace of being according to the image of God.⁽²⁰⁾

A more detailed examination of chapters 4-7 of INC, dealing with man's fall, reveals several important details in Athanasius' perception. First of all, it reveals that "the grace of being in the image", which is here said to have been lost, is the twofold relation of man to God through man's participation in God's Logos, entailing both man's understanding of God (κατανόησις τοῦ Θεοῦ) and man's sharing in God's eternity (τὸ αἰεὶ εἶναι) and their replacement respectively by evil and death.⁽²¹⁾ However, this does not mean that the loss of grace is an absolute one, not only because grace is not a mere function but a faculty, but also and more importantly, because, as we have seen, grace is a relational concept entailing not only man but also God, the former as a free receiver and the latter as a free giver. Thus men can still use their "rational faculty",⁽²²⁾ which is an aspect of their nature -- a faculty implanted into their being by the Creator when they were made according to his own image -- but which they use in the wrong way, "inventing evil"⁽²³⁾ and "incurring corruption".⁽²⁴⁾ The phrase "the rational man who was made in God's image was being lost",⁽²⁵⁾ rather refers to man's loss of the dynamic appropriation of God's special grace, as opposed to a loss of man's rational faculty. To put it another way, in losing the sense of God man does not become completely

irrational, and in enduring death and corruption he is not utterly annihilated. This is the case not only because of the way in which man has been made but also because of the continuing act of the Creator Logos towards man.(26)

Yet the hard fact remains that man is really trapped into a situation from which he cannot escape by his own efforts. The image of God in man, as man's capability of understanding, of being with and of being assimilated to God remains within man, but the actual fulfilment of this capability has become an impossibility for man *per se* on account of the consequences of his freely chosen fall. This is particularly stressed in INC7, where Athanasius explains why repentance (μετάνοια), although open to man as a possibility, could never lead to the fulfilment of God's additional grace in man. Repentance "does not have the power to recall somebody from what is according to nature, except only to put an end to sinning".(27) Having established that such was fallen man's predicament, Athanasius turns for the solution to man's salvation by the gracious intervention of God through his Logos.

What else should take place? Or who was needed for such a grace (τοιούτην χάριν) and recall, except God the Logos who initially created all things out of nothing? For it belonged to him to bring what was corruptible to incorruption, and to preserve what was fitting above all to the Father (τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐλογον πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα). For

being the Logos of the Father and being above all, consequently he alone was able to regain all (that was lost) and to suffer for all and was capable to intercede to the Father about all.(28)

In other words, though the additional grace, the grace of being in the divine image, seems to have been lost (in the sense of being inactive or unproductive or even suspended) on the part of man, this is not the case when it is looked at from the side of God, its ultimate source. The thought here is that God's act of grace is not limited by man's negative response to it. God's grace can still find ways of freely establishing itself in man for man's benefit. This is because God's grace, which embraces the whole of God's creation and particularly mankind, is ultimately rooted in God's goodness and integrity.(29) Thus God intervenes once more through his Logos who has been from the beginning the basis of the whole of creation. The phrase "such a grace and recall"(30) in the above text probably suggests yet another form of divine grace, distinct from, but not incoherent with, the additional grace of the image or the general grace of creation.

This new form of grace results from Athanasius' Logos-centred approach to grace, explicitly revealed in such phrases as: "by the grace of the Logos",⁽³¹⁾ or "by the grace of participation in the Logos",⁽³²⁾ or "He alone was able to regain all that was lost...".⁽³³⁾ It falls in direct line with the notion of the Logos' being the very image of God by whose intervention the additional

grace originally granted by God to mankind, the grace of being in God's image and likeness, might be restored. In a phrase which is characteristic of the Athanasian Logo-centric perspective on grace, it is stated that "our transgression called out the philanthropy of the Logos".⁽³⁴⁾ Elsewhere he puts it somewhat differently, when he states that "it was unbecoming that what had once been created rational and had partaken of God's Logos should perish and return again to non-existence through corruption",⁽³⁵⁾ because, as he explains, this would have been unworthy of God's goodness.⁽³⁶⁾

(c) Grace and Salvation

The reaffirmation and fulfilment of the additional grace
of being in God's image through the Inhomination of the Logos
of God

In the second part of the *De Incarnatione* (chs. 7b-16), where Athanasius elaborates the doctrine of the Inhomination of the Divine Logos, i.e. the doctrine of the person of Christ, the term grace has two major associations: it is "the grace of the resurrection"⁽³⁷⁾ and "the grace of being in (or, according to) God's image and likeness" (ἡ τοῦ κατ' εἰκόνα χάρις)⁽³⁸⁾ which is restored to man by the inhominated Logos.⁽³⁹⁾ These two associations, the resurrection of the body and the restoration of the divine image in man's soul, bring out the full meaning of the grace of the Inhomination or the grace of Christ, which embraces the whole of human nature. They correspond to the two

soteriological causes of the Inhomination of the Logos, following the two main aspects of the fall of mankind, namely the subjection to corruption and death and the loss of knowledge of and communion with God.(40)

Before examining details of Athanasius' exposition of these two senses of the grace of the Saviour Christ, it is important to observe that, whereas in the context of creation Athanasius started with the grace of being in God's image and likeness and then moved on to the theme of incorruptibility and immortality, more or less treating the latter as a consequence following from the actualization of the former, in the case of salvation he reverses his perspective, starting with the grace of the resurrection, which restores the incorruptibility and immortality of mankind and only then does he move on to the restoration of the grace of being in God's image and likeness, as if the latter is now the consequence of the former! Naturally the question arises here, whether this reversal in the perspective of the additional grace is merely incidental and, therefore, insignificant. We think not. It seems, from a closer examination of the text, that it is the result of Athanasius' attachment to the biblical Pauline perspective, which sees the subjection of all human beings to death and corruption, resulting directly from the sin of the protoplasts, as the root of their turning away from God and falling into sin. In other words, Adam and Eve's legacy of mortal humanity to their descendants is a "starting point" or a "root" of the latter's sin. It provides the basis for the accuser (the devil)

and the excuse for the sinner.⁽⁴¹⁾ It is precisely this "starting point" or "root" that the Saviour came first to destroy through his saving death and resurrection and thus to make possible the free return of human beings to communion with him and through him with God the Father. To put it in the terms of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is through his death and resurrection that Christ destroyed the fear of death which constitutes the strength of sin and the devil. Athanasius explains this, somewhat indirectly, in INC7, where he argues, that repentance could not suffice for man's salvation, inasmuch as it can only put an end to sinning, but cannot liberate the penitent from natural corruption and death (τὸ κατὰ φύσιν) which was irreversibly brought to him by sin. In saying this, Athanasius is suggesting that the "primary cause" (ἡ πρώτη αἰτία) in man's salvation is the liberation of humanity from the grip of natural corruption and death into which it fell through the sin of the protoplasts. It was after the firm establishment of the hope of the resurrection through his own resurrection that Christ challenged the people to return to the grace of the image, i.e. to a free relationship to, and communion with, him and the saints. In other words, according to Athanasius the Saviour's primary target was to treat the deadly consequence of the original transgression upon all humanity, so that human beings may respond freely -- as is required by reason of their original freedom -- to his challenge of repentance and restoration through forgiveness. This suggests, of course, that man's original fall has resulted in an inescapable bondage to death, but not to sin. Man can still freely choose to reject sin, to repent and to seek God's

forgiveness and mercy. But he needs "proof", as it were, that his repentance will be rewarded with eternal life. This is precisely what the grace of the resurrection provided. The resurrection of Christ and the grace of the resurrection which ensued from this has removed the inescapable barrier of death and thus prepared the way for a free return of man to God and to salvation. This will become further clarified as we turn to the examination of the basic elements of the grace of the resurrection in Athanasius' understanding.

The Grace of the Resurrection

The opening sentences of INC8 offer an initial account of the Inhomination of the Logos, but then the discourse turns to the presentation of the soteriological purpose of the Inhomination, namely to Christ's vicarious sacrificial death on behalf of all human beings,⁽⁴²⁾ whereby the law of corruption which held universal sway over mankind was abolished, since its force or authority was fulfilled "in the dominical body" (ἐν τῷ κυριακῷ σώματι). The ultimate purpose of it all was, as Athanasius puts it, that the inhominated Logos...

might bring back to incorruptibility the human beings who had turned to corruption, reviving them from the state of death, through the appropriation of their body to himself and *through the grace of the resurrection* (τῇ τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριτι), wiping out death from them as the fire wipes out

the straw [lit. the reed].(43)

In INC9 and INC10 Athanasius elucidates the meaning of *the grace of the resurrection* by explaining the logic of the saving death of Christ. The central point of this elucidation is the Divine Logos who, as Athanasius explained in his account of man's creation (both in GENT2f and in INC3), is the indisputable basis of God's additional grace to man. It is because of his personal involvement in the inhomination, "the assumption of a (single) mortal human body to himself",⁽⁴⁴⁾ that this body is "sufficient",⁽⁴⁵⁾ or "appropriate",⁽⁴⁶⁾ as the Logos' "temple", and "instrument"⁽⁴⁷⁾ to be used in death "as an utterly immaculate sacrificial offering and victim",⁽⁴⁸⁾ i.e. "as a substitute for all"⁽⁴⁹⁾ and that it should remain incorruptible, and thus *through the grace of the resurrection* corruption might cease to have an ultimate grip on all. In other words, the grace of the resurrection has a universal range, which includes every human being; the basis of it is not the body assumed by the Logos as such, but the fact that this body has become united with the universal head of all humanity and all creation, the Creator himself, the Divine Logos.⁽⁵⁰⁾

The significance of the Logos' inhominal intervention in the human affairs, based on the initial premise that humanity was made through him,⁽⁵¹⁾ is further expounded in INC10. This significance is understood to be twofold, comprising "the abolition of human death through the offering of Christ's own body" and

"the rectification of human negligence (ἀμέλεια) through Christ's own teaching".(52) Ultimately however, as Athanasius' great array of biblical citations and exegetical comments shows, the saving work of the Logos is the work of God. Christ tasted death on behalf of all "by the grace of God".(53) The common resurrection of all human beings at the end of time is also a grace given from and ultimately revealed by God.(54)

Athanasius gives yet another exposition of the "grace of the resurrection" later on in his discourse (INC:20ff), where he discusses some important aspects of the death and resurrection of Christ.(55) In INC20 he repeats the main points of his understanding of Christ's death. It was, he says, only through the Lord Jesus Christ, who, as Divine Logos, is the principle of life himself (αὐτοζωή), that the corruptible could be changed to incorruptibility(56) and the mortal could be raised to immortality.(57) Also, it was only through the same that what was owed by all (namely, to die) had to be repaid.(58) This is exactly why the Logos came and sojourned amongst human beings as one of them. He came to achieve all this for them. Thus, having first revealed his Divine identity through his (miraculous) works, he then offered "the universal sacrifice", (59) by delivering his own temple to death "instead of all".(60) His aim in this was to make all human beings free from the irrevocable natural consequences of the original transgression, i.e. to show himself to be greater than death, and to put forth his own incorruptible body as the first-fruits of the universal resurrection.

Athanasius acknowledges that there is a paradox here, inasmuch as two opposite operations seem to have been at work in Christ: on the one hand the operation of death and corruption, and on the other hand the operation of immortality and incorruptibility. But as he explains, these two operations are connected with the two elements which constitute the one Christ, namely the body (the humanity) and the Divine Logos.⁽⁶¹⁾ Thus, as Athanasius points out, Christ's death is a real death, because his body is truly human and mortal, even though it was constituted through a new miracle, the virginal birth. On the other hand, death and corruption, although truly at work in Christ's human body, could not have had, he says, any lasting results, because the body was indwelt by (ἐνοικήσαντα), or co-existed with (συνόντα), God's incorruptible and immortal Logos. This means that the paradox is resolved by the mystery of the Incarnation, the co-existence of the mortal and creaturely human body with the immortal and uncreated Divine Logos. But it also means that the Incarnation is the presupposition, or ultimate ground, of the grace of the resurrection. In other words the Athanasian perspective on the grace of the resurrection is inseparable from the vicarious death of the Saviour, which, in turn, is possible because of the fact of the Incarnation of the Creator Logos. Here Incarnation and atonement (the Divine-human constitution of the person of Christ and the work of Christ on the Cross) are mutually interconnected. Thus, the grace of the resurrection is inseparable from the incarnate Lord.

Hence the grace of the resurrection is "the grace of the Saviour"⁽⁶²⁾ and therefore salvation must be primarily understood as the conferring of the grace of the resurrection upon the whole of humanity by the incarnate Creator-Saviour.

In INC21a Athanasius explains the difference which the grace of the resurrection has made to human death in view of the fact that the latter continues to be at work among human beings. Human death, he says, is no longer ultimate, nor is it a sign of condemnation, but the path to a greater resurrection. Since the grace of the resurrection of Christ has now abolished the previously inescapable principle of corruption, human death is only a temporary dissolution of the mortal body⁽⁶³⁾ and should be understood in terms of the burial of a seed inside the earth which takes place in order to produce life. This means that the grace of the resurrection is as irreversibly final (i.e. eschatological) as the deadly legacy of the original transgression of the first man had been, for it refers both to the ultimate future and to its real implications for the present. Therefore Athanasius can point out that,

death is so truly dead ... that it is no longer terrible; rather those who believe in Christ trample over death, as if it was nothing, and even prefer to die rather than deny their faith in Christ; and all this because they know that in dying they are not lost, but live and become incorruptible through the resurrection.⁽⁶⁴⁾

In the following chapters (INC20bff) Athanasius explains why the death of Christ had to be received from outside and not from himself. In doing this, he makes abundantly clear that the grace of the resurrection has resulted in the destruction of human death and the abolition of the power of sin and the devil. But this primary grace of the Saviour, the grace of the resurrection, finds its ultimate manifestation and completion in the restoration of the grace of being in God's image and likeness, the additional grace, which God gave mankind when he created them through his Logos and which secures man's eternity and well being. Thus the free and totally gratuitous bestowal of the grace of immortality on the human being, which lies at the very heart of the Gospel, is matched by the restoration of the human knowledge of God and the world as God's creation. It seems clear that in Athanasius' mind the grace of the resurrection embraces the being of mankind and the grace of the restoration of God's image and likeness, mankind's true knowledge of God and the world. But these "two graces" are ultimately the two aspects of the "one grace" of the one Saviour. This is what Athanasius discusses in INC11ff and what enables him to formulate some of his most profound statements on the saving grace of the Incarnate Logos. It is to these that we must now turn.

The Grace of the Divine Image

In INC11 Athanasius begins his discourse on the Saviour's

restoration of the grace of God's image and likeness in man by recalling first God's original design in creating mankind through his Logos. He speaks again of "the inherent weakness of human nature and of its inability to know the Creator with its own resources"⁽⁶⁵⁾ and, generally, of "the deficiency of created beings in grasping and knowing their divine Creator".⁽⁶⁶⁾

It is important to note here that Athanasius traces these creaturely limitations, as far as the relation of creatures to God is concerned, to two factors, namely, to creatures being both "generate", or "out of nothing",⁽⁶⁷⁾ and also "corporeal", or "bound to a body",⁽⁶⁸⁾ in contrast to God who is both "ingenerate" (ἀγέννητος) and "incorporeal" (ἄσώματος). These statements complement Athanasius' earlier statement in INC3 concerning the limited existence of creatures by reason of their particular mode of generation.⁽⁶⁹⁾

In any case, it is because of mankind's inescapable creaturely limitations that God had mercy on mankind so that human beings might not be deprived of the knowledge of God and should not have their being to no purpose. In other words, it is by a special grace of God that the human creaturely being was given, from the first moment of its appearance in existence, the possibility to know God and to remain in existence for ever. As Athanasius explains, this grace is connected with the fact that mankind was originally created according to, or in, the image and likeness of God, i.e. in God's Logos. This means, in turn, that through this

grace human beings may perceive in their minds (νοοῦντες) the very Icon of God, his own Logos, and through him they could gain some mental grasp (ἐννοίαν) of God the Father, thereby being enabled to live the truly divine and blessed life. However, this possibility was interrupted through the fall.

Athanasius holds that human beings went out of their minds (παράφρονες), totally neglecting (κατολιγωρήσαντες) the grace of being in the image and likeness of God; in consequence, they confused (ἐθόλωσαν) their soul, forgot their mental grasp of God (ἐπιλαθέσθαι τῆς περὶ Θεοῦ ἐννοίας) and, worst of all, invented idolatry and imported it into their minds.⁽⁷⁰⁾ INC11b is a summary of the greater part of GENT which analyses the evil course of the consequences of the fall of mankind. It stresses the fact that all this was a terrible deceit (πλάνη), which in a sense blinded human beings and deprived them of the vision of the Logos of God who continued to appear to them in a great variety of ways.

In INC12 Athanasius explains that the root cause of this deceit is man's neglectfulness (ἀμέλεια) of the knowledge of God, his laziness (ὀκνηρόν) in studying God's providence in creation through his Logos and his failure to listen to the saints and the prophets whom God sent to edify the Jews and the whole oecumene. The result of it all was that human beings became irrational (ἄλόγους, ἄλογωθέντας); not, of course, in the sense that they lost their natural capacity of rationality, but in the

sense that they misapplied it, as Athanasius puts it:

they sated themselves with so many more evils and sins that they *appeared* (ὡς δοκεῖν) to be no longer rational, but to *be considered* (ἀλλὰ νομίζεσθαι) as irrational *on account of their manners* (ἐκ τῶν τρόπων).(71)

In other words, it is not the capacity of nature that is lost, but the manner of activity in which this nature is engaged, and which militates against nature, not allowing it to operate according to its true and inherent pattern.

All this, of course, has to do with the grace of being in God's image and likeness, since the human rationality, as we have already discovered, is directly connected with it in the thought of Athanasius. Thus we may say that this grace has not been lost to man as an inherent capacity, but has simply ceased to be the driving, or operating, force of his true life. It is in this latter sense that it needs to be "rejuvenated";(72) and this, as Athanasius explains, is a divine "demand",⁽⁷³⁾ arising from the very logic of God's good creative act which made man with this capacity for an eternal purpose. However, man's capacity for God, his endowment with rationality and mental power, the grace of being in God's image and likeness, remains in him as the sufficient presupposition of his free return to God and to his God-ordained eternal destiny. Athanasius states this explicitly in the beginning of INC12, where he says that "the grace of being

in the image is sufficient in itself for the knowledge of God the Logos and, through him, of the Father".⁽⁷⁴⁾ What is particularly important here and needs to be carefully considered is that it is from such a basis of human capacity and self-determined responsibility for God, implanted into human nature by God himself, that he views God's revelatory interventions in the on-going works of creation and providence and in the giving of the law and the prophets. These are God's appeals, as it were, to man's capacity, which, on account of man's willful fall, remains inactive as far as the reality of God and man's relation to it is concerned.

However, the fact that man freely fails to respond to these challenges means that God is presented with a great dilemma. On the one hand, God cannot restore the proper function of the capacity of man for him by enforcing it upon man in defiance of man's free response⁽⁷⁵⁾, and on the other hand, "it is of no value and no glory to God to have his creature, which was made capable of participating in him, to be wasting away".⁽⁷⁶⁾ The answer to this dilemma is, according to Athanasius, what amounts to the greatest possible appeal of God to man, namely, the incarnate intervention of the very Image of God according to which man was made, in his own words:

It should not happen that the beings which had once communicated with the Image of God should perish. What should God do? Or what should happen, except that what

was made according to the Image should be renewed (τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα πάλιν ἀνανεῶσαι), so that through it men might once again come to know God? And how could this take place, except through the very Image of God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, coming to be in the midst of it all (αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκόνης παραγενομένης)? For it was not possible through men, since they too had been made according to the Image; nor through angels either, since they were not God's very image either. Hence God's Logos came to be in the midst of it through himself, so that being himself the Image of the Father he might recreate man who was according to the image (εἰκὼν ὢν τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπον ἀνακτίσαι δυνήθῃ). And again this could not be done otherwise, unless death and corruption were to be abolished. Consequently he took a mortal body, so that death might be wiped out in it, and the human beings who were according to the image might be again renewed. Therefore no one else could meet this need, except the Image of the Father.⁽⁷⁷⁾

The above text clarifies fully what we have already discovered about Athanasius' understanding of the phrase "in God's image and likeness". There is for him a clear distinction between "the image of God" (ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ), i.e. the Logos of God, and "that which is in God's image and likeness" (τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ), i.e. the human beings. At the same time, however, there is a clear need for these two to be in a certain relation to each other, so that the former may give

itself to the latter and the latter may receive or participate in the former and, thereby, sustain the human being in the true and eternal life. However, a difficulty arises when the human side does not allow this need to be fulfilled and, as a result, the human being is led along the road of destruction. This is a great difficulty, as God cannot force a response from the human being, for otherwise the whole design of his grace connected with his image and its reflection in man would be jeopardized. It is precisely to meet this particular difficulty that God goes to the extent of presenting his image in a human form. He still does not force human beings to respond to the need of their relation to him. Instead he establishes in his incarnate image the truth which humanity needs in order to meet its existential problem. In the incarnate divine Image, the Lord Jesus Christ, human beings are offered the chance both "to be recreated once again" (ἀνακτισθῆναι) with God and "to be renewed" (ἀνακαλινθῆναι) through "the rejuvenation" (ἀνανεωθῆναι) of the grace of the image of God in them.⁽⁷⁸⁾ This is an essential component of the grace of the Saviour, the restoration of the grace of the image in man. But how does Athanasius understand its operation? This is what he tries to explain in INC14ff.

In INC14 Athanasius explains the restoration of the image of God in man through Christ in two ways. Firstly, he uses the somewhat crude example of a form (μορφή) which is imprinted on a piece of wood. To renew the imprint of this form on the wood, when dirt from outside (ἐξωθεν ρύποι) has made it to

disappear by covering it up (παράφανισθείσης), one needs to use once again the original form so that it can be re-impressed on the wood (ἀνατυποῦσθαι).(79) Secondly, he uses Christ's teaching on salvation as "regeneration" (ἀναγέννησις) as recorded in the Gospel, citing Luke 19:10, which stresses that Christ came to save, and supplementing this verse with John 3:5, which emphasises that salvation involves a "regeneration".(80) Both these cases are expounded in terms of the restoration of the grace of divine image in man. In his discussion Athanasius stresses on the one hand the forgiveness of sins which the incarnate Son of God came to bring to humanity, and on the other hand the regeneration and recreation of the soul through the grace of the image. In both cases it is made clear that the image of God in man is not lost, but obscured, or inactive, on account of sin "which has been brought into man's soul from outside".(81) Thus Christ's work is to wipe out the obstacle of sin from man's rational soul and mind and to persuade (μεταπειῶσαι) man who must make the response to look to him and, through him, to God for his renewal. Inasmuch as this sin entails man's rational and mental attachment to sensible creaturely things, which capture his bodily senses, Athanasius points to the assumption of the human body by the Divine Logos as the means through which he can lead the human rational souls and minds to rise beyond the sensible creation to the Divine Creator Logos, who constitutes the true ground of their existence, and to regain through him the vision of God. In Athanasius' view, the assumption of the human body by the Logos, i.e. the Incarnation, was necessary, because the sin of

human beings consisted of their wrong attachment to bodily things. Through this assumption, he says, "the Logos captured the senses of human beings"⁽⁸²⁾ and "through his bodily acts he revealed the truth of his Godhead to them and, through himself, of the Father".⁽⁸³⁾ It is in this incarnate encounter with the divine Logos, the very Image of God, that human beings regain the possibility of their renewal. What has been made after the image, is now confronted by it and the renewal of its relationship to it becomes a real possibility. What the incarnate Logos precisely does in this encounter, or how his Godhead is revealed through his humanity, is the subject-matter of the section that follows at this point in Athanasius' discourse.⁽⁸⁴⁾ This, however, does not necessarily have to be explored here. Yet, what is important to repeat here is the concluding statement of Athanasius in INC16 in his discussion of the grace of the divine image, because it links this grace to the grace of the resurrection and thus summarizes in a succinct way the grace of the Saviour Christ:

Through the Incarnation the Saviour was conferring a twofold benefaction on mankind, inasmuch as he was both, abolishing death from our midst and renewing us, and, being unapparent and invisible was making himself apparent through the works, and known as the Son of God and Logos of the Father, the leader and king of the universe.⁽⁸⁵⁾

3. Conclusions

It is important in assessing Athanasius' doctrine of grace in GENT and INC to take into account the particular historical context which prompted him to write these works. It is generally accepted that this context entails the particular problems confronting the church at that time and particularly the challenge of Hellenism (in its two senses, the philosophical and the pagan/religious) and Judaism. Alexandria had the largest Jewish community outside Palestine. Although there is no evidence of any Jewish attack on Christian doctrine, the fact that large Christian, Jewish and Pagan communities lived side by side in the great city made discussions and conflict inevitable. In these early books Athanasius offered the Christian message to both the Jews and the Pagans, by expounding the Christian doctrine of God the Creator, and stressing the role of the divine Logos and the place of man in creation. Creation through the Logos and in the Logos, and salvation by means of the Logos' incarnation are presented as essential data of the Christian perspective. They constitute the continuous divine activity of God the Creator and Saviour of the world, which is in fact his grace.

The starting point of Athanasius' Christian teaching is from that which is already accepted in Alexandria. There is the one God and there is his divine Logos who was recognized at that time, through the works of Philo, Clement and Origen, as God's creative power. The Alexandrian heritage of Clement and Origen

shows an obvious interest in the Creator Logos. From the inherited Christian teaching, and even before the birth of Athanasius, the Logos was identified as the Son of God, Jesus Christ. In GENT and INC Athanasius, like his predecessors Clement and Origen, takes for granted that the Logos is the Son of God Incarnate. In INC 41 Athanasius addresses the Greeks by saying, 'If they completely deny that there is a Logos of God, they are acting foolishly in mocking at what they do not know. But if they confess that there is a Logos of God and that he is Prince of all, and that by him the Father made creation, and that by his providence all things take light, life and being, and that he reigns over all, so that by the works of his providence he is known and through him the Father'. These words form the basic argument addressed to the Greeks and at the same time create Athanasius' approach to the Incarnation of the Logos. The Logos is in the entire cosmos, which is a body. 'What is unfitting in saying that he came in a man?' (INC 41). This question is answered by Athanasius, by saying, that if it is fitting for the Logos to be in the whole cosmos, it will be also fitting for the Logos to appear in a human body. Athanasius draws a parallel between the cosmos and the human body. Both are illuminated and moved by the Logos. By this Athanasius fortifies his argument and advances his approach to the Incarnation by saying that it is reasonable to think that the Logos can use a human body as an instrument, as he used the cosmos to reveal to us his divinity. More important is the fact that Athanasius uses the word life to introduce both the Jews and the Greeks to the Christian

teaching. For the Logos in the flesh has life which has defeated our death and 'renewed for us the origin of life by giving hope of the resurrection' (INC 10). This word life was used several times to underline the fact that in the incarnate Logos human life was renewed and man was made immortal.

It is essential for us to see in the work of the Logos, as Co-Creator with the Father, the origin of the Christian doctrine of grace. Here it becomes clear that grace is a continuation of the work of the Logos who grants being, life, movement, illumination and fellowship with God the Father. This particular role of the Logos as the Creator of the cosmos is one of the reasons for his Incarnation. Thus grace like creation belongs to the cosmic role of the Logos.

In GENT and INC Athanasius shows that this grace is given from God through his Logos. This theme runs through both books. It is connected both with the responsibility of God and his Logos in creating and in sustaining creation. God is the source of everything and his Logos is the instrument, the king and the leader of creation, like the conductor of an orchestra (GENT 40-44). This unique relationship provides Athanasius with an opportunity to attack both Judaism and Hellenism. His polemical argument with the Jews, which starts in INC22 onwards, provides him with an opportunity to discuss the incarnation, death and resurrection of the Logos and to explain the reasons for his death on the cross. It is in this context that Athanasius speaks about

the grace of the resurrection and the destruction of death. Athanasius appeals to the life of Christians in his time as evidence for faith in the resurrection.

The relationship between God and the Logos is explained in such a way as to present a Christian defence to the people who may have encountered members of the Jewish community in Alexandria. The Christian defence takes the doctrine of creation, the relationship of the Father and the Son and the condition of humanity, especially the problem of sin and death, and tries to give an answer to this problem. Since everything is given by the Father through the Logos, Athanasius concentrates on the grace of the Image of God in man to explain the Christian teaching and to prove it to Jews and Christians. The Logos is the true image of the Father, whereas man is created according to this Image, i.e. the Son. The distinction between the Logos and humanity affirms the divinity of the Logos and highlights the contingency of human nature.

The Jews in Alexandria were familiar with the divine Image in man, whereas the Greeks were not familiar with this divine image as a participation in the Logos. Athanasius combines the biblical teaching in an attempt to create a comprehensive and practical approach to Christian doctrine. It is not the creation of man out of nothing that demands the Incarnation of the Logos; creation by the word of God is enough to bring forth creation out of nothing. But this creation out of nothing cannot, on its

own, renew and strengthen what is already in existence (INC 44). The essential approach of Athanasius is to locate the doctrine of creation according to the Image in the relationship between the Father and the Son. By doing so he provides the Christians with a biblical foundation for the involvement of God and his Logos in creation and in salvation. For the Jews know God, whereas the Greeks are quite familiar with the Logos. Athanasius speaks very often of God the Father and his Logos more than the Father and the Son, to adapt to those who were familiar with the Logos from Hellenic Jews and Greeks. It is also obvious that Athanasius' understanding of the creation of man and his fall and the grace of salvation is centred on the theme of restoring life and abolishing death. His basic concept of the grace of renewal, restoration, regeneration or recreation is more central than the forgiveness of sins. One can rightly deduce from this that it is the doctrine of man's obscured divine image which is the cause for such alternative concepts. The renewal of the divine Image in man cannot be explained except in the context of this grace of restoration, regeneration, renewal or recreation and above all the grace of eternal life. The doctrine of grace in INC cannot be understood without this background. The Father gives everything through the Logos in order that the Logos may bring back creation to the Father, redeemed and deified through him. The positive side of grace is explained in terms of restoring life, imparting knowledge, abolishing corruption and in particular granting the grace of resurrection to mortal and corruptible humanity. Through the Creator Logos, human beings will be

raised from the dead, bear life restored, and so corruption will be destroyed. So grace is expressed as the continuing creative power of the Logos-Creator, who brought everything out of nothing and restored it by his creative activity as Saviour.

It is clear that although it is generally viewed by Athanasius as a concept that embraces the entire creation, grace is particularly related to the creation of man and especially to man's relation to God. As a relational concept it pertains to both the divine and the human realities. Thus it is closely connected with God's Logos, or God's Image, through whom all things were made and are governed, and also with man's soul which has been made logical (after the divine Logos), or according to the Image and likeness of God. Thus grace is not only God's revelation to man through his Logos but also man's capacity for free choice of participation in this revelation. Man's knowledge of God through the divine Logos is closely connected with man's participation in God's eternal life, i.e. with the grace of man's deification. Thus grace entails both the knowledge of God and the life of immortality. It is the way whereby the Creator's design for man is fulfilled.

Nevertheless man is fallen and unable to realize this design, the reason being man's sin which has led him away from God's Logos and from God himself. He is in trouble both in his soul and in his body, because he cannot see God and is trapped into mortality. The two problems of true knowledge and life, which

are the concern of both Jews and Greeks, can only be adequately dealt with by God himself, but man's responsibility cannot be overlooked. It is God who can save, but it is man who must freely receive salvation. God cannot impose his grace on man. Since, however, man fails to receive the grace of God, and as a result suffers fatal consequences, it is God the Logos who chooses to intervene by becoming man. The giver of grace comes to the level of the recipient of grace in order to restore his grace in man. This is the meaning of the incarnation of the divine Logos as far as grace is concerned.

The death of Christ on behalf of all is ^{for the} fundamental grace which the incarnate Creator Logos bestows on humanity, because it becomes the means of forgiveness of sins and abolition of mortality. Freed from death man is then instructed to receive inner renewal through the restoration of the grace of the image and likeness of God in himself. This is the second reason for the incarnation.

The important point in this doctrine of grace is that it is both divine and human inasmuch as it entails the relation of God to man and *vice versa*. This means that man's fall from it does not necessarily imply that grace is lost. Actually grace remained available to man even after his rejection of it because God did not cease to be gracefully disposed towards him. It is precisely this divine aspect of grace which provided the way of its restoration in man through the incarnation. Athanasius does not

forget this fact. Thus his approach to creation, fall and salvation is based on the consistency and goodness of God. It is clear in GENT and INC that grace is prior to the Incarnation of the Logos; it is given at the creation and sustained by the Logos and was reserved for creation in spite of the fall and corruption. It is obvious from the whole presentation in both GENT and INC that Athanasius does not operate with a special doctrine of grace which is revealed only in the New Testament. He sees the Christian message as a continuation of the work of the Creator Logos, and therefore the Incarnation which lies at the heart of the Christian message entails both the resurrection ~~and~~ the immortality of the human body and the renewal of the divine image in the soul of man. What is given in the New Testament is in continuity with what had originally taken place before the incarnation in the creation of man. The grace of the incarnate Logos is primarily a restoration of his grace to prelapsarian man. Since, however, it is also a fulfilment of the promise^{of immortality} which was contained in the grace granted to the protoplasts, it is also an advanced grace to a higher relationship with God.

PART II

1. GRACE IN *CAR1*

According to the above listed data there are forty six explicit references to χάρις and cognate terms in *CAR1*.⁽¹⁾ Leaving aside the three references which employ this term adverbially in the sense of "for the sake of" or "according to"⁽²⁾, the rest of these references have a theological connotation and relate to the theological debate between Athanasius and the Arians. Some eight references are to do with Arian doctrine,⁽³⁾ whereas the remaining ones with Athanasius' orthodox response to the former. In view of this, and taking into consideration the general structure of the treatise, it would seem best to present our analysis of the doctrine of χάρις in *CAR1* under the general headings: (a) the Arian doctrine of grace and (b) the Athanasian response to the Arian doctrine on grace.

Examining these data in the light of the actual contents⁽⁴⁾ of this writing we observe that both the Arian and the Athanasian doctrines on χάρις present an important common feature: they are both fundamentally linked with Christology. This is not surprising if we consider that the subject-matter of *CAR1* is most clearly the doctrine of Christ. Yet, these two doctrines differ quite radically, inasmuch as they see the link between grace and Christology in opposing ways. For the Arians it is the doctrine of grace that seems to be the determining factor of their

Christology; whereas for Athanasius the opposite seems to be the case. This difference goes much deeper because it entails not only a different approach to the Biblical data on Christology, but also a different doctrine of God. This will become apparent as we analyse the details of the available data, both from the systematic and the exegetical angles.

(a) The Arian Doctrine of Grace

The Arian references to χάρις in CAR1 are of two kinds: 1) those occurring in general theological statements deriving from their circles, and 2) those connected with their Biblical exegesis. The former are mainly to be found in CAR1:5-9, where Athanasius sets out the Arian theological positions, whereas the latter are systematically presented in chapters 37-40. At first encounter it seems that the second kind of references provide some sort of basis for the justification of the Arian position. In other words, one could argue, on this evidence, that the basis of the Arian doctrine is exegetical. This is confirmed by the fact that the references are explicitly linked with Biblical statements. Yet, in Athanasius' view, it is not the Biblical references to grace but Arius' alleged "new wisdom" (καινή σοφία)⁽⁵⁾ which has priority, as is best exemplified in Arius' *Thalia*. The *Thalia*, says Athanasius, has no basis in the "many compositions and numerous homilies upon the Old and the New Testaments", which have been in existence in the Church.⁽⁶⁾ Indeed, Athanasius speaks of the Pharisaic hypocrisy of the Arian use of Scripture which

implies the reading of prior views into the Holy Writ and consequently the falsification of the real meaning of the Word of God.⁽⁷⁾ In view of this we shall follow in our analysis the order in which CAR1 presents the Arian data on grace, i.e. we shall treat first their systematic theological/logical arguments and then move on to their biblical/exegetical arguments.

Arian theological/logical arguments

The first Arian statements on χάρις are found in extracts from Arius' *Thalia* which Athanasius presents in CAR1: 5, 6 and 9.⁽⁸⁾ The central point emphasized in the first extract is the sharp ontological distinction between God as God and God as Father: God has always been God, but not always Father. This naturally leads to the sharp distinction between God and the Son. If God has not been eternally Father, but became such afterwards (ὕστερον) - when he made the Son - then the Son could not be eternal either. Actually the Son is a creature who came into being out of nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων), like all other creatures, and was made by God to be used as an instrument (means) for the creation of humanity (ἵνα ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ δημιουργήσῃ). The implication of this is that, when the Son is called God's Wisdom, or God's Logos, this should not be taken literally, but should rather be understood in terms of the Son's participation in God's proper Wisdom and Logos. This means, as Athanasius explains, that there are for Arius two Wisdoms and/or Logoi. There is the Wisdom which is proper to (ιδία) and co-existing with

(συνυπάρχουσιν) God and there is the Son (Christ) as God's Wisdom who is only called (ὠνομάσθαι μόνον) such by participation (μετέχοντα) in the former, i.e. by grace (κατὰ χάριν).

It is obvious, then, that in Arian doctrine grace could not be identified with the divine being as such, but with that divine gift which makes it possible for the Son to be in touch with the divine being. For the Son to be God's Wisdom and Logos "by participation and grace" ultimately means that he is not truly God, but a creature of "mutable nature" (τρεπτῆς φύσεως).(9)

Though closely interrelated, "participation" (μετοχή) and "grace" (χάρις) do not seem to be identical; the former presupposes "self-determination and free will" (τὸ ἰδίον αὐτεξούσιον - ἕως βούλεται),(10) or "effort and achievement" (ἀρετή),(11) whereas the latter presupposes God's will for (θεοῦ θελήσει)(12) and gift(13) to him who freely chooses to remain good. In the Arian view, as Athanasius presents it, the Son, like the other created beings who receive God's grace, has fulfilled the preconditions of free participation in virtue.

The same doctrine is advocated in the second extract from the *Thalia*. Here it is argued that the Logos is called "God" "by partaking of grace" (μετοχῇ χάριτος) like all the rest. This means that he is "God in name only" (λέγεται ὀνόματι μόνον θεός).(14) as opposed to being such in reality. The latter phrase suggests a

sort of nominalism, but this is not an explicit inference. What Arius most probably means is what Athanasius goes on to explain, namely, that the Logos is "other than and dissimilar to the Father's being and property in every way and is like the things made [creatures], being actually one of them".⁽¹⁵⁾ That this is the case is confirmed by the extract from the *Thalia* which Athanasius cites in this chapter. Here we read that "the beings (οὐσίαι) of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, are separate with respect to nature, estranged from each other, disconnected, alien and without participation in each other".⁽¹⁶⁾ Particularly important is the last phrase, "without participation in each other's being" (ἀμέτοχοι εἰσὶν ἀλλήλων αἱ οὐσίαι..), because it implies that the Son's participation in God's grace (which Arius accepts) should not be understood as participation in God's being or glory.

The same points are advanced in the third extract from the *Thalia* which emphasize that Christ is not true God but "that he too is deified by participation" (μετοχῇ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεοποιήθη) and that he is God's Logos and Wisdom only in name (ὀνόματι μόνον), or that he is called Son and Power "by grace" (χάριτι).⁽¹⁷⁾

Several questions naturally arise here: What does Arius actually understand by χάρις? How does he perceive of the relation of God's grace to God's being? Does he conceive of God's grace in terms of act? Though it is obvious that such questions cannot be fully answered before further investigation, it

is important to raise them here and to answer them as far as the evidence allows. Thus, it seems clear on the present evidence that Arius believes: a) that the Divine names (titles) which are attributed to the Son are the result of his receiving or partaking of Divine grace, b) that this divine grace is not to be identified with God's being, since such a participation is explicitly denied, but c) with a Wisdom-Logos in God which is proper to or existing in God, i.e. a property of his being.

The above views of Arius are succinctly summarized in a statement in CAR1:36 which concludes the systematic section of Athanasius' treatment of the Arian Christology in CAR1 (chs. 11-36). Jesus Christ is mutable in his being and, therefore, differs radically from God. He is God's Logos, Son, Wisdom only accidentally as a result of some grace and habit of virtue (ὥς ἐν οὐσίᾳ συμβεβηκός, or ὥς ἐν οὐσίᾳ συμβεβηκέναι τινὰ χάριν καὶ ἔξιν ἀρετῆς).(18) χάρις here is obviously a gift of God (actually a property of his being identified with an inherent Divine Logos-Wisdom) which is granted to Christ as a reward for his virtue, but which does not alter his created being into one that is uncreated and divine. Christ is the receiver of grace and not the source of it. His divine titles denote "accident" (συμβεβηκός, i.e. something which is acquired from without), not "being" (οὐσία).

Arian biblical/exegetical arguments

It is precisely this last point of Christ as receiver of divine

grace that Arianism wants to stress in appealing to such verses as Phil. 2:9f, Ps. 44:8 (LXX) and Hebr. 1:9, which are the subject-matter of the second part of CAR1.⁽¹⁹⁾ As Athanasius puts it in the beginning of this part the Arians appeal to these verses and add, as if saying something wise,

If he has been exalted and received grace and was therefore anointed, he received a reward for his free choice (μισθὸν τῆς προαιρέσεως ἔλαβεν); and if he acted according to free choice (προαιρέσει δὲ πράξας), he is certainly of a mutable nature.⁽²⁰⁾

Such views, says Athanasius, were spoken and written by Eusebius [of Nicomedia] and Arius,⁽²¹⁾ while others publicly repeated them in the market place. Their argument runs like this:

If he received what he had as a reward of his free choice, without having previously had these, he must have acted as one who was in need (of them) and therefore, having gained them by reason of virtue and improvement (ἐξ ἀρετῆς καὶ βελτιώσεως), he could obviously be called on their account both Son and God but could not be a true Son.⁽²²⁾

This is because those who are called sons by reason of virtue and grace (ἐξ ἀρετῆς καὶ χάριτος) are not sons in the same way as true offspring, e.g. as Isaac is son of Abraham, or Joseph of

Jacob, or as the brightness of the sun. The former have the grace of being sons by acquisition (ἐκ τοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν χάριν) as opposed to being such by nature (ἀντὶ τῆς φύσεως); they are other than what is given to them. Such, indeed, are the human beings who have received the Spirit by participation and whom Scripture calls "sons born and raised" (Is. 1:2). But these may lose and regain the Spirit in accordance with their behaviour and accordingly could cease or resume to be called sons by grace.

It is in terms of such grace - as opposed to nature - says Athanasius, that the Arians understand the Saviour. For them he is neither true God, nor true Son of God, nor like God the Father in being. He acquired these "names" when he became obedient unto death and was subsequently highly exalted receiving the "name" which is above every other name "as a grace" (Phil. 2:10). Here, too, God's grace is clearly 'accidental' and distinguished from his being, but no light is shed as to what it is. The association of grace with "names" suggests once more a sort of nominalism.(23)

(b) Athanasius' Response to the Arian Doctrine of Grace.

Athanasius' response to the Arian doctrine of χάρις follows the pattern of his presentation of this doctrine, i.e. it provides 1) a thorough reply to the Arian systematic theological/logical statements, and 2) a detailed response to the Arian biblical/exegetical arguments. The former is to be found in the

first half of CAR1 which ends with chapter 36, and the latter in the second half, i.e. chs. 37-64. Here we shall examine them in turn.

Response to theological/logical statements

Athanasius' first response appears in CAR1:9. It is a well-rounded Christological statement which represents the orthodox faith as derived from the divine Scriptures and which contradicts in a most specific manner the particular Arian views on the Son.

The Son is true by nature, and genuine Son of the Father, proper to his [Father's] being, only-begotten Wisdom, the true and only Logos of God; he is not a creature, nor something made, but a proper offspring of the Father's being. Thus, he is true God, one in being (ὁμοούσιος) with a true Father... He is the character of the Father's hypostasis, light from light, power and true icon of the Father's being... He ever was and is and never was not. For the Father, being everlasting, his Logos and Wisdom would be also everlasting.(24)

In other words, there are not two Sons, or Wisdoms, or Logoi, one in God and another among the creatures, who are linked together by grace, as Arius holds. Rather the link of grace, as Athanasius explicitly points out, is applicable only to the

[human] creatures and it consists in their participation in the [One divine] Logos through the [One divine] Spirit, which is spoken of as "grace from the Father" (χάριν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς).(25) It is clear that, although the notion of grace as "participation in God's Logos" is common to Athanasius and Arius, yet it is equally clear that their views on the Logos import into it a radical differentiation.

For Arius "grace", as we have noted, is purely accidental, whereas for Athanasius it is more existential or ontological. This is because Arius' divine Logos (i.e. the Logos who is inherent to God), seems to be, given his unitarianism, a mere divine property, or power or attribute of the divine being, as he is for Paul of Samosata, whereas in Athanasius' understanding the Logos of God is, given his Trinitarianism, a concrete or distinct existence (ἐνυπόστατος Λόγος) born eternally out of the Father and co-existing with him as another ὑπόστασις.(26)

The radical difference between the Athanasian and the Arian doctrines of the Logos inherent in God, which is the basis of the radical differentiation of their doctrines of grace, is further explained in CAR1:16. Here Athanasius shows that the Logos of God is eternally born of God's being and fully participates (ὅλως μετέχεσθαι) in it. For Arius, however, both notions, that of generation and that of participation, are external to God's being and are applicable both to the created Logos and to other creatures. The radical differentiation that this difference imports

into the notion of grace can be explained when one contrasts the Arian and the Athanasian understanding of "participation in grace" (μετοχή χάριτος). In the Arian view, as we have already seen, this is an accidental or even nominalist connotation. In the Athanasian view, however, as explained in CAR1:16, participation in grace is participation in the Divine Son, as contrasted to participation in the Father, which is applicable only to the Logos and is indissolubly linked with his eternal generation from the Father's being.

Such thoughts being evidently unseemly and beyond the truth, we are driven to say that what is from the being of the Father, and proper to him, is entirely the Son; for to say that God is wholly participated in, is equal to saying that he begets; and what does the begetting denote but a Son? And thus *of the Son himself, all things partake according to the grace of the Spirit coming from him*; and thus this reveals that the Son himself partakes of nothing, but what is partaken from the Father is the Son; for in partaking of the Son himself, we are said to partake of God; and this is what he [Peter] said, that you may become partakers of the Divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4); as the Apostle [Paul] says too, "Do you not know that you are a temple of God?" and, "We are the temple of the living God?" (I Cor. 3:16; 2 Cor. 6:16).(27)

Particularly interesting here is the contrast between the Son's participation in the being (οὐσία) of the Father and the

participation of all creatures in the Son according to the grace of the Spirit which is supplied by the Son. It suggests a) that the Son is the *Giver* of Divine grace, b) that participation in the Spirit is essential to it, and c) that its effect is the participation of all creatures in the Son. This conception of grace rules out any participation of the Son in it. For Athanasius grace is given by the Son himself and the creatures which receive it become through it partakers of the Son.

A similar point is made by Athanasius as he reaches the end of his extensive refutation of the Arian denial of the true Divine Son in CAR1:20, where he contrasts once more the Son of God to all creatures. Creatures, he says, have no resemblance in essence with the Creator, because they are outside him and have come into existence by his grace and will through the Logos.⁽²⁸⁾ Grace and will are here linked with what God does through the Logos "outside himself" (ἐξωθεν αὐτοῦ), i.e. outside his being. This certainly includes the event of creation and its relativity. It is an event that can freely come and freely go. This implies that grace has a similar status, because it is the basis of creation and is not linked with God's being. It is freely given and freely taken and, thus marks the creation or termination of life. The Son is not Son by grace, i.e. not a son who came to be and could cease to be such, but belongs to the very being (οὐσία) of God. As such he has always been in existence and could not be seen as an incidental being (ἐπισυμβέβηκε)⁽²⁹⁾ like the creatures. This means that the eternal Son of God is the basis for the doctrine of

grace, as opposed to the doctrine of grace being the basis for the doctrine of the Son (the Arian position).

This perspective of Athanasius on the Son as the giver and basis of grace, rather than as receiver of it, is further stressed in CAR1:34 in the context of Athanasius' response to the Arian identification of God as the *ingenerate* being (τὸ ἀγέννητον) in contrast to the Son who is *generate* (γεννητός) and, therefore, created. For Athanasius the identification of God as Father, which suggests the inclusion of the Son in the doctrine of God, is to be preferred over the identification of him as the *ingenerate* being. The reasons for this include not only the fact that *ingenerate* is an ambiguous, unscriptural and, indeed a philosophical term - "invented by the Greeks who were ignorant of the Son" - which contrasts the absolute and uncreated being of God the Creator to the relative and contingent creation, but also the fact that God as Father of a Son is biblical and has its origins in Christ himself, who both, "made it known and granted it as a grace" (τὸ δὲ Πατὴρ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐγνώσθη καὶ κεχάρισται).(30)

What is made abundantly clear in this text and especially in the last phrase (καὶ κεχάρισται) is that the knowledge of God as Father is a grace given by the Son. As such this teaching perfectly and coherently matches up Athanasius' earlier statement, i.e. that grace is bound up with the Son himself as the source or giver of grace, by which human creatures may become partakers of God. The new nuance of meaning introduced here into the

notion of the grace given by Christ is that of the knowledge of God as Father which includes the knowledge of his Divine Son. In other words, what Athanasius is suggesting here, although he does not spell it out in so many words, is that grace is essentially connected with the knowledge of God in Trinity. This is to be seen in the concluding words of CAR1:34 which are particularly revealing.

And it was his will that the Chapter of our faith should have the same bearing, in ordering us to be baptized not into the name of *unoriginate* and *originate*, nor into the name of *Creator* and *creature*, but into the name of *Father and Son and Holy Spirit*. For being thus perfected, we too, who are derived from creatures, are made sons and, in using the name of the Father, acknowledge through this name the Logos who is in this very Father. It has been demonstrated that their argument about the term *unoriginate* is in vain and is nothing more [in content] than a mere fantasy.⁽³¹⁾

Response to biblical/exegetical arguments

A close examination of the precise structure of the second part of CAR1 (chs. 37-64), which, as we have noted, contains Athanasius' response to the Arian exegetical arguments, indicates that he follows a double procedure. First, he introduces the particular Arian data and offers a sort of general response, using the first Arian exegetical argument as his starting point (chs.

37-39). Then, he responds to these data in greater detail, taking them one by one (chs. 40-64). Since there are, as we have seen in the preceding section of this chapter, three Arian exegetical arguments, connected with the verses Phil. 2:9f, Ps. 44:8 (LXX) and Hebr. 1:9, this latter part of Athanasius' response to the Arians is subdivided into three sub-sections, each of them dealing with one of these verses respectively (chs. 40-45, 46-53, 54-64).(32)

In his general response to the Arian exegetical arguments Athanasius stresses the point that all the verses cited by the Arians relate to the Incarnation of the Logos/Son of God. They do not refer to him apart from his becoming man and taking up the form of the servant (CAR1:38). This means that to use such statements in order to draw conclusions about the pre-incarnate Logos/Son is totally erroneous. He elaborates this point by developing a sort of negative argument, which is designed to expose the Arian position and which we shall try to summarize here.

Granted that it was in his incarnate state that the Son came to be Son, Logos and God - something which the Arians could not contest - the crucial question that one has to raise is connected with his identity in his pre-incarnate condition(?). If he was none of the above mentioned attributions (Logos, Son, God, etc.), then he must have been either something else, or he might have been nothing at all, i.e. non-existent. If the first case is

applicable, then one is obliged to arrive at the impossible conclusion that it was not the pre-existent one who came to improve the flesh, but that the flesh which the pre-existent one took actually improved him! If, on the other hand, the second case is applicable, then one is also bound to accept that Christ came into existence only when he became incarnate. In turn this means that he is nothing more than a mere man; but this is the position of Paul of Samosata and the Jews, which stands in direct opposition to that of the Church.

To explain the position of the Church and the unacceptability of the two above-mentioned possible inferences of the Arian position, Athanasius supplies several biblical references. He mentions the pre-incarnate manifestations of Christ to the saints in OT times (Abraham, Moses, Daniel) and the worship which was rendered to him by them (Gen. 18:1f, Ex. 3:1f and Dan. 7:10), Christ's reference to the glory which he had beside the Father before the world was made (John 17:5) and several other texts from the Book of the Psalms, which were understood in the Church as referring to Christ (Ps. 17:10 & 14). Thus he concludes that in the Church's view Christ

was not a man who afterwards became God, but one who being God afterwards became man that he might deify us.(33)

To strengthen this argument Athanasius adduces further

biblically based counter-arguments to the Arian position which run as follows. If the Son was called Son and God only when he became man, and had not been such before, then he must be inferior to Moses who preceded him inasmuch as he had been called God of Pharaoh, or to those other "Gods" who are mentioned in Ps. 81:1. Such a view, however, of sons and gods existing before this Son and God, says Athanasius, contradicts the plain teaching of the Scriptures: that through him all things were created (John 1:3); that he pre-existed before all things (Col. 1:17); and that he is the first-born of all creation (Col. 1:15); that they all partook of this Logos. The plain biblical teaching, says Athanasius, is that there can be no divine adoption (υιοθεσία) of anyone without the true Son, as is explicitly stressed in Mt. 11:27, nor any deification (θεοποίησις) without the true Logos, as is explicitly stated in Jn. 10:35. Thus,

if all those who were called sons and gods, either on the earth or in heaven, were all adopted and deified through the Logos, and if the Logos is himself the Son, it is obvious that all became sons through him; that he was always a Son before them, or rather, that he alone was a true Son and he alone is true God of true God and did not receive these as a reward for his virtue, neither is he something other than these, but is all these both in nature and essence; because he is an offspring of the Father's essence (being), so that nobody may doubt that the Logos is also unchangeable in likeness to the unchangeable Father.(34)

What all this amounts to is an important distinction between who the Son is in himself and what he is said to be, or to become, in his incarnation. According to the former he is Son of God by nature and according to the latter, he is, or is called, Son of God by grace. This distinction suggests that the Son's divine identity is not determined nor obscured by his incarnation, or, putting it otherwise, that there is no confusion between the Son's divine and human identities. It also suggests that the Incarnate Son is both the giver and the receiver of grace, the former by virtue of being God's true Logos and Son and the latter by virtue of his having also become true man. This is exactly the view that Athanasius elaborates in his detailed exegetical discussions of the three verses put forth by the Arians in CAR1:40-64. Let us examine each in turn.

The case of Phil. 2:9f.

In his discussion of the statement, Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομάτων of Phil. 2: 9f (CAR1: 40 - 45), Athanasius cites the whole passage of Phil. 2: 5-11 in order to argue that, according to it, Christ's exaltation and the bestowal upon him of the name above every name were preceded by his humiliation through the assumption of the form of the servant, which, however, did not alter the fact that in himself he was in the form of God and equal with God. In other words, his exaltation and reception of the grace of the name, like his humiliation which preceded them, are connected

with his incarnation and more particularly with the humanity which he assumed to himself, and not with himself as God's Logos and Son. In himself he was both unalterable and most high and therefore no exaltation and no improvement could raise him any higher.

Athanasius asks, "What grace could have received he who is the giver of grace?"⁽³⁵⁾ And then, he goes on to argue: If that grace was the name that would make him worshipful, as the Arians argued, Scripture, i.e. Ps. 53:3, Ps. 19:8, Hebr. 1:6 and Ps. 96:7 and Ps. 71:17, 5, shows that he already had it and was actually worshipped as God before his becoming man. Athanasius concludes that:

It was not the being (οὐσία) of the Logos, who was and is always in God, that was exalted, but his humanity (ἀνθρωπότης).⁽³⁶⁾

This, says Athanasius, is no riddle (αἵνιγμα) but the divine mystery (μυστήριον θεῖον) of the Incarnation of the Logos, which took place for us human beings.

The whole of CAR1:41 is an elaboration of the point that the exaltation of Christ is connected with his humanity (which is denoted in a variety of ways: ἡ ἀνθρωπότης, τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἡ σὰρξ, ἡ τοῦ δούλου μορφή) and his saving work for humanity in general. Likewise CAR1:42 is an elaboration of the claim that "the

grace of the name" (the ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα...) was connected with his becoming man for us men. As Athanasius puts it,

It is as man that he is said to receive what he always had as God, so that t h i s g r a c e, which is thus granted, might reach us too. For the Logos was not impaired when he took a body, so that he might ask to receive a g r a c e, but rather he deified that which he put on and, more than that, he gave it as g r a c e to the race of men.(37)

This means that

this g r a c e and exaltation [of Christ] are ours.(38)

The same points are made in CAR1,43 where Athanasius stresses, that,

the fact that the Lord who came to be in a body and be called Jesus is worshipped, is believed to be Son of God and is he through whom the Father is known, clearly shows, as it has been said, that it is not the Logos as Logos that received t h i s g r a c e, but we... It is we, then, that were exalted, on account of the fact that the most high Lord came to be in us, and it is for our sake that the g r a c e is given, on account of the fact that the Lord who gives the g r a c e has become a man like us... In other words, it is with reference to us and on our account that it is said that he was exalted and received the g r a c e of the name.(39)

In CAR1:44 Athanasius qualifies the above understanding of

Phil. 2:9f as "most ecclesiastical" (μάλα ἐκκλησιαστικὴν) and suggests that one can go deeper into its meaning. This deeper meaning is connected with Christ's resurrection from the dead (ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἐστὶ δηλωτικὸν τὸ ῥητόν).(40) He is the only human being who died and rose whole again, because he is not only from Adam, as everybody else is, but he is also from God, inasmuch as being God he also became man. He is a second man from heaven (I Cor. 15:47) or a heavenly man. Thus Paul's statement in Phil. 2:9f is identical in meaning with Peter's statement in Acts 2:24 which refers to Christ's resurrection. Following up the exposition of this deeper meaning in CAR1:45, Athanasius reaches a conclusion which is the pivot of his reply to the Arian exegesis of Phil. 2:9f.

It is because he is said to have been exalted and to have received *g r a c e* from God that the heretics think that this suggests a deficiency or a mutability in the being of the Logos (ἐλάττωμα εἶναι ἢ πάθος τῆς τοῦ Λόγου οὐσίας) ... The fact is, however, that here we have a paradox which can truly startle anyone; namely, that the *g r a c e* which the Son gives from the Father, he is said to receive, and the exaltation which the Son bestows from the Father, is that with which the Son is himself exalted. For he who is the Son of God has himself also become Son of man; and as Logos he gives whatever comes from the Father; for all the things which the Father does and gives he does and gives through

him; and as Son of man he is humanly said to receive what is from himself, inasmuch as the body, the nature of which is to receive the g r a c e, is his and not anybody else's, as it has been said. For he received as far as the man was being exalted; this exaltation was the fact that he was deified. But the Logos himself already had this from all eternity in accordance with his own paternal Godhead and perfection.⁽⁴¹⁾

The clear message of this exegesis is that the incarnational context of Phil. 2:9f cannot be ignored in any attempt to understand its meaning. As far as the Athanasian doctrine of grace is concerned, we encounter here what we encountered before; namely, that the Son of God is the source or basis of God's grace. We also encounter an entirely new and crucial point; namely, that this grace of God through the Son is now received by him as man and secured in his own humanity. Christ then is the basis of grace in two senses, one Divine and another human. In the former sense he is the Giver of it, in the latter, the receiver. From this perspective the Arian view of grace and its connection with Christology is either confusing or one-sided; confusing, because it suggests two Logoi; one-sided, because it turns Christ into a mere man.

The case of Ps. 44:7-8

The same, says Athanasius, is the case with the second Arian

text, Ps. 44:7-8, which speaks of the anointing of God the Logos by God above all his partakers. His partakers are to be identified with us human beings. As for him, he was not anointed in order to become God or king, since he was both, but "for us". Similarly he is not sanctified as if he was not holy, but because he became man for our sake. He received the Spirit because he became man and wore our body. Indeed he received the Spirit in a measure which is above everybody else, so that we human beings might receive the Spirit from him and thus partake of him. This means that his anointing with the Spirit at his baptism is a grace that is given and received by the Son on account of his becoming man. It has no reference to his Godhead, but to his flesh, his body, which becomes the instrument of our anointing and our participation in him. Furthermore it must be clearly distinguished from the anointing which the saints of the Old Testament received and on account of which they became sanctified. He is the source of sanctification who sends and receives the sanctification, because, being God, he became a man for us. This is fully and biblically expounded and articulated in CAR1:46-53, which constitutes one of the clearest Athanasian statements on the vicarious soteriological character of the humanity of Christ and of the whole economy of the Incarnation of the Son and Logos of God. There is no need to enter here into a detailed analysis of Athanasius' rich and biblically based arguments, since his exegetical incarnational outlook is clear. We may however cite the texts which contain the word "grace", not only because they summarize this outlook, but also because they

reveal some particular pneumatological nuances of Athanasius' use of the term "grace"; that grace is connected with the Holy Spirit and sanctification. The first text comes from CAR1:48 and reads as follows:

It was for us, then, that he asked for glory and was said to have received (τὸ ἔλαβεν), to have received g r a c e (τὸ ἐχαρίσατο) and to have been exalted (τὸ ὑπερύψωσεν), in order that we might receive, be granted the g r a c e and be exalted in him, just as he sanctifies himself for us that we might be sanctified in him.⁽⁴²⁾

The second text comes from CAR1:50. Here Athanasius argues on the basis of the biblical data that the incarnate divine Saviour is the same one who gave the grace of the Spirit to his disciples and who said to the Jews that he received the Spirit or that he cast out demons in the power of the Spirit. His argument is summed up as follows:

... in both respects it was ourselves who needed to be sanctified with the g r a c e of the Holy Spirit and who were not able to cast out demons without the power of the Spirit. Thus just as the statement of the Apostle shows that we would not have been redeemed nor exalted, unless he who is in the form of God received the form of the servant (Phil. 2:6-7), likewise the statement of David shows that we would not have become partakers of the Spirit nor sanctified

had not the Logos himself who is the giver of the Spirit said that he anointed himself with the Spirit for us. It is sure, therefore, that it was we who received when he said that he had been anointed in the flesh. For when the flesh was first sanctified in him and when he was said on its account to have received as man, we have the g r a c e of the Spirit following up and receive [it] from his fullness (Jn.1:16).(43)

What is clear from these texts and the whole drift of Athanasius' anti-Arian exegesis of Ps. 44:8, is that χάρις is still connected with man's participation in the Logos/Son, as we actually saw in his earlier statements both in CAR1 and in INC, but that this participation takes place through the grace of the Spirit which is given by the Son and which is fully secured for humanity in his humanity which he assumed at his incarnation.

The case of Hebr. 1:9

In the final section of CAR1 (chs. 54-64) Athanasius advances his anti-Arian exegesis of Hebr. 1:9. A brief survey of the main contents of this section will provide the necessary context for our exploration of his eight explicit references to χάρις.

CAR1:54 advances Athanasius' basic hermeneutical principle according to which the interpretation of a given biblical verse presupposes precise discernment of the time (occasion), the person and the subject-matter of the discourse -- something which

Athanasius explains by supplying concrete biblical examples (Acts 8:34, Matth. 24:3, I Thess. 5:1ff, Gal. 3:1,5,6ff, Is. 7:14, Deut. 18:15, Is. 53:7, Acts 8:32ff) of people who erred because they did not have such a discernment. He actually mentions Hymenaeus and Alexander, who erred respectively about the "time" [of the resurrection and of the new economy], and the Jews, who erred about the divine "person" (of the incarnate Saviour).

CAR1:55 demonstrates the concrete application of this hermeneutical principle to the verse under discussion. Thus, Athanasius explains, on the basis of Hebr. 1:1-2 and 1:3-4, that the real context of Hebr. 1:9 is the incarnate economy of the divine Son/Saviour, which took place in these last days and which should be distinguished from the economies which preceded it which were administered by angels. In view of this the statement of Hebr. 1:9, according to which the Son "became superior to the angels", simply stresses the superiority of the Son's ministry (the ministry of the New Testament) over that of the angels (the ministry of the Old Testament) and, therefore, of the person of the former over those of the latter. Indeed, inasmuch as he did not say "greater" (μείζων) but "superior" (κρείττων), says Athanasius, the Apostle was revealing a natural difference between the Son and the angels, as opposed to putting forth a comparison of homogeneous beings (creatures), as the Arians erroneously thought.

CAR1:56 strengthens the above position by examining the

status of the "person" of the Son -- not on the basis of the *γενόμενος* of Hebr. 1:9, but, as Athanasius explains, on the basis of the *γεννηθείς*, which is suggested by the term Son and is syntactically and logically prior to the *γενόμενος* -- and comparing it, in the light of other biblical verses, to that of the Angels which establish the identity of the Son as Creator (e.g. Jn. 1:3, Ps. 103:24). The conclusion here is that the Son of God is not, as far as his status goes, homogeneous with the creatures and that the claim that he is to be identified, as far as the essence of his being is concerned, with angels does not differ from the heretical claims of the Valentinians and Carpocrates who regard the angels as creators of the world.

Further elaborations of this conclusion are advanced in CAR1:57 where Athanasius sharply and essentially (i.e. in terms of *οὐσία*) distinguishes, on the basis of further biblical evidence (Ps. 88:7, 85:8, etc.), between the Son of God (*ὁ γεννηθείς Υἱός*) and the creaturely sons (*τὰ γεννητά*), as well as between the Creator and the creatures.

It is in CAR1:58, however, where Athanasius continues his exposition of the above distinction and stresses the perishability of the creatures and the imperishability of the Creator Son, that we come across most of his explicit references to *χάρις* in this section. The creatures, he says, have been made out of nothing and, therefore, are perishable. If they remain in existence, this is not due to them, but "to the grace of the Creator" (*καὶ μὴ*

ἀπόληται διὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ πεποιηκότος ταῦτα).(44) This suggests the important nuance that χάρις is connected with the continuous activity of the Logos in maintaining the creation in existence.

All this, says Athanasius in the beginning of CAR1:59, points to the fact that Hebr. 1:9 is not a comparison of the Son's being before his Incarnation with that of the angels, but has a direct reference to the incarnate Son's ministry or economy. Thus, he points out, that the Apostle really,

wanted to show that the Incarnate Son was not like those who came before him and that, as much as he is different in nature from those who were sent before hand by himself, so much and even more superior is the g r a c e, which took place through him and from him, to the ministry which took place through angels. This is because servants can only demand the fruit, whereas a Son and Master can cancel debts by grace (χαρίσασθαι τὰς ὀφειλάς) and transfer the vineyard. Besides, what is immediately brought in by the Apostle in Hebr. 2:1-3 shows the difference between the Son and the created beings... Let them see, then, the g r a c e which came through the Son and let them learn from the works which bear witness to him, that he is other than created beings and that he alone is true Son abiding in the Father and the Father in him...(45)



The above text shows that through the Incarnation the grace of God, which is directly linked to and administered by the Son, has taken the new form of "forgiveness of debts" (χαρίσασθαι τὰς ὀφειλάς), something which was lacking in the Old Testament economy. In CAR1:59 Athanasius links this forgiveness with Christ's victory over death on behalf of all humanity and with his superior sacrifice and clearly shows that, in fact, it constitutes the essence of the superiority of the New Testament grace over the Old Testament Law, which is ultimately rooted in the Son's natural superiority over the angels.

Christ's death and sacrifice on behalf of all humanity as the heart of the New Testament grace is further emphasized in CAR1:60 and is actually expounded on the basis of Paul's teaching (Rom.8:3,9) in terms of liberation from the dominion of sin, death and the flesh and introduction into the life of the Spirit. The concluding statements of Athanasius in this chapter are particularly pointed:

By making the flesh appropriate^{to} the Logos, he made it possible for us no longer to walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit, and so he [Paul] said many times: "We are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit;" and, "The Son of God came into the world not to judge the world but in order that all might be redeemed and the world might be saved through him" (Jn 3:17). For at that time the world was judged by the Law as being responsible, but now the Logos

has accepted the condemnation upon himself and, having suffered on behalf of all, has granted the g r a c e of salvation to all. This is what John saw and shouted: "The Law was given through Moses but the g r a c e and the truth came to pass through Jesus Christ" (Jn 1:17). Thus the g r a c e is superior to the Law and the truth to the shadow.(46)

What is particularly interesting here is how grace is linked, on the one hand to the event of the Incarnation of the Logos of God and to the implications of this for humanity and, on the other hand, to the redeeming work of the Incarnate Logos on behalf of all humanity centred on his sinless life which culminated in his vicarious death and suffering. Grace, then, has a concrete basis in the Incarnate Logos who was slain for the salvation of the world and involves the liberation of humanity through forgiveness from the bondage of sin and death.

CAR1:61 draws the conclusion that the "superior" of Hebr. 1:9 in no way implies any preexisting inferiority of the Son vis-à-vis the angels, and further substantiates it by showing how, not only the Son sits at the right hand of the Father, but also the Father sits at the right hand of the Son! Thus, both share the same Godhead and ... the one is in the other. The same train of thought is carried on in CAR1:62, 63 and 64, where Athanasius supplies arguments against the supposition that the Son could be identical with the angels and that the γεγόμενος of Hebr. 1:9

could refer to the being (οὐσία) of the Son. Other verses in the Scriptures (i.e. Ps. 30:3, Ps. 9:10, Gen. 14:13-16, III Kings 18:4 (LXX), Gen. 19:3, Job 29:15-16) employing the same word [γενοῦ and ἐγένετο], cannot be taken as denoting beginning of existence (οὔτε τὸ ἐγένετο ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι σημαίνει). Athanasius concludes in CAR1:64 with a statement which unequivocally states his exegetical incarnational perspective and links the grace of salvation with the incarnate economy of the eternal Son/Logos of God in its various aspects:

Thus, when we hear what is said: *Becoming superior to the angels*, and *became*, we must not understand that it denotes some sort of beginning of the Logos, nor should we imagine that from these words that he is a created being, but should understand what is said by Paul as referring to the ministry and the economy which he carried out when he became a human being. For it was, when *the Logos became flesh and dwelt amongst us* and came *to minister* and to give to all the *g r a c e* of salvation, that he became to us salvation and life and redemption, and the economy which he undertook for our sake *became superior to that of the angels* and he became the way and the resurrection. And so, just as the *Become to me God my protector* (Ps. 30:3) does not denote a becoming of the being (essence) of God, but, his philanthropy, as we have already said, likewise the present *Becoming superior to the Angels* (Hebr. 1:9) and the *So much superior a guarantor did Jesus become* (Hebr. 7:22) do not

denote the being of the Logos as being created, God forbid, but the beneficence of his incarnation to us, however ungrateful the heretics might be and contestants for the sake of impiety.(47)

(c) Conclusions

Our above analysis of the Arian and Athanasian doctrines of χάρις demonstrates that neither of them is developed for its own sake, but both of them emerge as important aspects in the Arian-Athanasian dispute over the person of Christ. It demonstrates, then, that both of these doctrines are closely connected with Christology, although there is a crucial difference in their perception of this connection which ultimately makes them in consonant. It is by explaining this difference that we may best present their distinctive stances and clarify their incompatibility.

For the Arians, χάρις is prior to and constitutive of Christology. In other words, it is "by grace" that Christ is what he is in relation to God, either in his pre-incarnate or in his incarnate states. To be more specific, he is God's Logos, Son, Wisdom, Image, etc. "by grace" or "by participation in the grace" of God, rather than "by nature" or "by virtue of his being". This means that Christ's "divinity" with all its far-reaching implications, implied by all the above terms, is but a grace (a gift) of God which is acquired from without (his being) as a reward for his virtue, free choice and obedience to God's will. This is applied

to him in his pre-incarnate condition as the pre-existent Logos, but it is also re-affirmed in and through his Incarnation. Thus, having become a man, the Logos re-receives, as it were, the grace of God by doing God's will for man and, therefore, he comes to be attributed with all the divine names and becomes the Christ who leads humanity to a restored relation with God.

On closer examination, Arius' conception of χάρις is rather obscure. At worst it implies some sort of "nominalism", inasmuch as through it the Logos, who is ultimately a created being, comes to be called, or to be considered to be, divine. At best it is -- always on the basis of what Athanasius says about the Arian doctrine -- a "participation in" or "reception of" God's power (grace) which turns Christ into a divine Logos, Son, Wisdom, Icon -- a possibility open to all spiritual creatures and especially to all humanity by imitation. In this connection there is one very interesting instance where this power is identified with a Logos in God, as opposed to the primordially created Logos who became incarnate in Christ. This suggests that Arius' view represents a combination or compromise of the Antiochian Samosatean and the Origenist Alexandrian Logos doctrines, since the dynamic Logos of the former is reminiscent of Arius' "Logos in or co-existing with God", and the hypostatic Logos of the latter, of Arius' primordially created Logos who became such by grace and participation.

However, there are more obscurities in Arius' doctrine of

grace. The contrast between God's "being" and God's "grace" suggests that grace is "accidental" and does not have a real ground in God's very being. This contrast is also present in Athanasius but it has a different meaning because God's grace^{could}_{be} identified with God's Logos/Son who is co-essential (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father. Another obscurity is connected with the failure of Arius to distinguish between the Logos as Logos and the Logos as man. Thus what is said of the Logos as man is automatically transferred to the Logos as Logos. This is most clearly shown in the Arian handling of various biblical Christological texts, such as Phil. 2:9f, Ps. 44:8 (LXX) and Hebr. 1:9. In all these verses the Incarnate Logos is said to have received the grace of being called God, God's Logos, God's Son, etc., and to have been exalted to the place of God in heaven. The argument here is that, if his name/s and status is a consequence of his being a recipient of God's grace, then the Incarnate Logos cannot be truly God in his being. This suggests not only that the "becoming" of the Incarnate Logos is on a par with the "becoming" of the pre-existent discarnate Logos, but also that grace is a matter of becoming and not of being.

Athanasius' anti-Arian doctrine sees Christology as the basis of χάρις. This applies both, to the pre-existent Christ, i.e. to God's eternal and co-essential Logos/Son and to Christ, the incarnate Logos/Son of God, who became man without ceasing to be God. Athanasius' identification of χάρις with God's Logos is quite explicit. It is by participating in him that created beings

participate in God's grace and become deified. Thus God's Logos/Son is the very source and substance of grace. This participation seems to be two-fold, inasmuch as it applies a) to all creatures in general and b) to human (logical or rational) beings in particular. But there is an even greater depth to Athanasius' identification of χάρις with God's Logos/Son, a depth which is connected with the Holy Spirit. The grace of God, which ^{could} be identified with the Logos/Son, is communicated through the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from God the Father and rests upon God's Logos/Son. Thus Athanasius can speak of χάρις as "the grace of the Logos through the Spirit" or as "the grace of the Spirit through the Logos".

What does Athanasius do with the biblical Christological verses which present Christ as "recipient" or "partaker" of grace and as having become what he is in his relation to God "by grace" and "participation"? Here we have Athanasius' most profound thought. For him Christ is both the "giver" and the "recipient" of grace. The former has to do with his Divine person and the Holy Spirit who rests upon him and the latter with his "flesh", his "humanity", his "incarnate economy", which he assumed for the sake of human beings and for their salvation. There is a difference, then, between what the Logos became through his incarnation and what he is eternally in himself. Instead of splitting the Logos into a Logos existing in God and a creaturely Logos who participates in the former, as the Arians do, Athanasius distinguishes between the Logos as God and the

Logos as man, or to put it more specifically, between the Logos as Logos and the flesh or humanity which this Logos made his. This means that the grace of Christ is on the one hand the union of humanity with the Godhead of the eternal Logos/Son -- an event which is "natural" and "real" as opposed to being "nominal" or "accidental" -- and more specifically with the movement of the Holy Spirit from the Logos as God to the Logos as man! There is no theological difference between the notion of grace before and the notion of grace after the Incarnation. The only difference is that, whereas before the Incarnation this grace had not been fully and permanently appropriated by humanity through any human being, after the Incarnation, such an appropriation has been realized in and through the very humanity of the incarnate Logos/Son of God. It is by explaining this realization or appropriation, in the context of his anti-Arian exegesis of the biblical verses put forward by the Arians, that Athanasius goes still further into his exposition of the meaning of the grace of Christ. When received by humanity this grace is the "grace of salvation", the "grace of the resurrection", "the grace of deification and sonship". All this is a matter that concerns the participation of the creaturely human being in the uncreated perfections of the Divine Trinity. It is man's assimilation with God as opposed to absorption by or identification with God's very being.

2. GRACE IN CAR2

There are twenty one explicit references to χάρις in CAR2.⁽¹⁾ These occur throughout the Oration and most of them are connected with Athanasius' responses to the Arian exegesis of certain biblical Christological verses (Hebr. 3:2, Acts 2:36 and especially Prov. 8:22,23).⁽²⁾ Because of this, we shall adopt in this chapter the same procedure as in CAR1, i.e. we shall examine first the Arian references to χάρις and then those relating to Athanasius' response.

a) The Arian Doctrine of Grace

One implicitly finds the first Arian references to χάρις in reading Athanasius' response to the Arian exegesis of Acts 2:36 which is advanced in CAR2:11b-18a. It seems that the Arians had been arguing that the Logos was a creature because, according to Peter's statement, he "was made Lord and Christ" (Κύριον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν καὶ Χριστόν), or, as Athanasius puts it, because "his lordship and royal status over us had been established by grace" (κατὰ χάριν).⁽³⁾ This is in line with the earlier exegetical arguments of the Arians which are discussed in CAR1, and with the other argument based on Hebr. 3:2 which is analysed by Athanasius in the first chapters of CAR2 (chs. 6-11a). Their point is that, on the basis of the letter of the Scriptures, the Logos received a particular grace and, therefore, he cannot be identified with God who is the giver of grace.

On the other hand Athanasius finds the Arian Asterius contradicting this very point in dealing with the meaning of another Christological verse which refers to God's Wisdom (I Cor. 1:24). He cites two sets of Asterian extracts which state two different things about God's Wisdom. According to the first (anti-orthodox) set, there are two kinds of divine Wisdoms, one which is eternal and inherent in God, and another, which is created and identical with the Son and which is actually called "Wisdom by grace" - indeed this latter, although only-begotten, is in fact one among many others.

The Sophist Asterius wrote, what we have stated above, as follows: "Blessed Paul did not say that he preached Christ, the Power of God or the Wisdom of God, but without the addition of the article, 'God's power' and 'God's wisdom' (1 Cor. 1:24), thus preaching that the proper Power of God Himself which is natural to him, and co-existent in him ingenerately, is something besides, generative indeed of Christ, and creative of the whole world, concerning which he teaches in his Epistle to the Romans thus, "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead" (Rom. 1:20). For as no one would say that the Godhead there mentioned was Christ, but the Father himself, so, as I think, "His eternal Power and Godhead also is not the Only Begotten Son, but the Father who begat him". And he teaches that there is another power

and wisdom of God, manifested through Christ. And shortly after the same Asterius says, "However his eternal power and wisdom, which truth argues to be without beginning and ingenerate, the same must surely be one. For there are many wisdoms which are one by one created by him, of whom Christ is the first-born and only-begotten; all however equally depend on their Possessor. And all the powers are rightly called his who created and uses them -- as the prophet says that the locust, which came to be a divine punishment of human sins, was called by God himself not only a power, but a great power; and blessed David in most of the Psalms invites, not the Angels alone, but the powers to praise God".(4)

According to the second set of Asterius' (anti-pagan) texts, however, God's Wisdom is only one, inherent in God and so transcendent that even its name cannot be shared by any creature by virtue of some sort of grace.

Indeed, Asterius himself, as if forgetting what he wrote before in Caiaphas' fashion, involuntarily, when urging the Greeks, instead of naming many wisdoms, or the *antithesis*, afterwards confesses but one, in these words: "God the Logos is one, but many are the things rational; and one is the essence and nature of Wisdom, but many are the things wise and beautiful". And soon afterwards he says again: "Who are they whom they honour with the title of God's children? For

they will not say that they too are words, nor maintain that there are many wisdoms. For it is not possible, whereas the Logos is one, and Wisdom has been set forth as one, to dispense to the multitude of children the Essence of the Logos, and to bestow on them the appellation of Wisdom".(5)

It seems that what Asterius is actually trying to say is similar to what Arius had said about two Wisdoms or Logoi, one inherent in God, and another, created and called such by virtue of his participation in the former by grace, which Athanasius quotes in CAR1.

Accordingly, he [Arius] says that there are two Wisdoms, first the attribute co-existent with God, and next, that in this Wisdom the Son was originated, and was only named Wisdom and Logos as partaking of it. "For Wisdom", says he, "by the will of the wise God, had its existence in Wisdom". In like manner, he says that there is another Logos in God besides the Son, and that the Son again, as partaking of it, is named Logos and Son according to grace. And this too is an idea proper to their heresy, as shown in other works of theirs, that there are many powers; one of which is God's own by nature and eternal; but that Christ, on the other hand, is not the true power of God; but, as others, one of the so-called powers, one of which, namely, the locust and the caterpillar is called in Scripture, not merely the power, but the great

power. The others are many and are like the Son, and of them David speaks in the Psalms, when he says, "The Lord of hosts", or "powers" (Ps. 24:10). And by nature, as all others, so the Logos himself is alterable, and remains good by his own free will, while he chooses.⁽⁶⁾

Whilst Arius did allow some sort of participation in name, Asterius seems to be unwilling to go that far, at least in certain instances, as the fragment quoted by Athanasius indicates.

This confusion in the Arian-Asterian view of grace becomes more evident in CAR2:51 where God's fatherhood is for the Arians common to the Logos/Son and to the creatures!⁽⁷⁾ What emerges, however, from these points is the determination of the Arians to keep the "Giver of grace" and the "Recipient of grace" apart, identifying the former with God's very Logos or Wisdom (most probably a divine energy), and the latter, with a creature, which may be called God's Logos or Wisdom by participation in the former, or by receiving the former as a grace from God. We may summarize the Arian position on χάρις by means of the following three statements: a) χάρις is God's energy, identified with his Logos or Wisdom; b) only God can be the author or giver of χάρις; c) only creatures are in need and can receive this χάρις. The Christological corollary to this position is that, as a recipient of χάρις, Christ could not be but a creature. The fact that he is called in the Scriptures God's Logos, Wisdom, Son, etc., results from his participation in God's χάρις.

which is the proper bearer of these names.

(b) Athanasius' Anti-Arian Doctrine of Grace

God's grace is granted in the Son

As far as the Arian exegetical arguments are concerned Athanasius argues against them in the same way as in CAR1. The Son received grace not because he was in need of it, or in order to become God's Son, but for our sake, because he became a man. Indeed, the grace of God given to God's Son is fundamentally and intimately connected with his Incarnation which took place for the sake of humanity. This becomes particularly clear in a text from Athanasius' anti-Arian discussion of Hebr. 3:2, which reads as follows:

But when the Father willed that a ransom should be given for all and grace [redemption, pardon, forgiveness] should be granted to all (καὶ πᾶσι χάρισασθαι), then the Logos took on the flesh from the earth -- as Aaron did with the priestly robe -- having Mary as mother of his body instead of an uncultivated earth, so that having what could be offered, he might bring forth himself to the Father and might cleanse by his own blood all of us from our sins and might raise us from the dead.(8)

The clear implication here is that the grace [of redemption

and forgiveness] which God gives to human beings is indissolubly linked with the high-priesthood of Christ and his self-offering upon the Cross, which, most clearly presupposes the Incarnation, the assumption, that is, of human flesh by the Logos from the virgin Mary, in a way which is parallel to that of the first Adam -- since Mary is likened to an "uncultivated earth" (Cf. Gen.2:5f). It also means that the grace which Christ receives is received by him as man, on account of his manhood, and not as God. To argue for the latter would be to make Christ "depend on us rather than us on him" and, therefore, to reject the truth that, although, as man he is recipient of divine grace for us, nevertheless, as God, he is and remains the source of grace.

This last point is very clearly made in Athanasius' response to the Arian arguments based on Acts 2:36: "He [God] made him Lord and Christ". By these words, says Athanasius: "Peter meant his [Christ's] kingdom and lordship which was created and came to be in us according to grace".⁽⁹⁾ In other words, they have a direct reference to Christ's humanity. This in no way contradicts Christ's Godhead, because, as Athanasius goes on to argue, Peter had very clearly confessed the Son's true Godhead, when he said in the Gospel, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mt 16:16), and at Pentecost, "He poured the Spirit on us" (Acts 2:17), indicating, thereby, that He was God inasmuch as only God can give the Spirit.

The same doctrine reappears in another text in CAR2:30,

where Athanasius argues against the Arians that "it was not for his sake, but for ours, that the Logos became a man". This means that "we are not [the cause of] grace [given] to him, but he to us".⁽¹⁰⁾ It is interesting to note that Athanasius actually sees this ontological priority of the Logos over humanity as being parallel, or similar, to the biblical doctrine of the ontological priority of the man over the woman.⁽¹¹⁾ In the last analysis, however, Athanasius is emphasizing that as in creation so in redemption it is the Divine Logos who constitutes the ultimate ground, the "grace", on account of which we are saved, as opposed to any creaturely being. We owe him our salvation as we owe him our creation, because he is God the Creator who also became the Incarnate Redeemer. The implication here is that the grace of redemption is inter-connected with the grace of creation -- a view which we found in *De Incarnatione* -- and that both are united in the One Person of the Divine Logos/Son who became man.

This point is further drawn out by Athanasius in CAR2:41 and 42. Here he argues against the Arian doctrine of the Son-creature, which, as he says, resembles the Logos-creature doctrine of the Manichaeans. For him God the Father is inseparable from his Logos/Son and united with him in the unity of the one Godhead, because the Father creates all things through his Logos/Son and reveals himself in him and is named with him as effecting the fulfilment of holy Baptism. If the Logos/Son were a creature, his involvement in creation and in the holy bath

[baptism] would have been both unnecessary and impossible: unnecessary, because the Father's act would have been sufficient (αὐτάρκης); impossible, because, as a rational creature, he too would have been exposed to the need "of the grace which is from God" (τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος) and which is needed by all the reason-endowed creatures.⁽¹²⁾ This clearly implies that, as in the case of creation, so in the case of the grace of redemption and adoption to sonship, it is the Father who acts, through the Logos/Son, and not the Father alone and, therefore, that the Son is truly divine. This is made explicit in the following text:

It is impossible, therefore, when the Father grants the grace, not to give it through [lit. "in"] the Son (μὴ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ δίδοσθαι τὴν χάριν); because the Son is in the Father as the effulgence is in the light. Thus, it is not as if God were in need, but as being Father that "he established the earth through his own Wisdom" (Prov. 3:19) and brought all things into being through his own Logos, and confirms the holy bath in the Son. For where the Father is, there also is the Son, and where the light is, there also is its effulgence... For this reason, when he (the Son) was giving the promises to the saints, he spoke thus: "I and the Father shall come and make our dwelling in him" (Jn 14:23); and again, "So that as I and Thou are one, they too might be one in Us" (Jn 17:22). This means that the grace which is given is one and is given from the Father in (through) the Son (καὶ ἡ διδομένη δὲ χάρις μία ἐστὶ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐν Υἱῷ διδομένη): as

Paul writes throughout his Epistles: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1:7, I Cor. 1:3, Eph. 1:2).(13)

Particularly interesting here is the phrase "in the Son" (ἐν υἱῷ),(14) because it implies that the grace which comes from the Father rests in the Son and is communicated by him or through him to those who are related to or drawn by him. The Son is the basis, the deposit, as it were, of the divine grace and also the instrument or vehicle of it. This is why this grace is qualified as the grace of divine sonship or adoption (υἱοποίησις θεία),(15) whereby those who receive it may call upon God as their Father. This becomes clearer in the next section, CAR2:44ff, where Athanasius argues against the Arians' attribution of "sonship by grace" to the Son.

Before we move to this, however, we must also note another interesting point which Athanasius makes in CAR2:42, namely, the necessary connection between the right faith and the grace of sonship which is communicated through the holy bath of baptism into Christ. No grace of sonship is conveyed by baptism into the Son, if the Son is not correctly held to be true Son of God; in other words, if there is absence of right (orthodox) faith. This is said to be the case of the Arians, whose baptism is "completely empty and without any effect",(16) in spite of their calling the Son "Lord", because they do not have a correct faith about the Son's Godhead. Thus, the Lord himself ordered in the Gospel

that "baptism" should be preceded by "teaching and learning" (Mt 28:19), "so that the faith might become the right one through teaching and, then, the fulfilment of baptism might be added through faith".⁽¹⁷⁾ What actually lies behind all this is the conviction that the Arians' denial of the right faith concerning the Son's Godhead deprives them completely of the baptismal grace of divine adoption. Indeed, as Athanasius points out, not only the Arians, but also the rest of the heretics, the Manichaeans, the Phrygians and the disciples of Paul of Samosata, who fail to think correctly about Christ and possess an unhealthy faith, are polluted, rather than redeemed when they are baptized!⁽¹⁸⁾

All these clearly show Athanasius' perspective on grace. Christ is the recipient of grace, inasmuch as he is a man who acts for the salvation of all humanity. This, however, does not contradict the fact that as God's Logos, Son and Wisdom is the source of the grace which he receives as man by virtue of his Incarnation. Divine grace always comes from the Father through the Son and in the Son. This last statement about the grace being "in the Son", implies two senses. One suggesting that he is the giver of grace (the grace which adopts) and another, that he is also the recipient of grace (the grace of adoption), because of his humanity. It is this second sense of grace, the grace of adoption to divine sonship which Athanasius elaborates next:

Divine Sonship by grace

It is in the second part of CAR2 (chs. 44 to the end), as we noted above, that Athanasius speaks explicitly about the grace of divine adoption in and through Christ as he engages in an extensive discussion of the meaning of Prov. 8:22f, which was used by the Arians as the biblical basis of their doctrine of Christ. Having first argued about the orthodox, although hidden, meaning of this verse, which the Arians had failed to understand (chs. 44-47), and which entails the pre-existence of Wisdom (chs. 48-56), Athanasius turns next to the crucial distinction between creation and generation (chs. 57-61) -- a fundamental notion of Nicene Christological doctrine -- which establishes his anti-Arian doctrine of Christ.⁽¹⁹⁾ It is in this context and as he elaborates this distinction, that he also speaks about two kinds of divine sonship, a "sonship by grace" (κατὰ χάριν)⁽²⁰⁾ which creatures receive from God, and a "sonship by nature" (φύσει)⁽²¹⁾ which belongs to God's Wisdom, i.e. God's Logos/Son. Although ontologically they are distinct, these two sonships are not unrelated, because the former is based on the latter, although the opposite is not the case -- it is in and through the Son of God by nature that certain creatures become sons of God by grace. It is clear, however, that this distinction constitutes an important means for clarifying Athanasius' doctrine on divine grace which is derived from God the Father and his Logos who is his Son by nature.

The first explicit references to this distinction come in

CAR2:51, where Athanasius argues against the Arian application of the notion of divine sonship by grace to the Son and the creatures indiscriminately.

But if, because he was called child (παῖς), they idly talk, let them know that both Isaac was called Abraham's child, and the son of the Shunamite was called young child. Reasonably then, since we are servants, when he became like us, he too calls the Father Lord, as we do; and this he has done from love to man, that we too, being servants by nature, and accepting the Spirit of the Son, might have confidence to call him *by grace* Father, who is by nature our Lord. But as we, in calling the Lord Father, do not deny our servitude by nature (for we are his works, and it is he that has made us, and not we ourselves, Ps. 100:3), so when the Son, on taking the servant's form, says, "The Lord created me a beginning of his ways" (Prov. 8:22), let them not deny the eternity of his Godhead.(22)

Here it is clear that divine sonship by grace is granted to those creaturely (human) beings who receive the gift of the Spirit of the (divine or true) Son (who is such by nature). As a result of it, God can now be addressed by these creaturely beings not only as Lord, but also as Father, i.e. in the same way as he is addressed by the Son. By the same token when the Son takes up the form of the servant (and becomes incarnate) he may address God not only as Father but as Lord. Although the reverse result

takes place in these two cases, the same principle applies to both of them, namely, that no change in their nature takes place; the creatures do not cease to be creatures and the Son does not cease to be true divine Son. This means that the grace which is given by God and received by the creature does not alter either the Godhead or the manhood but restores their relation, with all the far-reaching implications which this restoration brings, particularly for the creature.

This doctrine is again discussed and further elaborated in CAR2:59 in the context of Athanasius' exposition of God's actions in the creation and adoption of human beings:

This is exactly God's love for mankind, that of whom he is Maker, of them also he becomes Father by grace afterwards, and this happens when the human beings who have been created, as the Apostle said, receive in their hearts "the Spirit of the Son who cries Abba Father" (Gal. 4:6). These are those who, having accepted the Logos, received authority from him to become children of God; for, being creatures by nature, they would not have been made sons in any other way, except by receiving the Spirit of the One who is by nature a true Son... For this reason we are not first born and then created; for it is written "Let us make man" (Gen. 1:26), and afterwards, when we receive the grace of the Spirit (τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν), we are also said to have been born. Accordingly the great Moses has spoken in

the Ode [Cf. Deut. 32 which Athanasius cites in the beginning of this chapter] with good understanding first about creation and afterwards about generation, so that those who hear about generation might not forget their initial nature, but realize that they are creatures from the beginning, and that, when they are said to be born as sons by grace (ὅταν δὲ κατὰ χάριν λέγωνται γεννᾶσθαι ὡς υἱοί), they are human beings and creatures by nature no less than before.(23)

This rich text indicates Athanasius' understanding of the grace of adoption. First of all it indicates that the divine grace of adoption draws human beings out of the (limited) context of creation and introduces them into union and communion with the holy Trinity. It is important to note that this grace is fundamentally linked not only with the Father and the Son, but also with the Holy Spirit, "the Spirit of the Son" who cries Abba Father. In other words, there is here a clear trinitarian pattern to grace. Looked at from the side of God who grants it, it begins with the Father, is realized in the Father's true Son, and is communicated to those who are adopted by God to be conformed to his Son by the operation of the Holy Spirit. Looked at from the side of those who are recipients of it, this grace implies that through the Spirit they participate in the Son and through him they communicate with God as their Father.

It is also important to note that this trinitarian movement, which is extended from God to men and from men to God, does

not abolish the creaturely status of human beings. Human beings remain creatures by nature, even though they are made sons by grace. Nevertheless, this does not mean that grace has no real effect on the creaturely nature. There is a change which is effected by this grace of adoption, a change which does not abolish but restores and perfects creaturehood, in accordance with the Creator's ordinance and operation which is primarily revealed in Christ, the incarnate Creator and Redeemer. Thus, in CAR2:65 Athanasius speaks of "the first creation" (τὴν πρώτην) -- presumably, that which is in Adam -- and "the new one" (τὴν καὶ νήν) -- which is in Christ, and clarifies that "the latter is in fact the former but renewed and preserved".⁽²⁴⁾ He also says that this is precisely the meaning of Prov. 8:22ff and, especially, of the statement that Christ, i.e. the Wisdom of God, is "the beginning of God's ways for his works", which is restated in the New Testament in Jn 14:6 ("I am the way").

A careful study of CAR2:65-70 reveals the meaning of this restoration and renewal of the human creation which takes place by grace in and through Christ. It is the abolition of sin and death from human nature and its return to the life of paradise. Thus, Athanasius speaks of:

1) Christ's resurrection as the beginning of God's ways;⁽²⁵⁾
or,

2) Christ's return to God, on behalf of man, of man's debt

to him, and also of God's return to man of what was lacking to man, namely immortality and the way to paradise;⁽²⁶⁾ as he explains it in another text in CAR2:67, this grace is a sort of restoration of humanity's original condition and also its rise to a higher level;⁽²⁷⁾ or,

3) Christ's death as effecting the death of all, whereby the decision [that the sinner should die] was fulfilled and all people were freed both from sin and the curse which was incurred by it and were clothed with immortality and incorruptibility;⁽²⁸⁾ or

4) the Incarnation of God's Logos and, particularly, of his incarnate life, as the means whereby the poisonous bite of the devil lost its power; in other words, of Christ's exclusion, from his humanity, of any fleshly movement or emergence of evil and, consequently, the exclusion of death resulting from sin;⁽²⁹⁾ or

5) the dissolution of the works of the devil (1 Jn 3:8) by God's incarnate Logos and his uniting us with himself, so that we may be where he is, i.e. in God's kingdom in heaven, never succumbing to the devil any longer but constituting a new creation.

The most important point here is the fact that all this primarily takes place in Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, and is directly related to his humanity. We become sons of God by grace, "because he became man for the sake of the grace which

is for us"!(30) Thus the ἐκτίσεν of Prov. 8:22, which Athanasius understands as referring to the Incarnation of God's Wisdom (Logos/Son), "implies the grace towards the works, since it was for them that the Wisdom was created".(31) In other words the Incarnation of God's Wisdom took place in order to secure God's grace towards humanity in the humanity of God's Incarnate Wisdom, i.e. in Christ. The importance of this is brought out in a text in CAR2:68, where Athanasius explains that in the case of the prelapsarian Adam the grace given to him was externally received and was not conformably united to the body,(32) because it suggests that in Christ this grace has become one with humanity.

Other important texts in this connection speak of the pre-eternal design of God concerning this grace which Athanasius deduces from Pauline teaching. Thus, in CAR2:75 he speaks about the "grace which occurred in us through the Saviour (ἡ παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἰς ἡμᾶς γενομένη χάρις)(33) as having been prepared for us before we were made, or rather before the creation of the world. In the same chapter he speaks about "the grace which is given to us in Christ is said to be the result of God's pre-eternal pre-desposition (πρόθεσις) and not the result of human works";(34) in CAR2:76 he speaks about "the grace which reaches us as having been stored in Christ", (35) and also, "the life and grace which we receive from Christ as living stones who are being built on him, was founded upon him before the ages".(36)

c) Conclusions

CAR2 clearly shows that the main difference between the Arians and Athanasius, as far as the doctrine of grace is concerned, lies in the fact that for the former the source and the recipient of grace are radically distinguished, whereas for the latter they are intimately related. The reason for this difference is to be traced in their radically different doctrines of the Incarnation.

For the Arians God's absolute transcendence does not leave any room for a real incarnation of God. As a consequence the Logos/Son who becomes Incarnate cannot be fully or truly God, but a creature. Now this creaturely Logos, Son, Wisdom, etc., of God is the recipient of God's grace which is identified with a Logos, or Wisdom inherent in God.

For Athanasius Christ is both the giver and recipient of grace, because he is God's true Logos, Son, Wisdom, etc, who became incarnate. The fact that he is giver of grace points to his true Divine Sonship, and the fact that he is receiver of grace points to his true incarnation, or true humanity.

As a giver of grace, however, the Son is not alone, because grace is related to the whole Trinity. It comes from the Father, through the Son in the Spirit. Thus Athanasius can speak of the grace of God, the grace of the Son, or of Christ, and the grace

of the Spirit. As such, grace exhibits the same Trinitarian pattern with the act of creation (from the Father through the Son in the Spirit).

The crucial point, however, concerning this "Trinitarian" grace of God, is that it is given in and through the Incarnate Son. The Incarnate Son takes it to himself, to his humanity, not because he needs it for himself, but because he claims it for all human beings, who have lost it but are in need of it. Indeed it was to achieve this that the Son became Incarnate in the first instance.

In explaining what this grace does to humanity, Athanasius returns to his early teaching, advanced in his early work *De Incarnatione*, and speaks of the restoration of humanity to immortality through the resurrection, and of its return to the life of paradise through the abolition of sin, which actually entails an advance to a higher level. Thus, he can speak of "the grace of the resurrection" (ἡ χάρις τῆς ἀναστάσεως), or he can say "that humanity has in him [in Christ] been perfected and restored as it was made in the beginning, indeed, [endowed] with a greater grace (μείζονι χάριτι)".

All this takes place in Christ for all, according to the Father's design, and is communicated to all through Christ's Spirit who cries Abba Father! Since this grace is "in the Son", those who receive it are said to be made "sons by grace" (υἱοὶ κατὰ

χάριν). Athanasius also calls them "gods" because the Son is God and because their adoption to divine sonship is synonymous with deification (θεοποίησις). Becoming "sons" and "gods", however, they do not cease to be human, creaturely, beings, but have also acquired a new relationship with God as sons by adoption and grace.

The most profound point in this doctrine is the pre-eternal design of God, whereby adoption to and grace of divine sonship were established in the Son before creation and before all ages. Thus, what took place in time through the Incarnation, had had a primordial or pre-eternal foundation in the Son on account of God's eternal will.

All this makes it clear that for Athanasius the doctrine of grace is most intimately linked with the second person of the Trinity, the Incarnate Son of God, although it is true that the whole Trinity is the source of it. By contrast, the Arians have no Trinitarian and no Christological foundation in their doctrine of grace. For them, grace seems to be an act of a unitarian God which is identified with God's acts or energies towards his creatures and which does not touch either the being of God or the being of humanity.

3. GRACE IN CAR3(*)

There are more references to χάρις in CAR3 than in any other work of Athanasius,⁽¹⁾ yet χάρις is not a major theme of this Oration. The main theme of CAR3 is Christological and relates to the true Godhead of Christ which is denied by the Arians. It is in the course of Athanasius' response to the Arian theses and arguments that χάρις emerges, since it was used by the Arians in support of their views.

All the references to χάρις in CAR3 occur in the first two parts of the Oration which deal respectively with 1) the Son's unity with the Father (chs. 1-25), and 2) the Son's relation to (chs. 26-58) the Father against the Arian claims.⁽²⁾ Our analysis of these references will follow the structure of the Oration, since references to the Arian view of χάρις are few and indirect, the emphasis being laid on orthodox doctrine. There will be two sections to this chapter, dealing with χάρις in the contexts a) of the divine unity of the Father and the Son, and b) of the Son's relationship with the Father in the context of the Incarnation.

(a) Grace and the Unity of the Father and the Son:

Athanasius' Response to the Arian Positions.

The exegesis of John 14:10

The first explicit references to χάρις appear in CAR3:2,3,

where Athanasius advances a critical discussion of Asterius' [Arian] understanding of Jn 14:10 which [verse] relates to the unity of the Father and the Son. According to Asterius the statement of Jn 14:10b differentiates the Son from God's "word" and "power", which were distinct from him and were given to the Son by the Father and, thus, explains how the "Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father" (Jn 14:10a). In other words, Christ as the Son of God is "in the Father", or "united with Him", because of the Father's "word" and "power" which were given to him and to which he submitted.

But let us see also what the advocate of heresy, Asterius the Sophist, said; for he too has written, becoming jealous of the Jews, the following: "For it is obvious that it was on this account that he spoke of himself as being in the Father, and, again, of the Father being in him, for neither the word which came through him does he say to be his, but the Father's, nor the works to be his own, but the Father's who gave the power.(3)

The critical point raised by Athanasius against this view, is that it implies no differentiation between the Son of God and other creatures who also received God's word and power. Such a differentiation, however, is demanded by the fact that Christ as God's Son is in fact God's very Word and Wisdom and the Image of the Father's being. Indeed, inasmuch as he is himself God's Word and Power, he could not have received some other word

or power from God. Besides, the saints who announced God's will and performed miracles, e.g. David (Ps. 85:8, LXX), Solomon (1 Kings 8:59), Elisha (2 Kings 5:8,15), and Samuel (1 Sam.12:17,18), always acknowledged that what they said or did was based on God's Word or Power, i.e. God's Son, and not on themselves. In Athanasius' own words:

Thus the Apostles stated that it was not by their own power that they made the signs, but by the Lord's grace;⁽⁴⁾ and if the Son had this g r a c e in common with the rest, he would not have said "I am in the Father and the Father in me", but "I too am in the Father and the Father is in me too".⁽⁵⁾

Irrespective of the intricacies of the Christological exegetical debate between Asterius and Athanasius over Jn 14:10, which, as Athanasius points out, resembles the debate between Jews and Christians concerning Christ's identity, two points clearly emerge here directly related to the theme of our investigation: a) that grace^{could} be identified by both Athanasius and the Arians with God's word and power, especially with the latter, and b) that, whereas for the Arians this grace is given by God to the Son as well as to the saints, for Athanasius this grace^{could} be identical with the Son himself, who belongs to the Father, and is given to the saints by him. This second point exposes the stark difference between the Athanasian and the Asterian/Arian conceptions of grace, which we have also encountered in the previous Orations.

For Athanasius, God's grace cannot be understood apart from the Son, because he is the very Logos, the Wisdom, the Image and the Power of God. To separate God's grace of word and power from the being of the Son, as the Arians do, is "to fall into the error of the Jews", as Athanasius himself says in the introductory rubric to his quotation from Asterius.⁽⁶⁾ The fact that the Son does not speak his own words and does not perform his own works, but is himself the Father's word and power, implies that the Father is truly in him and that he is truly in the Father, or, that both Father and Son are truly one. Another way of putting it, is to say that the Son has no words and no power of his own, only those of his Father, and this indicates their natural unity or unity in being.

It is this "natural unity" or "unity in being" of the Father and the Son, being the sense of Jn 14:10, that Athanasius further expounds in CAR3:4ff, where he emphasizes the "one Godhead" common to the Father and the Son. In CAR3:6 he employs the imagery of a "King and his image" and the Pauline notion of the "form of God" (cf. Phil. 2:8ff) in order to affirm that the Son's being, as God's "image" and "form", could not refer only to a part, but to the whole of the Godhead. "The form of the Servant is not a part of the Godhead, but the fullness of the Father's Godhead is the being of the Son"⁽⁷⁾ In other words, the Son is totally the "image" and totally the "form" of the Godhead. It is on this basis that he goes on to make the following affirmation which brings out his view of grace:

It is indeed the fact that the Father's peculiarity and Godhead is in the Son that shows the Son to be in the Father, and that he is always undivided; thus, whoever hears and sees that what is said about the Father is to be also said about the Son, not by way of being added to his being by *g r a - c e* or participation, but because the very existence of the Son is proper to the paternal being, will understand well what has been said."⁽⁸⁾

The significance of this statement for our research is twofold. Firstly, it shows that God's grace is not external to the being of the Son, as the Arians argued, since this being belongs to the paternal being as his offspring. Secondly, it shows that on this basis the Son's Sonship cannot be understood as a posterior event (*ἐπιγενόμενον*) in terms of grace (*κατὰ χάριν*) or participation (*κατὰ μετοχήν*), as is the case with other creatures. This in turn reveals that for Athanasius God's *χάρις* is differentiated, though not divided, from God's being (*οὐσία*), or even his Godhead (*θεότης*) and that it is synonymous with the term "participation" (*μετοχή*).⁽⁹⁾ What this actually implies is not explained here and, therefore, further investigation into the Athanasian texts is required.

In CAR3:10f Athanasius clarifies further the unity of the Father and the Son as entailing identity of being (*οὐσία*) by differentiating and not just unity of mutual agreement, i.e. unanimity of will.⁽¹⁰⁾ As he explains, the unity implied in a

situation of unanimity is one that angels and saints have with God when they accept his will, as a result of which they are themselves called God's "sons" (Ps. 88:7), "gods" (Ps. 85:8) and God's "image and glory" (1 Cor. 11:7). This unanimity is not, however, an acceptable model for understanding the unity between the Son and the Father. It is precisely in expounding this point that Athanasius makes a passing reference to the "grace of the Image", which again unites creation with God and which, though related to the Son, is not the basis for understanding his union with the Father, but of our union with God. Here is Athanasius' most pertinent statement:

For, although we have been created after the Image (of God) and have been living as God's image and glory (1 Cor. 11:7), this again is not on our own account, but we have the g r a c e of this calling on account of God's true Image and true Glory which dwelt in us and which is his Logos, who later on became flesh for us.(11)

What Athanasius is saying here is that we are called "God's image and glory" by grace, and that this grace is in fact the very Image and Glory of God dwelling in us, namely, the very Logos of God who became flesh for us. This confirms what we found earlier, namely, that grace is identical with God's Logos/Son and that it is his very presence and act in humanity which secures this grace for those human beings who are recipients of it. The new element which is added to our understanding here is the close

connection between "grace" and God's very "Image" and "Glory". If God's grace is God's Logos/Son then this has to do with the Logos/Son as God's very Image and Glory. This in turn means that participation in this grace involves some sort of assimilation to and communion with the Son. Athanasius provides no further elaboration of this here.

It is, however, in the same connection, i.e. in the framework of his discussion of the ontological unity of the Father and the Son, that Athanasius adds yet another important point concerning grace as he expounds Jn 14:23. According to this the indwelling of the Son in the saints includes the indwelling of the Father as well. He says:

Thus, as we said a little earlier,⁽¹²⁾ when the Father gives g r a c e and peace, this is also given by the Son, as Paul points out by what he writes in every epistle: "G r a c e to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1:7, I Cor. 1:3, Eph. 1:2). For there is one and the same g r a c e from the Father in the Son, as there is one light of the sun and the effulgence and as the sun shines through the effulgence. Again in the same manner he sends his wishes to the Thessalonians and says: "May God himself our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ direct (κατευθύναι) our way to you" (1 Thess. 3:11) and thereby maintains the unity of the Father and the Son. He did not say, "May they direct" (κατευθύνουσιεν), as if a double

g r a c e (διπλῇ χάρις) was given by two, i.e. by this one and that one, but he says, "May he direct" (κατευθύναι), in order to show that the Father gives this (grace) through the Son... Now the "one gift" (δόσις) demonstrates the unity of the Father and the Son... It is through the Son that what is given is given, and there is nothing which the Father operates without the Son; for in this way the recipient has g r a c e secured (ἀσφαλῆ).(13)

There are three very important points in this text concerning grace. Grace is given: 1) *from* the Father *and from* the Son, 2) *from* the Father *through* the Son, and 3) *from* the Father *in* the Son. All these points, established on biblical grounds, differentiate the Son from the creatures and indicate his unity with the Father in being, nature and Godhead. Particularly important, however, are two further points which are related to the above three.

Firstly, that grace is like the light which has both its source and its transmission without being split by them into two. As such it has the Father as its source (in which case only the preposition *from* (ἐκ) is applied to the Father) and the Son as its means of transmission (in which case not only the preposition *from* (ἐκ) but also the prepositions *through* (διὰ) and *in* (ἐν) are also applicable), but never becomes "double" (διπλῇ). Secondly, that this arrangement, whereby the grace is one and it is *from* the Father (origin) and *from, through* and *in* the Son (communi-

cator), makes grace "secure" (ἀσφαλῆ). Though Athanasius does not explain what he means by this last point, in the light of what he says here and what we have learned from him so far it seems that he is thinking of the fact that grace is not just *from* and *through* the Son, but also *in* the Son, i.e. tied to the Son or resting upon the Son -- something which he states explicitly. Presumably this is related to the fact that the Son is the very basis of the grace of creation, and especially to the fact that he has finally, explicitly and irreversibly revealed this to be so through the Incarnation. This last point is strongly suggested by the way in which Athanasius identifies in this text the "Son" with the "Lord Jesus Christ" as he cites his biblical references; but this point emerges once more and with somewhat greater clarity in another text in CAR3:13.

This is exactly what the Apostle did, in saying: "G r a c e to you and peace *from* God our Father *and [from]* the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1:7b); for in this way the blessing was secured on account of the Son's indivisibility from the Father and of the fact that the g r a c e given is one and the same. For when the Father gives, what is given is *through* the Son; and when the Son is said to grant a g r a c e it is the Father who supplies it *through* the Son and *in* the Son. For the Apostle says, in writing to the Corinthians, "I always give thanks to my God for you for the g r a c e which has been given to you *in* Christ Jesus" (1.Cor.1:4). Besides,

this can be seen in the case of the light and the effulgence; for whatever is enlightened by the light the same is also flooded by the effulgence; and whatever is flooded by the effulgence the same receives its enlightenment from the light. Likewise when the Son is seen, the Father is seen also; for he is the Father's effulgence and thus the Father and the Son are one.(14)

Athanasius strengthens this doctrine in the following chapter where he argues that the unity of the Father and the Son in the communication of the gift of grace cannot be extended to the angels. "Angels cannot be said to grant *g r a c e* along with God (συγχαρίζεσθαι) whenever he grants *g r a c e* (χαρίζομένου)." This is due to the fact that angels are creatures who simply function as ministerial spirits. Thus as far as the divine grace is concerned, angels only "announce" (ἀπαγγέλλοντες) the gifts which are granted by God through his Logos.(15) The exclusion of the Angels from the communion of the Father and the Son in the granting of the gifts of grace on account of their created nature clearly implies that divine grace is "uncreated". This point which was more explicitly made by later fathers, is in the light of this text unmistakably Athanasian.

What emerges from all the above examined texts is that God's grace, although originating from the Father and the Son and communicated through and in the Son, is never separated from either of them, just as their being is undivided. Although

God's grace is his own gift, it is also himself, because his gift is never divided from himself but actually resides in the unity of the being of the Father and the Son and thus unites anyone who receives it with God himself. This is a great mystery, which is connected with the mystery of God's being. Yet it is precisely the unity in being of God the Father with the Son which the Arians contest and so Athanasius attempts to clarify it by contrasting the Orthodox to the Arian exegesis of another set of relevant Johannine verses (cf. Jn 17:11, 22-23). In doing this, i.e. in distinguishing the unity of the Father and the Son from the unity of the human beings with God, he provides further elaborations of his understanding of God's grace and of its divine and uncreated character.

The exegesis of John 17:11, 22-23.

In CAR3:17ff Athanasius turns to a new discussion of the Arian claim that the Father's unity with the Son is the same as the Father's unity with us on the basis of Jn 17:11, 20-23, which the Arians employ in order to deny the true Godhead of the Son. The Arian argument is summed up in an extract from an Arian text which Athanasius cites:

If, then, it is the case that as we become one in the Father, likewise he too is one with the Father, and he too is in the Father (Jn 17:11, 22f), how do you say this on the basis of his words, "I and the Father are one" (Jn 10:30), and "I in

the Father and the Father in me"(Jn 14:10), which indicate that he is proper to and alike with the Father's essence? For it would be necessary in this case to accept that, either we too are proper to the Father's essence, or he too is alien [to the Father's essence] as we too are alien.(16)

Given that the Son is truly God, this claim, says Athanasius, makes

the gifts which are given to human beings by g r a c e these they want to make equal to the Godhead of the Giver; For hearing that human beings become sons of God, they considered themselves as well to be equal with God's true and natural Son".(17)

In developing his argument against this Arian thesis Athanasius tries to establish two points. Firstly, the Arians' interpretation of the above verses from the Gospel of John is contrary to the Patristic tradition,(18) since by taking the text literally they fail to understand the custom of Holy Scripture in using natural things as images and paradigms for human beings in order to explicate the movements of human free will (τὰ ἐκ προαιρέσεως φαίνηται τῶν ἀνθρώπων κινήματα) as imitations of the movements of natural things.(19) Secondly, the divine sonship which human beings acquire by grace does not imply identity of nature with the true Son of God, but a) imitation of God's acts, and b) participation in the Spirit of the Son.

Regarding the first point, Athanasius argues that the exegesis

of any verse in the Gospel presupposes, on the one hand, proper coordination of this verse with other related verses in the same Gospel, i.e. the proper contextual setting, and, on the other hand, identification of the imagery used in it, and its real meaning in the light of the actual realities involved, i.e. the existential or ontological contexts.⁽²⁰⁾ It is, however, the second point which obviously demands our closer attention here, as something which is directly related to our research topic and which seems to be 'new', to some extent, to Athanasius' argumentation described so far. We shall best do this by turning to the most pertinent texts:

For as there is one natural, true and only-begotten Son, we too become sons, not as he is by nature and in truth, but by the *g r a c e* (κατὰ χάριν) of the one who called us; thus, being human beings from the earth, we come to bear the name of gods, not as the true God, or his Logos, but as God willed who gave us this as a *g r a c e* (χαρισάμενος). Likewise we become compassionate as God, not achieving equality with God, nor becoming natural and true benefactors; for being benefactors is not our own invention, but God's, so that we too may transfer to others, all the things which happen to us from God himself by *g r a c e*, without making any distinctions, but simply extending our doing-good (εὐποιῖα) to all. For it is in this way that we somehow become his [God's] imitators (μιμηταί), and not otherwise, namely, by administering to each other (διακονοῦμεν ἀλλήλους) the things which come from him.⁽²¹⁾

This text clearly shows that divine sonship, or deification, is a grace (χάρις) which is granted to human beings by God and which does not imply any natural identity with God, but likeness to, or imitation of, God (the Father) and his Son (Logos) in doing-good or administering good to each other. This likeness or imitation of doing-good (εὐποιΐα) and service (διακονία) is, in turn, closely related, on the one hand, to a reception on the part of human beings of God's divine εὐποιΐα and, on the other hand, to a transmission of this εὐποιΐα to others. Athanasius does not fully explain what this divine εὐποιΐα is, since his main concern is not to explain its meaning but to make this gift, as distinct from their creaturely nature, the basis of their "divine status". Nevertheless, he does make some points about this εὐποιΐα which throw further light on the meaning of χάρις.

Athanasius ties God's εὐποιΐα to his will, as distinct from his nature, because he says that becoming divine sons or bearing the name of gods is something that happens to us human beings in accordance with the will of God who grants this (ὥς ἠθέλησεν ὁ τοῦτο χαρισάμενος θεός). Furthermore, he ties this εὐποιΐα to God's διακονία towards human beings and to the resulting διακονία of human beings towards each other, because he speaks of "the things which happen to us from God by grace" (τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ χάριν εἰς ἡμᾶς γεγόμενα), and which "we administer to others by means of our imitating God" (τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ διακονοῦμεν ἀλλήλοις). All these points undoubtedly reveal that Athanasius understands divine χάρις as resting on

God's good will and good acts towards human beings, which find their true corollary, or counterpart, in good will and good acts among human beings. In other words, it becomes clear here that grace is an εὐποιΐα which begins with God, but continues its operation through those who receive its effects. Thus, there is in this grace a kind of dynamic circuit of giving -- receiving -- giving (a re-transmission = ἀνα-μετάδοσις), which is destined to extend to all people without discrimination. As such, God's grace becomes the "entelechy", as it were, of a mutual service (διακονία πρὸς ἀλλήλους), in which the gifts of God are communicated and shared by all human beings. As Dragas puts it, "For Athanasius, created being, and in particular human being, is *in actu*, and not *in statu*. Put otherwise, human being is man's history. This understanding of man is appositely indicated in Athanasius' usual designation of man by the term γενητός. This term denotes that the human being is a genesis. Man is what he becomes and he becomes what he does. His true becoming and doing, however, is one that originates with God his Creator and Saviour and more particularly with God's grace. Thus ultimately, χάρις has to do with a coordination of "will" and "act", divine and human, which does not alter the divine and human natures, but brings out the potency of the former while causing the perfection of the latter".(22)

We note here that Athanasius relies upon 1 John 5:20 for highlighting χάρις as God's εὐποιΐα towards humanity through his incarnate Son, and for shedding more light on the grace of

adoption by connecting it with the gift of the Holy Spirit. He says:

"We know that the Son of God is come, and he has given us a mind to know the true God, and we are in him who is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ; this is the true God and eternal life" (1 Jn 5:20), and we are made sons through him by adoption and g r a c e, as we partake of his Spirit for "as many as received him," he says, "to them gave power to become children of God, even to them that believe on his Name" (Jn 1:12), and therefore also he is the Truth, saying, "I am the Truth," and in his address to his Father, he said, "Sanctify them through Your Truth, Your Logos is Truth" (Jn 14:6; 17:17); but we by imitation become virtuous and sons.(23)

Here Athanasius clarifies further his understanding of χάρις as divine εὐποιΐα from the Father through the Son by linking it with the notion of "divine sonship by adoption" which entails the gift of the Holy Spirit. By doing this, he reveals, on the one hand, the Trinitarian origin and basis of χάρις and, on the other hand, the fact that χάρις essentially entails the assimilation of human beings with the Son of God Incarnate. Although he does not yet state this explicitly, Athanasius strongly suggests that the grace which is given from the Father through the Son is finally appropriated *in the Spirit*. Thus as the divine χάρις is Trinitarian so is adoption. Once more, however, he highlights at this point

the human presupposition to God's granting of this χάρις, which is best qualified as grace of divine adoption. He does this in two ways: by citing John 1:12 which stresses that authority to become children of God which is given to those who accept God's true Son, who became Incarnate, and believe in his name; and by citing John 14:6 together with John 17:17 and stressing that it is by imitation (κατὰ μίμησιν) of the true Son of God that human beings become divine sons by adoption.

The point that re-emerges here most clearly is that χάρις is God's free gift to humanity and that as such it is not imposed by force on human beings but entails their free response. God's gift is in fact the Incarnate Son himself, through whom human beings become divine sons "by adoption" (θέσει) or "by grace" (κατὰ χάριν) through partaking of the Spirit of the Son. Human response in this case entails acceptance of the Incarnate Son for what he is and for what he stands, i.e. the standard or model to be followed or imitated in life. Inasmuch as the grace of adoption is God's act in Christ and through the Spirit which embraces the human beings who freely accept and imitate Christ, grace is both participation in what God gives and imitation of what God has set up as a model for life, i.e. participation (μετοχή) in and imitation (μίμησις) of God's Incarnate Son.

That the Incarnate Son is the focus of God's grace to humanity is once again eloquently and profoundly expounded in CAR3:22 and 23, where Athanasius elaborates the notion of the

'body' which the Son assumed through the Incarnation in order to render it, as he puts it, 'perfect', and make it the basis of humanity's reunion with God and deification. It is, however, in CAR3:24 that Athanasius explains how all this is implemented through *the grace of the Spirit* which is supplied by God through the Incarnate Son:

"Hereby we know that we dwell in him [God] and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit" (1 Jn 4:13). Therefore, because of the g r a c e of the Spirit (διὰ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν), which has been given to us, we come to be in him, and he in us; and since it is the Spirit of God [that is involved], through his coming to be in us, obviously, we too are considered to be in God as having the Spirit, and God is in us. So, then, we do not come to be in the Father as the Son is in the Father; because *the Son is not a partaker of the Spirit so that he might, thereby, come to be in the Father; nor is he a recipient of the Spirit, but rather he supplies him to all; and it is not the Spirit who conjoins the Logos to the Father, but rather it is the Spirit who receives from the Logos* [my italics]. As regards the Son, he is in the Father as his own Logos and Radiance, but as regards us, we are strange to and distant from God without the Spirit; *it is by partaking of the Spirit that we are conjoined with the Godhead* [my italics]; so, for us to be in the Father is not of ourselves, but of the Spirit who is in us and abides in us as long as we preserve him in us through confession; as John again says, "Whosoever would confess that Jesus is the Son

of God, God shall dwell in him and he in God". (1 Jn 4:15)
 What then is [your alleged] likeness and equality of us with
 the Son?(24)

Here Athanasius reiterates the connection, conjunction, or coinherence, between God and the Christians through the grace of the Holy Spirit. In doing this, however, he also explains the order of this conjunction. The order is [Father→ Son→ Spirit]→ [Christians] and not, [Father→ Spirit]→ [Christ + Christians] as the Arians contended. This means that Christ as the Logos/Son of God is not the recipient, but the giver of the grace of the Spirit and, as such, he is differentiated from us who are recipients. The radical nature of this differentiation in the mind of Athanasius appears in his statement that without the Spirit human beings cannot be conjoined with God, nor with Christ.

But as regards us, we are strange to and distant from God without the Spirit; it is by partaking of the Spirit that we are conjoined with the Godhead.(25)

This also indicates that whereas χάρις as participation entails partaking of the Spirit of Christ, χάρις as imitation entails assimilation to Christ's humanity.

Finally CAR3:25 sums up once more Athanasius' understanding of John 17:21. This verse does not imply an identity of Christians with Christ, but rather constitutes a prayer

whereby the Son asks for the gift of the Spirit to be granted to the disciples. As recipients of the Spirit the disciples may also exhibit on their own creaturely level the uncreated eternal unity which binds together Father and Son. This "requested unity", as it were, can be firmly established on the unshakable and permanent grace of the Spirit given by the Father through the Son to the disciples.

The Saviour, then, saying of us, "As you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they too may be one in us," (Jn. 17:21) does not signify that we were to have identity with him, for this was shown from the instance of Jonah; but it is a request to the Father, as John has written, that the Spirit should be granted through the Son to those who believe, through whom we are found to be in God, and in this respect to be conjoined in him. For since the Logos is in the Father, and the Spirit is given from the Logos, he wills that we should receive the Spirit, that, when we receive him, having the Spirit of the Logos who is in the Father, we too may be found, on account of the Spirit, to have become One in the Logos, and through him in the Father. And if he says, "as we" (Jn. 17: 22), this again is only a request that such g r a c e of the Spirit as is given to the disciples may be unfailing and irrevocable. For what the Logos has by nature, as I said, by being in the Father, that [which he has] he wishes to be given to us through the Spirit irrevocably. The Apostle knowing this, said, "Who shall separate us from the

love of Christ?" for "the gifts of God" and "g r a c e of his calling are (ἀμεταμέλητα) irrevocable" (Rom. 8:35; cf. Rom. 11:29). It is the Spirit, then, who is in God and not we [viewed in] ourselves; and as we become sons and gods because of the Logos who comes to be in us, likewise we shall come to be in the Son and in the Father and to be thought of as having become one in the Son and in the Father because of the Spirit who comes to be in us, the Spirit, that is, who is in the Logos who, in turn, is truly in the Father. When, then, a man falls from the Spirit on account of some wickedness, if he repents, the grace remains irrevocable to such as are willing; otherwise he who has fallen is no longer in God, because that Holy Spirit and Paraclete which is in God has deserted him, and he who sinned will be in the one to whom he subjected himself.(26)

In this text Athanasius makes it clear that the grace of the Spirit is the basis for the human imitation of the divine unity which binds together Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This grace is granted by the Father at the request of the Son and.. -- though he does not say it in so many words -- through the Son. More importantly it is governed by no necessity. It is not irresistible as a result of some inscrutable divine fiat and, therefore, does not operate irrespectively of either divine or human freedom. Hence, the request that it may become *unfailing* (ἀδιάπτωτος) in the disciples, as it is *irrevocable* (ἀμεταμέλητος) as a calling which is initiated by God. These two qualifiers of grace, *unfailing* and

irrevocable, which are in our view related to the human and the divine freedom respectively, clearly suggest both the dynamics of grace and the dramatic aspect of salvation which grace effects. They really suggest that it is the irrevocability of the divine grace, arising from the natural unity of the Divine Trinity and the majesty of God's free and good choice, that constitutes the firm foundation of the 'infallibility' of the faith of the disciples; and, in turn, this faith arises out of that free and good choice which makes the human being to be really and in truth in the image and likeness of God.

Undoubtedly Athanasius does not elaborate his thought very much here, but what he says is most suggestive, especially when its inner implication is explored. This, however, is suggested by two striking phrases: the phrase which qualifies the divine will and act: *For what the Logos has by nature in the Father that he wishes to be given to us through the Spirit irrevocably* (τὸ γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρχον τῷ Λόγῳ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἀμεταμελήτως διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος δοθῆναι βούλεται), and the corollary to it, the phrase which follows almost a little later and qualifies the human will and act: *For the grace remains irrevocable to those who are willing* (ἡ μὲν χάρις ἀμεταμέλητος διαμένει τοῖς βουλομένοις). Athanasius is obviously speaking here about the grace of sonship by adoption. For 'what the Logos has by nature in the Father' is very likely to be his sonship which is given to us as grace [of sonship] by adoption, and may remain irrevocable.

From what Athanasius has pointed out so far we are led to conclude that there is a basic difference between the divine nature and the divine grace, i.e. between the divine being to which the Trinity belongs and the divine act which is communicated by the Trinity (from the Father through the Son in the Spirit) to us. The unity of the divine Trinity is not constituted by any grace, because the three persons are one in being and share all the divine attributes of the Godhead with each other by nature. This is most clearly demonstrated through Athanasius' insistence that the Son is one with the Father in nature and essence and not on account of his reception of the grace of the Spirit. By contrast, human beings are called to become, and do become, one with God and in God through the grace of the Spirit, who is given to them from the Father through the Son. Moreover, human beings are perfected in their nature as they grow in grace which is both participation in and imitation of God's Incarnate Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, implemented by the Spirit and through faith and right conduct. Being such, human perfection cannot be a matter of necessity but a matter of free good choice and good act which are supported and directed by God's free good choice and good act. This means that human perfection can be lost, because the divine grace is not irresistible. Nevertheless, it is the irrevocable character of the divine grace that constitutes the possibility of the restoration of human beings in this divine grace through repentance.⁽²⁷⁾ Such a restoration in divine grace entails restoration to human perfection.

**(b) Grace and the Son's Relationship with the Father
in the Context of the Incarnation**

In the second part of CAR3 (chs. 26-58) we come across, as we have noted in the beginning of this chapter, several explicit references to χάρις, all of which are connected with Athanasius' reply to four new Arian theses concerning the Son.⁽²⁸⁾ These theses are based on certain NT verses and amount to an unequivocal denial of the true Godhead of the Son. They are outlined in CAR3:26 and can be summarized as follows:

a) the Son is not from the Father's essence nor from him by nature; b) he is not the Father's true and natural Power; c) he is not the Father's own and true Wisdom; and d) he is not the genuine Logos of the Father without whom the Father never existed and through whom he created everything. The Arians have built the above mentioned theses on the following findings respectively: a) "he [the Son] received authority and everything from the Father" (Mt. 28:18; 11:27, Jn 5:22; 3:35-36; 6:37); b) He was troubled and asked for the cup of death to be removed (Jn 12:27-28; 13:21 and Mt. 26:30); c) he grew up in wisdom and asked questions which implied ignorance (Lk. 2:52, Mt. 16:13, Jn 11:16 and Mk. 6:38); and d) the Son also cried of dereliction on the Cross, asked the Father to glorify him, prayed in times of temptation and confessed his ignorance of the time of the end (Mt. 27:46, Jn 12:28; 17:5, Mt. 26:41 and Mk. 13:32).⁽²⁹⁾

The references to χάρις appear in the context of Athanasius' response to these theses. This response, which does not correspond exactly to the order or the contents of the theses described in CAR3:26, consists of the following five sections:

1) chs. 27-35: a general response, which includes methodological considerations and is focused on the orthodox rule of biblical exegesis;

2) chs. 35-41: a particular response to the Arian interpretation of verses relating to the first and third Arian theses;

3) chs. 42-50: a particular response to the Arian interpretation of verses relating to the fourth Arian thesis;

4) chs. 51-53: a particular response to the Arian interpretation of verses relating to the third Arian thesis; and

5) chs. 54-58: a particular response to the Arian interpretation of verses relating to the second Arian thesis.

Our analysis of the references to χάρις in these sections has led us to identify four particular themes which are related to the doctrine of grace and which we shall present below.

1st theme:

the grace of impassibility and immortality

This theme emerges in the context of Athanasius' elucidation of the rule for the sound interpretation of the Bible. Athanasius was forced to speak about this rule because of the Arian handling, or mishandling, of the Bible, which was displayed in the four new Arian theses. He identifies this rule with "the scope and character of holy Scripture" (ὁ σκοπὸς καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ἁγίας Γραφῆς), namely, the double declaration concerning the Saviour (ἡ διπλῇ περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐπαγγελία) which relates to the Saviour's Godhead and manhood. As he puts it, Scripture proclaims the Saviour as the one who has been always God, Son, Logos, Effulgence and Wisdom of God the Father, and who afterwards became man for us, having received flesh from the Virgin Mary, the bearer of God (θεοτόκου).(30)

Athanasius explains this in a discussion about Christ's sufferings (τὰ πάθη) and divine works (τὰ ἔργα) in CAR3:32. It is in the course of doing this that he refers to the χάρις which ensued from the assumption of the infirmities of the flesh by the divine Saviour on account of his incarnation. So Athanasius points out that,

when the flesh suffered, the Logos was not external to it; and therefore the passion is said to be his and that, when he did his Father's works in a divine fashion, the flesh was not

external to him, but it was in the body itself that the Lord did do them. Hence, when he was made man, he said, 'If I do not do the works of the Father, do not believe me; but if I do them, though you do not believe me, believe the works, so that you may know that the Father is in me and I in him' (Jn 10:37-38).(31)

Apparently what Athanasius wants to stress here is the double activity, human and divine, which is manifested in the Incarnate Lord and which, as he says, should not be attributed to two different subjects, as the Arians seem to suggest, but to one and the same, the Logos. That this implies no confusion of the human and the divine in Christ, but a true coordination, or communication, of human and divine activities, is most clearly seen in what Athanasius says about three gospel incidents: the healing of Peter's mother in law, the restoration of the sight of the man born blind and the raising of Lazarus. Here is the crucial text:

And thus when there was need to raise Peter's mother in law, who was sick with fever, he stretched forth his hand in a human fashion (ἀνθρωπίνως), but He stopped the illness in a divine fashion (θεϊκῶς). And in the case of the man born blind from birth, it was human spittle (ἀνθρώπινον πτύσμα) which he gave forth from the flesh, but it was by divine act (θεϊκῶς) that he did open the eyes through the clay. And in the case of Lazarus, he gave forth an human voice as man

(φωνήν ἀνθρωπίνην ὡς ἄνθρωπος); but it was in a divine fashion and acting as God (θεϊκῶς δὲ ὡς θεός) that he did raise Lazarus from the dead.(32)

It is after this that Athanasius introduces the notion of χάρις as he goes on to explain further this coordination of human and divine activities in the Incarnate Logos. This coordination, he says, entails the fact that the sufferings (τὰ πάθη), which are proper to the humanity (flesh) of the Logos, should be ascribed to him as man, just as the achievement and the grace (τὸ κατόρθωμα καὶ ἡ χάρις), which are coordinated with them [the sufferings], should be ascribed to him as God. As he puts it:

These things were so done and manifested, because he had a body, not in imagination, but truly; and it had to be that, for the Lord, in putting on human flesh, he had to put it on whole with the [natural] sufferings (passions) which are proper to it; so that, just as we say that the body was his own, so also we may say that the sufferings of the body were proper to him alone, though they did not touch him in his Godhead. If, then, the body had been another's, it would be to him too that the sufferings would have to be attributed; but if the flesh is the Logos' (for 'the Logos became flesh'), it is of necessity that the sufferings of the flesh are also ascribed to him, whose flesh this is. And to whom the sufferings are ascribed, such as, to be condemned, to be scourged, to thirst, and the cross, and death, and the

other infirmities of the body, to him too is the achievement and the grace (τὸ κατόρθωμα καὶ ἡ χάρις) also ascribed. For this cause then, consistently and fittingly such sufferings are ascribed not to another, but to the Lord; so that the grace (ἡ χάρις) also may be from him, and that we may not become worshippers of any other, but remain truly devout towards God, because we invoke no originate thing, no common man, but the natural and true Son from God, who has also become man, yet is no less Lord and Saviour.(33)

This text clearly indicates that χάρις refers to Christ's divine act upon the human nature which is thereby enabled to reach impassibility and immortality. This does, however, presuppose Christ's human act, whereby he freely accepts in his humanity, and for the sake of all humanity, the passion and the death, which are imposed on him on account of human sin. Thus the χάρις of overcoming suffering and death as God is also the χάρις of suffering and dying as man for the sake of humanity. In other words χάρις is essentially linked with the mystery of the inhominated Logos, which entails the union and active coordination of the divine and the human realities.

In CAR 3:33f Athanasius further explains this point about χάρις as he clarifies his understanding of Christ's sufferings and death, impassibility and immortality. The Logos, he says, made the properties of the flesh (τὰ ἴδια τῆς σαρκὸς) his own in order to abolish the weaknesses of the flesh, redeeming man and raising

him from death with his power. He especially underlines the fact that the Logos performed the divine works of the Godhead through his humanity in order to deify it by grace.

If the works of the Logos' Godhead had not taken place through the body, man would not have been deified; and again, had not the properties of the flesh been ascribed to the Logos, humanity would not have been thoroughly delivered from them... Nevertheless "death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. 5:14); and thus men remained mortal and corruptible as before, liable to the passions proper to their nature. But now that the Logos has become an human being and has appropriated what pertains to the flesh, no longer do these things touch the body, because of the Logos who has come into it, but they are destroyed by him; and henceforth human beings no longer remain sinners and dead according to the passions which are proper to them, but having risen on account of the Logos' power, they remain immortal and incorruptible for ever. Whence also, whereas the flesh is born of Mary the Bearer of God, he who supplies to others their origin into being himself is said to have been born, in order that he may transfer our origin into himself, and we may no longer, as mere earth, return to the earth, but as being knit into the Logos from heaven, may be carried to heaven by him. Therefore in like manner and not without reason has he

transferred to himself the other passions of the body also; that we, no longer as being men, but as belonging to the Logos, may have share in eternal life. For we no longer die in Adam according to our former origin but henceforth, our origin and all infirmity of flesh being transferred to the Logos, we rise from the earth, the curse from sin being removed, because of him who is in us, and who has become a curse for us. And with reason; for as we are all from earth and die in Adam, so being regenerated from above of water and Spirit, we are all quickened in Christ; the flesh being no longer earthly, but being henceforth made property of the Logos, by reason of God's Logos who for our sake "became flesh".(34)

Here Athanasius speaks about the complete deliverance of man from the infirmities which are attributed to his flesh and especially from mortality and corruptibility. These infirmities were taken up by the Logos precisely in order to be removed from humanity.(35)

Recalling Rom. 5:14 Athanasius highlights the difference between human death before and after the Incarnation. He explains that the divine Logos, having become incarnate, has deified his body by performing the works of his Godhead through it. The very presence of the divine Logos in the human body has resulted in the latter's complete deliverance from fleshly passions. Particularly interesting here is the use of the term

"deification" which Athanasius connects not only with the body of Christ but also with the whole of humanity. He states that, the Logos "having become man and having appropriated to himself what pertains to the flesh, human beings no longer remain sinners and dead". What he has in mind is the incorporation of all human beings into the body of Christ, which, as he states elsewhere,(36) constitutes for him the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation. Thus, Athanasius holds that the divine Logos destroyed the passions of the flesh, sin and death and, consequently, raised the human race to immortality and incorruptibility.

Athanasius also speaks here about the salvation and resurrection of human beings through the Incarnate Logos, as he expounds the point that the Logos transferred to himself everything human. By doing this he links his understanding of χάρις with the gift of the resurrection which is rooted in the very fact of the incarnation of the Logos. He explains that by virtue of the human birth of the divine Logos, whereby the Logos was united with all human beings, the human origin (γένεσις) has been transferred into the Logos himself. The implication of this is that humanity is no longer merely earthly, as descending from Adam, but also heavenly, having its origin in the Logos. Human beings are no longer mere earth returning to earth, but are carried to heaven by the Logos who is from heaven and has conjoined them to himself. Athanasius also explains that the Logos transferred to himself, not without reason, the other passions of the body so that human beings may partake

of eternal life as belonging to the Logos. The precise meaning of the "other passions" is not very clear. They are probably linked with the consequences of sin upon the human being which are not natural but additional infirmities, although there is a connection between all infirmities. It seems that for Athanasius the eternal Son and Logos of God assumed the infirmities of humanity in two ways, firstly by virtue of his birth into the human race, his incarnation or inhomination, and secondly by his acceptance of the passion and the cross which redeemed humanity from the grip of sin. Whilst Athanasius lays much emphasis in this section on the incarnation and the union of the impassible Godhead with the passible flesh (humanity), the thought of the redemptive suffering of Christ which culminated on the cross and ^{his} entry into death is always in his mind. The incarnation establishes the atonement between the divine and the human in the inhominated person of the divine Redeemer, but it is the whole incarnate economy, which culminates in Christ's sufferings and death on account of sinful humanity, that effects its application to all human beings.

In the conclusion of this chapter Athanasius underlines the role of baptism in the appropriation of the grace of salvation and deification in Christ by human beings, thus indicating that grace is concretely appropriated and revealed in the Church. He speaks of "regeneration from above, of water and the Spirit, and of the human flesh becoming the property of the Logos (λογοθεΐσα) because the Logos became flesh for us".⁽³⁷⁾ This indicates that

the basis of χάρις in the union and communion of the human and the divine is not only strictly Christological but also ecclesiological.

In CAR3:34 Athanasius clarifies further the grace of the deification of humanity and the inheritance of eternal life, which humanity received by grace, because of its unity with the Incarnate Logos. He does this as he explains that humanity becomes impassible and free from fleshly passions through Christ's manifestation,⁽³⁸⁾ whereby the impassibility of the Logos is transferred to humanity in general through his own humanity.

Let no one, then, be offended at what belongs to man, but rather let man know that the Logos himself is impassible by nature, and yet, because of that flesh which he put on, these [passions] are ascribed to him, since they are proper to the flesh and the body itself is proper to the Saviour. And whereas he himself, being impassible by nature, remains as he is, not harmed by these passions, but rather obliterating and destroying them, men, whose passions are changed and abolished, as it were, in the impassible One, henceforth become themselves also impassible and free from them for ever, as John taught, saying, 'And you know that he was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin' (1 Jn 3:5).⁽³⁹⁾

Particularly fascinating is the way in which Athanasius

highlights this point concerning the grace of deification, i.e. of impassibility and incorruptibility, by personifying the flesh of Christ, so to speak, and making it speak for itself and explain what the Incarnation has meant for it. It is the flesh itself, he says, who is now able to answer the contentious heretic and say,

I am from earth, being by nature mortal, but afterwards I have become the Logos' flesh, and he 'carried' my passions, though he is without them; and so I became free from them, being no more abandoned to their service because of the Lord who has made me free from them. For if you object to my being rid of that corruption which is by nature, see that you do not object to God's Logos having taken my form of servitude; for as the Lord, putting on the body, became a human being, so we human beings are deified by the Logos as being taken up by him through his flesh, and henceforward inherit life everlasting.⁽⁴⁰⁾

It is clear from the above text that Athanasius understands the grace of deification of humanity in terms of impassibility and eternal life. He obviously has in mind the humanity of Christ as it is after the passion and the resurrection, but it is equally obvious that he sees all human beings related to it. Although he does not explain how the rest of humanity is related to the humanity of the exalted Lord, it seems likely that he is thinking dynamically, i.e. in terms of the on-going operation of the plenitude of grace which is established in and through the risen

Christ himself. All this means that grace is fundamentally connected with humanity reaching impassibility and incorruptibility and that this ensues from the Logos' assumption of human passion and death in his own humanity. The universalist tone of Athanasius' statements here, which is typical of his theology, is the outcome of his attachment to Pauline doctrine. His understanding of Christ as the Incarnate Creator of the universe leads him always to present the universal implications of the incarnation and the whole incarnate economy. His "Christus Victor" Christology, however, which is as typical of his thought as it is of many of the early Fathers, does not imply the kind of universalism which eliminates the place of the human factor in the mystery of salvation. As we have seen, the grace of Christ has a universal range, but is not imposed upon humanity by some sort of sovereign divine will. It is freely given and freely received, for, as we have already noted, for Athanasius *the grace remains irrevocable to those who are willing* (ἡ μὲν χάρις ἀμεταμέλητος διαμένει τοῖς βουλομένοις, CAR3:25).

2nd theme:

the grace of the knowledge of God

In CAR3:35-41 Athanasius replies, as we have already noted, to the arguments of the Arians related to the first and fourth of their new theses. The Arians denied the true Godhead of the Son on the grounds that, according to the Gospels, he received gifts from God which he lacked (the first thesis), and asked questions

which exposed his ignorance (the fourth thesis). The Arian argument was that in either case he could not have been true Son of God. Athanasius' general reply is that the Gospel sayings, which the Arians use in this case, are not said of the Son as Son, but of the Son as Son of man, i.e. of the Son incarnate. They are "human sayings" (ἄνθρωπίνως λεγόμενα) which are applied to the Saviour because of his humanity. Far from suggesting a denial of his Godhead, they reveal his grace to humanity. Since the first explicit references to χάρις appear in connection with the fourth thesis, we shall deal with that first, leaving the discussion of the first thesis for the following section.

In CAR3:37 Athanasius reviews the Gospel verses which present the questioning Christ, focusing on the cases of the Lord's questions about the loaves in the incident of the feeding of the five thousand (Mk. 6:38) and about the place where Lazarus had been laid on the occasion of his burial (Jn 11:34). He does this in order to show that Christ was not ignorant in his Godhead but in his manhood. As he puts it:

On the one hand there is no ignorance in the Godhead and, on the other hand, it is a property of the flesh to be ignorant" (ἐν μὲν τῇ θεότητι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄγνοια, τῆς δὲ σαρκὸς ἰδιὸν ἔστι τὸ ἀγνοεῖν).(41)

In CAR3:38 Athanasius makes the same point but uses the term "the humanity" (τὸ ἀνθρώπινον) of Christ, which suggests

that the "ignorant flesh" is in fact the "ignorant humanity".(42) Thus the argument of Athanasius is that, if ignorance is a property of humanity, and if the Son of God truly became human, there is nothing strange if he demonstrated human ignorance in his human life. The careful study of such cases, however, on the basis of the Gospel accounts, also reveals the soteriological purpose of such demonstrations. The point is that he truly upheld the ignorance of humanity in order to deify it with his Godhead which possesses all knowledge. The crucial Athanasian text here is the following:

Therefore this is plain to every one, that the flesh indeed is ignorant, but the Logos himself, considered as the Logos, knows all things even before they come to be. For he did not cease to be God, when he became man; nor, whereas he is God, does he shrink from what is man's; perish the thought; but rather, being God, he has taken to himself the flesh, and being in the flesh deifies the flesh. For as he asked questions in it, so also in it did he raise the dead; and he shewed to all that he who quickens the dead and recalls the soul, much more discerns the secret of all. Indeed he knew where Lazarus lay, and yet he asked; for the all-holy Logos of God, who endured all things for our sakes, did this, so that by carrying our ignorance, he might give us the grace of the knowledge of his own only and true Father, and of himself, sent because of us for the salvation of all, than which no grace could be greater.(43)

In this text Athanasius reveals the deeper meaning of the grace of knowledge which the incarnate Son gives as God to humanity through his own humanity. It is the knowledge of the Father, which Athanasius qualifies as the "greatest grace". The way in which the incarnate Son acted in the case of Lazarus demonstrates not only the fact that the Saviour did indeed take up our ignorant humanity, but also that he knows as God the mystery of death and whence to recall Lazarus' soul. The ultimate purpose of this coordination of the ignorant human flesh and the knowledgeable divine Logos/Son is the gift to humanity of the ultimate grace, the knowledge of God the Father. Athanasius, however, implies here the other important theological point according to which the incarnate Son does not reveal his Godhead independently of the Father. The knowledge of the divine Son is inseparable from the knowledge of the divine Father. Thus the "greatest" (μεῖζων), as Athanasius calls it, grace of the knowledge of the Father includes the knowledge of the Son. Ultimately, however, the knowledge of the Father includes for Athanasius not only the knowledge of the Son but also the knowledge of the Holy Spirit. The greatest grace of the knowledge of the Father is in fact the knowledge of the Holy Trinity. This is indeed the typical Athanasian position as it is stated in several places in the Trilogy against the Arians and above all in the Letters to Serapion.⁽⁴⁴⁾

The case of Christ's ignorance rests upon the same incarnational soteriological premises as the case of Christ's

sufferings and death. In both cases it is the real assumption of humanity by the divine Saviour Logos/Son of God that constitutes the ground of their occurrence. Correlated to this, however, is the unalterable presence of the real Godhead of the Saviour as the ground of the soteriological outcome of this occurrence, namely, the deification of humanity. In the light of the present discussion of Christ's ignorance, it is clear that Athanasius understands deification not only in terms of impassibility and incorruptibility, but also in terms of illumination and the knowledge of God. In other words, deification embraces the whole of humanity, the physical and the psychological, the body and the soul. Athanasius does not speak of this scholastically (philosophically), because he tends to see humanity in the biblical perspective as a unity, and his statements clearly put it forward.

The theme of Christ's ignorance is taken up once more in CAR3:42ff, where Athanasius discusses the particular case of Christ's ignorance of the end time (Mk 13:32). Although he initially points out that the very sequence of the reading (εἰρημὸς τοῦ ἀναγνώσματος) indicates Christ's knowledge, rather than ignorance,⁽⁴⁵⁾ Athanasius returns to the familiar perspective which we encountered above.⁽⁴⁶⁾ It is for the sake of the flesh and because he did truly become man that the divine Logos claimed ignorance for himself. Ignorance is a property of the flesh, of the humanity of the Logos (τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ). "It is because he truly became man, that he is not ashamed, on account of the ignorant flesh, to say, I do not know, in order to show,

that, though he knows as God, he is ignorant on account of the flesh".(47) Far from debasing the Logos, the whole passage reveals his philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία), in that "he became like us for us".(48) His ignorance, then, is entirely human, just like his hunger, his thirst and his passion. On the other hand, because he is God's Logos he knows everything and there is nothing of which he is ignorant. The case of Lazarus demonstrates precisely this,(49) because it shows that the one who asks where Lazarus has been laid is also the one who recalls Lazarus' soul from the place to which it had departed at his death.(50)

There is no need to enter into any particular analysis of the rest of the arguments which Athanasius uses to explain Christ's ignorance about the end time. What is important to underline here is what he says at the end of his treatment of this topic. It is for the benefit of humanity that he allows in this episode his human ignorance to take, as it were, the upperhand. As he puts it,

It is, therefore, on account of the benefit which results from ignorance that he said this ["I do not know"]. For in saying this, he wants us to be always ready... Thus it is because the Lord knows above us what is to our benefit that he insured the disciples in this way.(51)

This talk about the disciples being ready and secure is obviously connected with the earlier point about the free

appropriation of the grace of God which is given in Christ. Christ's human ignorance in this case is a grace because it prepares human beings to receive his grace freely and securely.

3rd theme:

the grace of authority and glory

This theme is connected with Athanasius' refutation of the first new Arian thesis. The main thrust of this refutation is exactly the same as the one he put forward earlier. The Arians do not take sufficient notice of the fact of the Incarnation and consequently misunderstand the gospel sayings which are applicable to the Saviour as man. The key text for our present theme is the following:

When the Saviour, then, says, according to the sayings which they allege, 'Authority was given to Me' (Mt. 28:18) and 'Glorify your Son,' (Jn 17:1) and when Peter says, authority is given to him (1 Pet. 3:22), we understand all these passages in the same sense, namely, that he says all this humanly because of the body [which he put on]. For though he had no need, nevertheless he is said to have received what he received humanly, so that again, inasmuch as the Lord has received, and the g i f t rests upon him, the g r a c e may remain sure. For when man receives alone, he has the possibility of losing [what he received]; and this was demonstrated in the case of Adam, for after having received

he lost. It is in order that g r a c e might become irremovable, and be kept secure for human beings, that he appropriates to himself the gift and says that he has received authority, as man, which he always has as God; and he who glorifies others says, "Glorify me", so that he may show that he has a flesh which is in need of these. Hence when the flesh receives [something], and because the one who receives is in him and has become man by assuming it, he is said to be the one who has received.(52)

Here it becomes clear that the Saviour received the gifts of authority and glory and that these gifts are said to have been given to him because they were given to his humanity. Far from being pointers to an inferiority in the divine status of the Saviour, they are pointers to the real and personal involvement of the Son of God in the divine work for the salvation of the human race. They are also pointers to the unshakable (βεβαία) and irremovable (ἀναφαίρετος) nature of God's grace which is given to humanity in and through Christ. Particularly important is here the point that by becoming himself a man the divine Saviour has claimed for himself as man the grace which Adam, the forefather of all humanity, received and lost. This contrast between Adam and Christ clearly suggests the universal, panhuman range of divine grace. As in the case of the former, so in the case of the latter, it is the whole humanity that is involved.

Equally important here is the statement that the Saviour gives to himself as man *what he has as God*, because it suggests that God's grace is a divine uncreated property which characterizes the divine nature and which is communicable to created humanity. It is precisely because of this that Athanasius so often uses the word deification (θεοποίησις) to describe the appropriation of the divine grace by the humanity of the Lord and by extension to the entire human race.

In CAR3:39 and 40 Athanasius discusses further the gifts of glory and authority which the Lord is said to have received as man in the Gospel. His primary intention, as it becomes amply clear, is to show that what he received as man, he always had as God and, consequently, to conclude that "whatever is humanly said of the Saviour in the Gospel, which happens to be alien to God, when looked at from the point of view of the nature (φύσις=reality) to which these sayings refer, should be thought out in relation to the humanity of the Logos and not to his Godhead. For though 'the Logos became flesh', yet to the Logos belong the g r a c e and the power.".(53)

In dealing in CAR3:39 with the grace of glorification, which the Incarnate Logos received for the sake of humanity according to John 17:1, Athanasius reprimands the Arians for using this fact to divide the Logos from the Father and to deprive humanity of divine grace.(54)

Furthermore Athanasius denounces the Arian thinking on this point as Judaic, and then goes on to explain by citing other verses that the glorification which the Saviour received after his resurrection refers to the humanity of the Logos and not to the Logos himself. The Logos was always in possession of divine glory and was known as Lord of glory. It was his humanity that received this glory through him from the Father. Here are Athanasius' actual words:

But if the Logos did come among us in order that he might redeem mankind; and if the Logos became flesh in order that he might sanctify and deify them (for indeed for the sake of this did he become [flesh]), to whom is it not obvious, that what he says that he received when he became flesh, is not for his sake, but for the sake of the flesh? For the charisms given through him from the Father were for this [flesh], in which he was when he spoke. But let us see what he asked for, and what were all these [charisms] which he was said to have received, so that in this way too they may be brought to their senses. He asked, then, for glory (Jn. 17:1), yet he had said, 'All things were delivered to me' (Lk. 10:22); and after the resurrection, he says that he has received all authority (Mt. 28:18); but even before he had said, 'All things were delivered unto me,' he was Lord of all, for 'all things were made through him' (Jn 1:3); and 'there is One Lord through whom are all things' (I Cor. 8:6); and when he asked for glory, he was, as he [always] is, the Lord of glory;

as Paul says, 'If they had known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory'(1 Cor. 2:8); for he had that glory which he asked for when he said, 'the glory which I had with you before the world was (Jn 17:5).(55)

In CAR3:40 Athanasius turns to the grace of authority (ἐξουσία), given to the Lord in his humanity after the resurrection (Mt. 28:18) for our sake, in order to show, by taking recourse to other gospel verses, that this grace was actually his by virtue of his Godhead. Here is the most pertinent text:

As for the authority, which he said he received after the resurrection, he did have it before he received it, and before the resurrection. For it was of himself that he rebuked Satan, saying, "Get behind me, Satan" (Lk. 4:8); and to the disciples he gave authority against him, when, on their return, he said, "I beheld Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven"(Lk. 10:18-19). And again, that what he said to have received he possessed before receiving it, is clearly shown; for he drove away the demons, and unbound what Satan had bound, as he did in the case of the daughter of Abraham; and he also remitted sins, saying to the paralytic, and to the woman who anointed his feet, "Your sins are forgiven you" (cf. Lk. 13:16; Mt. 9:5; Lk. 7:48); and he also raised the dead, and restored the original nature of the blind, granting him sight. And all this he did, not as one who was going to receive, but as one who was 'possessor of authority'(Is. 9:6

LXX). From all this it is plain that what he had as Logos, when he had become man and was risen again, he says that he received this humanly; so that for his sake human beings might from now on have authority on earth against demons, as having become partakers of divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4); and might reign for ever in heaven, as having been delivered from corruption. Thus we must come to know this once for all, that none of those things which he says that he received, did he receive as not possessing before; for being God, the Logos had them always; but now he is said humanly to have received, so that, as the flesh received in him, from it also the gift might from now on abide surely in us. For what is said by Peter, 'receiving from God honour and glory (1 Pet. 1:17), Angels being made subject unto Him'(1 Pet. 3:22), has this meaning. As he inquired humanly, and raised Lazarus divinely, so the phrase 'He received' is spoken of him humanly, but the subjection of the Angels demonstrates the Logos' Godhead.(56)

The instances which Athanasius gives here are carefully chosen from the New Testament to show the different aspects of authority which the Logos practised as God, as 'possessor of authority' (ἐξουσιαστής)(57) It is clear from these instances that the Logos as Logos did not only have authority himself over Satan, but also granted authority to his disciples over Satan (Lk. 10:18,19). He had authority to remit sins, to raise the dead and to restore the original nature of the blind man, giving him the gift

of sight. This last instance clearly shows the incarnate Lord to be still the Creator, acting creatively even after the Incarnation. Nevertheless, the Incarnate Logos received (the grace of) authority in his flesh after the resurrection, in order to secure it for all humanity. Thus human beings receive the grace of authority from the flesh of the Logos. Particularly important is Athanasius' reference to the grace of authority "over demons" -- the only sort of authority which he mentions that the Lord had given to his disciples -- because it is at the heart of the Lord's authority and bears witness to the establishment of the kingdom of God. Grace, then, is divine authority, given in and through Christ to humanity for the re-establishment of the kingdom of God within creation. The humanity of Christ is the source of this grace, inasmuch as it is the channel through which God grants it to human beings.

4th theme:

the Son's advance in grace and mankind

This theme appears in CAR3:51ff where Athanasius discusses the meaning of the crucial verse Lk. 2:52. In the beginning of CAR3:51 he asks the important exegetical question, whether Jesus Christ is a common man (κοινὸς ἄνθρωπος), as the Samosatenes believe and the Arians virtually entertain (though not in name), or flesh-bearing God (θεὸς σάρκα φορῶν), as it is truly suggested in John 1:14. In the former case, the "advance" of Lk. 2:52 would refer to Christ, whereas in the latter the growth would be

connected with the flesh. Athanasius argues:

What advance did he have he who existed as equal with God? Or whereto could the Son increase, being always in the Father?... And again, if he advanced, as being Logos, what has he more to become than Logos and Wisdom and Son and God's Power? For the Logos is these [things], of which, if one could somehow partake, as it were, of one ray, such a man would become all-perfect among men, and equal to Angels. For Angels, Archangels, Dominions and all the Powers and Thrones, as partakers of the Logos, behold always the face of His Father. How, then, does he who supplies perfection to others, himself advance later than they? For Angels ministered to His human birth, and the passage spoken by Luke comes after the ministration of the Angels has been mentioned. How, then, could this at all come into the thought of man? Or how did Wisdom advance in wisdom? Or how did he, who to others gives grace (as Paul, knowing in every Epistle that through Him grace is given, says "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all"), advance in grace"? (58)

Here, Athanasius' argument clearly affirms that God does not advance and that the same must be the case with God's Logos, Son and Wisdom. Rather, the Logos is the giver of the grace of perfection, and all who partake even of one ray of his grace become perfect and equal to the angels. It is thus clear that it is

not the Logos as Logos, who, as such, is equal to the Father and ever exists in him, that advanced in wisdom and grace, but the flesh of the Logos which he put on when he became man. In other words, it is the humanity which the Logos put on, that advanced in grace, i.e. received the grace of perfection.

In CAR3:52, Athanasius repeats the point that advance in grace belongs to men as creatures capable of advance, and that it is achieved when they look to the Son who alone is in the Father,⁽⁵⁹⁾ or when they depart from the sensible things and come to rest in the Logos. He also maintains that when advance in grace is applied to the Son in Luke 2:52, it should be understood in terms of the flesh which he acquired when he became man. Thus, once again, Athanasius stresses that it was not the Logos as Divine Logos who was meant to have advanced, but the Logos as man; for he is perfect [Son] from a perfect Father and as such he leads others forward to advancement and perfection. This is why the Evangelist associated "advancement in grace" with "advancement in stature".

Of the body then is the advance; for in its advancing the manifestation of the Godhead to those who saw it advanced too. And, as the Godhead was more and more revealed, by so much more did his grace as man increase before all men. For as a child he was carried to the Temple; and when he became a boy, he remained in the sanctuary, and questioned the priests about the Law. And as his body increased by

degrees, and the Logos manifested himself in it, he was confessed henceforth by Peter first, then also by all, that "This is truly the Son of God" (Mt 16:16, 27:54).(60)

The central point here is that the revelation of the Godhead and the Son's advance in grace were concretely manifested in the growing humanity of the Incarnate Logos. This finds a striking expression in the phrase *the grace of the Logos as man* (ἡ χάρις ὡς ἀνθρώπου!). Certainly it is not the perfect Godhead but the revelation of it that advanced, keeping pace with the advancing humanity of the Incarnate Logos. In other words, the advance of the humanity of the Logos in grace was the means of manifesting the Godhead. This is the way for humanity to get some idea about the (invisible) Godhead and the advance in grace, namely, the advance in grace of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

At the end of this chapter, Athanasius recalls Proverbs 9:1 to explain further the orthodox understanding of the advance in grace of the humanity of Jesus Christ. Thus he states that this advancement in wisdom and grace is not the advancement of Wisdom itself; it is rather the advancement of humanity, as the house of Wisdom, in Wisdom. The suggestion here is that the Logos/Son, who, as God, is the Giver of grace, is said, as man, to advance in grace, because he receives grace in his humanity. These points are still further elaborated in the next chapter.

In CAR3:53, Athanasius speaks of the grace of deification in

terms of the manifestation of the Godhead through our humanity:

What moreover is this growth that is spoken of, but ... the deifying and grace imparted from Wisdom to men, sin and their inward corruption being obliterated in them, according to their likeness and relationship to the flesh of the Logos? For thus, the body increasing in stature, there developed in it the manifestation of the Godhead also, and to all it was displayed that the body was God's Temple, and that God was in the body.⁽⁶¹⁾

What is suggested here is that the Lord's advance in grace entails the advance of human beings in the grace of deification, i.e. the advance of the manifestation of God in them. This manifestation takes place because of the likeness of human beings with the incarnate Lord and especially with his flesh, his body, his humanity. Athanasius does not explain why, or how, or when this takes place. He simply assumes that it does so, probably on the basis of common Christian experience. What does, however, clearly emerge from what he says, is that the grace of deification has an objective grounding in the humanity of Christ, which constitutes the basis for its transmission to the rest of mankind. The grace which human beings receive has been already received by, or deposited in, the humanity which the Son of God assumed at his incarnation. Since this is coextensive with the advancement of the Son of God in man, this advancement constitutes the pattern of the advance of all humanity into the acquisition of the

same grace and truth.

In conclusion we may say that Athanasius agrees with the Arians that God does not grow in grace, because such a growth belongs to the creatures (including humanity), whereas God is the giver of grace; nevertheless he argues against them, that in Christ God has taken up the advance in grace of creatures, inasmuch as he has truly assumed our humanity to himself. His main claim against the Arians is that to argue that Christ is a creature because he advances in grace, as the Arians do, is to ignore the reality of the incarnation, or, worse still, to make the reality of the advance in grace, based on the reality of the Incarnation, the basis for denying the Giver of grace!

(c) Conclusions

The main point in CAR 3 is the difference between God the Creator and creation. Athanasius keeps the differences in his mind always in order to correct the errors of Arian Christology. Creatures, like angels and human beings are totally different from God.

To God belongs grace, power, authority, wisdom, immortality, incorruptibility and glory. By nature creation does not possess any of these qualities and attributes. Creation came out of nothing mutable, changeable, subjected to death, corruption and passibility. The Son of God and Logos belongs

to God and is in the Father from eternity. By nature the Son has what belongs to the Godhead of his Father, including grace. The Son passed over the dividing line between God and creation by accepting the lot of man and assuming a human body and so is subjected to whatever creation is subjected. Uniting both what is divine and what is created, the Son does not abolish or abandon his divine attributes nor hesitate to keep the human properties of the body. The goal which the Son planned for himself was to renew and deify creation by grace. This was achieved by accepting firstly from the Father whatever was needed to renew creation. Secondly, he gave grace to his own humanity and whatever he shared with the Father as his only Son.

Athanasius collects from the bible a large amount of material to prove the uniqueness of the Son. He shows that he is different from both the angels and all the great human figures of the Old Testament such as David, Solomon, Moses, Elisha etc. He is not merely a common man (κοινὸς ἄνθρωπος). These saints are totally different from the Son; none of them is one with the Father in the divine Godhead. These saints enjoyed divine grace and received power and wisdom and performed miracles, not because they were equal to the Son, but because they were obedient to the father; fulfilling his wish. The Son is different; he is not merely related as man to God through his will, but also is one with the Father in the divine nature. Athanasius is careful when he draws the line of demarcation between the Son, the

angels and the Saints; none of them is in the Godhead as the Son. They all belong to creation.

The divine theophanies of God in the Old Testament have been a major problem in Christology. They were treated differently by some of the fathers of the Church and caused a confusion between the Logos-Christology and the Angelic Christology. Athanasius does not discuss the problem in detail; he draws the distinction between the Son and the angels by maintaining that none of the angels is an efficient cause in creation or a creator. Therefore none of them can provide grace. The angels according to Athanasius' observations were not invoked or associated with God in prayer in the Old Testament, which means that they cannot provide grace since none of them is co-Creator with God. Athanasius charges the Arians with falling into the Angelic Christology of Gnostics which leads to polytheism.

The angels are not co-creators with God, nor do they possess the divine Godhead which allows them to pervade all things (CAR 3:15) like the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Athanasius highlights his particular understanding of God and Creation to support the Logos Christology which alone enabled him to establish a clear doctrine of grace. Only God the Creator, who is everywhere present, can grant to creation, because the Creator alone is able to maintain and preserve his creation, including the angels.

When the Son became man and put on human flesh, he became like us creatures. Nevertheless, the difference between the Son and the Saints remains constantly clear in the mind of Athanasius. The Saints grow and advance according to their nature. Extrinsically they receive grace, wisdom, power, authority, glory, knowledge and immortality. The Son incarnate does not receive any of these extrinsically but intrinsically from his own divinity and from what he shares with the Father. Thus one can see the great care and the fine treatment in Athanasius' Christology which asserts the fundamental uniqueness of the Son and his oneness with the Father.

The Son does not receive the grace in common with creation (CAR 3:3). Nor can creation ascend to the same divine status, and become equal to the Son, through the grace of participation (CAR 3:6.17). The basic difference between God the Son and other creatures was seen by Athanasius as the difference between what belongs to the divine Godhead by nature and what is bestowed through grace. It is by receiving grace that we can imitate the Son of God and become adopted children, but we remain unable to bestow on others the divine grace itself. What is given by God in Christ does not involve the participation of creation as a source of grace; but remains participation in the divine act and will which involves the Father and the Son (CAR 3:19,22).

The participation of the creation in Christ does not mean its becoming the source of grace. Nevertheless, this participation remains in the divine act and will; this involves the Father together with the Son.

This, however, does not blind Athanasius to the reality of the created nature of the human flesh which the Son put on or appropriated for our sake. The Incarnation becomes the very cause of grace. Here one can see that grace is the divine response to the human need. This divine response is granted from God the Father to creation through the Son Incarnate. Athanasius is at pains to prove that what makes the Son look like one of the Saints is due to the fact that the Son acts as a human being and lives according to what is proper to his humanity. He strongly emphasized that accepting and receiving power, authority, glory, growth in stature and grace are all for our sake. The Son, considered as the eternal Son of the Father, remains totally distinct from creation because he suffers hunger, fatigue etc. In this respect the contribution of Athanasius to the doctrine of salvation and the doctrine of grace becomes more clear and can be summarised as follows:

1. Human infirmities, which are proper to the human nature, were accepted in order to be defeated and abolished. This strikes the essential chord in Athanasius' teaching on grace, because what is defeated and abolished is, in particular, weakness, corruptibility, death and sin.

2. The Son grants to his humanity the grace of glory, power, authority and immortality and thus brings his humanity to the high standard of his divine life.

3. This happens not through a mental meditation, but through the human life of Jesus Christ which contains suffering, ignorance, weakness and above all its capability of death. Because of his deep faith in the Incarnation of the Son of God, Athanasius was able to demonstrate that through the human life of Jesus Christ, what was proper to humanity had been changed by the divinity of the Son.

4. The Son accepted our human birth in order to appropriate our nature, and thus becomes the beginning of a new creation, or in the words of Athanasius 'to transfer our origin to himself'. He also grew up and advanced in grace from childhood to adulthood to reveal the advancing grace of the knowledge of the Father. He was baptized in order to receive the grace of the Holy Spirit in his humanity that we may be granted this grace through him. He died and was risen in order to deal with the greatest need of all: forgiveness from sins and the grace of immortality. We must not be tempted to summarise the doctrine of grace in Athanasius, by using the single word deification. This can obscure the incarnational foundation of the doctrine of grace, because grace is to be seen in the unified actions of the divine and the human in Jesus Christ. These divine and human actions

are his birth, baptism, death and resurrection which forms the foundation of the divine grace which is granted to humanity.

5. Deification plays an essential part in the writings of Athanasius, but it must be seen as a result of the collective events of the life, death and resurrection of the Incarnate Son. We can see clearly that in authority and power, each is a grace received from the Father by the Incarnate Son in order to be delivered to the believers through Christ. The incarnate Son receives from the Father what belongs to him since eternity and was never lacking in him. Athanasius highlights this particular concept of grace in order to defend the faith of the Church and in particular the practice of the Church itself. In other words, Athanasius deals with Arianism and the doctrine of grace in a pastoral way. It is essential for any pastor not only to refute doctrinal errors but also to declare and strengthen what is practised by the Church. The doctrine of grace as explained indirectly in CAR3 is obviously concerned with what believers in Christ receive in Baptism and what they practise through their Christian life, such as casting out demons and enjoying the grace of adoption, waiting for the resurrection on the last day. This can be lost if the Son is not eternal nor is one with the Father in the Godhead. The divinity of the Son and his incarnation is the sole source of grace. In this sense Arianism is a threat to the new fellowship between God and creation in Christ and can render the Incarnation ⁱⁿ effective.

PART III

GRACE IN ATHANASIUS' *SER1-4*1. Grace in *SER1*

There are sixteen explicit references to the term χάρις in *SER1*,⁽¹⁾ apart from the two references which use this term adverbially in the sense of "for the sake of".⁽²⁾ The rest of these references have a clear theological connotation and are spread throughout the Letter^{to Serapion},⁽³⁾ in which Athanasius argues against the new heresy of the Tropici. These Tropici "oppose the Holy Spirit, saying that he is not only a creature, but actually one of the ministering spirits, and differs from the angels only in degree".⁽⁴⁾

Our investigation of these references will follow the structure of the Letter, since the references to the Tropici's view of χάρις are indirect and the emphasis is laid on the orthodox doctrine. The Tropici did not question the concept of grace directly, but the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless Athanasius, who expanded the Church's teaching concerning the Holy Spirit in his refutation of the new heresy, could not separate the Holy Spirit from the gift of divine grace.

(a) Grace and the Exegesis of Am. 4:13

It is in chapter 4 of the first part of *SER1* (chs. 3-10),

where Athanasius deals with the refutation of the Tropicist exegesis of Amos 4:13, that we find the first explicit reference to χάρις. This reference is derived from the examples of the New Testament which Athanasius gives to clarify the great variety in the use of the word "πνεῦμα" in Scripture, and its orthodox interpretation. Athanasius distinguishes between "πνεῦμα" with the article, or with the other additions signifying the Holy Spirit, from "πνεῦμα" without these additions which cannot refer to the Holy Spirit.⁽⁵⁾ For example, he mentions the following additions to the word "πνεῦμα": "of God" (τοῦ Θεοῦ), "of the Father" (τοῦ Πατρός), "of Christ" (τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and "of the Son" (τοῦ Υἱοῦ). It looks as if Athanasius cites all these biblical texts in order to prove that the Holy Spirit is not a created Spirit. The closer study of his Letter, however, shows that his argument for the divinity of the Spirit goes much deeper into the NT theology of the Spirit, which is based on the Spirit's activity. It is the creative, redemptive and sanctifying activity of the Spirit as it emerges out of the pages of the New Testament that ultimately constitutes for Athanasius the authentic witness to his divinity. It is the fact that he is the giver of grace, or that divine grace cannot be understood apart from him, that reveals the Holy Paraclete's divine identity and establishes his consubstantiality with God.

In SER1:4 Athanasius recalls Paul's advice to the Thessalonians who were baptised and had already received the Holy Spirit, and exhorts the believers not to stop (the activity) of the Holy Spirit by quenching it. Athanasius sheds some light on

this advice, explaining why Paul uttered it.

What had they received but the Holy Spirit who is given to those who believe and are being born again "through the power of regeneration" (Tit. 3:5)? When he [Paul] wrote to the Thessalonians, "Quench not the Spirit" (1 Thess. 5:19), he was speaking to those who themselves knew what they had received, lest through lack of care they should quench the g r a c e of the Spirit which had been kindled within them.(6)

It seems that this kindling of the Spirit in the believers, mentioned by Paul (in Thess. 5:19), is for Athanasius identical with the indwelling of the grace of the Spirit in them. In other words Athanasius understands the indwelling of the Spirit as the grace of the Spirit which is working in the believers, though Paul did not mention grace at all in 1 Thess. 5:19. This grace of the Spirit has been lit up (ἀναφθεῖσθαι) like a fire inside the Christians who have willingly accepted the Holy Spirit through the laver of regeneration (διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας).(7) But the grace of the Spirit may be put out, or quenched (σβέσωσιν), when the attitude of the people towards grace changes negatively. This shows the responsibility of the Christians to keep the Spirit working in them, enlightened by his grace, by abstaining from every form of evil.(8) To put it differently, this grace of the Spirit can be kept alight as Christians take care of themselves to give the Spirit a chance to work in them, unhindered by sinful

deeds. It is noteworthy that although the Spirit is freely granted to Christians by God in their baptism, they have the ability to extinguish the grace of the Spirit by their misbehaviour.

The Old Testament pneumatological texts in SER1:5 are all about those who received the Holy Spirit and those who rebelled and provoked him to the extent that the Lord was turned to enmity towards them.⁽⁹⁾ These texts helped to prepare the way for Athanasius to deal with the baptism of the Lord and the descending of the Holy Spirit upon him, in the beginning of SER1:6. If the Spirit is fundamentally related to the grace which is granted to Christians at their baptism, as we have already seen, the relation of the Spirit to Christ, or the descent upon and indwelling of the Spirit in Christ is of crucial importance for the doctrine of grace; hence our closer examination of Athanasius' relevant texts. In SER1:6 Athanasius collects the most pertinent pneumatological verses from the NT which reveal the relation of the Spirit with Christ and through him with the Christians, as this is realised initially at baptism and subsequently extended throughout their whole life:

When our Lord was baptized in human fashion because of the flesh he was wearing, the Holy Spirit is said to have descended upon him. In giving him to his disciples he said: 'Receive the Holy Spirit' (Jn. 20:22); and he taught them: 'The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things' (Jn. 14:26). And a

little later, concerning the same: 'When the Paraclete is come, whom I shall send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father, he shall bear witness of me' (Jn. 5:26). Again: 'For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaks in you' (Mt. 10:20); and a little farther on: 'But if I, by the Spirit of God, cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you' (Mt. 12:28). And in him perfecting all our knowledge of God and the initiation whereby he joined us to himself and, through himself, to the Father, he charged the disciples: 'Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' (Mt. 28:19). When he promised to send him to them, 'He charged them not to depart from Jerusalem' (Acts 1:4); and, after a few days, 'when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven the sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance' (Acts 2:1-5). Hence also, through the laying on of the Apostles' hands, the Holy Spirit was given to those who were being born again.⁽¹⁰⁾

Athanasius was clear and precise in stating that the Holy Spirit had descended first upon the Lord in baptism because of

the flesh he was wearing. Thus it was not the Lord as the Son of God upon whom the Holy Spirit descended, as the Arians contended, but the Lord as the Incarnate Son, i.e. the Son of Man. It becomes clearer when we note that the Lord, immediately afterwards, gives the Holy Spirit to his disciples.

The fact that the Holy Spirit is given as the most important grace to the disciples and to the Church, becomes clear from the following points:

Firstly, the Holy Spirit, 'the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth', is given freely as grace from God, proceeding from the Father and sent by the Son.

Secondly, the Holy Spirit is freely accepted by human beings, because the Lord asked his disciples to 'receive the Holy Spirit' when he gave him as grace to them. Then he charged them to wait in Jerusalem, until the coming of the Paraclete and they were filled with the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, when the Paraclete comes, he will speak in the disciples because they have already accepted him. As his name indicates, he defends the Christians.

Thirdly, the Holy Spirit given to Christians is suggested to be the greatest grace that they can have, because of the role he performs in them. It is clear, from the text, that by the Holy Spirit the Christians are being initiated and joined to the Son, and through him to the Father.⁽¹¹⁾ ^ἡis emphasized by ^{Athanasius} ^α as the incorporation into the divine life, which is granted as grace in baptism.⁽¹²⁾ Moreover, on account of this initiation and

perfection, the Church grows and spreads through the world. For the Lord charged his disciples to go to all nations, making disciples and baptising into the name of the Trinity, ^{coming of} after the Pentecost and the Paraclete.

Fourthly, only after the Apostles 'were all filled with the Holy Spirit' could they depart from Jerusalem evangelizing all the nations. Then 'the Holy Spirit was given (as grace) to those who were (willingly) being born again' through the laying on of the Apostles' hands.(13)

In SER1:6 Athanasius recalls Peter⁽¹⁴⁾ speaking about the salvation of Christians as grace:

Peter wrote, "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and examined diligently, who prophesied of the g r a c e which should come unto you, searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ ^{who} was in them did point unto, when he testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glories which should follow them".(15)

Peter points out that Christians by virtue of their faith may win the ineffable joy of salvation which is faith's reward and goal. This salvation was the subject of the intense searching and the dedicated investigation by the prophets in the Old Testament. Thus they, inspired by the Holy Spirit, revealed the coming of

the grace (of salvation) and the time of its fulfilment. This grace which is given to us freely from Christ was the outcome of his own sufferings leading to glory. It seems that this grace embraces the whole work of Christ and is Christ himself. The prophets, inspired by the Spirit of Christ, reflect the importance of this grace which the people of former times were expecting to be fulfilled for the salvation of the believers.

Then Athanasius goes on to reveal the privilege of having the Spirit of God in us as Christians. He clarifies that the role of the Holy Spirit is to give us the sight to see the grace which is given to us by God. He recalls Paul (1Cor.2:10-12):(16)

"For the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who knows the things of man save the spirit of man which is in him? And so the things of God none knows save the Spirit of God. But we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might see the things that are granted us by God".(17)

Athanasius explains here that the believers receive the Spirit of God, and not the spirit of the world (when they join and continue as members of the Church). For God has given us his own Spirit to reveal to us both the deep things and the gifts he has given us. This in itself is a grace. Thus he enables us to be conscious of all his gifts, (ordinary and extraordinary). Accordingly we can appreciate God's gifts and benefit from them

in order to achieve the goal he intends. To put it differently, God has granted us his Spirit so that we may have insight and use his gifts according to his will; thus these gifts may not be given in vain.

Then Athanasius concludes his discussion about grace in SER1:6 by considering the situation of the unbelievers who have abandoned their faith. He recalls the Epistle to the Hebrews,⁽¹⁸⁾ speaking about the Spirit of grace (τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος) in the context of his warning the Christians about the repudiation of their faith. He reminds them about the severe punishment due to those who have violated the law of Moses. He compares the Christians with the Jews in the time of Moses who suffered severe punishment. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews warns the Christians about the even more severe punishment of those who have spurned the Son of God.

"How much worse punishment, do you think, will be deserved by the man who has trodden under foot the Son of God and has regarded the blood of the covenant, by which he was sanctified, as an unholy thing and has insulted the Spirit of grace"?(19)

The state of the apostate is described here under three distinct aspects: as an act of trampling on (καταπατήσας) the Son of God, as a profanation (κοινόν) against the blood of the covenant, and as a personal and wilful insult (ἐνυβρίσας) against

the Spirit of grace. The Holy Spirit is described here as the Spirit of grace⁽²⁰⁾ because the Holy Spirit is the revealer and communicator of grace. The Holy Spirit is characterised as such so that he might be distinguished by these functions. Thus he who refuses the Son of God by his deeds and his opinions, which are contrary to the faith, is considered as insulting the Spirit (of the Son), the ultimate or final communicator of grace. In other words, he has fallen from grace by his wilfulness. Eventually he deserves the more severe punishment, as his conduct discloses that he has abandoned his faith completely.⁽²¹⁾

After qualifying the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of grace here in SER1:6, Athanasius identifies further the work of grace in the next chapter.

According to SER1:9, Athanasius specifies the work of grace to include the renewal of the whole world, and not only humanity. He recalls the prophecy of Ezek. 36:26-27 to point to the effect of the Holy Spirit on the human spirit.

For this is also what God promised through Ezekiel, saying, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh, and I will put my Spirit within you" (Ezekiel 36:26). When has this been fulfilled, save when the Lord came and renewed all things by grace?⁽²²⁾

Several points emerge from this text: Firstly, that grace is the instrument by which the Incarnate Lord (Christ) renews all things (i.e. the entire creation). This means not only that Christ realized and fulfilled the prophesied riches of "grace", but also that grace cannot be understood apart from Christ. Secondly, that the renewal of all things by grace includes the renewal of human beings as the fulfilment of Ezekiel's prophecy. This implies that humanity and the whole of creation can be the recipients of grace. Thirdly, at the same time, it seems that the Holy Spirit is given to us as grace, whereby our created spirits are renewed. This is in full agreement with what Athanasius says in the same chapter regarding the Holy Spirit, that 'we are renewed by the Spirit of God' and that 'our spirit is renewed in him (the Holy Spirit).' Athanasius clarifies further the Trinitarian dimension of this grace of renewal, by his statement that the Father, through the Logos in the Spirit perfects and renews all things.(23)

In SER1:10 Athanasius quotes Heb.12:26-28 to explain that by the establishment of the unshakable kingdom, we receive the grace by which we offer a service well-pleasing to God.

For aforetime the law had "a shadow of good things to come" (Heb. 10:1). But when Christ was declared to men, and came saying, "I that speak unto you am he" (Jn 4:26), then, in the words of Paul: "his voice shook the earth, as he promised of old, 'Yet once more will I make to tremble not

the earth only, but also the heaven'. And this phrase, 'Yet once more', signifies the removing of the things that are shaken, that the things which are not shaken may remain. Since then we are receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken, we have g r a c e by which we offer service well-pleasing to God " (Heb.12:26-28). But that kingdom which he calls unshakable, David in the Psalms declares to be established. "The Lord reigns, he has clothed himself with majesty. The Lord has clothed and girded himself with strength. He has also established the world, that it shall not be moved " (Ps.93:2). So then this text in the prophet signifies the coming of the Saviour, whereby we are renewed and the law of the Spirit remains immovable.(24)

It is clear from the above text that we have received the unshaken kingdom as grace of renewal by which the Saviour came to renew everything and to maintain the Law of the Spirit. Athanasius shows that the thunder in the prophecy of Amos is the unshakable law of the Spirit, which we are granted by the coming of the Saviour. For the statement 'his voice shook the earth' suggests the removing of all earthly things which were shaken by the teaching of the Saviour. It is by our renewal by grace, and only then, that we can offer service well-pleasing to God. In other words, our renewal by this grace leads us to offer thanks to God.

At the same time, it seems that the law of the Spirit is the

Gospel for which the law (in the Old Testament) was but a shadow. Moreover, the perfection of the people, which the repeated sacrifices of the law could not achieve, was accomplished by the grace of renewal. In the next section χάρις is discussed in the context of the Tropicist's exegesis of 1 Tim 5:21 which is refuted by Athanasius.

(b) Grace and the Exegesis of 1 Tim. 5:21

In SER1:11-14 Athanasius refutes the Tropicist exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:21, "I charge you in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels that you observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality". The Tropicist argue from the silence of Paul about the Holy Spirit, that he is to be numbered with the creatures as one of the angels in this verse. It is in SER1:12 and 14 that we encounter two references to χάρις in Athanasius' exegesis of Ex.33:17-18. He recalls the Apostolic faith and the Christians' belief respectively, refuting the Tropicist exegesis of the verse under discussion (1 Tim 5:21).

In SER1:11 Athanasius proves from the Annunciation that the Holy Spirit is one of the three persons of the Holy Trinity and as such is different from the angels. For he says that, 'the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Almighty...who is inseparable from the Godhead and the might of the Logos'.⁽²⁵⁾ Then Athanasius deals with the Baptism of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Spirit on him in the river Jordan in the form of a dove, to continue his

refutation of the Tropicist exegesis. He proves that the Holy Spirit is not an angel because he was clearly seen as the Holy Spirit (in the form of a dove). Athanasius quotes Mt.28:19 to prove that Christ sends the Apostles to baptize in the name of the Trinity (giving the baptismal grace). Therefore the Holy Spirit is in the Godhead; he is not an angel as the Tropici claim, because a creature cannot link us with the Son or the Father. By implication he cannot share with them in giving us grace in baptism.

In SER1:12 Athanasius explains that God agreed to fulfil Moses' request to lead his people to the promised land because Moses found grace in God's sight.(26)

For when God said to him (Moses), "Depart, go up hence, you and your people which you have led up out of the land of Egypt, unto the land of which I sware unto Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob, saying, To your seed will I give it. And I will send my angel before your face, and he will drive out the Canaanites" (Ex.33:1-2), he (Moses) refused him, saying: "If you do not go with us yourself, carry me not up hence" (Ex.33:15). For he did not desire a creature to lead the people ... so of course he refused the angel, and besought God himself to lead them. But after God had given him a promise, saying to him, "I will do this thing also that you have spoken; for you have found grace in my sight, and I know you beyond all men" (Ex. 33:17-18) ..."The Spirit came down from the Lord and led them. So did you lead

your people to make yourself a glorious name" (Is. 63:14). Who cannot from these things perceive the truth? When God promised to lead them, lo! he promises no longer to send an angel, but the Spirit who is above the angels, and he leads the people. He shows that the Spirit does not belong to the creatures nor is he an angel, but is above the creation, united to the Godhead of the Father. For it was God himself who, through the Logos, in the Spirit, led the people.(27)

Here is the favour or kindness which Moses found in the sight of God. It was the reason why God accepted Moses' demand. This grace had God's knowledge of Moses as its basis. At the same time Moses' confidence in God made him insist on the guidance of God himself. In other words, Moses' boldness and confidence in God were the means, as it were, by which he found grace or the kindness of God. It is noteworthy that, although God accepted Moses' request that God himself might lead the people and promised Moses to do so, nevertheless it was the Holy Spirit who led them. Athanasius understands the kindness of God as a grace of the Trinity. He says that, 'It was God himself, who, through the Logos, in the Spirit, led the people.' Thus he concludes with his clear statement that 'the Holy Spirit belongs to the Godhead.'

It is interesting to notice that Athanasius provided here the biblical foundation of the right faith in the Holy Spirit.(28) He

repeats twice his favourite expression concerning the Holy Trinity, namely that God the Father does everything through the Logos in the Spirit.

In his refutation of the Tropicist exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:21, concerning the absence of any reference to the Spirit, Athanasius speaks implicitly about the coinherence in the Trinity and the grace of the Trinity given to mankind in SER1:14:

But the Apostolic faith is not thus, nor can a Christian endure these things for a moment. For the holy and blessed Trinity is indivisible and one in itself. When mention is made of the Father, there is included also his Logos, and the Spirit who is in the Son. If the Son is named, the Father is in the Son, and the Spirit is not outside the Logos. For there is from the Father one *g r a c e* which is fulfilled through the Son in the Holy Spirit (ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ πληρουμένη); and there is one divine nature, and one God 'who is over all and through all and in all' (Eph. 4:6). Thus Paul also, when he said, "I charge thee before God and Jesus Christ" (1 Tim 5:21), realized that the Spirit had not been divided from the Son, but was himself in Christ, as the Son is in the Father. But with them he appropriately introduced the elect angels so that the disciple to whom he was speaking a charge should obey his teacher's injunctions, inasmuch as the guardians were there to witness what was said. For the disciple knew, not only that what is spoken

from God is said through Christ in the Spirit, but also that the angels minister to our affairs, overseeing the needs of each one.(29)

Athanasius strikes a new note to prepare the reader to see that the oneness of God means one grace. He unfolds here the Apostolic faith and the Church tradition. Athanasius was confident that a Christian could not accept anything else (except the Apostolic faith). So, Athanasius characteristically discloses the doctrine of God as Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity.(30) The reason why Paul did not mention the Holy Spirit in his letter to Timothy is that Paul and Timothy understood the conception of the coinherent relations within the oneness of the Trinity as complete mutual indwelling of the three Persons in each other. While each Person remains what he is by himself as Father, Son or Holy Spirit, he is wholly in the others as the others are wholly in him.(31)

Athanasius clarifies that the oneness of the grace of the Trinity reflects the Apostolic faith of the doctrine of God (as Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity). To put it differently, the oneness of God and the Trinity of Persons are taken as a direct reference to the one grace of the one God, involving the three divine Persons of the Trinity. This grace of the Trinity, like all the divine activities, seem to have a "beginning" in the Father, a "middle" in the Son, and an "end" in the Spirit, and these are respectively denoted by the prepositions from (ἐκ), through (διὰ)

and in (ἐν). How does Athanasius understand the meaning of these prepositions? The best way of answering this seems to be by recalling Athanasius' common παραδείγματα in this respect, which are source, river and water; sun, ray and effulgence.

But why had Paul listed the elect angels with God and Jesus? It seems to be the traditional way of the Fathers to call to witness the greater with the less; so Athanasius considers the angels "appropriately introduced" with the Father and the Son.⁽³²⁾ The words of Athanasius suggest that Timothy was accustomed to this tradition and knew the guardianship of angels; this was a very ancient doctrine.⁽³³⁾

(c) Grace and the Persons of the Trinity

In SER1:22-27 Athanasius turns to Scripture to prove the main differences between the Holy Spirit who pertains to the Son and the creatures. He proves that there is no likeness between them. We find the only explicit reference to χάρις in this section is in Ch.22, where Athanasius deals with Tit. 3:4-7.

It is in SER1:22, then, that Athanasius deals with the justification of the Christians by the grace of God, in the context of the difference between the Holy Spirit and the creatures. He describes the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of holiness and renewal (Πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως). Although the Holy Spirit is peculiarly the principle of sanctification according to Athanasius

and the general consensus of Christian thought in the fourth century, Athanasius added here 'renewal' (καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως) to holiness instead of 'sanctification' (καὶ ἁγιασμοῦ). This shows that Athanasius does not distinguish sanctification from the restoration of human nature to incorruptibility. In fact all the terms used here in this paragraph concerning justification (δικαιοσύνη), regeneration or rebirth (παλιγγενεσίας), as well as sanctification and renewal are none other than the deification of our humanity consequent upon the Incarnation of the Logos,⁽³⁴⁾ by whom the creatures are sanctified, renewed and justified or recreated by God's grace:

The Spirit is, and is called, the Spirit of holiness and renewal. For Paul writes: "Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead, even Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 1:4). Again he says: "But you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6:11). And when writing to Titus, he said: "But when the kindness of God our Saviour and his love towards men appeared, not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy, he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life" (Tit.3:4-7). But the creatures are

sanctified and renewed. "You shall send forth your Spirit, and they shall be created, and you shall renew the face of the earth " (Ps.104:30).(35)

Here, Athanasius recalls Paul speaking about the goodness (χρησιτότης) of God the Father. This term (χρησιτότης) expresses the all-embracing kindness of God who shows his love to man (φιλανθρωπία). The love and kindness of God are mediated to men (through the sacrament of baptism) by the Church. The text suggests that the believers are recreated (justified) by the grace of God the Father, by the washing of rebirth (διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας), and the renewal through the Holy Spirit (ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος ἁγίου). This recreation by grace is suggested for many reasons. Firstly the words of Paul, "ἵνα, δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι" mean literally that it was God's purpose to put us, through his grace, into a right relationship with himself.(36) Secondly, Athanasius recalls Psalm 103:30 and Titus 3:4-7 which clearly means the recreation of man by the Spirit: "You shall send forth your Spirit and they shall be created, and you shall renew the face of the earth." Thirdly, the recreation (salvation) of man by the grace of God is suggested to be parallel to his first creation when he was created by additional grace in God's own Image. In the next chapter Athanasius concludes his thoughts about grace in SER1 by speaking about the giving of grace and the persons of the Trinity, especially the Holy Spirit.

In SER1:30 Athanasius discusses the importance of the role of the Spirit as one of the persons of the Trinity, stressing the theological point that everything is perfected in the Trinity (ἐν Τριάδι ἡ τελείωσις). In this chapter we come across five explicit references to grace, connected with the Spirit, the Son and the Trinity.

This is the indivisible unity of the Trinity; and faith therein is one... Knowing this (unity) the blessed Paul does not divide the Trinity as you (the Tropici) do; but teaching its unity, when he wrote to the Corinthians concerning things spiritual, he finds the source of all things in one God, the Father, saying: "There are diversities of gifts (χαρίσματα), but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God who works all things in all" (1 Cor. 12:4-6). The gifts which the Spirit distributes to each are bestowed from the Father through the Logos. For all things that are of the Father are of the Son also; therefore those things which are given from the Son in the Spirit are gifts of the Father. And when the Spirit is in us, the Logos also, who gives the Spirit, is in us, and in the Logos is the Father. It is said, "We will come, I and the Father, and make our abode with him" (cf. Jn. 14:23). For where the light is, there is also the radiance; and where the radiance is, there also is its activity and enlightening g r a c e. This again the Apostle teaches, when he wrote to the Corinthians,

in the second letter as well, saying: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all" (2 Cor 13:13). For this grace and gift (δωρεά) that is given is given in the Trinity, from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. As the grace given is from the Father through the Son, so we can have no communion in the gift except in the Holy Spirit. For it is when we partake of him that we have the love of the Father and the grace of the Son and the communion of the Spirit himself. This consideration also shows that the activity of the Trinity is one. The Apostle does not mean that the things which are given are given differently and separately by each Person, but that what is given is given in the Trinity, and that all are from the one God.(37)

Several important points emerge from this text. The grace pertains to the radiance (ἀπαύγασμα) of God, who is his Son our Lord Jesus Christ (ἡ τούτου... αὐγοειδὴς χάρις). It is because of the relationship between the Father and the Son, which is like the relationship between light and its radiance, that grace is qualified as luminous or enlightening (αὐγοειδής). However, the connection of grace with the Son of God is not exclusive or isolated. This is clearly seen from the fact that where the Son is there also are both his enlightening grace who is the Holy Spirit and his Father, who is the very light. Though it is not explicitly said, it is strongly implied that "the enlightening grace"

of the Radiance (the Son) is in fact connected with the Holy Spirit and originally with the Father. Thus, the grace of the Incarnate Son is ultimately given by the Holy Trinity. So, there are two formulae of grace here:

a) Grace is given from the Father, through the Son (δι' υἱοῦ), in the Holy Spirit.(38)

b) Grace is of the Son (τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν χάριν)(39)

What is the relation between 'through the Son' (δι' υἱοῦ) and of the Son (τοῦ υἱοῦ) in these two formulas? The former is obviously Trinitarian and the latter is Christological. Most probably the former refers to the Son as God, the Second Person of the Trinity, whereas the latter refers to the Son of God-become-man.

It is noteworthy that Athanasius considers that (χάρις) grace and (δωρεά) gift are almost equal. For he comments on the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. 13:13), saying that this grace and gift (χάρις καὶ δωρεά) is given in the Trinity. It seems that (χάρισμα) gift in 1 Cor. 12:14 is also understood by Athanasius as equal to grace. For he interprets the gifts which the Spirit distributes as bestowed from the Father through the Logos, in the same manner as he understands grace.

2. Grace in *SER3*

We only find explicit references to χάρις in Chapter 6 of the Letter of *SER3*. Athanasius asserts the faith of the Catholic Church as unity in Trinity. He explains that the grace of the Trinity is one, recalling Paul's benediction (2 Cor. 13:13). Then he builds the indivisibility of the Trinity on this oneness of the grace of the Trinity.

At the beginning of *SER3*, Athanasius declared his intention to abridge and briefly explain what he had said before in *SER1*. Although he used the same structure of *SER1* and almost the same biblical texts, he made some changes and added some important remarks. Creation *ex nihilo* remains his starting point. This is followed by the same point that the Spirit is called unction and seal.⁽⁴⁰⁾ What is new is that this unction is 'the breath of the Son',⁽⁴¹⁾ which seems to be adapted from Psalm 33:6. Here, the Spirit is qualified as the Spirit of the Son, who is given by him. The seal gives the impress of the Son.⁽⁴²⁾

Athanasius explains that we receive as grace "the form of Christ" who is the Holy Spirit. This leads him to conclude that we receive the Son also, since the Son is "in the form of the Father". Although Athanasius does not make explicit here the relationship between creation *ex nihilo* and grace, it is impossible to understand recreation and renewal (of what was created from nothing), without grace. For the grace of being and renewal are possible to be granted, only as an act of grace

by the Trinity. The same idea can be observed in Athanasius' argument concerning the Spirit as co-creator with the Father and the Son. The Father creates everything through the Logos in the Spirit. The special role of the Holy Spirit as co-creator is that creatures have their vital strength (τὴν τοῦ εἶναι ἰσχύν) out of the Spirit from the Logos. The words of Psalm 33:6 'Spirit of his mouth' are applied to the Son Creator who has the Spirit as the breath of his mouth.⁽⁴³⁾ This vital *power* is the breath of life which allows creation to continue in existence.

At the end of SER3:5 Athanasius points to the spiritual gifts of grace which are given by virtue of the Trinity. Before discussing the Trinitarian grace in SER3:6 he speaks about the Trinitarian gifts, taken obviously from the New Testament, in SER3:5. He stresses the singleness of the divine operation of distributing these gifts of grace by the three Persons of the Trinity. It is an operation as truly and definitely single which suggests the one action of the Trinity.

The Spirit is not outside the Logos, but, being in the Logos, through him is in God. And so the spiritual gifts are given in the Trinity. For, as he writes to the Corinthians, in their distribution there is the same Spirit and the same Lord and the same God, 'Who inspires them all in everyone' (1 Cor. 12:6). For the Father himself through the Logos in the Spirit works and gives all things/gifts.⁽⁴⁴⁾

Here Athanasius uses the words of Paul (1 Cor. 12:6),

concerning God, 'Who works all things in all.' Thus he comes out with his characteristic Trinitarian declaration about the single action of the Trinity; for the Father himself, through the Logos in the Spirit, works and gives all things. This declaration reflects our relationship with God, which is a relationship of grace, accomplished through the spiritual gifts of the Holy Trinity.

In SER3:6 Athanasius discusses the faith of the Catholic Church. He expounds the belief in the Trinity, stating the indivisibility of the Trinity and its one Godhead and one grace. He recalls Paul's writing about God's being "over all and through all and in all" (Eph. 4:6). Athanasius understands this verse in a Trinitarian and practical sense, as he interprets it elsewhere.⁽⁴⁵⁾ He interprets "over all" in relation to the Father, as beginning, as fountain (of grace) and "through all", meaning through the Logos, and "in all", with reference to the Holy Spirit. He continues explaining that it is a Trinity not only in name and form of speech, but in truth and actuality.

Assuredly, when he prayed for the Corinthians, he prayed in the Trinity, saying: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all (2 Cor. 13:13). For inasmuch as we partake of the Spirit, we have the g r a c e of the Logos and, in the Logos, the love of the Father. And as the g r a c e of the Trinity is one, so also the Trinity is indivisible. We can see this in regard to Saint Mary herself. The archangel

Gabriel, when sent to announce the coming of the Logos upon her, said, 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee', knowing that the Spirit was in the Logos. Wherefore he straightway added: 'and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow you' (Lk. 1:35), since Christ is 'the Power of God and the Wisdom of God' (1 Cor. 1:24). But if the Spirit was in the Logos, then it must be clear that the Spirit through the Logos was also in God. Likewise, when the Spirit comes to us, the Son will come and the Father, and they will make their abode in us. For the Trinity is indivisible, and its Godhead is one; and there is one God, 'over all and through all and in all' (Eph. 4:6). This is the faith of the Catholic Church. For the Lord grounded and rooted it in the Trinity, when he said to his disciples: 'Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' (Mt. 28:19). If the Spirit were a creature, he would not have ranked him with the Father; lest, by reason of something strange and foreign being ranked therewith, the Trinity should not be consistent. For what was lacking to God, that he should take to himself something foreign in essence and share his glory with it? God forbid! It is not so! He himself said: 'I am full' (Is. 1:11). Therefore the Lord ranked the Spirit with the name of the Father, to show that the Trinity is not composed of diverse elements, I mean of creator and creature, but its Godhead is one. It was because he had learned this that Paul taught the oneness of the g r a c e

given in the Trinity, saying: 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism' (Eph. 4:5). As there is one baptism, so there is one faith. For he who believes in the Father, in the Father knows the Son; and it is not apart from the Son that he knows the Spirit. Therefore he believes also in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. For the Godhead of the Trinity is one, as it is made known from one, even from the Father.(46)

Here Athanasius presents the faith of the Catholic Church in its actuality; he affirms the unity and indivisibility of the Trinity. He follows this by stating that the Lord grounded and rooted the Church in the Trinity by sending his disciples to all the nations, baptizing them in the Trinity. Thus, from all the nations, disciples were made through the grace of the Trinity by baptism.

Athanasius elucidates the theme of the unity in the Trinity and the oneness of the grace of the Trinity by four instances. They are the prayer of Paul for the Corinthians, the Annunciation of the archangel Gabriel of (the grace) of the coming of the Logos upon Saint Mary, the coming of the Spirit to us, and Paul's teaching of the oneness of the grace given in the Trinity.

In the first instance, Athanasius considers Paul's conferring his full benediction on the Corinthians; he prayed in the Trinity. In this benediction the grace of Christ flows from the love of the

Father, and is communicated to mankind by the Holy Spirit. In other words, Athanasius considers our participation in the Spirit as the first step to receive the grace of the Logos and eventually the love of the Father. Athanasius finds in the oneness of the grace of the Trinity the evidence that the Trinity is indivisible.

Then, in the second instance, Athanasius refers to the Annunciation of the coming (of the grace) of the Logos upon Saint Mary.⁽⁴⁷⁾ It is noteworthy here also that the Logos and the Spirit are in each other. This is one of the points where Athanasius implies the doctrine of the co-inherence of the Persons of the Trinity in one another. However, neither Shapland nor Prestige refers to this point as an example of this doctrine, like the other examples given in SER3:4 and SER4:4, 12.⁽⁴⁸⁾ He finds in the words of the archangel Gabriel the grace of the indivisible Trinity. However, only the Holy Spirit and the Logos were to come upon and overshadow St. Mary respectively.

The third instance of the oneness of the grace of the Trinity, and its indivisibility is concerning the coming of the Trinity to abide in us. Thus, it is suggested that we have the grace of the Trinity abiding in us to have the continuous blessing, guidance and help of the Trinity participating in our lives. It is interesting to notice the relation between the Trinity's abiding in us and the one God, 'over all and through all and in all.' It seems that 'in us' and 'in all' refer to the abiding of the Trinity in us as a favoured dwelling-place.

The fourth and last instance is of Paul's teaching the oneness of the grace given in the Trinity. Concerning the Church, the clear and intimate connection between the triple declaration of the one Lord, one faith and one baptism (with its one grace, Eph. 4:5) finds its archetype in the unity of the Trinity and its being consistent and not composed of diverse elements. In other words, this triple formula, with the one grace as its result, expresses the single fundamental fact of the one Lord in whom we believe and in whose name we have been baptised, receiving his grace. This is the great bond of unity among Christians.

3. Grace in *SER4*

In the second part of *SER4* (chs 8-21) Athanasius deals mainly with the blasphemy against the Spirit. He gives his own interpretation to the key verse 'every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven (for) men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven (Matt. 12:31, 32). We come across "ἁρὶς" five times in this second part of *SER4* in the context of the main topic of blasphemy.

In *SER4:13* Athanasius elucidates the radical difference between our repentance and our renewal by the grace of the Holy Spirit through baptism:

He (Paul) did not say that it is impossible to repent, but it is

impossible for us to renew ourselves through repentance. There is a great difference; for (the one) who repents ceases to sin, but he (still) has the scars of the wounds. But he who is baptized puts off 'the old (man)' and is renewed from above, born by the g r a c e of the Holy Spirit (γεννηθεῖς τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι).(49)

Several points emerge from this text. Firstly, we need renewal because of sin. This renewal cannot be achieved by our own efforts, but through baptism. For repentance is not sufficient(50) as far as it does not grant us grace. Secondly, a new birth is given by the grace of the Holy Spirit in baptism, as the old (nature) is renewed from above (after the Image of its creator). This suggests that a new spiritual nature is born by the grace of the Holy Spirit, to replace the old one. Thus by repentance the person puts an end to his old life, and by the grace of the Holy Spirit he may live differently,^{a life} appropriate to his new birth from above. Thirdly, it seems that Athanasius ascribes the birth from above to the grace of the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit is the Person who communicates to us grace. This grace involves the Trinity because we are baptized in the name of the Trinity as Athanasius mentions elsewhere.(51) It is noteworthy that the renewal of the baptised person from above, as being born by the grace of the Holy Spirit are Athanasius' own idea and words, since the N.T. did not use them.

In SER4:14 Athanasius elucidates the works of Christ during

the Incarnation. He points out that all the works of the Incarnate Lord, his marvellous deeds (miracles), were accomplished by his grace.

But these works have not occurred separately, according to their kind, ^{so} that the works which belong to the body (of the Lord) happened without the divinity, and the works of the divinity happened without the body. But all the works together were done by the one Lord, and these marvellous deeds (miracles) were done by his g r a c e.(52)

Athanasius does not accept a duality in the Person of the Incarnate God ^{did} as _^ some of the heretics who ascribed his works to his humanity only, and others who ascribed them to his divinity. He underlines here the unity of the Person of the Incarnate Lord, who performed all his works, and fulfilled marvellous deeds (miracles) by his grace. Thus, it seems that he revealed his divinity by these miracles, such as healing the man born blind (cf. Jn. 9:6). Athanasius mentions this incident here in the same chapter.(53) Christ used human and divine means to cure the blind man, because he spat on the ground as man, but his spittle had the power and grace(54) to cure the blind man. In other words, what is divine and what is human work together because of the one Incarnate Lord and the one grace given. Then for the second time, Athanasius discusses the grace of giving sight to the blind in the next chapter when he deals with the Pharisees' interpretation of the works of Christ.

In SER4:21, Athanasius speaks about the Pharisees, pointing out that as they dared to say that Christ cast out the demons by Beelzebul. They may say also that Beelzebul is speaking in Ex.4:11, and not God. The grace of giving sight, they ascribe to Beelzebul also.(55)

And when they (the Pharisees) read, 'Who gave man (his) mouth and who made him stone deaf and mute, and who gives him sight or makes him blind' (Ex.4:11)? In a similar way, they may say with madness that the speech here is also of Beelzebul. As to whomever they ascribe the g r a c e of recovering sight, they must also attribute the cause for the blindness. For it is said that the same Logos is the performer of both of them.(56)

Athanasius considers that the grace of restoring sight belongs to the Creator of humanity, who has authority over it. It seems that this grace of sight, especially that given to those who are blind from birth, is considered as if completing and repairing the original creation. It reveals the work of the Creator, which seems to be continuous by the Incarnate Logos and not only in the beginning of creation. Thus this grace witnesses to the divinity of Christ.

4. Conclusions

The doctrine of grace in SER1-4 is not treated as a separate topic. As in some of his other writings, Athanasius is deeply involved with the Arian controversy, but particularly here with the Tropic's heresy, and as always his basic concern is to defend the teaching of the Church. Grace is treated as an important item and as a part of the doctrine of God. In CAR1-3 grace is highlighted as one of the main activities of the Son, and as an integral part of the Father and Son relationship. But in the letters to Serapion, grace is treated in the following ways. 1. It is an activity of the Spirit. 2. It is communicated to us from the Father through the Son in the Spirit. 3. It is one grace of the Trinity which reflects its oneness, in spite of the multiple functions of grace.

1. Grace as an activity of the Holy Spirit:

Athanasius is interested in the doctrine of God. Yet, he prepares his attack on the Tropic in a way that he refutes their teaching by referring to the practical side of the doctrine of God, as for example it is practised in baptism. It is noteworthy that the most direct attack on the Tropic is centred on the divine human relationship. What the Son has achieved and fulfilled for us cannot reach us, nor can we receive it, except through the Holy Spirit. Here the main argument is the divinity of the Spirit

and his equality with the Father and Son. This implies the unity of the divine Trinity. The divinity of the Holy Spirit substantiates his ability to give grace. Thus by proving the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Athanasius has provided us with a clear-cut theology of grace. In the first place grace is not a vague activity of the Spirit; it is our union with God and his dwelling in us. The various aspects of grace which Athanasius discusses are all taken from the Bible. Athanasius goes beyond the mere quotation of the Biblical texts; he groups the various Biblical texts in order to answer the Tropici and to prove his main point. By doing this he has engaged himself in highlighting the grace that we actually receive from God through the Spirit. Since we have dealt before with adoption, participation in the divine nature, union with God, sanctification and other activities, it is only necessary for us to pinpoint the following:

a) Grace is certainly an activity of the Holy Spirit which cannot be separated from him. To put it differently, this activity of the Spirit is nothing but the same divine operation through which we receive his various gifts.

b) Athanasius does not engage himself in analysing the words which he uses to describe grace. The N.T. words χάρις, χάρισμα and δωρεά are taken for granted, since the theology of grace was not a controversial subject in the East before Athanasius and even after him. Therefore the various words used to describe grace are generally accepted but not defined. It may

be improper to try to analyse the linguistic difference, origin and usage of χάρις, χαρίσματα and δωρέα because Athanasius himself seems to be unaware of any differences. Therefore, a general description of the activities of the Holy Spirit is appropriate and serves to establish that the Spirit is one with the Father and the Son. If the Apostle Paul was careful to demonstrate the various gifts and ministries, which are distributed by the one and the same Spirit, maintaining a clear and obvious identity of the Holy Spirit, so was Athanasius who faced the teaching of the Tropici. Since the Tropici claimed that the Spirit is an angel and one of the creatures, Athanasius does not allow himself to be drawn into a pointless discussion about the identity of the Holy Spirit. If the Holy Spirit and the Spirit Creator are one and the same, it becomes more accurate to attribute to him the various activities. All the work and the various gifts are classified as the work of the one and only divine Spirit. This does not lead Athanasius to enter into a linguistic or theological analysis of the Biblical words used for the activities of the Spirit. He is concerned in the first place to formulate his argument to prove the divinity of the Spirit from his work and activities themselves. So, although he does not analyse in detail these works and activities, he takes the shortest way to prove that they are the works of God. This is clear from the many instances especially those in SER1 where the reader is faced with two options. Either he is to believe in the divinity of the Spirit and to accept the divine grace and union^{of man} with God, or to reject the divinity of the Spirit and consequently to reject the entire Christian teaching on salvation.

c) As we have noted before the very foundation of the theology of salvation (soteriology) is the doctrine of Creation. In GENT, INC and CAR1-3 the Logos Creator is the Logos Saviour. Here the same can be said about the Spirit Creator who works with the Son and the Father to bring creation to salvation. Athanasius endeavours to prove that the Holy Spirit works with the Son. The various Biblical texts are harmonised by Athanasius in such a way that he demonstrates that the Spirit is working with the Son and the Father, before and after the Incarnation of the Son. The Spirit grants life and preserves creation, visible and invisible, through his communion with the Father and the Son in the one essence. Since the Tropici accepted the divinity of the Son, how could they refuse the divinity of the Spirit if it was offered to them as an integral part of the divine salvation, which is granted by the Father and the Son? Athanasius selects various events from the life of the Incarnate Son such as the annunciation, the Baptism of Christ in ^{the river} Jordan, the promise of the Holy Spirit and Christ's command to baptise in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in order to prove the participation of the Spirit in the work of the Son. Moreover, the Son fulfils his work through the grace of the Holy Spirit. It is obvious from SER1-4 that Athanasius selected his Biblical texts to prove his general theme without arranging them in a systematic way. This may create a difficulty for us, if we attempt to systematise Athanasius' own theology of grace. But it is important to stress the fact that grace is located in three main

activities: firstly, the activity of the Spirit as co-Creator with the Son and the Father; secondly, the activity of the Spirit in association with the redeeming work of Christ; and thirdly, the activity of the Spirit in the life of the Church and the individual.

d) Athanasius^a introduces new terms for the gifts of the Spirit; they are all various facets of the divine grace. These new terms are based on the vocabulary of the N.T. and in particular the Pauline Epistles, which have the largest number of references to grace. These new terms used by Athanasius such as the grace of renewal and the enlightening grace do not form a departure from the general theme of the divine activities of the Spirit. The grace of renewal is obviously related to baptism and represents a new formulation of the text of Titus 3:5. This apposite term, the grace of renewal, brings out particular aspects of the work of the Spirit in creation and redemption. The Spirit Creator is the same one who renews creation or recreates it and unites it with God. The grace given in baptism is trinitarian; it does not allow any separation between creation and salvation. Athanasius maintains the unity of the work of the Spirit Creator and co-Redeemer with the Father and Son. He proves that the grace of renewal through baptism is what the Tropici will lose by their denial of the divinity of the Spirit.

The enlightening grace was not explained by Athanasius, as we have noted above. It is a part of his analogy drawn between the divine Trinity and the sun, whereby the Father is symbolized

by the sun, the Son by the Radiance, and the Spirit by the enlightening grace (αὐγοειδὴς χάρις). The theme of light and illumination is a common theme in the writings of Athanasius. Its source is the Bible and in particular the Gospel of John. The Bible itself does not use the expression 'enlightening grace', but we can link it with the grace of baptism which has been called the grace of light and the grace of illumination, even before Athanasius. This does not allow us to forget that creation is illuminated and enlightened by receiving the knowledge of God the Father through the revelation of Christ. In other words, it is the acceptance of the Father as the Light who shines in the Son who is received through the grace of baptism. The various divine activities must not be separated and should be seen together in creation and in the life of the Church.

2. The grace of the Trinity

The famous words of Athanasius, 'one grace from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit', are repeated several times in SER1-4. These words seem to have been formulated through the liturgical tradition of the Church, and in particular the sacrament of Christian Initiation. It is clear from the above mentioned texts that the sacrament of baptism has inspired Athanasius to refute the heresy of the Tropici and to provide him with a clear vision of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. When a Christian is baptised he receives the Spirit of Christ or the Spirit of the Son' (SER1:25). This very expression itself (The Spirit of Christ or

the Spirit of the Son) leads Athanasius straight to the grace of adoption, which is impossible to ^{be}_Λ bestowed on creation unless the Spirit is one with the Son and the Father in the Godhead, because it is the Spirit who transmits this grace to creation. The main thrust of Athanasius is the participation of creation in God. Here in SER1-4 the participation in the divine nature is specifically defined many times as the participation in the Trinity. It is also noteworthy that the word Trinity appears in SER1-4 many more times than in CAR1-3. The circumstance which led Athanasius to write SER1-4 was the Tropici's attack on the divinity of the Spirit (and not the divinity of the Son). Therefore Athanasius had to articulate his defence and formulate his approach to the Christian teaching in a precise way and accentuate the meaning of participation in the divine nature. Thus, he clarifies that the participation in the Trinity is given to us through the Holy Spirit who is the Spirit of the Son and who is one of the three persons of the Trinity. Athanasius highlights this fact in the whole chapter of SER1:30. The reader is confronted with two options, either to accept the unity of the Trinity, or to divide the Trinity, as in the case of the denial of the divinity of the Spirit. Athanasius, of course, has chosen the first option only and formulated his approach in a clear way as follows: If the Tropici say that God is a dyad and not a Trinity, then they 'no longer have faith and one baptism but two... But if God is a Trinity, then 'its holiness must be one and its eternity one and its immutable nature one'. This is the faith delivered to us, that God is Trinity in whose name every one is

baptised. One Baptism which is given from ^{the} Father, Son and Holy Spirit which also means that baptism is 'identical with itself' or unique of its kind.' The crucial question which Athanasius raises here is, what sort of grace is given to us, if the Holy Spirit were a creature? The answer is that it is the Spirit himself who is the only one who can unite us with the Father granting us a secure communion with God.

We receive the Spirit from the Son which means that whenever the Son is doing something, the Spirit is also in the Son. The analogy which is used by Athanasius is of great significance for his theology of grace: 'For where the light is, there is also the radiance and where the radiance is there is also its activity and its enlightening grace (SER1:30). Thus grace is the consummation of all the divine activities and the communion with God in the Holy Spirit himself. The above mentioned analogy is of considerable importance because it proves that the relation between Father, Son and Holy Spirit is the source and foundation of grace. The following words of Athanasius sum up the entire theology of grace as a gift from the Trinity.

"The activity of the Trinity is one." The Apostle does not mean that the things which are given are given differently and separately by each person, but that ^{that} which is given is given in the Trinity and that all are from the one God (SER1:31). We can add also the following words: 'When the Spirit is said to be in anyone it means that the Lord is in him' (SER1:31 and SER3:5).

This means that whenever there is a divine activity in a form of grace, it involves the entire Trinity. Thus the theology of grace is formulated in a right way which allows us to say that the aim of grace is to create, recreate and bring creation into communion with the Trinity. This holistic picture is essential for a correct understanding of the theology of St. Athanasius. To put it differently, God creates all things through the Lord in the Spirit (SER3:5).

When sin has altered creation and subjected it to death, God the Father who created everything through the Lord in the Spirit now recreates and renews creation (SER1:9), bestowing on it life and spiritual gifts from Himself through the Logos in the Spirit. So renewal is parallel to and in harmony with creation (SER3:6). 'When the Spirit comes to us, the Son will come and the Father and they will make their abode in us' (SER3:6). The final aim of the bestowal of grace is to grant creation communion with the Trinity. 'The spiritual gifts are given in the Trinity' (SER 3:5). 'For inasmuch as we partake in the Spirit, we have the grace of the Logos and in the Logos the love of the Father and as the grace of the Trinity is one, so also the Trinity is indivisible' (SER3:6). The words of Athanasius ^{that the} 'gifts of grace' ^{are} given in the Trinity are of special significance because they do not only prove the undivided nature of the Trinity but also that creation is called by grace to abide in the Trinity forever (SER1:25).

3. One grace which reflects the oneness of the Trinity.

In SER1:9 Athanasius says that the Lord came and renewed all things by grace. It is essential for us to look carefully at the grace of renewal which is described only as one sanctification of the Trinity (SER1:20, 30). The word 'one' is of prime importance for our study. It is used by Athanasius for the one activity of the Trinity (SER1:31) and the one grace. It is also used for the one divine nature of the Trinity which is indivisible (SER1:14, 17, SER4:6) and also for the one Spirit (SER1:27 SER3:4). It becomes obvious that Athanasius' insistence on the constant use of the word one for God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit the divine substance, the divine activity, the divine grace and sanctification, reveal to us a coherent theology of the one grace.

a) Everything was created by the grace of the indivisible unity in the Trinity and it is the same one who redeemed humanity. The oneness of God and his divine nature is always contrasted with the differences and mutability of creation. Thus the Angels are not one but many, while the Holy Spirit who is active in creation and redemption is one (SER1:11 20, 23, 26 SER3:4).

This leads Athanasius to deduce the most important definition of the nature of God the Creator, who is indivisible (SER1:14, 17) whereas creation is multiple and came out of nothing. The crucial point is that no creature can grant grace to other creatures and in particular the Angels who are multiple and not one (SER1:11, 20). Therefore they cannot grant grace to creation

because they are circumscribed while the Spirit himself is one and not many and fills all things (SER1:26). The presence of the Trinity in creation through the Logos and the Spirit means for Athanasius one divine activity of grace which brings all things out of nothing, sustains everything and sanctifies everything. The divine grace is one and belongs to the one divine nature and the one divine activity of the Trinity. Athanasius does not hesitate to speak of the various aspects of grace and to give it different names to reveal its multiple function, but at the same time maintains its one source and one goal which is the unity between God and humanity.

b) It is also of prime importance to realise that the one divine nature of the Trinity, with its one grace is also an integral part ^{of the doctrine of grace} and cannot be separated from the one baptism in the one Trinity (SER4:6). In other words, it becomes more obvious that Athanasius is not offering us an abstract philosophical concept of grace, but a pastoral one which leads the reader from the Bible to the Creed and from the Creed to baptism and from baptism to the one indivisible Trinity.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

As noted in the introduction, Athanasius of Alexandria never wrote a book on grace. The subject of grace was never treated in the East on its own, but has been treated as an integral part of the doctrine of God the Trinity, Christology and the Holy Spirit. These major doctrines were the central subject in the first five hundred years of the life of the Church, because of the various heresies which the Church had encountered. The refutation of Arianism, which dominated a great deal of the life and works of Athanasius, was not a heresy that was concerned with the doctrine of grace, but with the doctrine of God and Christology. Yet, it would be a great mistake to think that Arianism ignored the doctrine of salvation and especially grace. For the doctrine of God in Christianity, orthodox or heretical, has a great deal to do with salvation and grace. The earlier works of Athanasius GENT and INC appear to have been written prior to the Arian Controversy. In them Athanasius laid down the foundation for his theology of grace, which he never abandoned during his controversy with the Arians. This is particularly true of two important points of doctrine: firstly, that creation, which is the beginning of Christian theology, is an act of divine grace; and secondly, that the true life of creation and especially redemption are the context or realm in which the Trinity, Christ and the Holy Spirit are understood as the source and basis^{of grace}. This is the dynamic on-going view of divine grace. Both of these points appear in CAR1-3, and in SER1-4.

The doctrine of creation provides Athanasius with the right starting point for his theology of grace. For him the creation of the world and of man are the work of the Father of Jesus Christ. Man was created according to the divine Image. Both creation and being in the Image of God were seen as a divine grace. The Logos Creator appears in GENT as the one who gave being, life, order, and knowledge, by bestowing the grace of the divine Image on humanity, and organising creation in an orderly manner to witness to him and his Father. The work of the Logos Creator is elaborated further in INC to include an explanation of the doctrine of redemption, and the reasons for the Incarnation of the Logos. Athanasius considers the creation of man in the divine Image as making him especially worthy of the care of the Logos. This means that a special and unique relationship exists between the human race and the Logos of God, Jesus Christ.

When the fall happened, and this unique relationship was in danger of being lost as a result of the deformity of the divine Image in man, the Logos out of his goodness and care took the initiative to redeem the human race which was created in his Image. Thus the grace of the divine Image was restored to humanity. This is of prime importance because it reveals, firstly, that salvation is a divine work, which cannot be accomplished except by the Creator himself, who gave this salvation to humanity as grace; secondly, that it is God who saves, because of his goodness, not because of necessity; thirdly, that the human

race has the potentiality of a divine status, because it is created in or according to God's Image and because of its participation in the life of God through the Son. It is on the basis of such points that the ancient Christian tradition, which emerged as a result of the struggle with Paganism, Gnosticism, and Arianism, came to explain the link between creation and redemption, the nature of man and the goodness of God.

From GENT and INC one must deduce the fact that grace is God's free gift to humanity regardless of its fall. In other words, grace is prior to creation and to the fall. From CAR 1-3 one goes on to deduce that grace was given to humanity in Jesus Christ before the world began, because God, as a wise architect, planned the salvation of humanity before it came into being (cf. CAR2: 75-77 and 2 Tim. 8-10). The universe was created to be a place for God's Image, i.e. for man to live, to develop and to lead the universe to God the Creator. The fall which disturbed the relationship between God and humanity was reversed by the Incarnation of the Logos and through it a greater grace was given to humanity than in the beginning (its creation) (cf. CAR2: 67). Moreover grace was given from within humanity and not from without, as it was in the case of Adam (cf. CAR2: 68).

The divine Image, as the additional grace which was given by God to humanity, indicates that the entire doctrine of grace in Athanasius' writings is primarily a doctrine of relationship. A closer look at the texts which are analysed in this thesis proves:

firstly, that the relationship^η between the human race and God is a relationship between the Logos, "the very Image of God" (ἡ εἰκών), and humanity, "which is according to the Image" (τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα); secondly, that the Logos, as the very Image of the Father, is God's only Son and one with him, not related to him as a creature, as the Arians claimed; and thirdly, that the Holy Spirit is the Image of the Son in a similar way as the Son is the Image of the Father, and therefore not a creature. The Holy Spirit completes and perfects creation and the redeeming work of the Son. In this context of relationships between humanity and the Logos, the Logos and the Father, the Logos and the Spirit, the theme of the image is of great importance to Athanasius. We cannot understand Athanasius' teaching on grace without this theme of the image, because a) the creation of human beings is a grace which embraces not only their coming into existence but also their being made according to the divine image; b) the human nature, being contingent as a result of its creation *ex nihilo*, and being unable to survive independently of God, is supported and maintained in existence by divine providence; and c) all human abilities and faculties, and in particular the mind (νοῦς) or the soul, which is the source of knowledge, was created in the first place to receive the light of the Logos, and to share in his divine power, which is God's grace.

This provides a clear theology of grace which means that Athanasius could not have accepted the Arian interpretation of

Christianity because it contradicts in a radical way what he explains in his twin volumes of GENT and INC.

Athanasius is fully aware of the unique, Christian identity, namely that those who carry the name Christian have received their name from the Saviour (CAR1: 3,4). This identity, which is first expounded in GENT and INC, is the renewed grace of the Image of God, expressed by the overarching term of deification. Athanasius' awareness of the Christians' unique relationship with the Creator Logos, who is also the Redeemer, prompts him to draw the demarkation line between Christianity, and both Paganism and Judaism, as well as heresies such as Gnosticism and Arianism. Man is created according to the Image of God, which means that his life and being cannot be rightly fulfilled except in the unique relationship with the Logos. He assumed humanity to restore what is lost and to re-establish forever the unique relationship between mankind and God the Father through the Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of creation according to the Image of God is the principal line which was taken by Athanasius to refute Paganism, Gnosticism, and later on Arianism. According to Athanasius, sin has changed the nature of humanity and subjected it to death. Because man was given the additional grace of the Image, repentance was not sufficient to restore man and to liberate him from the power of corruption and death. The grace which was given at creation needed the divine giver himself to

come and restore it in man through his life, death and resurrection. It is interesting to note that Athanasius does not use the word grace for the cross but uses it for the resurrection. Thus the cross was not called grace by Athanasius, because there was no specific gift or grace given to humanity through it, except the destruction of death. In other words, the cross, which is essential and important for the redemptive work of the Logos, is in fact a destruction of what is negative, but leads to and creates the opportunity for what is positive, namely, the grace of the resurrection.

Athanasius is free from a theology which highlights the cross without giving the resurrection its prominent place as a divine gift, which has changed the fate of the human race. This is in harmony with his theology of creation and redemption. Death entered into the world as a result of the distorted knowledge and the corrupted mind of humanity. Man imagined what did not exist, i.e. evil, which had no correspondence in God (GENT4). When humanity was enslaved to the power of death, it was in danger of returning back to nothingness. It was maintained in existence by the divine kindness and mercy of God. When the Son of God became man, he abolished and destroyed death and liberated the human life from corruption and death by the grace of the resurrection. The destruction of death was achieved because of the immortal nature of the Logos. Being divine, he cannot be subjected to death.

Athanasius does not forget for a moment that the Redeemer is the Creator Logos and eternal Son of God, who, according to his divine nature, is above all, but who, according to his Incarnation has been counted among human beings as a creature. The divine nature of the eternal Son of God allows him to take a human body in order to receive our death in it, and destroy it, but at the same time through his divinity renew his own humanity and deify it. Thus he gives humanity the grace of deification. This theme is treated with particular clarity in INC and CAR1-3, and forms the heart of the theology of Athanasius. It can be briefly summarized as follows.

Firstly, in his earlier works Athanasius maintains the notion of the divinity of the Son of God, and explains his redeeming work through his incarnation, death and resurrection. Secondly, in CAR1-3 the same notion has been maintained in the light of the Nicene theology of the unity of the Father, and the Son. Thirdly, in the letters to Serapion the work of the Holy Spirit receives an extensive treatment, and becomes an integral part of the redeeming work of God the Trinity.

This development is due in fact to historical circumstances, that is, to the questions raised by the Arians. The Arians demanded a fresh and more detailed treatment of both Christology and the Trinity. An overall view of the major works which are treated in this thesis (GENT-INC, CAR1-3 and SER1-4] reveals that in a spontaneous way Athanasius has provided an

extensive commentary on the basic articles of the creed. This certainly was not done deliberately; yet it is not a strange development in the Nicene and post Nicene period and especially for such a theologian as Athanasius.

The Christian teaching on the creation of man is expounded in GENT and INC more than in any other of the Athanasian writings. The divinity of the Son, which is treated in GENT-INC, is treated in full in CAR1-3 to provide a clear Trinitarian theology. Whereas, it becomes clear that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which is not fully treated in CAR1-3 is elaborated further in the letters to Serapion (SER1-4). It is noteworthy that the references to Baptism are very few in GENT, INC and CAR1-3 but there are many more references in SER1-4. This is due to the fact that the Trinitarian Baptismal Formula became more needed than before at the time of Athanasius, because it came to be referred more to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, who was denied as one of the three persons of the Trinity by the Tropici.

What connects and harmonizes the entire theology of Athanasius is its soteriological goal. It is a theology which was created and used originally to defend the doctrine of salvation, namely, God's grace, giving all gifts through his Son and in the Spirit. The divinity of the Son and his incarnation are treated, both before and after Arianism, to reveal the redeeming work and the grace of the Saviour. Before Arianism, it is the grace of ^{the Logos} of,

our Lord Jesus Christ, who renews creation, liberates humanity from corruption and death, bestows the grace of the resurrection, and reveals the Father, restoring the grace of the image. After Arianism, it is the grace of the Holy Trinity, the one grace of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Trinitarian character of grace in CAR1-3 and SER1-4 does not contradict the earlier Christological character of grace in GENT and INC, because the link between the earlier and later development is the Son and the Holy Spirit who are one with the Father. Moreover, another important fact is that the deification of the humanity of the Son and the grace of deification which appear in INC, become more clear in CAR1-3 due to the fact that the Christological character of grace is now clearly understood in the light of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity.

Grace and the Humanity of the Son of God

The Christology of Athanasius does not contain the technical terms which were used before and after the Third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (AD 431). The unity between the divinity and the humanity of the Son of God was not under threat during most of his life time as happened afterwards. Although from 360s onwards this matter began to emerge and Athanasius did not fail to respond to it, he does not discuss the union between the divinity and the humanity in the same way as Cyril of Alexandria. He used in INC words like "life" (ch. 44) in order to explain the redeeming work of the Logos/Son of God. He does

not provide us with an analysis nor with an overall picture of the actual relationship between the divine nature of the Logos and his humanity. One important link between INC (cf. INC 31, 44) and CAR1-3 is the presence and indwelling of the Logos in his human body. In CAR1-3 Athanasius develops the expression "the Incarnate presence of the Logos". Another expression which Athanasius used in the Christological context is about Christ's "putting on human flesh and becoming man" (INC 44). These and other similar expressions highlight a dynamic Christology, and in spite of the fact that it is not capable of providing us with a fully developed Christology, yet it is able to explain the redeeming work of the Logos. The Son of God dwelt in a human body capable of death in order to destroy death and redeem mankind from it. Likewise the Son of God became a human being, receiving as such the grace which he always possessed as God so that mankind might be renewed in and through him. The humanity of Christ as the recipient of grace is the fundamental point in the teaching of Athanasius which is to become the basis for the subsequent Christological settlement, in view of such heresies as Apollinarianism and Nestorianism.

The human body died but came back to life because of the 'life' that dwelt in it. The negation of death by accepting it on the cross means that the very life of the Logos brought his body back from death to life. This resurrected body of the Son of God becomes impassible, immortal, glorified, in one word deified. This impassibility, immortality and deification are given to

humanity by the Incarnate Logos as a grace. This particular view runs through INC and CAR1-3, so that one cannot doubt that the author has remained consistent in his views and in his theology of grace. Thus Athanasius was able, during his anti-Arian activities, to maintain the same Christology and to answer the specific Arian objections. Firstly, the Logos is divine and not a creature. Secondly, the "incarnate presence" of the divine Logos/Son and his humanity are the cause for some of the difficult texts like Phil. 2:9, Ps. 44:7-8, *from* which the Arians used to deny his Godhead. Taking up the first point gave Athanasius an opportunity to defend the teaching of the Church and to maintain the equality of the Father and the Son. The second point led Athanasius to maintain his early Christology but to add to it a new element, ^{namely} that the incarnate Logos, who as Logos is giver of grace, is now ^{the} receiver of grace as well, because he wants to secure this grace for all humanity.

The Logos Incarnate as Receiver and Giver of Grace

In CAR1-3 Athanasius is concerned to prove the unity of the Father and the Logos/Son without losing sight of the humanity and the redeeming work of the Logos/Son Incarnate. He was able to defend the Nicene faith and to use it effectively to prove that in the Arian Christology and doctrine of God, there is no real place for salvation, renewal or grace. This particular defence is shaped in harmony with his early Christology. The Logos/Son of God assumed human flesh and in this flesh he achieved and

fulfilled his work as Redeemer. Here Athanasius was able to develop the same Christology in order to challenge the Arians. Firstly, the Logos/Son of God, being equal to God the Father, does not receive any grace from the Father, but possesses it and rather gives it. Secondly, as incarnate Logos/Son he received grace from the Father in his humanity, on behalf of all human beings. Thirdly, when the incarnate Logos/Son received grace, he became the giver of grace. This is obviously the same Christology of INC, but expanded to cope with the questions raised by the Arians. What is new in CAR1-3 is the receiving and giving of grace, which does not occur in INC. Moreover, a very important point which is of great significance for Athanasius' soteriology and his doctrine of grace is that the incarnate Logos secured and maintained grace through his natural unity with the Father, which was lacking in the case of Adam. The doctrine of grace, in this case, is certainly Christological in its context and Trinitarian in its source.

Athanasius' Doctrine of Grace and the Holy Spirit

In spite of the difficulties, which occurred in the history of the Christian doctrine concerning the divinity of the Holy Spirit, one realizes Athanasius' consistency and faithfulness to his theology of grace in GENT, INC and CAR1-3. The letters to Serapion add a great deal to what he said about the Holy Spirit before; nevertheless this addition is consistent with his early theology and in particular with his earlier doctrine of grace.

Firstly, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, who receives the grace from the Father through the Son and gives to creation. Secondly, the Spirit is one with the Father and the Son.

The first point is connected with the treatment of the subject of the Holy Spirit. Athanasius, who never lost sight of the Incarnation of the Son of God and of the fact that he is co-Creator along with the Father, integrates, in the letters to Serapion, the work of the Creator Spirit with the Incarnation of the Son and with the death and resurrection of Christ. The Holy Spirit had been working prior^{to} the Incarnation as Creator, but now after the Incarnation he recreates and renews Creation by grace and brings it into union with the Father and the Son. In this respect Athanasius' doctrine of grace in SER is not different in essence from that of his earlier writings; what is new is the detailed treatment.

The second point also shows the previous consistency whereby one grace corresponds to God the Trinity. Grace is the relationship of human beings with the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, or to use the words of Athanasius grace is in the Trinity. Thus we are in God through his Son and in the Spirit. This short statement summarizes what is treated at some considerable length in SER1-4 with an important addition; being in God takes place in Baptism and as a result of the Baptism of Christ the whole of his economy is consummated in Pentecost.

Athanasius' Doctrine of Grace

Firstly, the Alexandrian theologian does not give us a specific definition of grace or an explicit systematic doctrine of it. For him, Grace is ^adivine gift because it is given by God and received by man. It is a relationship of human beings with God the Father through his Son and in the Holy Spirit. Being a relationship with the living God, grace depends on God's goodness and generosity and also on the human willingness to accept it. To put it differently, grace is God's gift to creation freely given by God and freely accepted by mankind.

Secondly, in spite of the various manifestations of grace, it is essentially one and the same divine grace. The various names which describe it have reference to its particular place in the history of the divine--human relationship and the redeeming work of the Son of God. Thus grace can be spoken of under two main categories.

1. According to the source of grace, it is, the grace of the Trinity, given from the Father through the Son in the Spirit. Thus Athanasius can speak of the grace of the Logos, of the Son, of Christ, of the Lord, of the Saviour, or of the Holy Spirit.

2. According to the work of grace, that is, its achievement in the universe, it embraces the whole history of the creation of the

world by God. Thus it is designated as the grace of creation, whereby existing things came into existence from non-existence, the grace of being in the image of God, of adoption, of participation in the Son, of baptism, of salvation, of resurrection, of restoration, of renewal, of authority, of glory, of immortality and of deification. It is interesting to notice that the grace of creation and the grace of being in the image of God are given from the Father through the Son in the Spirit according to the absolute goodness of God. They are the only two aspects of grace which are given to humanity not depending on its acceptance, because it was not created yet and thus no human will was there to express its acceptance.

Thus the facets of grace can be summarised as follows:

- a) Divine grace is given at creation, such as the grace of the image, which is renewed and fortified forever by the Son and the Holy Spirit.
- b) The grace of adoption, which is our participation in the very sonship of the Son and in his unique relationship with the Father in the Holy Spirit.
- c) Grace is given in a new way to bring creation to a full and eternal union with God such as the grace of restoration, of the resurrection and of deification.

Thirdly, the doctrine of grace is obviously a part of Christology and cannot be understood without it. Since grace is

part of Christology, and Christology is part of the doctrine of the Trinity, grace cannot be understood apart from the Trinity.

Fourthly, our studies and our analysis of the texts of the main works of Athanasius show us that Athanasius is not interested in giving a scholastic doctrine of grace. Grace is given by the Son from the Father in the Holy Spirit. Since the Incarnate Son himself received grace from the Father on our behalf, it becomes obvious that grace cannot be separated from our fellowship with the Trinity. In fact, grace is this fellowship, communion or union with the Trinity itself.

Fifthly, Athanasius does not lay exclusive stress on any particular event in the life of Christ, such as his birth, baptism, death and resurrection. His arguments and his attempt to explain and to defend the divinity and the humanity of the Son may lead him to emphasize the importance of the birth from Mary or the Baptism in Jordan. His purpose can be seen as an attempt to refute the heretical understanding of the humanity and the divinity of the Son of God. Since the birth of Christ and his Baptism were misunderstood by the heretics, Athanasius points to the right way of understanding these events. The cross, the resurrection and the transformation of the humanity of the Son of God took place through all the events of his life and in particular the crucifixion and the resurrection. The Son of God accepted human death to grant mankind the grace of resurrection and life eternal. Athanasius does not treat the incarnation as an event that

has achieved a particular grace on its own. It is the crucifixion and the resurrection which made the other events of the Incarnate Son of God, such as his birth from the Virgin Mary or his Baptism, relevant and meaningful for the salvation of mankind. Thus there is one grace from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. So also, there is one Lord who did not provide humanity with one particular grace as a result of a particular event in his life, his birth, his death or his resurrection. There is, rather, one Lord who provides one grace through the totality of his redeeming work and his relationship with the Father and the Holy Spirit. This is a grace which is freely given and freely received, and entails mankind's participation in God's eternal life, glory, perfection.

^
and

FOOTNOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

(1) One could mention Augustine, Thomas Aquinas the Reformers, Luther and Calvin, and indeed several modern theologians, such as Barth, Torrance, Rahner, Küng, etc.

(2) Cf. WHITLEY, W. T. (Ed.), *The Concept of Grace*, London 1932; HARDMAN, D., *The Christian Doctrine of Grace*, 1947; GRAY, H. D., *The Christian Doctrine of Grace*, 1949; DAUJAT, J., *The Theology of Grace*, 1959; WATSON, P. S., *The Concept of Grace*, London 1959; MOELLER, C., & PHILIPS, G., *The Theology of Grace and the Ecumenical Movement*, London 1961; TORRANCE, T. F., "The Roman Doctrine of Grace from the point of view of Reformed Theology", *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*, 16 (1964) 290-312 (repr. in FRANSEN, Piet's *Intelligent Theology*, Darton 1969, vol. 3, pp. 46-77; RAHNER, K., *Theological Investigations*, vol.1, London 1965.

(3) Cf. DISDIER, M.-Th. "Le pélagianisme au Concile d' Ephèse", in *Echos d' Orient*, 34 (1931) 314-333; SPEIGL, Jakob, "Der Pelagianismus auf dem Konzil von Ephesus", *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum*, 1969, pp. 1-14.

(4) T.F.TORRANCE, *The doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1946. B. DREWERY, *Origen and the doctrine of Grace*, London 1960. E. EVERY, "Nature and Grace in the Eastern Orthodox Tradition", in *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, 8 (1949) No 3 supplementary issue on "Nature and Grace", pp. 21-28. E. JANCEY, *The doctrine of Grace (up to the end of the Pelagian Controversy)*, London 1925. E. LAMBERT, "The Orthodox Church's teaching of Grace", in *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, 6 (1945-6) 248-258.

(5) WHITLEY, W. T., *The Doctrine of Grace*, *op. cit.*

(6) GLOUBOKOWSKY, N., "The use and application of the expression and conception of χάρις in the Greek Fathers, down to and including St John of Damascus", in WHITLEY, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-105.

(7) The *Ibycus Concordance* supplies a few more references which are not mentioned by Müller's *Lexicon*.

(8) DRAGAS, G. D., *Athanasiana*, vol. 1, London 1980, pp. 99-142

(9) pp. 495-553.

(10) LEFORT, L. T., *Athanase, Lettres Festales et Pastorales en Copte* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 150, 151: Scriptores Coptici, 19,20), Louvain 1955. CURETON, W., *The Festal Letters of Athanasius*, London 1848. Also "Sancti Athanasii Epistolas Festales Syriace et Latine", in MAI, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae*, tom. vi:1, Roma 1853.

(11) Cf. GOLTZ's critical edition Λόγος σωτηρίας πρὸς τὴν παρθένον. *Eine echte Schrift des Athanasius* (Texte und Untersuchungen 29:2a), Leipzig 1905.

FOOTNOTES TO PART I: 1. Grace in *GENT*

- (1) See the list of data in chapter 3 of the Introduction.
- (2) *GENT*: 2, PG 25: 5D4. Thomson p.6 l.13.
- (3) χάριν, *GENT*: 4, 10, 12, 16, & 21, PG 25: 12A8, 24A1, 25C11, 33A2 and 41C7. Thomson p. 12 l.34, p. 28 l.26, p.34 l.12, p.42 l.4 and p.56 l.6.
- (4) *GENT*: 13, 17, PG 25: 28C12, 36B7, 36C5. Thomson p.36 l.10, p.46 l.2, p.48 l.10.
- (5) *GENT*: 9, PG 25: 21A10, 21A11. Thomson p.26 l.60, p.26 l.61.
- (6) *GENT* is broadly divided into the following parts: ch. 1 Introduction; chs. 2-29 Part One: the error of paganism; chs. 30-46 Part Two: the way of the truth; and ch. 47 The Epilogue. Cf. further, G. D. DRAGAS, *St Athanasius "Contra Apollinarem"*, Athens, 1985, pp. 428-429.
- (7) ἡ μὲν περὶ τῆς θεοσεβείας καὶ τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀληθείας γνῶσις, *GENT*: 1, PG 25: 4A1. Thomson p.2 l.1.
- (8) τὴν τῶν ἀπίστων ἀμαθίαν, *ibid.*, 5B10. Thomson p.4 l.42.
- (9) τὰ ψεύδη, *ibid.*
- (10) ὕστερον ἐπινοεῖν, *GENT*: 2, PG 25: 5C5. Thomson p.4 l.3.
- (11) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς καὶ παμβασιλεὺς θεός, ὁ ὑπερέκεινα πάσης οὐσίας καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπινοίας ὑπάρχων, ὅτε δὴ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ὑπέρκαλος ὢν, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Λόγου τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος κατ' ἰδίαν εἰκόνα πεποίηκε, *ibid.*, 5C8-13. Thomson p. 6 l.5-9.
- (12) *Ibid.*, 5C13, 8A2. Thomson p.6 l.8, p.6 l.18.

(13) τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς εἰκόνα, τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, οὐ καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γέγονεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, *ibid.*, 8A1,2. Thomson p.6 l.17,18.

(14) This point is most clearly made by DEMETROPOULOS, P. Ch. *The Anthropology of the Great Athanasius* ('Η Ἀνθρωπολογία τοῦ Μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου), Athens 1954, pp. 59ff.

(15) Cf. DEMETROPOULOS, *op. cit.* pp. 62ff. Cf. also BERNARD, R., *L' Image de Dieu d' après saint Athanase*, Paris 1952.

(16) ἵνα, τὴν ταυτότητα σώζων, μήτε τῆς περὶ Θεοῦ φαντασίας ποτὲ ἀποστῇ, μήτε τῆς τῶν ἁγίων συζήσεως ἀποπηδήσῃ, ἀλλ', ἔχων τὴν τοῦ δεδωκότος χάριν, ἔχων καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκ τοῦ πατρικοῦ Λόγου δύναμιν, ἀγάλληται καὶ συνομιλῇ τῷ Θεῷ, ζῶν τὸν ἀπήμονα καὶ μακάριον ὄντως τὸν ἀθάνατον βίον. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔχων ἐμπόδιον εἰς τὴν περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ γνῶσιν, θεωρεῖ μὲν ἀεὶ διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ καθαρότητος τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς εἰκόνα, τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, οὐ καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γέγονεν. ὑπερεκπλήττεται δὲ κατανοῶν τὴν δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πᾶν πρόνοιαν, ὑπεράνω μὲν τῶν αἰσθητῶν καὶ πάσης σωματικῆς φαντασίας γινόμενος, πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς θεῖα καὶ νοητὰ τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ νοῦ συναπτόμενος. Ὅτε γὰρ οὐ συνομιλεῖ τοῖς σώμασιν ὁ νοῦς ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐδέ τι τῆς ἐκ τούτων ἐπιθυμίας μεμιγμένον ἔξωθεν ἔχει, ἀλλ' ὅλος ἐστὶν ἄνω ἐαυτῷ συνὼν ὡς γέγονεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς· τότε δὴ, τὰ αἰσθητὰ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα διαβάς, ἄνω μετάρσιος γίνεται, καὶ τὸν Λόγον ἰδὼν, ὁρᾷ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν τοῦ Λόγου Πατέρα, ἡδόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ τούτου θεωρίᾳ καὶ ἀνακαινούμενος ἐπὶ τῷ πρὸς τοῦτον πόθῳ. ὥσπερ οὖν τὸν πρῶτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον, ὃς καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων γλῶττιαν Ἀδὰμ ὠνομάσθη, λέγουσιν αἱ ἱεραὶ Γραφαὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνεπαισχύντῳ παρρησίᾳ τὸν νοῦν ἐσχηκέναι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ συνδιαιτᾶσθαι τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν τῇ τῶν νοητῶν θεωρίᾳ, ἣν εἶχεν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ τόπῳ, ὃν καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Μωσῆς τροπικῶς παράδεισον ὠνόμασεν. Ἰκανὴ δὲ ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς καθαρότης ἐστὶ τὸν Θεὸν δι' ἐαυτῆς κατοπτρίζεσθαι, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Κύριός φησι. Μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὁψονται, GENT: 2, PG 25:

5D1-8B10. Thomson p.6 l.10 – p.8 l.35.

(17) ἔχων τὴν τοῦ δεδοκότος χάριν, ἔχων καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκ τοῦ πατρικοῦ Λόγου δύναμιν, *ibid.*, 5D4,5. Thomson p.6 l.13-14.

(18) Δύνανται γὰρ, ὥπερ ἀπεστράφησαν τῇ διανοίᾳ τὸν Θεόν, καὶ τὰ οὐκ ὄντα ἀνεπλάσαντο εἰς θεοὺς, οὕτως ἀναβῆναι τῷ νῷ τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ πάλιν ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Ἐπιστρέψαι δὲ δύνανται, ἐὰν ὃν ἐνεδύσαντο ῥύπον πάσης ἐπιθυμίας, ἀπόθωνται, καὶ τουσοῦτον ἀπονίψωνται, ἕως ἄν ἀπόθωνται πᾶν τὸ συμβεβηκὸς ἀλλότριον τῇ ψυχῇ, καὶ μόνην αὐτὴν ὥπερ γέγονεν, ἀποδείξωσιν, ἵν' οὕτως ἐν αὐτῇ θεωρῆσαι τὸν τοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγον, καθ' ὃν καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, δυνηθῶσι. Κατ' εἰκόνα γὰρ Θεοῦ πεποιήται, καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν γέγονεν, ὡς καὶ ἡ θεία σημαίνει Γραφὴ ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγουσα. Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν. Ὅθεν καὶ ὅτε πάντα τὸν ἐπιχυθέντα ῥύπον τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἀποτίθεται, καὶ μόνον τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα καθαρὸν φυλάττει, εἰκότως, διαλαμπρυνθέντος τούτου, ὡς ἐν κατόπτρῳ θεωρεῖ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν Λόγον, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν Πατέρα, οὐ καὶ ἔστιν εἰκὼν ὁ Σωτὴρ, λογίζεται. Ἡ εἰ μὴ αὐτάρκης ἐστὶν ἡ παρὰ τῆς ψυχῆς διδασκαλία διὰ τὰ ἐπιθολοῦντα ταύτης ἔξωθεν τὸν νοῦν, καὶ μὴ ὁρᾶν αὐτὴν τὸ κρεῖττον. ἄλλ' ἔστι πάλιν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν φαινομένων τὴν περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ γνῶσιν καταλαβεῖν, τῆς κτίσεως ὥπερ γράμμασι διὰ τῆς τάξεως καὶ ἁρμονίας τὸν ἑαυτῆς δεσπότην καὶ ποιητὴν σημαίνουσης καὶ βοώσης, GENT: 34, PG 25: 68C8-69A8. Thomson p.92 l.12 -- p.94 l.31.

(19) ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτεξούσιος γέγονεν [ἡ ψυχὴ], GENT: 4, PG 25: 9C3. Thomson p.10 l.12.

(20) Καὶ γινώσκουσα τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἑαυτῆς, ὁρᾷ ἑαυτὴν δύνασθαι κατ' ἀμφοτέρω τοῖς τοῦ σώματος μέλεσι χρᾶσθαι εἰς τε τὰ ὄντα καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα. ὄντα δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ καλὰ, οὐκ ὄντα δὲ τὰ φαῦλα. Ὅντα δὲ φημι τὰ καλὰ, καθότι ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος Θεοῦ τὰ παραδείγματα ἔχει· οὐκ ὄντα δὲ τὰ κακὰ λέγω, καθότι ἐπινοίαις

ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ὄντα ἀναπέπλασται, GENT: 4, PG 25: 9C8-14. Thomson p.10 l.16-20.

(21) καὶ γινώσκουσα τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἑαυτῆς ... ἀναπέπλασται ..., GENT: 4, PG 25: 9C8ff. Thomson p.10 l.16ff.

(22) GENT: 4, 5, PG 25: 9D8, 12A13. Thomson p.12 l.27, p.12 l.2.

(23) GENT: 5, PG 25: 12B15. Thomson p.14 l.14.

(24) GENT: 6, PG 25: 13C10,11. Thomson p.16 l.35.

FOOTNOTES TO PART I: 2. GRACE IN *INC*

(1) INC: 6, 31, PG 25: 105D3, 149D3. Thomson p.146 l.7, p.210 l.30.

(2) Excluding the Introduction and the Conclusion, the *De Incarnatione* is broadly divided into four main sections as follows:

Ch.1 Introduction. Chs. 2-7a Creation through and in the Logos with special reference to man's creation and fall. Chs.7b-16 The Inhomination of the Logos as the means for man's salvation. Chs.17-32 Specific clarifications concerning the saving aspects of the Logos' Inhomination. Chs.33-55 Replies to Jewish and Greek objections to the Inhomination of the Logos. Chs.56,57 Conclusion. For further details on the contents of INC see DRAGAS *Athanasius "Contra Apollinarem"*, *op. cit.* pp. 431-432.

(3) INC: 1, PG 25: 97A2. Thomson p.134 l.5.

(4) ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Λόγου τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν οἷς πρὸ πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς τὸ ἀνθρώπων γένος ἐλεήσας, ... πλέον τι χαριζόμενος αὐτοῖς, INC: 3, PG 25: 101B2-8. Thomson p.140 l.15-19.

(5) οὐκ ἀπλῶς, ὥσπερ πάντα τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς ἄλογα ζῶα, ἔκτισε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνα ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς, μεταδοὺς αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἰδίου Λόγου δυνάμεως, ἵνα ὥσπερ σκιάς τινας ἔχοντες τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ γενόμενοι λογικοί, διαμένειν ἐν μακαριότητι δυνηθῶσι, ζῶντες τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὄντως τῶν ἁγίων ἐν παραδείσῳ βίον, INC: 3, PG 25: 101B8-14. Thomson p.140 l.19-24.

(6) Εἰδὼς δὲ πάλιν τὴν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀμφοτέρωθεν νεύειν δυναμένην προαίρεσιν, προλαβὼν ἠσφαλίσατο νόμῳ καὶ τόπῳ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς χάριν. Εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ γὰρ παράδεισον αὐτοὺς εἰσαγαγὼν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς νόμον ἵνα, εἰ μὲν φυλάξαιεν τὴν χάριν, καὶ μένοιεν καλοὶ, ἔχωσι τὴν ἐν παραδείσῳ ἄλυστον καὶ ἀνώδυνον καὶ ἀμέριμνον ζωὴν, πρὸς τῷ καὶ τῆς ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίας αὐτοὺς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχειν, εἰ δὲ παραβαῖεν καὶ στραφέντες γένοιεντο

φαῦλοι, γινώσκοιεν ἑαυτοὺς τὴν ἐν θανάτῳ κατὰ φύσιν φθορὰν ὑπομένειν, καὶ μηκέτι μὲν ἐν παραδείσῳ ζῆν, ἔξω δὲ τούτου λοιπὸν ἀποθνήσκοντας μένειν ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἡ θεία Γραφή προσημαίνει λέγουσα ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ βρώσει φαγῇ ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἢ δ' ἂν ἡμέρᾳ φάγησθε, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε. Τὸ δὲ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε, τί ἂν ἄλλο εἴη ἢ τὸ μὴ μόνον ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀλλὰ ^{καὶ} ἐν τῇ τοῦ θανάτου φθορᾷ διαμένειν, INC: 3, PG 25: 101B14-D5. Thomson p.140 l.24 – p.142 l.39.

(7) ἀποστραφέντες τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν κατανόησιν, INC: 4, PG 25:104B1,2. Thomson p.142 l.13.

(8) ἐπινοήσαντες ἑαυτοῖς τὴν κακίαν, *ibid.* 104B3. Thomson p.142 l.14.

(9) κενωθέντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς περὶ θεοῦ ἐννοίας, *ibid.* 104B13-14. Thomson p.144 l.22.

(10) κενωθῆναι καὶ τοῦ εἶναι ἀεὶ, *ibid.* 104C2. Thomson p.144 l.24-25.

(11) ἔστιν μὲν γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν ἄνθρωπος θνητὸς, ἅτε δὴ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γεγονώς, *ibid.* 104C3-5. Thomson p.144 l.26-27.

(12) διὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς τὸν ὄντα ὁμοιότητα.. ἡμβλυνεν ἂν τὴν κατὰ φύσιν φθορὰν καὶ ἔμεινεν ἄφθαρτος, *ibid.* 104C5-8. Thomson p.144 l.27-29.

(13) ἦν εἰ ἐφύλαττε διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν κατανοήσεως, *ibid.* 104C6-7. Thomson p.144 l.27-28.

(14) INC: 5, PG 25: 105A11. Thomson p.144 l.12.

(15) Cf. καὶ ἐν τοῖς πλημμελήμασιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὐκ ἄχρις ὅρων

ὠρισμένων εἰστήκεισαν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ὀλίγον ἐπεκτεινόμενοι λοιπὸν καὶ εἰς ἄμετρον ἐληλύθασιν, *ibid.* 105A14-B12. Thomson p.144 l.14 -- p.146 l.3.

(16) καὶ παρανομίαν πᾶσαν ὑπερβάλλοντες, *ibid.* 105B5. Thomson p.146 l.19.

(17) ἀκόρεστοι περὶ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν γεγόνασιν, *ibid.* 105B7. Thomson p.146 l.19.

(18) πάντα δὲ τὰ κακὰ καθ' ἓνα καὶ κοινῇ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐπράττετο, *ibid.* 105B10,11. Thomson p.146 l.23-24.

(19) οὐκ ἦν δὲ τούτων μακρὰν οὐδὲ τὰ παρὰ φύσιν, *ibid.* 105B15-C1. Thomson p.146 l.27.

(20) ... καὶ τὴν τοῦ κατ' εἰκόνα χάριν ἀφαιρεθέντες ἦσαν, INC: 7, PG 25: 108D5. Thomson p.150 l.15-16.

(21) ... λογισάμενοι δὲ καὶ ἐπινοήσαντες ἑαυτοῖς τὴν κακίαν ... ἔσχον τὴν προαπειληθεῖσαν τοῦ θανάτου κατάκρισιν, INC: 4, PG 25: 104B2-5. Thomson p.142 l.13-15.

(22) λογισάμενοι... ἐλογίζοντο, *ibid.* 104B2,6. Thomson p.1432 l.13-16.

(23) ἐπινοήσαντες... τὴν κακίαν, *ibid.* 104B3. Thomson p.142 l.14.

(24) ὥς ἐλογίζοντο διεφθείροντο, *ibid.* 104B6. Thomson p.142 l.16.

(25) ὁ δὲ λογικὸς καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος ἠφανίζετο, INC: 6, PG 25: 105C12,13. Thomson p.146 l.3-4.

(26) A. HAMILTON's exposition, *The relationship between God and created reality* (1977) pp. 19ff, suggests "different temporal stages" in the divine act of creation, one connected with "nature" and another with "grace". This approach is rather Augustinian and does not do justice to

Athanasius' doctrine which, as we have shown, far from suggesting rigid distinctions, actually implies an intimate link between nature and grace and sees their application contemporaneously.

(27) οὔτε δὲ ἡ μετάνοια ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν ἀνακαλεῖται, ἀλλὰ μόνον παύει τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, INC: 7, PG 25: 108C14-D1. Thomson p.150 l.11-12.

(28) τί ἄλλο ἔδει γενέσθαι; ἢ τίνος ἦν χρεία πρὸς τὴν τοιαύτην χάριν καὶ ἀνάκλησιν ἢ τοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος πεποιηκότος τὰ ὅλα τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου; Αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἦν πάλιν καὶ τὸ φθαρτὸν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνεγκεῖν, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐλογον ἀποσῶσαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα. Λόγος γὰρ ὢν τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας ὢν, ἀκολούθως καὶ ἀνακτίσαι τὰ ὅλα μόνος ἦν δυνατός, καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων παθεῖν, καὶ πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ πάντων ἰκανὸς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, *ibid.*, 108D5-109A6. Thomson p.150 l.15-23.

(29) Cf. Athanasius's statement: οὐκ ἄξιον γὰρ ἦν τῆς ἀγαθότητος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγόμενα διαφθείρεσθαι ... καὶ τῶν ἀπρεπεστάτων ἦν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ τέχνην ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀφανίζεσθαι ... ἀτοπώτατον ἦν ἀπόλλυσθαι τὰ ἔργα ... οὐκοῦν ἔδει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μὴ ἀφιέναι φέρεσθαι τῇ φθορᾷ διὰ τὸ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ ἀνάξιον εἶναι τοῦτο τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθότητος, INC: 6, PG 25: 108A8-B13. Thomson p.148 l.15-25.

(30) τοιαύτην χάριν καὶ ἀνάκλησιν, INC: 7, PG 25: 108D6,7. Thomson p.150 l.17.

(31) τῇ τοῦ Λόγου χάριτι, INC:5, PG 25: 104D2. Thomson p.144 l.2.

(32) χάριτι δὲ τῆς τοῦ Λόγου μετουσίᾳς, *ibid.* 105A2,3. Thomson p.144 l.6.

(33) καὶ ἀνακτίσαι τὰ ὅλα μόνος ἦν δυνατός, INC: 7. PG 25: 109A4,5. Thomson p.150 l.21.

(34) ἡ ἡμῶν παράβασις τοῦ Λόγου τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ἐξεκαλέσατο, INC: 4, PG 25: 104A8,9. Thomson p.142 l.6-7.

(35) ἀπρεπές δὲ ἦν πάλιν τὰ ἅπαξ γεγόμενα λογικὰ καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ μετασχόντα παραπόλλυσθαι, καὶ πάλιν εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι διὰ τῆς φθορᾶς ἐπιστρέφειν, INC: 6, PG 25: 108A5-8. Thomson p.148 l.12-14.

(36) ἀνάξιον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθότητος, *ibid.*, 108A8. Thomson p.148 l.15.

(37) INC: 8 PG 25: 109D7; INC: 9 PG 25: 112A10; INC: 10 PG 25: 113A15; INC: 21 PG 25: 132C11. Cf. also INC: 21 PG 25: 132D2, where Athanasius calls "the grace of the resurrection" "grace of the Saviour" (ἡ τοῦ Σωτῆρος χάρις). Thomson p.152 l.34, p.154 l.7, p.156 l.21, p.184 l.5, p.184 l.9.

(38) INC: 7, 11, 12, PG 25: 108D5, 116B2,7, 116D5. Thomson p.150 l.16, p.160 l.16,22, p.162 l.1.

(39) INC: 12, PG 25: 116D5. Cf. also INC: 11, 13, 14, PG 25: 116B2, 120B2-C3, 120C4-D5. Thomson p.162 l.1, p.160 l.17, p.164 l.24 -- p.166 l.35, p.166 l.1-13.

(40) At the end of INC10 Athanasius says that the destruction of corruption and death through the Inhominated Logos' death and resurrection constitutes the "first cause of the Inhomination": αἰτία μὲν δὴ πρώτη τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος αὐτῆ. With this statement Athanasius concludes his section INC 8-10 which deals with Christ's abolition of corruption and death. Though he does not speak explicitly of a second cause, Athanasius' exposition of the restoration of the grace of being in the image and likeness of God in INC 11-12 clearly suggests that this is a sort of second cause of the Inhomination. However, the first and the second causes are clearly interrelated. This is particularly seen in the opening statements of INC 20, where Athanasius speaks of only one cause in which he includes both the restoration to incorruptibility and the

recreation (ἀνάκτισις) of that which is according to the image. They are respectively Christ's answers to the problem of corruption and death and to the problem of the loss of the vision of God and participation in the godly life or life of the saints. Put otherwise, they are the grace which restores in man the additional grace of being in God's image and likeness which was originally given to man at his creation but which was jeopardized through man's free turning away from God to sin.

(41) This is particularly seen in the Pauline texts (as well as Hebrews) which Athanasius cites in these chapters and around which he constructs his doctrine. These include: Rom. 6:8 (INC:8), 1 Cor. 15:54 (INC:9), 2 Cor. 5:14-15 (INC:10), Heb. 2:9, 10, 14-15 (INC:10), 1 Cor. 15:21-2 (INC:10), 1 Tim. 6:15 and Tit. 1:3 (INC:10), Hebr. 2: 14-15 (INC:20), Hebr. 11:35 (INC:21), 1 Cor. 15:53-5 (INC:21), 1 Cor. 15:55 (INC:27).

(42) ἀντὶ πάντων αὐτὸ θανάτῳ παραδιδούς προσῆγε τῷ Πατρί, INC: 8, PG 25: 109C13,14. For full and illuminating discussions of Athanasius' doctrine of the Logos' Inhomination and human death on the basis of this and subsequent chapters see DRAGAS, *Athanasius Contra Apollinarem*, *op. cit.*, pp. 231ff and 433ff.

(43) ὥς δὲ εἰς φθορὰν ἀναστρέψαντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πάλιν εἰς τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν ἐπιστρέψη, καὶ ζωοποιήσῃ τούτους ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου, τῇ τοῦ σώματος ἰδιοποιήσῃ καὶ τῇ τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριτι τὸν θάνατον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὥς καλὰ μὴν ἀπὸ πυρὸς ἐξαφανίζων, INC: 8, PG 25: 109D4-8. Thomson p.152 l.32-35.

(44) ἐαυτῷ λαμβάνει σῶμα, as Athanasius puts it in INC: 9, PG 25: 112A5,6. Thomson p.154 l.1.

(45) ἰκανόν, INC: 9, PG 25: 112A7. Thomson p.154 l.2.

(46) κατάλληλον, INC: 9, PG 25: 112A13. Thomson p.154 l.10.

(47) τὸν ἐαυτοῦ ναὸν καὶ τὸ σωματικὸν ὄργανον, INC: 9, PG 25: 112A15. Thomson p.154 l.12.

- (48) ὡς ἱερεῖον καὶ θῦμα παντὸς ἐλεύθερον σπίλου, IN: 9, PG 25: 112A10,11. Thomson p.154 l.7-8.
- (49) ἀντὶ πάντων or ἀντίψυχον ὑπὲρ πάντων, INC: 9, PG 25: 112A7, B1. Thomson p.154 l.5
- (50) Cf. here the firm establishment of this point by G. D. DRAGAS in his *Athanasius Contra Apollinarem*, op. cit. p. 235-242.
- (51) τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ γενόμενον γένος.. τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τοῦ καὶ κατ' ἀρχὴν πεποιηκότος αὐτοῦς, INC: 10, PG 25: 112D3,4 and 113B8,9. Thomson p.156 l.7-8.
- (52) INC: 10, PG 25: 113A1,2. Thomson p.156 l.9.
- (53) χάριτι Θεοῦ (Hebr. 2:9), INC: 10, PG 25: 113A15. Thomson p.156 l.1.
- (54) τὴν κοινὴν πάντων ἀνάστασιν, ἣν καιροῖς ἰδίοις δείξει ὁ καὶ ταύτην ἐργασάμενος καὶ χαρισάμενος Θεός, INC: 10, PG 25: 113C14,15. Thomson p.158 l.45-46.
- (55) Cf. the structure of INC in DRAGAS, *Athanasius Contra Apollinarem*, op. cit. p. 432.
- (56) τὸ φθαρτὸν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν μεταβαλεῖν, INC: 20, PG 25: 129C13,14. Thomson p.182 l.3.
- (57) τὸ θνητὸν ἀθάνατον ἀναστῆσαι (or παραστῆσαι), INC: 20, PG 25: 129D4,5. Thomson p.182 l.6.
- (58) τὸ ὀφειλόμενον παρὰ πάντων ἔδει λοιπὸν ἀποδοθῆναι, INC: 20, PG 25: 129D10,11. Thomson p.182 l.11.
- (59) τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντων θυσίαν, INC: 16, 20, PG 25: 124D3, 132A2,3.

Thomson p.177 l.16, p.182 l.14.

(60) ἀντὶ πάντων, INC: 20, PG 25: 132A3. Thomson p.182.l.14.

(61) On the "body" used as equivalent to "humanity" see VOISIN, G., "La doctrine Christologique de S. Athanase", *Revue d' Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 1 (1900) 226-248, and DRAGAS, G. D., "Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, the forgotten aspect of Athanasius' Christology", *Studia Patristica*, 16 (1985) 281-294.

(62) ἡ χάρις τοῦ Σωτῆρος, INC: 21, PG 25: 132D2. Thomson p.184 l.9.

(63) κατὰ τὸ τοῦ σώματος θνητὸν διαλυόμεθα μόνον τῷ χρόνῳ, INC: 21, PG 25: 132C11,12. Thomson p.184 l.5.

(64) ἀλλ' εἶναι νεκρὸν αὐτὸν ἀληθῶς,... οὐκέτι μὲν ὁ θάνατός ἐστι φοβερός, πάντες δὲ οἱ τῷ Χριστῷ πιστεύοντες, ὡς οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ὄντα πατοῦσι καὶ μᾶλλον ἀποθνήσκουν αἰροῦνται, ἢ ἀρνήσασθαι τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν πίστιν. Ἵσασι γὰρ ὄντως, ὅτι ἀποθνήσκοντες οὐκ ἀπόλλυνται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζῶσι, καὶ ἄφθαρτοι διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως γίνονται, INC: 27, PG 25: 141C10-144A1. Thomson p.198 l.2 -- p.200 l.13.

(65) τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς φύσεως αὐτῶν, ὡς οὐχ ἱκανὴ εἶη ἐξ ἑαυτῆς γινῶναι τὸν Δημιουργόν, οὐδ' ὅλως ἔννοιαν λαβεῖν Θεοῦ, INC: 11, PG 25: 113D3-5. Thomson p.158 l.2-4.

(66) τὴν τῶν γεννητῶν ἔλλειψιν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πεποιηκότος κατάληψιν καὶ γνῶσιν, *ibid.* 116A3,4. Thomson p.158 l.6-7.

(67) "γεννητά", or "ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γεγενῆσθαι", *ibid.* 113D6. Thomson p.158 l.4.

(68) τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπους κάτω πρὸς σῶματι πεπλάσθαι, *ibid.* 116A1,2. Thomson p.158 l.5.

(69) οὐχ ἱκανὸν εἶη κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἰδίας γενέσεως λόγον διαμένειν αἰεὶ, INC: 3, PG 25: 101B6,7. Thomson p.140 l.18.

(70) INC: 11, PG 25: 116B8-C2. Thomson p.160 l.23-30.

(71) ἑαυτοὺς πλείοσι κακοῖς καὶ ἁμαρτήμασιν ἐνεφόρησαν, ὥς μηκέτι δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς λογικοὺς, ἀλλὰ ἀλόγους ἐκ τῶν τρόπων νομίζεσθαι, INC: 12, PG 25: 117C4-6. Thomson p.162 l.28 -- p.164 l.30.

(72) τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα πάλιν ἀνανεῶσαι, INC: 13, PG 25: 120B3. Thomson p.164 l.24.

(73) ἔδει, *ibid.* 120B2. Thomson p.164 l.24.

(74) αὐτάρκης μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἡ κατ' εἰκόνα χάρις γνωρίζειν τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν Πατέρα, INC: 12, PG 25: 116D5-7. Thomson p.162 l.1-3.

(75) INC: 13, PG 25: 117C10-15. Thomson p.164 l.3-6.

(76) *Ibid.* 117D2,3 & 120B1. Thomson p.164 l.10 and p.164 l.32.

(77) οὐκ ἔδει δὲ τὰ ἅπαξ κοινωνήσαντα τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκόνας ἀπολέσθαι. Τί οὖν ἔδει ποιεῖν τὸν Θεόν; Ἡ τί ἔδει γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα πάλιν ἀνανεῶσαι, ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ πάλιν αὐτὸν γνῶναι δυνηθῶσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι; Τοῦτο δὲ πῶς ἂν ἐγεγόνει, εἰ μὴ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκόνας παραγενομένης τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; Δι' ἀνθρώπων μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἦν δυνατόν, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γεγόνασιν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δι' ἀγγέλων. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ εἰσιν εἰκόνες. Ὅθεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος δι' ἑαυτοῦ παρεγένετο, ἵν' ὡς εἰκὼν ὦν τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπον ἀνακτίσαι δυνηθῇ. Ἄλλως δὲ πάλιν οὐκ ἂν ἐγεγόνει. εἰ μὴ ὁ θάνατος ἦν καὶ ἡ φθορὰ ἐξαφανισθεῖσα ὅθεν εἰκότως ἔλαβε σῶμα θνητὸν, ἵνα καὶ ὁ θάνατος ἐν αὐτῷ λοιπὸν ἐξαφανισθῇ δυνηθῇ, καὶ οἱ κατ', εἰκόνα πάλιν ἀνακαινισθῶσιν ἄνθρωποι. Οὐκοῦν

ἐτέρου πρὸς ταύτην τὴν χρείαν οὐκ ἦν εἰ μὴ τῆς εἰκόνοσ τοῦ Πατρός, INC: 13b, PG 25: 120A15-C3. Thomson p.164 l.22 – p.166 l.35.

(78) INC: 14, PG 25: 120C12-D5. Thomson p.166 l.7-13.

(79) *Ibid.* 120C9,10. Thomson p.166 l.5.

(80) *Ibid.* 120D4. Thomson p.166 l.12.

(81) *Ibid.* 120C4-D5. Thomson p.166 l.1-13.

(82) τὰς αἰσθήσεις πάντων [ἀνθρώπων] προσλαμβάνει, INC: 15, PG 25: 121D2,3. Thomson p.170 l.13-14.

(83) ἀφ' ὧν ὁ Κύριος ἐργάζεται διὰ τῶν τοῦ σώματος ἔργων..., INC: 15, PG 25: 121D4,5. Thomson 170 l.14-15.

(84) INC: 17ff.

(85) INC: 16, PG 25: 124D8-125A5. Thomson p.172 l.21-25.

FOOTNOTES TO PART II: 1. GRACE IN *CAR1*

(1) See the Introduction of this thesis, ch. 3.

(2) *CAR1*: 38, 44, 47; PG 26: 92B10, 101D1, 108C8.

(3) *CAR1*: 5, 6, 9, 36, 37, 38; PG 26: 21B9, 24A2, 29B11, 88A12, 88C5, 89B11 and 89C3.

(4) *CAR1* is broadly divided into four main sections: *CAR1*:1-10 (Introduction to the Arian Heresy), *CAR1*:11-22a (The Refutation of the Arian denial of the Son), *CAR1*:22b-36 (The Refutation of the Arian logical arguments against the Son) and *CAR1*:37-64 (The Refutation of the Arian Biblical exegetical arguments). Cf. DRAGAS, *Contra Apollinarem*, pp. 445-6.

(5) Οἱ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἀποτιναζόμενοι πίστιν καὶ καινῶν κακῶν ἐφευρεταὶ γενόμενοι, οἱ τὰ μὲν τῶν θείων Γραφῶν λόγια καταλείψαντες, τὰς δὲ θαλείας Ἀρείου σοφίαν καινὴν ὀνομάζοντες, *CAR1*: 4, PG 26: 20A3-6.

(6) Διὸ καὶ θαυμάσειεν ἄν τις, ὅτι πολλὰ πολλῶν συντάγματα καὶ πλείστας ὁμιλίας εἰς γε τὴν Παλαιὰν καὶ τὴν Καινὴν γραψάντων, καὶ παρὰ μηδενὶ θαλείας εὐρισκομένης. *CAR1*: 4, PG 26: 20A8-11. In *CAR1*: 8, PG 26: 28B10-C2 Athanasius puts it differently: the Arian position has no basis in the traditional Catechism, or in the teaching of the Fathers.

(7) Καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἔλαθεν ὁ δόλιος, ἀλλὰ καίτοι πολλάκις, ὡς ὄφεις, ἄνω καὶ κάτω στρέφων ἑαυτόν, ὅμως πέπτωκεν εἰς τὴν πλάνην τῶν Φαρισαίων. Ὡς γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι θέλοντες παρανομεῖν, ἐσχηματίζοντο τὰ τοῦ Νόμου μελετᾶν ῥήματα, καὶ θέλοντες ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν προσ^σκεθέντα καὶ παρόντα Κύριον, ὑπεκρίνοντο μὲν ὀνομάζειν τὸν Θεόν, ἠλέγχοντο δὲ βλασφημοῦντες ἐν τῷ λέγειν· Διὰ τί σύ, "ἄνθρωπος ὢν Θεὸν σέαυτὸν ποιεῖς" καὶ λέγεις, "Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν"; οὕτω καὶ ὁ κίβδηλος καὶ Σωτάδειος

ἽΑρειος ὑποκρίνεται μὲν ὡς περὶ Θεοῦ λέγων, παρεντιθεὶς τὰς τῶν Γραφῶν λέξεις, ἐλέγχεται δὲ πανταχόθεν ἽΑρειος ἄθεος, ἄρνούμενος τὸν Υἱόν, καὶ τοῖς ποιήμασιν αὐτὸν συναριθμῶν, CAR1: 4, PG 26: 20B10-C8.

(8) CAR1: 5, 6, 9, PG 26: 21B9, 24A2, 29B11.

(9) CAR1: 5, PG 26: 21C8.

(10) *Ibid.* 21C5-6.

(11) *Ibid.* 21C11.

(12) *Ibid.* 21B6.

(13) ταύτην τὴν δόξαν δέδωκεν, *ibid.* 21C10.

(14) CAR1: 6, PG 26: 24A3-4.

(15) ἄλλότριος μὲν καὶ ἀνόμοιος κατὰ πάντα τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας καὶ ἰδιότητός ἐστι· τῶν δὲ γεννητῶν καὶ κτισμάτων ἴδιος καὶ εἷς αὐτῶν τυγχάνει, CAR1: 6, PG 26: 24A5-8.

(16) CAR1: 6, PG 26: 24B4-6.

(17) CAR1: 9, PG 26: 29B6, 10f.

(18) CAR1: 36, PG 26: 88A10-11, 11-12.

(19) CAR1: 37-64.

(20) Εἰ διὰ τοῦτο ὑψώθη, καὶ χάριν ἔλαβε, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κέχρισται, μισθὸν τῆς προαιρέσεως ἔλαβε. Προαιρέσει δὲ πράξας, τρεπτῆς ἐστὶ πάντως φύσεως, CAR1: 37, PG 26: 88C11-14.

(21) CAR1: 37, PG 26: 88C14-89A1. Probably a hint to the Epistles. Cf.

Theodoret's *Historia Ecclesiastica* I: 5,6.

(22) Εἰ γὰρ μισθὸν προαιρέσεως ἔλαβεν ἃ ἔσχεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐσχηκὼς αὐτὰ εἰ μὴ τοῦ δεομένου τὸ ἔργον ἐνεδείξατο, ἐξ ἀρετῆς ἄρα καὶ βελτιώσεως ταῦτα ἐσχηκὼς, εἰκότως ἐλέχθη διὰ ταῦτα καὶ Υἱὸς καὶ Θεὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς Υἱός, CAR1: 37, PG 26: 89A3-8.

(23) WOLFSON, H. A., "Philosophical Implications of Arianism and Apollinarianism", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 12 (1958) 3-28.

(24) Υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς φύσει καὶ γνήσιός ἐστι τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἴδιος τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ, Σοφία μονογενής, καὶ Λόγος ἀληθινὸς καὶ μόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὗτός ἐστιν οὐκ ἔστι κτίσμα οὔτε ποίημα, ἀλλ' ἴδιον τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας γέννημα. Διὸ Θεός ἐστιν ἀληθινός, ἀληθινοῦ Πατρὸς ὁμοούσιος ὑπάρχων. Τὰ δ' ἄλλα, οἷς εἶπεν, Ἐγὼ εἶπα. Θεοί ἐστε, μόνον μετοχῇ τοῦ Λόγου διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ταύτην ἔχουσι τὴν χάριν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς. Χαρακτήρ γάρ ἐστι τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑποστάσεως, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, καὶ δύναμις καὶ εἰκὼν ἀληθινὴ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας. Τοῦτο γὰρ πάλιν εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος. Ὁ ἐμὲ ἐωρακὼς ἐώρακεν τὸν Πατέρα. Ἀεὶ δὲ ἦν καὶ ἔστι, καὶ οὐδέποτε οὐκ ἦν. Αἰδίου γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ Πατρὸς, αἰδῖος ἂν εἴη καὶ ὁ τούτου Λόγος καὶ ἡ Σοφία, CAR1: 9, PG 26: 28D1-29A10.

(25) CAR1: 9, PG 26: 29A3-4.

(26) It is interesting that Athanasius often accuses Arius of following Paul of Samosata (Cf. CAR1: 25, 38, CAR2:13, 43 and DRAGAS, *Contra Apollinarem*, p. 151). What he probably has in mind is Arius' attempt to combine the Logos doctrine of Paul of Samosata with the Alexandrian Logos doctrine. Following the former, Arius did believe in a Logos in God who is a mere power and following the latter he believed in a hypostatic Logos who was above all creatures but a creature in himself.

(27) Τοιούτων δὴ οὖν ἀτόπων καὶ παρὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀναφαινομένων λογισμῶν, ἀνάγκη λέγειν τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς ἴδιον αὐτοῦ σύμπαν εἶναι τὸν Υἱόν· τὸ γὰρ ὅλως

μετέχεσθαι τὸν Θεόν, ἴσον ἐστὶ λέγειν, ὅτι καὶ γεννᾷ· τὸ δὲ γεννᾷν τί σημαίνει ἢ Υἱόν; Αὐτοῦ γοῦν τοῦ Υἱοῦ μετέχει τὰ πάντα κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος γινομένην παρ' αὐτοῦ χάριν· καὶ φανερόν ἐκ τούτου γίνεται, ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν ὁ Υἱὸς οὐδενὸς μετέχει, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μετεχόμενον, τοῦτό ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱός. Αὐτοῦ γὰρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ μετέχοντες, τοῦ Θεοῦ μετέχειν λεγόμεθα· καὶ τοῦτό ἐστὶν, ὃ ἔλεγεν ὁ Πέτρος· "Ἴνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως", ὡς φησι καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος· "Οὐκ οἶδατε, ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε;" καὶ "Ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐσμεν ζῶντος." CAR1: 16, PG 26: 44D1-45A12.

(28) CAR1: 20, PG 26: 53A10-11.

(29) CAR1: 20, PG 26: 53B2.

(30) Καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο [ἀγένητον] μὲν ἄγραφτον καὶ ὑποπτον, ἅτε ποικίλην ἔχον ἐστὶ τὴν σημασίαν, ὥστε τοῦ ἐρωτωμένου περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πολλὰ τὴν διάνοιαν περιφέρεσθαι, τὸ δὲ Πατὴρ ἀπλοῦν καὶ ἔγγραφον καὶ ἀληθέστερον καὶ σημαῖνον μόνον τὸν Υἱόν ἐστὶ. Καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀγένητον παρ' Ἑλλήνων εὐρηται τῶν μὴ γινωσκόντων τὸν Υἱόν, τὸ δὲ Πατὴρ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐγνώσθη καὶ κεχάρισται, CAR1: 34, PG 26: 81B7-15.

(31) Καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον δὲ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν εἰς τοῦτο συντείνειν ἠθέλησε, κελεύσας ἡμᾶς βαπτίζεσθαι οὐκ εἰς ὄνομα ἀγενήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ, οὐδὲ εἰς ὄνομα κτίστου καὶ κτίσματος, ἀλλ' "εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος". Οὕτω γὰρ τελειούμενοι καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐκ ποιημάτων ὄντες, υἱοποιούμεθα λοιπόν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς δὲ ὄνομα λέγοντες, ἐπιγινώσκομεν ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου καὶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Πατρὶ Λόγον. Μάταιος ἄρα καὶ ἡ περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀγενήτου λέξεως ἐπιχείρησις αὐτῶν δέδεικται, καὶ μηδὲν πλεῖον ἔχουσα ἢ μόνην φαντασίαν, CAR1: 34, PG 26: 81C8-84A9.

(32) Cf. here the careful analysis of Dr DRAGAS in his *Contra Apollinarem*, p. 446ff.

(33) Οὐκ ἄρα ἄνθρωπος ὢν, ὕστερον γέγονε θεός· ἀλλὰ θεὸς ὢν, ὕστερον γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, ἵνα μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς θεοποιήσῃ, CAR1: 39, PG 26: 92C1-3.

(34) Εἰ δὲ πάντες ὅσοι υἱοὶ τε καὶ θεοὶ ἐκλήθησαν, εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, εἴτε ἐν οὐρανοῖς, διὰ τοῦ Λόγου υἱοποιήθησαν καὶ ἐθεοποιήθησαν, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐστὶν ὁ Λόγος. δῆλον ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ μὲν οἱ πάντες, αὐτὸς δὲ πρὸ πάντων, μᾶλλον δὲ μόνον αὐτὸς ἀληθινὸς Υἱός, καὶ μόνος ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ θεὸς ἀληθινός ἐστὶν, οὐ μισθὸν ἀρετῆς ταῦτα λαβών, οὐδὲ ἄλλος ὢν παρά ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ φύσει κατ' οὐσίαν ὢν ταῦτα. Γέννημα γὰρ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας ὑπάρχει, ὥστε μηδὲνα ἀμφιβάλλειν, ὅτι καθ' ὁμοιότητα τοῦ ἀτρέπτου Πατρὸς ἀτρεπτὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ Λόγος, CAR1: 39, PG 26: 93A8-B5.

(35) Ποίαν δὲ καὶ χάριν ἔλαβεν ὁ τῆς χάριτος δοτὴρ; CAR1: 40, PG 26: 96A11-12.

(36) οὐ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ Λόγου ὑψουμένην σημαίνει ἣν γὰρ ἀεὶ καὶ ἔστιν ἴσα θεῷ. ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητός ἐστιν ἡ ὕψωσις, CAR1: 41, PG 26: 96C3-5.

(37) ὥς ἄνθρωπος, λέγεται λαμβάνειν ὅπερ εἶχεν ἀεὶ ὥς θεός, ἵνα εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσῃ καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη δοθεῖσα χάρις. Οὐ γὰρ ἡλαττώθη ὁ Λόγος σῶμα λαβών, ἵνα καὶ χάριν ζητήσῃ λαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ ἐθεοποίησεν ὅπερ ἐνεδύσατο, καὶ πλέον ἐχαρίσατο τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο, CAR1: 42, PG 26: 100A2-7.

(38) CAR1: 42, PG 26: 100B6-7.

(39) Τὸ δὲ καὶ ἐν σώματι γενόμενον τὸν Κύριον καὶ κληθέντα Ἰησοῦν προσκυνεῖσθαι, πιστεῦεσθαί τε αὐτὸν Υἱὸν θεοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπιγινώσκεισθαι τὸν Πατέρα, δῆλον ἂν εἴη, καθάπερ εἴρηται, ὅτι οὐκ ὁ Λόγος^{ἡ Λόγος} ἐστίν, ἔλαβε τὴν τοιαύτην χάριν, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς... ὅτι ἡμεῖς μὲν ὑψώθημεν, διὰ τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι τὸν Ὑψιστον Κύριον, καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς ἡ χάρις δίδοται, διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι ὥς ἡμᾶς

ἄνθρωπον τὸν χορηγοῦντα τὴν χάριν Κύριον... Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἄνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος ἐγγέγονει, οὐκ ἂν ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ ἁμαρτιῶν λυτρωθέντες ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστημεν, ἀλλ' ἐμένομεν ὑπὸ γῆν νεκροί οὐδ' ἂν ὑψώθημεν εἰς οὐρανοὺς, ἀλλ' ἐκείμεθα ἐν τῷ ᾧ. Δι' ἡμᾶς ἄρα καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο, CAR1: 43, PG 26: 100C10-15, 101A7-11 and 101B11-16.

(40) CAR1: 44, PG 26: 101C8-9.

(41) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ αὐτὸς λέγεται ὑψῶσθαι, καὶ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ ἐχαρίσατο, καὶ νομίζουσιν οἱ αἰρετικοὶ ἐλάττωμα εἶναι ἢ πάθος τῆς τοῦ Λόγου οὐσίας,... Καὶ ἔστι παράδοξον καὶ ἐκπλήξαι δυνάμενον ἀληθῶς ἣν γὰρ δίδωσιν ὁ Υἱὸς παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς χάριν, ταύτην αὐτὸς ὁ Υἱὸς λέγεται δέχεσθαι καὶ τὴν ὑψωσιν, ἣν ὁ Υἱός, παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ποιεῖ, ταύτην ὡς αὐτὸς ὑψούμενός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱός, αὐτὸς γέγονε καὶ Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὡς μὲν Λόγος, τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς δίδωσι. πάντα γὰρ, ἃ ποιεῖ καὶ δίδωσιν ὁ Πατήρ, δι' αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ τε καὶ παρέχει. ὡς δὲ Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, αὐτὸς ἀνθρωπίνως λέγεται τὰ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ δέχεσθαι, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἑτέρου, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ εἶναι τὸ σῶμα, τὸ φύσιν ἔχον τοῦ δέχεσθαι τὴν χάριν, καθάπερ εἴρηται. Ἐλάμβανε γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὑψοῦσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Ὑψωσις δὲ ἦν τὸ θεοποιεῖσθαι αὐτόν. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Λόγος εἶχεν ἀεὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν πατρικὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεότητα καὶ τελειότητα, CAR1: 45, PG 26: 104C3-5, 105A14-B14.

(42) Δι' ἡμᾶς ἄρα καὶ δόξαν ἥτει, καὶ τὸ, ἔλαβε, καὶ τό, ἐχαρίσατο, καὶ τό, ὑπερύψωσε, λέλεκται ἵν' ἡμεῖς λάβωμεν, καὶ ἡμῖν χαρίσῃται, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑψωθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὥσπερ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀγιάζει, ἵν' ἡμεῖς ἀγιασθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, CAR1: 48, PG 26: 113A6-10.

(43) ἵνα δειχθῇ, ὅτι κατὰ τὰ ἀμφοτέρω ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν, οἱ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀγιάζεσθαι δεόμενοι τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι δαίμονας ἐκβάλλειν ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος δυνάμεως. Διὰ τίνος δὲ καὶ παρὰ τίνος ἔδει τὸ Πνεῦμα δίδοσθαι ἢ διὰ τοῦ

Υίου, οὐ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι; Πότε δὲ λαμβάνειν ἡμεῖς; ἐδυνάμεθα, εἰ μὴ ὅτε ὁ Λόγος γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος; Καὶ ὥσπερ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λεγόμενον δείκνυσιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἐλυτρώθημεν καὶ ὑπερυψώθημεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ἔλαβε δούλου μορφήν οὕτως καὶ ὁ Δαβὶδ δείκνυσιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως μετέσχομεν τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ ἡγιασθῇμεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ τοῦ Πνεύματος δοτὴρ αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος ἔλεγεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῷ Πνεύματι χρίεσθαι. Διὸ καὶ βεβαίως ἐλάβομεν, αὐτοῦ λεγομένου κεχρίσθαι σαρκί. Τῆς γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ σαρκὸς πρώτης ἁγιασθείσης, καὶ αὐτοῦ λεγομένου δι' αὐτὴν εἰληφέναι, ὡς ἀνθρώπου ἡμεῖς ἐπακολουθοῦσαν ἔχομεν τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν, ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ λαμβάνοντες, CAR1: 50, PG 26: 117A2-B5.

(44) CAR1: 58, PG 26: 133A6-7.

(45) ἠθέλησε δεῖξαι οὐχ ὅμοιον εἶναι τοῦτον τοῖς πρότερον ἵνα, ὅσῳ τῇ φύσει διαφέρει τῶν προαποσταλέντων παρ' αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτῳ καὶ πλέον ἢ παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ γενομένη χάρις κρείττων τῆς δι' ἀγγέλων διακονίας γένηται. Δούλων μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀπαιτεῖν μόνον τοὺς καρπούς. Υἱοῦ δὲ καὶ δεσπότου χαρίσασθαι τὰς ὀφειλάς, καὶ μεταθεῖναι τὸν ἀμπελῶνα. Καὶ τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα γοῦν παρὰ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου δείκνυσι τὴν διαφορὰν τοῦ Υἱοῦ πρὸς τὰ γενητά,... Θεασάσθωσαν γοῦν τὴν διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ χάριν, καὶ ἐπιγνώτωσαν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μαρτυρούμενον αὐτόν, ὅτι τῶν μὲν γενητῶν ἄλλος ἐστί, μόνος δὲ αὐτὸς Υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν αὐτῷ, CAR1: 59, PG 26: 133C10-136A7, 136B11-15.

(46) Τὴν δὲ σάρκα δεκτικὴν τοῦ Λόγου κατασκευάσας, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς μηκέτι κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα, καὶ πολλάκις λέγειν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμέν ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι καί, "Ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οὐχ ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα πάντας λυτρώσῃται, καὶ σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ. Τότε μὲν γὰρ ὡς ὑπεύθυνος ὁ κόσμος ἐκρίνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου. ἄρτι δὲ ὁ Λόγος εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐδέξατο τὸ κρίμα, καὶ τῷ σώματι παθὼν ὑπὲρ πάντων, σωτηρίαν τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐχαρίσατο. Τοῦτο δὲ βλέπων κέκραγεν Ἰωάννης. Ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ

χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο. Κρείττων δὲ ἡ χάρις ἢ ὁ νόμος, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια παρὰ τὴν σκιάν, CAR1: 60, PG 26: 137C10-140A6.

(47) γενόμενος κρείττων τῶν ἀγγέλων, καί, ἐγένετο, ἀκούοντας, μὴ ἀρχὴν τινα τοῦ γίνεσθαι ἐπινοεῖν τοῦ Λόγου, μηδὲ ὅλως ἐκ τούτων γενητὸν αὐτὸν φαντάζεσθαι. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς διακονίας καὶ οἰκονομίας, ὅτε γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, νοεῖν τὸ λεγόμενον παρὰ τοῦ Παύλου. Ὅτε γὰρ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, ἤλθέ τε ἵνα διακονήσῃ καὶ πᾶσι σωτηρίαν χαρίσῃται τότε* ἡμῖν ἐγένετο σωτηρία, καὶ ἐγένετο ζωὴ, καὶ ἐγένετο ἰλασμός. τότε ἡ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ οἰκονομία κρείττων γέγονε τῶν ἀγγέλων, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁδός, καὶ ἐγένετο ἀνάστασις. Καὶ ὥσπερ τό, Γενοῦ μοι εἰς Θεὸν ὑπερασπιστήν, οὐκ οὐσίας γένεσιν σημαίνει αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται· οὕτως καὶ νῦν τό, γενόμενος κρείττων τῶν ἀγγέλων, καί, ἐγένετο, καί, τοσοῦτω κρείττων γέγονεν ἕγγυος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, οὐ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ Λόγου γενητὴν σημαίνει, μὴ γένοιτο! ἀλλὰ τὴν γενομένην ἐκ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς εὐεργεσίαν· κἂν ἀχάριστοι τυγχάνωσιν οἱ αἰρετικοὶ, καὶ φιλόνεικοι πρὸς ἀσέβειαν, CAR1: 64, PG 26: 145A15-C5.

FOOTNOTES TO PART II: 2. GRACE IN CAR2

(1) See the list provided in the Introduction, which lists 26 references. Five of these, however, are used adverbially and have no direct bearing on our investigation. These are: CAR2:54, 61, 67, 72, 79; i.e. PG 26:261A3, 277A11, 289A8, 300C12, 316A5.

(2) Cf. the structure of the treatise in DRAGAS, .. *Contra Apollinarem*, p. 462, which shows how these verses are taken up in the argument.

(3) CAR2:18, PG 26:184B4-6.

(4) ... ὁ δὲ σοφιστὴς Ἀστέριος ἔγραψεν ἅπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς προτέροις εἶπομεν οὕτως. "Οὐκ εἶπεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος Χριστὸν κηρύσσειν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν ἢ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ δίχα τῆς τοῦ ἄρθρου προσθήκης "δύναμιν Θεοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν". ἄλλην μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν τὴν ἔμφυτον αὐτῷ καὶ συνυπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ ἀγεννήτως κηρύσσων, γεννητικὴν μὲν οὖσαν δηλονότι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δημιουργικὴν δὲ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου, περὶ ἧς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ διδάσκων λέγει· "Τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδίου αὐτοῦ δύνამις καὶ θειότης". Ὡςπερ γὰρ τὴν εἰρημένην ἐνταῦθα θειότητα οὐκ ἂν τις φαίη Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν τὸν Πατέρα, οὕτως οἶμαι καὶ ἡ αἰδίου αὐτοῦ δύνამις καὶ θειότης οὐχ ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱός, ἀλλ' ὁ γεννήσας ὑπάρχει Πατήρ. Ἄλλην δὲ δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν διδάσκει Θεοῦ εἶναι διὰ Χριστοῦ δεικνυμένην". Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀστέριός φησι: "Καίτοι γε ἡ μὲν αἰδίου αὐτοῦ δύνამις καὶ σοφία, ἣν ἀναρχόν τε καὶ ἀγέννητον οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποφαίνονται λογισμοί, μία ἂν εἴη δήπουθεν καὶ ἡ αὐτή, πολλὰ δὲ αἱ καθ' ἕκαστον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κτισθεῖσαι, ὧν πρωτότοκος καὶ μονογενὴς ὁ Χριστός· πᾶσαί γε μὴν ὁμοίως εἰς τὸν κεκτημένον ἀνήρτηνται, καὶ πᾶσαι δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ τοῦ κτίσαντος καὶ χρωμένου καλοῦνται δικαίως· οἷον ὁ μὲν προφήτης τὴν ἀκρίδα, δίκην τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων θεήλατον γινομένην, οὐ δύναμιν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγάλην φησὶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προσαγο-

ρεύεσθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ δὲ γε μακάριος Δαβὶδ ἐν πλείοσι τῶν ψαλμῶν οὐκ ἄγγέλοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δυνάμεσιν αἰνεῖν παρακελεύεται τὸν Θεόν." (CAR2:37, PG 26:225B2-228A6).

(5) Καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀστέριος ὥσπερ ἐπιλαθόμενος ὧν πρότερον ἔγραψεν, ὕστερον κατὰ τὸν Καϊάφαν ἄκων καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς Ἑλληνας ἐνιστάμενος οὐκέτι μὲν πολλὰς σοφίας οὐδὲ τὴν κάμπην ὀνομάζει, μίαν δὲ λοιπὸν ὁμολογεῖ γράφων οὕτως· "Εἷς μὲν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, πολλὰ δὲ τὰ λογικά, καὶ μία μὲν τῆς Σοφίας οὐσία τε καὶ φύσις, πολλὰ δὲ τὰ σοφὰ καὶ καλὰ". Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα πάλιν λέγει· "Τίνες ἂν εἶεν οὓς παῖδας Θεοῦ προσαγορεύειν ἀξιοῦσιν; Οὐ γὰρ δὴ λόγους τε καὶ τούτους ὑπάρχειν φήσουσιν οὐδὲ σοφίας εἶναι πλείονας ἐροῦσιν. Οὐ γὰρ δυνατὸν ἐνὸς ὄντος τοῦ Λόγου καὶ μίας ἀποδεκθείσης τῆς Σοφίας, τῷ πλήθει τῶν παίδων τοῦ Λόγου τὴν οὐσίαν ἐπινέμειν καὶ τῆς Σοφίας χαρίζεσθαι τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν. CAR2:40, PG 26:232A9-B8.

(6) Δύο γοῦν σοφίας φησὶν εἶναι, μίαν μὲν τὴν ἰδίαν καὶ συνυπάρχουσαν τῷ Θεῷ· τὸν δὲ Υἱὸν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ σοφίᾳ γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ ταύτης μετέχοντα ὠνομάσθαι μόνον Σοφίαν καὶ Λόγον. Ἡ Σοφία γάρ, φησί, τῇ σοφίᾳ ὑπῆρξε σοφοῦ Θεοῦ θελήσει. Οὕτω καὶ Λόγον ἕτερον εἶναι λέγειν παρὰ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τούτου μετέχοντα τὸν Υἱὸν ὠνομάσθαι πάλιν κατὰ χάριν Λόγον καὶ Υἱὸν αὐτόν". Ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν ἴδιον φρόνημα, δηλούμενον ἐν ἑτέροις αὐτῶν συγγράμμασιν, "ὅτι πολλαὶ δυνάμεις εἰσὶ, καὶ ἡ μὲν μία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἰδία φύσει καὶ αἰδῖος, ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς πάλιν οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀληθινὴ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ μία τῶν λεγομένων δυνάμεων ἐστὶν καὶ αὐτός, ὧν μία καὶ ἡ ἀκρίς καὶ ἡ κάμπη οὐ δύναμις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγάλη προσαγορεύεται· αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ καὶ ὁμοιαί εἰσι τῷ Υἱῷ περὶ ὧν καὶ Δαβὶδ ψάλλει λέγων· 'Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων' καὶ τῇ μὲν φύσει, ὥσπερ πάντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶ τρεπτός, τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ἕως βούλεται μένει καλός· CAR1:5, PG 26:21A13-C6.

(7) Εἰ δ' ὅτι παῖς ἐκλήθη, φλυαροῦσι, γινωσκέτωσαν ὅτι καὶ

Ἰσαὰκ παῖς ὠνομάσθη τοῦ Ἀβραάμ καὶ υἱὸς τῆς Σουναμίτιδος παιδάριον ἐκλήθη... CAR2:51, PG 26: 253C1ff.

(8) ὅτε δὲ ἠθέλησεν ὁ Πατὴρ ὑπὲρ πάντων λύτρα δοθῆναι, καὶ πᾶσι χαρίσασθαι, τότε δὴ ὁ Λόγος, ὡς Ἀαρὼν τὸν ποδήρη, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἔλαβε τὴν ἀπὸ γῆς σάρκα, Μαρίαν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀνεργάστου γῆς ἐσχηκῶς μητέρα τοῦ σώματος, ἵνα ἔχων τὸ προσφερόμενον αὐτός, ὡς ἀρχιερεύς, ἐαυτὸν προσενέγκῃ τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι πάντας ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καθάρσῃ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναστήσῃ, CAR2: 7, PG 26: 161B10-C3.

(9) τὴν κατὰ χάριν ποιηθεῖσαν καὶ γενομένην καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ κυριότητα, CAR2:18, PG 26: 184B4-6.

(10) ὥστε χάριν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἔχειν, καὶ μὴ ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ, CAR2:30, PG 26: 209A10-11.

(11) Πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι φαίνεται μᾶλλον αὐτὸς ὁ Υἱὸς δι' ἡμᾶς γεγινώς, καὶ οὐκ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτόν, οὐ γὰρ δι' αὐτὸν ἐκτίσθημεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς δι' ἡμᾶς πεποιήται, ὥστε χάριν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἔχειν, καὶ μὴ ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ, καθάπερ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρί, CAR2: 30, PG 26: 209A7-11.

(12) CAR2:41, PG 26: 233A1-B14.

(13) ἀδύνατον, παρέχοντος τοῦ Πατρός, μὴ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ δίδοσθαι τὴν χάριν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱός, ὡς τὸ ἀπαύγασμα ἐν τῷ φωτί. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἐνδεὴς ὁ Θεός, ἀλλ' ὡς Πατὴρ τῇ ἐαυτοῦ σοφίᾳ τεθεμελίωκε τὴν γῆν, καὶ τῷ ἐξ αὐτοῦ Λόγῳ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε, τό τε ἅγιον λουτρὸν ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ βεβαιοῖ. Ἐνθα γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Υἱός ἐστὶν ὡς ἐνθα τὸ φῶς, ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, CAR2: 41-42, PG 26: 233C6-13, 236A14-B7.

(14) It is notable that in chs. 41-42 Athanasius uses only the term Son (Υἱός) when he speaks about holy Baptism and the adoption to divine sonship which is granted through it, whereas he uses the term Logos when

he talks about creation.

(15) ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸν υἱοποιήσας Θεὸς ἰκανὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ἡμᾶς υἱοποιῆσαι, CAR2:41, PG 26: 233B9-10.

(16) παντελῶς κενὸν καὶ ἀλυσιτελές, CAR2:42, PG 26: 237A4.

(17) ἵν' ἐκ τῆς μαθήσεως ἡ πίστις ὀρθῇ γένηται καὶ μετὰ πίστεως ἡ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τελείωσις προστεθῇ, CAR2:42, PG 26: 237B3-5.

(18) ῥυπαίνεσθαι μᾶλλον ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ ἢ λυτροῦσθαι, CAR2:43, PG 237B11

(19) Cf. DRAGAS, "The Eternal Son" in T.F. TORRANCE (Ed.)'s *The Incarnation, Ecumenical Studies in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed*, Handsel press, Edinburgh 1981, ch. 2, and T. F. TORRANCE "The Incarnate Saviour", in his *The Trinitarian Faith*, T.& T. Clark, Edinburgh 1988, pp. 146-190.

(20) CAR2:59f, PG 26: 272Bff.

(21) *ibid.*

(22) Εἰ δ' ὅτι παῖς ἐκλήθη, φλυαροῦσι, γινωσκέτωσαν, ὅτι καὶ Ἰσαὰκ παῖς ὠνομάσθη τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Σουμανίτιδος παιδάριον ἐκλήθη. Εἰκότως ἄρα, δούλων ἡμῶν ὄντων, ὅτε γέγονεν ὡς ἡμεῖς, Κύριον τὸν Πατέρα καλεῖ καὶ αὐτός, ὡς ἡμεῖς καὶ τοῦτο δὲ φιλανθρωπευόμενος οὕτω πεποίηκεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς, δοῦλοι κατὰ φύσιν ὄντες, καὶ δεξάμενοι τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, θαρρήσωμεν τὸν φύσει Κύριον ἑαυτῶν, τοῦτον τῇ χάριτι Πατέρα καλεῖν. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς τὸν Κύριον Πατέρα καλοῦντες, οὐκ ἄρνούμεθα τὴν κατὰ φύσιν δουλείαν, αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐσμεν ἔργα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ οὐκ ἡμεῖς. οὕτως ὅταν ὁ Υἱὸς τὴν τοῦ δούλου μορφήν λαμβάνων λέγῃ, Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἄρνείσθωσαν τὴν ἀιδιότητα τῆς τούτου θεότητος, CAR2: 51, PG 26: 253C1-D1.

(23) Αὕτη δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ φιланθρωπία ἐστίν, ὅτι ὧν ἐστὶ ποιητής, τούτων καὶ πατήρ κατὰ χάριν ὕστερον γίνεται δέ, ὅταν οἱ κτισθέντες ἄνθρωποι, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, λάβωσιν εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἐαυτῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ κράζον, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ Πατήρ. Οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν ὅσοι, δεξάμενοι τὸν Λόγον, ἔλαβον ἐξουσίαν παρ' αὐτοῦ τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι. ἄλλως γὰρ οὐκ ἂν γένοιντο υἱοί, ὄντες φύσει κτίσματα, εἰ μὴ τοῦ ὄντος φύσει καὶ ἀληθινοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑποδέχονται,... Διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν ἡμεῖς οὐ πρῶτον γεννώμεθα, ἀλλὰ ποιούμεθα. γέγραπται γάρ. Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον ὕστερον δὲ, δεξάμενοι τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν, λεγόμεθα τό τε λοιπὸν καὶ γεννᾶσθαι. Ἀμέλει καὶ ἐν τῇ Ὁδῇ Μωσῆς ὁ μέγας μετὰ διανοίας καλῆς πρῶτον τό, ἐκτίσατο, καὶ ὕστερον τό, ἐγέννησεν, εἶρηκεν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μή, ἀκούσαντας τό, ἐγέννησεν, ἐπιλαθέσθαι αὐτοῦς ^{τῆς} ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐαυτῶν φύσεως, ἀλλ' ἵνα γινώσκωσιν ὅτι ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν εἰσὶ κτίσματα, ὅταν δὲ κατὰ χάριν λέγωνται γεννᾶσθαι, ὡς υἱοί, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἥττον εἰσὶ πάλιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ποιήματα κατὰ φύσιν, CAR2: 59, PG 26: 273A3-12, C2-10.

(24) ἀνανεοῦντος καὶ τὴν πρώτην καὶ τὴν καινὴν γενομένην διατηροῦντος, CAR2:65, PG 26: 285B7-9.

(25) διὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν λέγεται καὶ διὰ ταύτην αὐτὸς ἀρχή, τότε δὲ γέγονεν ἀνάστασις, CAR2:66, PG 26: 285C7-9.

(26) ἵνα ἀνθ' ἡμῶν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδούς, τὰ λείποντα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι' ἐαυτοῦ τελειώσῃ· ἔλειπε δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ ἀθανασία καὶ ἡ εἰς τὸν παράδεισον ὁδός, CAR2:66, PG 26: 288B12-15.

(27) τότε γὰρ αὐτὰ καὶ ἐτελείωσεν ἰασάμενος τὰ τραύματα ἡμῶν καὶ χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν... Τετελείωται οὖν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη, ὥσπερ ἦν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν γεγονὸς τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος, καὶ μείζονι μᾶλλον χάριτι, CAR2:67, PG 26: 289A10-13; B8-11.

(28) ὡς πάντων δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντων, ὁ μὲν λόγος τῆς ἀποφάσεως πληρωθῇ (πάντες γὰρ ἀπέθανον ἐν Χριστῷ), πάντες δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ γένωνται λοιπὸν ἐλεύθεροί μεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τῆς δι' αὐτὴν κατάρας, ἀληθῶς δὲ διαμείνωσιν εἰσαεὶ ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἀθανασίαν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνδυσάμενοι, CAR2:69, PG 26: 293B2-8.

(29) Τοῦ γὰρ Λόγου ἐνδυσσαμένου τὴν σάρκα, καθὼς πολλάκις δέδεικται, πᾶν μὲν δῆγμα τοῦ ὄφεως δι' ὅλου κατεσβέννυτο ἀπ' αὐτῆς· εἴ τι ἐκ τῶν σαρκικῶν κινήματων ἀνεφύετο κακόν, ἐξεκόπτετο, καὶ συνανηρεῖτο τούτοις ὁ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀκόλουθος θάνατος, CAR2:69, PG 26: 293B8-13.

(30) εἰ δὲ ἡμεῖς θέσει καὶ κατὰ χάριν γινόμεθα υἱοί, δῆλον ὅτι καὶ ὁ Λόγος διὰ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς χάριν γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος εἶρηκε, Κύριος ἔκτισέ με, CAR2:61 PG 26: 277A9-11.

(31) Καὶ τὸ ἔκτισε, δὲ εἰς τὰ ἔργα τὴν χάριν ἔχει· εἰς αὐτὰ γὰρ καὶ κτίζεται, CAR2:62, PG 26: 280A7f.

(32) οἷος ἦν καὶ ὁ Ἀδὰμ πρὸ τῆς παραβάσεως ἔξωθεν λαβὼν τὴν χάριν καὶ μὴ συνηρμοσμένην ἔχων αὐτὴν τῷ σώματι, CAR2:68, PG 26: 292C9f.

(33) CAR2:75, PG 26: 305B5f.

(34) οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν, τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, CAR2:75, PG 26: 308A6f.

(35) ... ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἦν ἀποκειμένη ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάνουσα χάρις, CAR2:76, PG 26: 308C2-3.

(36) CAR2:76, PG 26: 308C11.

FOOTNOTES TO PART II: GRACE IN *CAR3*

(*)

THE AUTHENTICITY OF *CAR3*

The problem of the authenticity of *CAR3* is not part of this study, not only because it goes beyond the scope of the present research, but also because the matter seems to have been settled amongst contemporary scholars in favour of the traditional Athanasian authorship. Charles Kannengiesser's attempts in recent years to question this view have not met with the approval of the specialists. This is clearly ascertained in the reviews of Kannengiesser's book *Athanase d' Alexandrie, évêque et écrivain: Une lecture des Traités Contre les Ariens*, [Theologie Historique 71], Beauchesne, Paris 1983 which have been published so far.

Professor G. Stead, who rejects Kannengiesser's claim, criticises his arguments in his review in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 36 (1985) 220-229: for failing to relate Athanasius' thought to any other theology than that of the Arians, for never allowing any weakness, incoherence or imbalance in Athanasius' own theology, for assuming without examination that the difference in style between *CAR1-2* and *CAR3* is not seen in any other works of Athanasius, whereas *ILL*, for example, shows that the Athanasian style can be matched with that of *CAR3*.

Slusser argues in his review in *Theological Studies* 46 (1985) 144-146 that Kannengiesser's arguments are quite obscure and unconvincing. This applies both to the so-called difference in the style of theological discourse between *CAR3* and *CAR1-2* which is not substantiated and to the lack of lexical studies which are promised but are not supplied.

Stockmeier's review in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 79 (1986) 58-59 is equally critical of Kannengiesser's theory and points out that the so-called difference in topic and terminology between *CAR3* and *CAR1-2* might rather point to a later writing by Athanasius.

Hanson review in his *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, T. & T Clark, Edinburgh 1988 pp 418-419, rejects Kannengiesser's claims and points out the reasons which make *CAR3* an early work of Athanasius written during 339 to 345 along with *CAR1-2*.

H. Crouzel's review in *Bull. de Litterature Ecclesiastique* 86 (1985)

229-30 expresses serious doubts about Kannengiesser's claim that *CAR3* was written by Apollinarius mainly on the grounds that it relies on studies which were not done and which indicate an incomplete knowledge of Athanasius and that it has not met with the approval of the specialists.

Finally de Halleux points out in his review in the *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 16 (1985) 222-224, that Kannengiesser's analysis is unconvincing because it is very limited and lacking in comparisons which go beyond *CAR3* itself and actually embrace Apollinarius' literary work. The same author points out in another review in the *Revue d' Histoire Ecclesiastique* 80 (1985) 297-8 that Kannengiesser's treatment of *CAR3* is somewhat revolutionary and does not satisfy what people expect from a specialist in this field, especially when there is a lack of a critical edition of the text under investigation.

(1) There are fifty occurrences of χάρις in *CAR3*.

(2) The third part of the treatise (chs. 59-67) deals with God's will and the Son's divine Sonship. For a schematic and detailed analysis of the contents of *CAR3* see, DRAGAS, *Contra Apollinarem*, pp.493-494. The third part of the treatise (chs. 59-67) deals with God's will and the Son's divine Sonship. For a schematic and detailed analysis of the contents of *CAR3* see, DRAGAS, *Contra Apollinarem*, pp.493-494.

(3) Ἰδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ τοῦ συνηγόρου τῆς αἰρέσεως Ἀστερίου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ· γέγραφε γὰρ καὶ αὐτός, εἰς τοῦτο ζηλώσας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ταῦτα. "Εὐδηλον γάρ, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο εἶρηκεν ἑαυτὸν μὲν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ δὲ πάλιν τὸν Πατέρα, ἐπεὶ μήτε τὸν λόγον, ὃν διεξήρχετο, ἑαυτοῦ φησιν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Πατρός, μήτε οἰκεῖα τὰ ἔργα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς δεδοκότος τὴν δύναμιν, *CAR3*:2, PG 26: 324C11-325A4.

(4) οἱ τε ἀπόστολοι ἔλεγον, οὐκ ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει ποιεῖν τὰ σημεῖα· ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου χάριτι, *CAR3*:2, PG 26: 325C8-10.

(5) Ἀλλ' εἶπερ ἦν οὕτως ὁ Κύριος εἰρηκῶς, ἔδει μὴ εἰπεῖν αὐτόν, Ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον· καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ

Πατρί, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ δὲ καὶ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστὶν ... κοινὴν δὲ μετὰ πάντων ἔχη τὴν αὐτὴν χάριν, CAR3:3, PG 26: 328A3-8.

(6) Cf. γέγραφε γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς, εἰς τοῦτο ζηλώσας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ταῦτα ..., CAR3:2, *ibid.* 324C12-13.

(7) Οὐκ ἐκ μέρους δὲ ἡ τῆς θεότητος μορφή, ἀλλὰ τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς θεότητός ἐστι τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ ὅλος Θεός ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱός, CAR3:6, PG 26: 332B13-15. Cf. also SER1: 16 and G.D.DRAGAS's comments in his *Athanasiana*, p.69: "So St Athanasius draws here the great theological principle that in theology the Father-Son is an existence of ὅλος ὅλου, whereas in anthropology existence is μέρος μέρους.

(8) Καὶ ἡ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δὲ ἐν Υἱῷ ιδιότης καὶ θεότης δείκνυσι τὸν Υἱὸν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τὸ ἀεὶ ἀδιαίρετον αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ ἀκούων δὲ καὶ βλέπων τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ταῦτα λεγόμενα περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐ κατὰ χάριν ἢ μετοχὴν ἐπιγενόμενα τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἴδιον τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας ἐστὶ γέννημα, νοήσει καλῶς τὸ εἰρημένον ..., CAR3:6, PG 26: 332C13-333A6.

(9) BERNARD makes a similar point in his comment on this same text (CAR3:6), namely, that both Athanasius and Arius are in agreement in considering participation and grace as synonyms, "On remarquera qu' Arius et Athanase sent d'accord pour accoler comme synonymes participation et χάρις" (BERNARD, *L'image de Dieu*, pp. 117 - 118). KOLP also cites Bernard's words as evidence that participation equals the grace of God's gift which is given in and through God's Son (KOLP, *Participation*, p. 181), but he makes no reference to the above text which is quite explicit and cites, instead, other texts which do not explicitly refer to participation. Thus he adds the phrase κατὰ μετοχὴν (through participation) to the phrase κατὰ χάριν (through grace) in his comment on CAR3:17 and 39 on pages 301 and 306 of his thesis respectively, although there is no explicit reference to participation in these texts.

(10) ἃ θέλει ὁ Πατήρ, ταῦτα θέλει καὶ ὁ Υἱός, CAR3: 10, PG 26: 341A5_6.

(11) Εἰ γὰρ καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γεγόναμεν, καὶ εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα Θεοῦ ἐχρηματίσαμεν, ἀλλ' οὐ δι' ἑαυτοὺς πάλιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἐνοικήσασαν ἐν ἡμῖν εἰκόνα καὶ ἀληθῆ δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ, ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς ὕστερον γενόμενος σὰρξ, ταύτην τῆς κλήσεως ἔχομεν τὴν **χάριν**, CAR3: 10, PG 26: 344A7-10.

(12) Cf. CAR2: 42, PG 26: 236B.

(13) Διὰ τοῦτο, καθάπερ μικρῶ πρόσθεν εἵπομεν, καὶ διδόντος τοῦ Πατρὸς **χάριν** καὶ εἰρήνην, αὐτὴν καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς δίδωσιν, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος ἐπισημαίνεται διὰ πάσης ἐπιστολῆς γράφων. "**χάρις** ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ". Μία γὰρ καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ **χάρις** ἐστὶ παρὰ Πατρὸς ἐν Υἱῷ, ὡς ἔστιν ἐν τῷ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος, καὶ τὸ φωτίζειν τοῦ ἡλίου διὰ τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος γίνεται. Οὕτω γοῦν πάλιν ἐπευχόμενος Θεσσαλονικεῦσι καὶ λέγων. "Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς", τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐφύλαξεν· οὐ γὰρ εἶπε κατευθύνειν, ὡς παρὰ δύο διδομένης, παρὰ τούτου καὶ τούτου, διπλῆς χάριτος, ἀλλὰ, κατευθύναι, ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι ὁ Πατὴρ δι' Υἱοῦ δίδωσι ταύτην... νῦν δὲ ἡ τοιαύτη δόσις δείκνυσι τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ... Διὰ γὰρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δίδοται τὰ διδόμενα. οὐδὲν δέ ἐστίν, ὃ μὴ δι' Υἱοῦ ἐνεργεῖ ὁ Πατήρ. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ὁ λαβὼν ἀσφαλῆ τὴν **χάριν** ἔχει, CAR3: 11, 12, PG 26: 344C10 - 345A15, B7f, 13-15.

(14) Ὅπερ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος ἐποίει λέγων. "**Χάρις** ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἀσφαλῆς ἦν ἡ εὐλογία διὰ τὸ ἀδιαίρετον τοῦ Υἱοῦ πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ὅτι μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἡ διδομένη **χάρις**. Κἂν γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ δῶῃ, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ διδόμενον.* κἂν ὁ Υἱὸς λέγηται χαρίζεσθαι, ὁ Πατήρ ἐστίν ὁ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ παρέχων. "Εὐχαριστῶ γὰρ φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος γράφων

Κορινθίοις, τῷ Θεῷ μου πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ." Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ φωτὸς καὶ ἀπαύγασματος ἄν τις ἴδοι. καὶ γὰρ ὅπερ φωτίζει τὸ φῶς, τοῦτο τὸ ἀπαύγασμα καταυγάζει. ὅπερ δὲ καταυγάζει τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, ἐκ τοῦ φωτός ἐστὶν ὁ φωτισμός. Οὕτω καὶ βλεπομένου τοῦ Υἱοῦ, βλέπεται ὁ Πατήρ· τοῦ γὰρ Πατρὸς ἐστὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα· καὶ οὕτως ὁ Πατήρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν εἰσι, CAR3: 13, PG 26: 349A10-B10.

(15) τὰς παρ' αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ Λόγου δωρεὰς διδομένας, CAR3: 14, PG 26: 349C10.

(16) Εἰ ὥπερ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ γινόμεθα ἐν, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἐστὶ, καὶ οὕτως ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτός; πῶς ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν αὐτὸν, "Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἐσμεν", καί, "Ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἐμοί", ἴδιον καὶ ὅμοιον τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας αὐτὸν φάσκετε; Ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἢ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἰδίους εἶναι τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἢ κάκεῖνον ἀλλότριον εἶναι, ὥπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν ἀλλότριοι, CAR3: 17, PG 26: 357C⁴360A5.

(17) τὰ γὰρ κατὰ χάριν διδόμενα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ταῦτα θέλουσιν ἴσα τῆς τοῦ διδόντος εἶναι θεότητος. Ἀκούοντες γοῦν υἱοὺς χρηματίζοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐνόμισαν καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἴσους εἶναι τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ φύσει Υἱοῦ, CAR3: 17, PG 26: 360A10-15.

(18) Cf. his statement, φέρε συντόμως, ὡς παρὰ τῶν Πατέρων μεμαθήκαμεν, ἐκ τοῦ ῥητοῦ τὴν ἑτεροδοξίαν ἐκείνων ἐλέγξωμεν, CAR3: 18, PG 26: 360C7-9.

(19) Cf. CAR3: 18, PG 26: 361A3-4.

(20) Cf. E. T. POLLARD, *Johannine Christology*, pp. 184-245 and T. F. TORRANCE's essay on "The Hermeneutics of Athanasius", in Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος, 52 (1970) 446-468, 89-106, 237-249; 53 (1971) 133-149.

(21) Ὡς γὰρ ἑνὸς ὄντος Υἱοῦ φύσει, καὶ ἀληθινοῦ, καὶ μονογενοῦς, γινόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς υἱοί, οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνος φύσει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χ ἄ ρ ι ν τοῦ καλέσαντος· καὶ ἄνθρωποι τυγχάνοντες ἀπὸ γῆς, θεοὶ χρηματίζομεν, οὐχ ὡς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, ἢ ὁ τούτου Λόγος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἠθέλησεν ὁ τοῦτο χ α ρ ι σ ἄ μ ε - ν ο ς Θεός. οὕτω καὶ ὡς ὁ Θεὸς οἰκτίρμονες γινόμεθα, οὐκ ἐξισούμενοι τῷ Θεῷ, οὐδὲ φύσει καὶ ἀληθινοὶ εὐεργέται γινόμενοι. οὐ γὰρ ἡμῶν εὖρεμα τὸ εὐεργετεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἵνα δὲ τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ χ ἄ ρ ι ν εἰς ἡμᾶς γενόμενα, ταῦτα καὶ ἡμεῖς μεταδιδώμεν εἰς ἑτέρους, μὴ διακρινόμενοι, ἀπλῶς δὲ εἰς πάντας ἐκτείνοντες τὴν εὐποιίαν. κατὰ τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον δυνάμεθά πως αὐτοῦ μιμηταὶ γενέσθαι, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλως, ὅτι τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ διακονοῦμεν ἀλλήλοις, CAR3: 19, PG 26: 361C10-364A12.

(22) Cf. DRAGAS, *Athanasiana* p. 148f.

(23) Οἶδαμεν ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦκει, καὶ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν, ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεόν· καὶ ἐσμέν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος· ἡμεῖς δὲ θέσει καὶ χ ἄ ρ ι τ ι υἱοποιούμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ, μετέχοντες τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ. "Ὅσοι γάρ, φησὶν, ἔλαβον αὐτὸν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ". Διὸ καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ἔστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια, λέγων, "Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια· ὅτε καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ αὐτοῦ προσομιλῶν ἔλεγεν" "Ἀγιάσον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου. ὁ Λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν. ἡμεῖς δὲ κατὰ μίμησιν γινόμεθα ἐνάρετοι καὶ υἱοί, CAR3: 19, PG 26: 364B4-C1.

(24) Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκωμεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν." Οὐκοῦν διὰ τὴν δεδομένην ἡμῖν τοῦ Πνεύματος χ ἄ ρ ι ν ἡμεῖς τε ἐν αὐτῷ γινόμεθα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν διὰ τούτου γινομένου ἐν ἡμῖν εἰκότως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔχοντες τὸ Πνεῦμα, νομιζόμεθα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ γενέσθαι. καὶ οὕτως ἐστὶν ὁ

θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν. Οὐκ ἄρα ὡς ἔστιν ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς γινόμεθα ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ; οὐ γὰρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς μετέχων ἐστὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἵνα διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ γένηται; οὐδὲ λαμβάνων ἐστὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς τοῖς πᾶσι τοῦτο χορηγεῖ; καὶ οὐ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸν Λόγον συνάπτει τῷ Πατρὶ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τὸ Πνεῦμα παρὰ τοῦ Λόγου λαμβάνει. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Υἱὸς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ ἐστίν, ὡς Λόγος ἴδιος καὶ ἀπαύγασμα αὐτοῦ. ἡμεῖς δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ Πνεύματος ξένοι καὶ μακράν ἐσμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τῇ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος μετοχῇ συναπτόμεθα τῇ θεότητι. ὥστε τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ μὴ ἡμέτερον εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ὄντος καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν μένοντος, ἕως αὐτὸ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ φυλάττομεν ἐν ἡμῖν, λέγοντος πάλιν τοῦ Ἰωάννου. "Ὅς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Θεῷ." Ποία τοίνυν ὁμοιότης καὶ ποία ἰσότης ἡμῶν πρὸς τὸν Υἱόν; CAR3: 24, PG 26: 373A14-B7; B14-C10.

(25) *Ibid.*

(26) Οὐκοῦν ὁ Σωτὴρ λέγων περὶ ἡμῶν τὸ, Καθὼς σὺ, Πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἔν ᾧσιν· οὐ τὴν ταυτότητα ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ μέλλοντας ἔχειν σημαίνει, ἐδείχθη γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάνν παραδείγματος καὶ τοῦτο· ἀλλὰ ἀξίωσίς ἐστι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔγραψεν, ἵνα τὸ Πνεῦμα χ α ρ ῖ σ η τ α ι δι' αὐτοῦ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, δι' οὐ καὶ δοκοῦμεν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ γίνεσθαι, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο συνάπτεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶν ^{ἐν} τῷ Πατρὶ, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Λόγου δίδοται, θέλει λαβεῖν ἡμᾶς τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἵνα, ὅταν ἐκεῖνο λάβωμεν, τότε ἔχοντες τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ ὄντος ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, δόξωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἔν γίνεσθαι ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ. Τὸ δέ, ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἐὰν λέγῃ, οὐδὲν ἕτερον πάλιν ἐστίν, ἢ ἵνα ἡ γινομένη τοιαύτη τοῦ Πνεύματος χ α ρ ι ς εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀδιάπτωτος καὶ ἀμεταμέλητος γένηται. Τὸ γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν, ὡς προεῖπον, ὑπάρχον τῷ Λόγῳ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἀμεταμελήτως διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος δοθῆναι βούλεται· ὅπερ ὁ Ἀπόστολος γινώσκων ἔλεγε· Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χ α ρ ῖ σ μ α τ α τοῦ Θεοῦ

καὶ ἡ χάρις τῆς κλήσεως. Τὸ ἄρα Πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ τυγχάνον, καὶ οὐχ ἡμεῖς καθ' ἑαυτούς· καὶ ὥσπερ υἱοὶ καὶ θεοὶ διὰ τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν Λόγον, οὕτως ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ ἐσόμεθα, καὶ νομισθησόμεθα ἐν Υἱῷ καὶ ἐν Πατρὶ ἐν γεγενῆσθαι διὰ τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν ^{εἶναι} Πνεῦμα, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ τῷ ὄντι ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ. "Ὅτε γοῦν ἐκπίπτει τις ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος διὰ τινὰ κακίαν, ἡ μὲν χάρις ἀμεταμέλητος διαμένει τοῖς βουλομένοις, κἂν τις ἐκπεσὼν μετανοῇ· οὐκέτι δὲ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος ὁ πεσὼν, διὰ τὸ ἀποστῆναι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἅγιον καὶ παράκλητον Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκείνῳ ἔσται ὃ ἐαυτὸν ὑπέταξεν ὁ ἁμαρτάνων, CAR3: 25, PG 26: 376A5-C12.

(27) Cf. CAR1:37.

(28) It was M. RICHARD who first identified these theses in his essay: "Saint Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens", *Mélanges de Science religieuse*, 4 (1947) 5-54.

(29) For a full discussion of these theses in the context of reassessment of RICHARD's views on them cf. DRAGAS, *Contra Apollinarem* pp. 297ff and also pp. 493f and 499ff.

(30) CAR 3:29.

(31) "Ὅθεν τῆς σαρκὸς πασχούσης, οὐκ ἦν ἐκτὸς ταύτης ὁ Λόγος. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται καὶ τὸ πάθος. καὶ θεϊκῶς δὲ ποιούντος αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Πατρός, οὐκ ἦν ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ σὰρξ. ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι ταῦτα πάλιν ὁ Κύριος ἐποίει. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος ἔλεγεν. Εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι. εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύετε, ἵνα γινώσκητε, ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ, CAR3: 32, PG 26: 389C6-392A5.

(32) Ἀμέλει ὅτε χρεῖα γέγονε τὴν πενθερὰν τοῦ Πέτρου πυρέσσουσιν ἐγεῖραι, ἀνθρωπίνως μὲν ἐξέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα, θεϊκῶς δὲ ἦν παύων τὴν νόσον. Καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλοῦ

άνθρωπινον ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκός, ἠφίει τὸ πτύσμα, θεϊκῶς δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἥνοιγε διὰ τοῦ πηλοῦ. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Λαζάρου φωνὴν μέν, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀνθρωπίνην ἠφίει. θεϊκῶς δὲ ὡς Θεός, τὸν Λάζαρον ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, *ibid.*

(33) Ταῦτα δὲ οὕτως ἐγίνετο, καὶ ἐδείκνυτο, ὅτι μὴ φαντασίᾳ ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς ἦν ἔχων σῶμα. ἔπρεπε δὲ τὸν Κύριον, ἐνδιδυσκόμενον ἀνθρωπίνην σάρκα, ταύτην μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων παθῶν αὐτῆς ὅλην ἐνδύσασθαι, ἵνα, ὡπερ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ λέγομεν εἶναι τὸ σῶμα, οὕτω καὶ τὰ τοῦ σώματος πάθη ἴδια μόνον αὐτοῦ λέγεται, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἥπτετο κατὰ τὴν θεότητα αὐτοῦ. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐτέρου ἦν τὸ σῶμα, ἐκείνου ἂν λέγοιτο καὶ τὰ πάθη. εἰ δὲ τοῦ Λόγου ἡ σὰρξ (ὁ γὰρ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο), ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς πάθη λέγεσθαι αὐτοῦ, οὐ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ἐστίν. Οὐ δὲ λέγεται τὰ πάθη, οἷά ἐστι μάλιστα τὸ κατακριθῆναι, τὸ μαστιγωθῆναι, τὸ διψᾶν, καὶ ὁ σταυρός, καὶ ὁ θάνατος, καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τοῦ σώματος ἀσθένειαι· τούτου καὶ τὸ κατόρθωμα καὶ ἡ χάρις ἐστί. Διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν ἀκολούθως καὶ πρεπόντως οὐκ ἄλλου, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Κυρίου λέγεται τὰ τοιαῦτα πάθη. ἵνα καὶ ἡ χάρις παρ' αὐτοῦ ᾗ καὶ μὴ ἄλλου λάτραι γινώμεθα, ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς θεοσεβεῖς, ὅτι μηδένα τῶν γεννητῶν, μηδὲ κοινόν τινα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ φύσει καὶ ἀληθινὸν Υἱὸν τοῦτον καὶ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον, οὐδὲν ἥττον Κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Θεὸν καὶ Σωτῆρα ἐπικαλούμεθα, CAR3: 32, PG 26: 392A13-392C5.

(34) Τοῦτο δὲ τίς οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσειεν; ἢ τίς οὐκ ἂν σύνθοιτο θεῖον ἀληθῶς εἶναι τὸ πρᾶγμα; Εἰ γὰρ τὰ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ Λόγου ἔργα μὴ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἐγίνετο, οὐκ ἂν ἐθεοποιήθη ἄνθρωπος· καὶ πάλιν, εἰ τὰ ἴδια τῆς σαρκὸς οὐκ ἐλέγετο τοῦ Λόγου, οὐκ ἂν ἠλευθερώθη παντελῶς ἀπὸ τούτων ὁ ἄνθρωπος... καὶ ὁμως, Ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωσέως, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας, ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ καὶ οὕτως ἔμμενον οὐδὲν ἥττον οἱ ἄνθρωποι θνητοὶ καὶ φθαρτοί, δεκτικοὶ τῶν ἰδίων τῆς φύσεως παθῶν. Νῦν δὲ τοῦ Λόγου γενομένου ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἰδιοποιουμένου τὰ τῆς σαρκός, οὐκέτι ταῦτα τοῦ σώματος ἄπτεται διὰ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ γενόμενον Λόγον· ἀλλ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μὲν ἀνήλwται, λοιπὸν δὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὐκέτι κατὰ τὰ ἴδια πάθη

μένουσιν ἀμαρτωλοὶ καὶ νεκροὶ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Λόγου δύναμιν ἀναστάντες, ἀθάνατοι καὶ ἄφθαρτοι αἰεὶ διαμένουσιν. Ὅθεν καὶ γεννωμένης τῆς σαρκὸς ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου Μαρίας, αὐτὸς λέγεται γεγεννηθῆσαι, ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις γένεσιν εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρέχων· ἵνα τὴν ἡμῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν μεταθῇ γένεσιν, καὶ μηκέτι ὡς γῆ μόνη ὄντες εἰς γῆν ἀπέλθωμεν, ἀλλ' ὡς τῷ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ Λόγῳ συναφθέντες, εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναχθῶμεν παρ' αὐτοῦ. Οὐκοῦν οὕτω καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάθη τοῦ σώματος οὐκ ἀπεικότως εἰς ἑαυτὸν μετέθηκεν. ἵνα μηκέτι ὡς ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ὡς ἴδιοι τοῦ Λόγου, τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς μετάσχωμεν. Οὐκέτι γὰρ κατὰ τὴν προτέραν γένεσιν ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἀποθνήσκομεν. ἀλλὰ λοιπὸν τῆς γενέσεως ἡμῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς σαρκικῆς ἀσθενείας μετατεθέντων εἰς τὸν Λόγον, ἐγειρόμεθα ἀπὸ γῆς, λυθείσης τῆς δι' ἁμαρτίαν κατάρας διὰ τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γενόμενον κατάραν· καὶ εἰκότως γε. Ὡςπερ γὰρ ἐκ γῆς ὄντες πάντες ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἀποθνήσκομεν, οὕτως ἄνωθεν ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος ἀναγεννηθέντες, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιούμεθα; οὐκέτι ὡς γηϊνης, ἀλλὰ λοιπὸν λογωθείσης τῆς σαρκὸς διὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, ὅς δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγένετο σὰρξ, CAR3: 33, PG 26: 393A1-6, 393A14-396A8.

(35) Incorruptibility (ἀφθαρσία) and immortality (ἀθανασία) are closely correlated by Athanasius, so that they seem almost synonymous with each other and with the notion of deification. Cf. NORMAN, *Deification* pp. 149-152, quoting ROLDANUS, *Le Christ et L'Homme* p. 194f and KOLP, *Participation*, p. 314.

(36) Cf. CAR2:61, where he says that, "his flesh was saved and liberated before all others, as being the Logos' body (τοῦ Λόγου σῶμα γινομένη). Henceforth we, becoming incorporate with it (ὡς σύσσωμοι), are saved after its pattern (τυγχάνοντες, κατ' ἐκεῖνο σωζόμεθα).

(37) Λοιπὸν λογωθείσης τῆς σαρκὸς διὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, ὅς δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγένετο σὰρξ, CAR3: 33, PG 26: 396A6-8.

(38) 1 Jn 3:5.

(39) Μὴ τοίνυν ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων τις σκανδαλιζέσθω, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον γινωσκέτω, ὡς τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ ὁ Λόγος ἀπαθὴς ἐστὶ, καὶ ὅμως δι' ἣν ἐνεδύσατο σάρκα, λέγεται περὶ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα, ἐπειδὴ τῆς μὲν σαρκὸς ἴδια ταῦτα, τοῦ δὲ Σωτῆρος ἰδιον αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα. Καὶ αὐτοῦ μὲν ἀπαθὴς τὴν φύσιν, ὡς ἔστι, διαμένει, μὴ βλαπτόμενος ἀπὸ τούτων, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐξαφανίζων καὶ ἀπολλύων αὐτά. οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι, ὡς εἰς τὸν ἀπαθῆ μεταβάλλοντες αὐτῶν τῶν παθῶν καὶ ἀπηλειμμένων, ἀπαθεῖς καὶ ἐλεύθεροι τούτων λοιπὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας γίνονται, καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων Καὶ οἶδατε, ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ. καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστι..., CAR3: 34, PG 26: 396A9ff.

(40) Εἰμὶ μὲν ἐκ γῆς κατὰ φύσιν θνητὴ, ἀλλ' ὕστερον τοῦ Λόγου γέγονα σὰρξ, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐβάσταξέ μου τὰ πάθη, καίτοι ἀπαθὴς ὢν. ἐγὼ δὲ γέγονα τούτων ἐλευθέρα, οὐκ ἀφιεμένη δουλεύειν ἔτι τούτοις διὰ τὸν ἐλευθερώσαντά με Κύριον ἀπὸ τούτων. Εἰ γὰρ ἐγκαλεῖς, ὅτι τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἀπηλλάγην φθορᾶς, ὅρα μὴ ἐγκαλέσης, ὅτι ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος τὴν ἐμὴν τῆς δουλείας ἔλαβε μορφήν. Ὡς γὰρ ὁ Κύριος, ἐνδυσάμενος τὸ σῶμα, γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, οὕτως ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄνθρωποι παρὰ τοῦ Λόγου τε θεοποιούμεθα προσληθέντες διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ λοιπὸν ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομοῦμεν, *Ibid.*

(41) *Op. cit.*

(42) Cf. CAR3: 30 where Athanasius states that "flesh" stands for "man": τῆς Γραφῆς ἔθος ἐχούσης λέγειν σάρκα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὡς διὰ Ἰωὴλ τοῦ προφήτου φησί (3:1) ... καὶ ὡς Δανιὴλ εἶρηκε (Βήλ 5) ... σάρκα γὰρ καὶ οὗτος [Δανιήλ] καὶ Ἰωὴλ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος λέγουσι.

(43) Οὐκοῦν παντὶ τοῦτο δῆλόν ἐστιν, ὅτι τῆς μὲν σαρκὸς ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγνοεῖν, αὐτοῦ δὲ ὁ Λόγος, ἢ Λόγος ἐστί, τὰ πάντα καὶ πρὶν γενέσεως γινώσκει. Οὐδὲ γάρ, ἐπειδὴ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, πέπαιται τοῦ εἶναι Θεός. οὐδέ, ἐπειδὴ Θεός ἐστι, φεύγει τὸ ἀνθρώπινον. μὴ γένοιτο. ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον Θεὸς ὢν, προσελάμβανε τὴν σάρκα, καὶ ἐν

σαρκὶ ὧν ἐθεοποιεῖ τὴν σάρκα. Καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐπυνθάνετο, οὕτω καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν νεκρὸν ἡγείρε. καὶ πᾶσιν ἔδειξεν, ὅτι ὁ νεκροὺς ζωοποιῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνακαλούμενος, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὰ κρυπτὰ πάντων ἐπιγινώσκει, καὶ ἐγίνωσκε ποῦ κεῖται Λάζαρος. ἀλλ' ἐπυνθάνετο. ἐποίει γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πανάγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ὁ πάντα δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνας, ἵνα καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἄγνοιαν ἡμῶν βαστάξας, χαρίσεται γινώσκειν τὸν μόνον ἑαυτοῦ ἀληθινὸν Πατέρα καὶ ἑαυτὸν τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ πάντων ἀποσταλέντα, ἥς μείζων οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο χάρις, CAR3: 38, PG 26: 404C2-405C2.

(44) Cf. for example the beginning of CAR1:16, and similar statements in CAR1: 46, 47, 48, 50, CAR2: 18, 41, 59, CAR3:19, 24, 25, etc. For the evidence from the *Ad Serapionem* see below.

(45) CAR3: 42.

(46) CAR3: 43ff.

(47) Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται διὰ τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἀγνοοῦσαν εἰπεῖν, Οὐκ οἶδα, ἵνα δείξη, ὅτι, εἰδὼς ὡς Θεὸς ἀγνοεῖ ἐν σαρκικῶς, CAR3: 43, PG 26:416A2-5.

(48) CAR3: 45.

(49) CAR3: 46.

(50) *Ibid.*

(51) διὰ τὸ συμφέρον ἄρα τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἀγνοίας τοῦτο εἶρηκε. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο λέγων, βούλεται διὰ παντὸς ἡμᾶς ἐτοιμοὺς γίνεσθαι... Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος, τὸ ἡμῶν συμφέρον ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς γινώσκων, οὕτως ἠσφαλήσατο τοὺς μαθητάς, CAR3: 49f.

(52) Ὅταν τοίνυν καὶ περὶ ὧν προφασίζονται ῥητῶν λέγη ὁ Σωτὴρ, Ἐδόθη μοι ἐξουσία, καὶ Δόξασόν σου τὸν Υἱόν, λέγη τε ὁ Πέτρος,

Ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσίᾳ, τῇ αὐτῇ διανοίᾳ ταῦτα πάντα γινώσκωμεν, ὅτι ἀνθρωπίνως διὰ τὸ σῶμα ταῦτα πάντα λέγει. Οὐ γὰρ χρεῖαν ἔχων, ὅμως αὐτὸς ὡς εἰληφῶς λέγεται ἅπερ ἐλάμβανεν ἀνθρωπίνως. ἵνα πάλιν, ὡς τοῦ Κυρίου λαβόντος, καὶ ὡς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναπαυομένης τῆς δόσεως, βεβαία ἡ χάρις διαμείνη. Ἄνθρωπος μὲν γὰρ μόνος λαμβάνων θνατὸν ἔχει καὶ τὸ ἀφαιρεθῆναι. καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ἐδείχθη. λαβὼν γὰρ ἀπώλεσεν. Ἴνα δὲ ἀναφαίρετος ἡ χάρις γένηται, καὶ βεβαία φυλαχθῇ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἰδιοποιεῖται τὴν δόσιν, καὶ λέγει ἐξουσίαν εἰληφέναι, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἣν αἰεὶ ἔχει ὡς θεός. καὶ λέγει, Δόξασόν με, ὁ ἄλλους δοξάζων, ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι σὰρκα χρήζουσιν ἔχει τούτων. Διὸ κακείνης λαβούσης, ἐπειδὴ ἡ λαβοῦσα ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστὶ, καὶ προσλαβὼν αὐτὴν ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ὡς αὐτὸς εἰληφῶς λέγεται, CAR3: 38, PG 26: 404C1-405C2.

(53) οὕτως ἐὰν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα λέγεται περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ, πάλιν εἰς τὴν φύσιν τῶν λεγομένων ἐνορῶντες, καὶ ὡς ἀλλότρια ταῦτα θεοῦ τυγχάνει ὄντα, μὴ τῇ θεότητι τοῦ Λόγου ταῦτα λογιζώμεθα, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι αὐτοῦ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο,... ἀλλὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἴδια τὰ πάθη. καὶ εἰ ἡ σὰρξ θεοφορεῖται ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ δύναμις ἐστὶ τοῦ Λόγου, CAR3: 41, PG 26: 409C4-412A2.

(54) διὰ τί τὸν διδόντα ὡς λαμβάνοντα νομίζομεν ... καὶ τὸν μὲν Λόγον διαιροῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρός, ὡς ἀτελῆ καὶ χρεῖαν ἔχοντα, τὴν δὲ ἀνθρωπότητα τῆς χάριτος ἐρημοῦμεν; Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος, ἢ Λόγος ἐστὶ, δι' ἐαυτὸν ἐστὶ λαβὼν καὶ δοξασθεὶς ... ποία ἀνθρώποις ἐστὶν ἐλπίς; CAR3: 39. PG 26: 405C7-15.

(55) Εἰ δ' ἵνα λυτρώσῃται τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐπεδήμησεν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ἵνα αὐτοὺς ἀγιάσῃ καὶ θεοποιήσῃ, γέγονεν ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ (τούτου γὰρ χάριν καὶ γέγονε), τίνι λοιπὸν οὐκ ἐστὶ φανερόν, ὅτι ταῦθ' ἅπερ εἰληφέναι λέγει, ὅτε γέγονε σὰρξ, οὐ δι' ἐαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν σὰρκα λέγει; ἐν ἣ γὰρ ἦν λέγων, ταύτης ἦν καὶ τὰ διδόμενα χαρίσματα δι' αὐτοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρός. Τίνα δὲ ἦν ἃ ἠτεῖτο, ἴδωμεν, καὶ τίνα ἦν ὅλως, ἃ ἔλεγεν εἰληφέναι, ἵνα

κἄν οὕτως αἰσθέσθαι δυνηθῶσιν ἐκεῖνοι. Δόξαν τοίνυν ἡτεῖτο, καὶ ἔλεγε. Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐξουσίαν πᾶσάν φησιν εἰληφέναι. Ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὶν εἶπη, πάντα μοι παρεδόθη, πάντων ἦν Κύριος, πάντα γὰρ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. καὶ εἰς Κύριος ἦν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα. καὶ δόξαν μὲν αἰτῶν, Κύριος τῆς δόξης ἦν καὶ ἔστιν, ὡς Παῦλός φησιν. Εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν οὐκ ἂν τὸν Κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν. Εἶχε γὰρ ἦν ἡτεῖτο λέγων. Τῇ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί, CAR3: 39, PG 26: 403/1/-408B15

(56) Καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἦν ἔλεγε μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, εἰληφέναι ταύτην εἶχε καὶ πρὸ τοῦ λαβεῖν, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. Αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐπετίμα δι' ἑαυτοῦ τῷ Σατανᾷ λέγων. Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ. τοῖς δὲ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδου κατ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ὅτε καί, ὑποστρεψάντων αὐτῶν, ἔλεγεν. Ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν, πεσόντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλιν, ὅπερ ἔλεγεν εἰληφέναι, τοῦτο καὶ πρὸ τοῦ λαβεῖν ἔχων δείκνυται. τοὺς τε γὰρ δαίμονας ἀπήλυνε. καὶ ὅπερ ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς, ἔλυεν αὐτός, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀβραμιαίας θυγατρὸς ἐποίησε. καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἠφίει, λέγων τῷ παραλυτικῷ, καὶ τῇ τοὺς πόδας ἀλειψάσῃ γυναικί. Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. Καὶ νεκροὺς μὲν ἤγειρε, τοῦ δὲ τυφλοῦ τὴν γένεσιν ἀποκαθίστα, χαριζόμενος αὐτῷ τὸ βλέπειν. Καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίει, οὐ μέλλων, ἕως λάβῃ, ἀλλ' ἐξουσιαστῆς ὢν. Ὡς ἐκ τούτων δῆλον εἶναι, ὅτι ἃ εἶχε Λόγος ὢν, ταῦτα καὶ γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἀνθρωπίνως εἰληφέναι λέγει, ἵνα δι' αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς γῆς ὡς κοινωνοὶ γενόμεθα θείας φύσεως, λοιπὸν ἐξουσίαν ἔχωσι κατὰ δαιμόνων, ἐν δὲ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. ὡς ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς φθορᾶς, αἰωνίως βασιλεύσωσι. Καθόλου γὰρ τοῦτο χρὴ γινώσκειν, ὅτι οὐδὲν ὢν λέγει εἰληφέναι, ὡς μὴ ἔχων ἔλαβεν· εἶχε γὰρ αὐτὰ ἀεὶ θεὸς ὢν ὁ Λόγος. Λέγεται δὲ νῦν ἀνθρωπίνως, ὅτι ἔλαβεν, ἵνα, τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν αὐτῷ λαμβανούσης, λοιπὸν ἐξ ἐκείνης καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διαμείνῃ βεβαίως. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Πέτρου λεγόμενον. ὅτι λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων, τοιοῦτον ἔχει τὸν νοῦν. Ὡς ἐπυνθάνετο ἀνθρωπίνως, ἤγειρε δὲ θεϊκῶς τὸν Λάζαρον. οὕτω τὸ μὲν, ἔλαβεν,

ἀνθρωπίνως εἴρηται. ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὑποταγή τὴν θεότητα τοῦ Λόγου δείκνυσιν, CAR3: 40, PG 26: 408C1-409B8.

(57) LAMPE's Lexicon translates ἐξουσιαστής as 'one who wields supreme power and final authority'. Athanasius uses it twice more but without ὦν in CAR2:24 PG 26:197B1 and in ILL PG 25:217A14, for the Son; also MUELLER's Lexicon translates it dominator.

(58) Ποίαν εἶχε προκοπὴν ὁ ἴσα θεῷ ὑπάρχων; ἢ ποῦ εἶχεν αὐξάνειν ὁ Υἱὸς αἰὶ ὦν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ; ... Πάλιν τε εἰ Λόγος ὦν προκόπτει, τί μείζον ἔχει γενέσθαι Λόγου καὶ Σοφίας, καὶ Υἱοῦ, καὶ θεοῦ δυνάμενως; ταῦτα γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Λόγος, ὦν εἴ τις ὡς ἀκτῖνα μετασχεῖν πῶς δύναίτο, ὁ τοιοῦτος παντέλειος ἐν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ἴσος ἀγγέλοις γίνεται. Καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις, καὶ ἀρχάγγελοι, καὶ κυριότητες, καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις, καὶ θρόνοι. τοῦ Λόγου μετέχοντες, βλέπουσι διαπαντός τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. Πῶς οὖν ὁ ἄλλοις τὴν τελειότητα παρασχών, αὐτὸς μετ' ἐκείνους προκόπτει; " Ἄγγελοι γὰρ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην αὐτοῦ γένεσιν διηκόνησαν καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον παρὰ τοῦ Λουκᾶ μετὰ τὴν διακονίαν τῶν ἀγγέλων εἴρηται. Πῶς οὖν ὅλως κἂν εἰς ἐνθύμησιν ἐλθεῖν ἀνθρώπου δύναται; " Ἡ πῶς ἡ Σοφία ἐν σοφίᾳ προέκοπτεν; ἢ πῶς ἄλλος χάριν διδοὺς (καθὼς ὁ Παῦλος, διὰ πάσης ἐπιστολῆς δι' αὐτοῦ δίδοσθαι τὴν χάριν γινώσκων, φησὶν, ' Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν", αὐτὸς ἐν χάριτι προέκοπτεν; CAR3: 51, PG 26: 429C2-3; C10-432A15.

(59) Cf. also GENT2 where Adam is said to advance in grace, before his fall, as we pointed out in an earlier chapter.

(60) Τοῦ σώματος ἄρα ἐστὶν ἡ προκοπή αὐτοῦ γὰρ προκόπτοντος, προέκοπτεν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἡ φανέρωσις τῆς θεότητος τοῖς ὁρώσιν ὁρῶ δὲ ἡ θεότης ἀπεκαλύπτετο, τοσοῦτῳ πλεῖον ἡ χάρις ἠύξανεν ὡς ἀνθρώπου παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. Παιδίον μὲν γὰρ ἐβαστάζετο, παῖς δὲ γενόμενος, ἀπέμενεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τοὺς ἱερέας ἀνέκρινε περὶ τοῦ νόμου κατ' ὀλίγον δὲ τοῦ σώματος αὐξάνοντος, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου φανεροῦντος ἑαυτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὁμολογεῖται λοιπὸν

παρὰ μὲν Πέτρου πρῶτον, εἶτα καὶ παρὰ πάντων, ὅτι ἀληθῶς Υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐστὶν οὗτος, CAR3: 52, PG 26: 433A6-B1.

(61) Τίς δέ ἐστιν ἡ λεγομένη προκοπὴ ἢ καθὰ προεῖπον, ἡ παρὰ τῆς Σοφίας μεταδιδομένη τοῖς ἀνθρώποις θεοποίησις καὶ χάρις, ἐξαφανιζονένης ἐν αὐτοῖς τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς φθορᾶς κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα καὶ συγγένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ Λόγου; Οὕτω γὰρ αὐξάνοντος ἐν ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ σώματος συνεπεδίδото ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἡ τῆς θεότητος φανέρωσις, καὶ ἐδείκνυτο παρὰ πᾶσιν, ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστι, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ σώματι, CAR3: 53, PG 26: 433B9-C4.

FOOTNOTES TO PART III: GRACE IN ATHANASIUS' *SER1-4*

(1) cf. the introduction of this thesis, Ch.3.

(2) SER1:21, 32; PG 26: 580C12, 605B3

(3) SER1 is broadly divided into seven main sections: SER1:1-2 (Introduction to the new heresy of Tropicism or Pneumatomachianism), SER1:3-10 (Refutation of the Tropicist exegesis of Amos 4:13), SER1:11 - 14 (Refutation of the Tropicist exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:21), SER1:15-21 (Refutation of the Tropicist argument that the Spirit, if not a Creature, must be a Son), SER1:22-27 (Proof from Scripture that the Spirit pertains to the Son, and has no likeness to the creatures), SER1:28-31 (Appeal to the tradition and life of the Church), SER1:32-33 (Conclusion). cf. Shapland, *The Holy Spirit*, pp. 50 - 52.

(4) SER1:1 PG 26: 532A1-4.

(5) It is interesting to notice that Athanasius does not seem to abide by his own rule in SER1:33, where he takes ἐν πνεύματι in Jn. 4:24 of the Holy Spirit, and in SER1:8, where he proposes a different interpretation for τὸ πνεῦμα in 2 Cor. 3:17. Cf. Shapland, *The Holy Spirit*, pp. 69f. But it is likely that Athanasius' rule is not meant to be taken in an absolute sense, but as indicative of the "habit" (ἔθος) of Scripture, as he likes to call it.

(6) Τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε", εἰδόσι καὶ αὐτοῖς ὅπερ ἔλαβον ἔλεγεν, ἵνα μὴ σβέσωσιν ἐξ ἀμελείας τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀναφθεῖσαν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν SER1:4, PG 26: 537B6-9.

(7) Paul uses παλιγγενεσία once only in his epistles in the sense of baptismal renewal. Even more than ἀνακαίνωσις, the word παλιγγενεσία suggests that the restoration of man is preceded by a radical reconstruction of the old man. Baptismal reconstruction and renewal are closely linked with the Holy Spirit in the words of St Paul, as is shown in the rest of Tit.3:5: "διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ

ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου". Attempts have been made to distinguish in this passage between baptism, referred to as λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, and the post-baptismal gift of the Spirit: Cf. SEEBERG, *Der Katechismus*, p. 219 and COPPENS, *L'imposition des mains*, p. 260. The gift of the Spirit would not then be related with baptism. This explanation, however, must be rejected since the words of Paul do not justify it, especially the genitives παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως which are a hendiadys, and ἀνακαινώσεως which as a term for renewal, indicates elsewhere an effect of baptism. Cf. YESBAERT, *Greek Baptismal Terminology*, pp. 130-135.

(8) cf. 1 Thess. 5:22.

(9) Gen. 1:2, 6:3, Num. 11:29, Judg. 3:10, 11:29, 13:24, 13:25, 15:14 Ps. 50:13, 142 :10f, Is. 61:1, 30:1, 48:16, 59:21, 63:9-10, Ez. 11:24, Dan. (Soz. 45-46), Mich. 2:7.

(10) Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος ἡνίκα, καθὰ προεῖπον, ἀνθρωπίνως ἐβαπτίζετο, δι' ἣν ἐφόρει σάρκα, λέγεται καταβεβηκέναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. τοῦτο διδοὺς μὲν τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἔλεγε. Λάβετε Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐδίδασκε δὲ αὐτούς. Ὁ Παράκλητος τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ Πατήρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα. Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν. Ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ Παράκλητος, ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ. καὶ πάλιν. Οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν. καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα. Εἰ δὲ ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ τὴν μὲν πᾶσαν θεολογίαν καὶ τὴν ἡμῶν τελείωσιν, ἐν ἣ συνῆπτεν ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ τῷ Πατρί, ἐν τούτῳ συμπληρῶν, παρήγγειλε τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. ἐπαγγειλάμενος δὲ αὐτοῖς αὐτὸ πέμψειν, παρήγγειλεν ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι. καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀλίγας, Ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἦσαν πάντες ὁμοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. καὶ

ἐγένετο ἄφνω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦχος, ὥπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας, καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οἶκον, οὐ ἦσαν καθήμενοι. καὶ ὤφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμενοι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός, καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐφ' ἓνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις, καθὼς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς. Ἐνθεν οὖν καὶ μὲν διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐδίδото τοῖς ἀναγεννωμένοις τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. SER1: 6, PG 26: 541B13-544B8.

(11) It seems, that this baptismal initiation and incorporation into the divine life is the basis of the idea of Athanasius that grace was received from without in the Old Testament (cf. CAR2:68) in contrast to the New Testament. It is noteworthy that the baptismal initiation (ἡ τελείωσις) or (ἡ τελείωσις τοῦ βαπτίσματος) as Athanasius says explicitly elsewhere, (cf. CAR2:41).

(12) Cf. SHAPLAND, *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p 139 n1.

(13) Cf. Acts 8:17 as quoted by Athanasius (Καὶ διὰ μὲν τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐδίδото τοῖς ἀναγεννωμένοις τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), SER1: 6, PG 26: 544B6-8.

(14) 1 PET:1:9-11.

(15) Πέτρος ἔγραψε. "Κομιζόμενοι τό τέλος τῆς πίστεως, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν. περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηρεύνησαν προφῆται, οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες, ἐρευνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον ἐδηλοῦτο ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα, καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας." SER1: 6, PG 26: 544B14-C5.

(16) The verses 1 Cor 2:10-11 are mentioned a second time in SER3:1.

(17) Τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα πάντα ἐρευνᾷ, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ. Τίς γὰρ οἶδε τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; Οὕτω καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν, εἰ μὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπο τοῦ Θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν, SER1: 6 PG 26: 545A5-12.

(18) Heb. 10:29.

(19) Πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς Διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας;" SER1: 6 PG 26: 548A9-13.

(20) This unique description is not found elsewhere in the N.T.

(21) It is noteworthy that the divinity of the Holy Spirit occupies the same place and importance as the divinity of the Son in Athanasius' theology in GENT, INC and CAR1-3. His argument about the Holy Spirit in SER1:6 runs parallel to his anti-Arian arguments about the Son. For Athanasius describes the Holy Spirit in SER1-4 as the one who, a) perfects creation in the knowledge of God, b) works in Baptism, unction or initiation to bring us to God, and c) joins us to himself and through himself to the Son and the Father, as the Son says explicitly (cf. SER1:11, PG 26: 560B4-5). These three points seem to be basic in the theology of the Holy Spirit and of grace in Athanasius' letters on the Holy Spirit. It seems that the word 'grace' in SER1:6 and other texts stands for the Holy Spirit himself who is God's gift to us..

(22) Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ διὰ Ἰεζεκιήλ ἐπεγγείλατο ὁ θεὸς λέγων. "Καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν καρδίαν καινὴν καὶ πνεῦμα καινὸν δώσω ὑμῖν. καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν καρδίαν τὴν λιθίνην ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν. καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν καρδίαν σαρκίνην. καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν." Πότε δὴ τοῦτο πεπλήρωται, εἰ μὴ ὅτε παραγενόμενος ὁ Κύριος ἀνεκαίνισε τὰ πάντα τῇ χάριτι; SER1: 9, PG 26: 552C12-553A5.

(23) ἐν ᾧ [Πνεῦμα] τὰ πάντα ὁ Πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ Λόγου τελειοῖ καὶ ἀνακαινίζει. SER1: 9, PG 26: 553B5,6.

(24) Πρότερον μὲν γὰρ σκιὰν εἶχεν ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν. ὅτε δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπηγγέλη τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ παρεγένετο λέγων. 'Αὐτὸς ὁ λαλῶν πάρ εἰμι. τότε, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος, 'ἡ τούτου φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλειψεν, ἐπαγγειλαμένου πρότερον. Ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν. Τὸ δὲ ἔτι ἅπαξ δηλοῖ τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετάθεσιν, ἵνα μείνῃ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα. Διὸ Βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες, ἔχομεν χάριν δι' ἧς λατρεύομεν εὐαρέστως τῷ Θεῷ." Ἦν δὲ λέγει βασιλείαν οὗτος ἀσάλευτον, ταύτην στερεωθεῖσαν ψάλλει Δαβίδ. 'Ο Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν, εὐπρέπειαν ἐνεδύσατο. ἐνεδύσατο Κύριος δύναμιν καὶ περιεζώσατο. Καὶ γὰρ ἐστερέωσε τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἥτις οὐ σαλευθήσεται. Τὸ ἄρα παρὰ τῷ προφήτῃ ῥητὸν τὴν ἐπιδημίαν τοῦ Σωτῆρος σημαίνει. ἐν ἣ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνεκαινίσθημεν, καὶ ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος ἀσάλευτος διαμένει, SER1: 10, PG 26: 556A8-B10.

(25) SER1: 11, PG 26: 557C8-11.

(26) Ex.33:17-18.

(27) Λέγοντος αὐτῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 'Πορεύου, ἀνάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν σὺ καὶ ὁ λαός σου, οὓς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ὤμοσα τῷ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τῷ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ τῷ Ἰακώβ λέγων. Τῷ σπέρματι ὑμῶν δώσω αὐτήν. καὶ συναποστελῶ πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐκβαλεῖ τὸν Χαναναῖον. 'παραιτεῖται λέγων. 'Εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς συμπορεύῃ μεθ' ἡμῶν, μή με ἀναγάγῃς ἐντεῦθεν. Οὐκ ἐβούλετο γὰρ κτίσμα προηγεῖσθαι τοῦ λαοῦ ... Ἀμέλει, τὸν ἄγγελον παραιτησάμενος, παρεκάλει αὐτὸν τὸν Θεὸν καθηγεῖσθαι αὐτῶν. Τοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ ἐπαγγειλαμένου καὶ εἰπόντος πρὸς αὐτόν. 'Καὶ τοῦτόν σου τὸν λόγον, ὃν εἶρηκας, ποιήσω. εὗρηκας γὰρ χάριν ἐνώπιόν μου, καὶ οἶδά σε παρὰ πάντας.'... Κατέβη Πνεῦμα παρὰ Κυρίου καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτούς. Οὕτως ἤγαγες τὸν λαόν σου ποιήσας σεαυτῷ ὄνομα δόξης. 'τίς ἐκ τούτων οὐ συνορᾷ τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Τοῦ γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐπαγγειλαμένου καθηγεῖσθαι, ἰδοὺ οὐκ ἔτι ἄγγελον ἐπαγγέλλεται πέμπειν, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, καὶ αὐτὸ καθηγούμενόν ἐστι τοῦ λαοῦ. Καὶ δείκνυται,

ὅτι οὐ τῶν κτισμάτων, οὐδὲ ἄγγελός ἐστι τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ ἄνω τῆς κτίσεώς ἐστιν, ἡνωμένον τῇ θεότητι τοῦ Πατρός. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐν Πνεύματι καθηγεῖτο τοῦ λαοῦ, SER1: 12 PG 26: 560B12-561A13.

(28) This text seems to be significant in understanding this right faith in the divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is followed closely, both in substance and form, by Didymus, *de Trin.* II.629. Nowhere is his dependence upon Athanasius more closely to be seen, cf. SHAPLAND *Concerning the Holy Spirit* pp89-90, n.1.

(29) Ἄλλ' οὐχ ἡ ἀποστολικὴ πίστις ἐστὶ τοιαύτη, οὐδ' ὅλως Χριστιανὸς ἀνάσχοιτο ἄν τούτων. Ἡ γὰρ ἁγία καὶ μακαρία Τριάς, ἀδιαίρετος καὶ ἡνωμένη πρὸς ἑαυτήν ἐστι. καὶ λεγομένου τοῦ Πατρὸς, πρόσεστι καὶ ὁ τούτου Λόγος καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ Πνεῦμα. Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ὀνομάζεται, ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκτὸς τοῦ Λόγου. Μία γάρ ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς χάρις δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ πληρουμένη. καὶ μία θεότης ἐστὶ, καὶ εἷς Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, εἰρηκῶς, 'Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.' ἐγίνωσκεν, ὅτι οὐ διηρεῖτο τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' ἐν Χριστῷ ἦν καὶ αὐτό, ὥπερ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐν τῷ Πατρί. τοὺς δὲ ἐκλεκτοὺς ἀγγέλους συνεπήγαγεν εἰκότως, ἵνα, ἐπειδὴ διαμαρτυρία ἦν τῷ μαθητῇ λεγομένη. γινώσκων, ὡς τὰ μὲν λεγόμενα παρὰ Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι λελάληται, οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι διακονοῦσι τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν, ἐπισκοποῦντες τὰς ἐκάστου πράξεις, φυλάξῃ τὰς τοῦ διδασκάλου παραινέσεις, ὡς ἔχων τοὺς ἐφορῶντας τῶν λεγομένων μάρτυρας, SER1: 14, PG 26: 565A13-C3.

(30) cf. TORRANCE, *The Trinitarian Faith*, p. 303.

(31) The actual term "coinherence" was not used by Athanasius, but it is certain that it was he who developed the conception of coinhering relations in God without using the latter technical term. cf. Hilary *De Trin* 3:1 as quoted by TORRANCE, *The Trinitarian Faith*, p. 305.

(32) Cf. Chrysostom, on the same passage, as he takes the point from Basil (de Sp.S,29), as quoted by SHAPLAND *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 94 n10.

(33) cf. HERMAS, *Mand.* 6:2; JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apol.* Sec. 5; ATHENAGORAS *Leg.*24; Origen received it, *de Prin.* 1:8.1, *c.Cels.* 5:4, etc., and thence it passed into the main stream of Eastern theology; as quoted by SHAPLAND, *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 94 n11.

(34) cf. INC 4-10 and 54; SHAPLAND, *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 122, n.9. and p. 82.

(35) Πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης καὶ ἀνακαινώσεώς ἐστὶ τε καὶ λέγεται τὸ Πνεῦμα. γράφει γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος 'Τοῦ ὀρισθέντος Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ Πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.' Καὶ πάλιν φησὶν, 'Ἄλλ' ἡγιάσθητε, ἄλλ' ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. ὅτε καὶ πρὸς Τίτον γράφων ἔλεγεν. "Ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρησιμότης καὶ ἡ φιλάνθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὧν ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὐ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, ἵνα, δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι κληρόνομοι κατ' ἐλπίδα γεννηθῶμεν ζωῆς αἰωνίου'. Τὰ δὲ κτίσματα ἁγιαζόμενά εἰσι καὶ ἀνακαινιζόμενα. 'Εξαποστελεῖς' γὰρ 'τὸ Πνεῦμά σου, καὶ κτισθήσονται, καὶ ἀνακαινιεῖς τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς', SER1: 22 PG26: 581C3-584A11.

(36) Cf. BARCLAY, *N.T.* Vol 2, p. 169.

(37) Καὶ αὕτη τῆς Τριάδος ἡ ἀδιαίρετος ἐνότης, καὶ μία ἡ εἰς ταύτην πίστις ἐστίν... Τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, οὐ διαιρεῖ τὴν Τριάδα, ὥσπερ ὑμεῖς ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐνότητα ταύτης διδάσκων ἔγραψε Κορινθίοις περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν, καὶ τὰ πάντα εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν τὸν Πατέρα ἀνακεφαλαιοῖ λέγων. 'Διαιρέσεις δὲ

χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα. καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Κύριος. καὶ διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. Ἄ γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκάστῳ διαιρεῖ, ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Λόγου χορηγεῖται. Πάντῃ γὰρ τὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστὶ. διὸ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι διδόμενα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐστὶ χαρίσματα. Καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος δὲ ὄντος ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ὁ τοῦτο διδούς ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ. καὶ οὕτως ἐστὶ τό, Ἐλευσόμεθα ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν, καθάπερ εἴρηται. Ἐνθα γὰρ τὸ φῶς, ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα. καὶ ἔνθα τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ τούτου ἐνέργεια καὶ αὐγοειδὴς χάρις. Καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν διδάσκων ὁ Παῦλος ἔγραφεν αὐθις Κορινθίοις καὶ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ Ἐπιστολῇ λέγων. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.' Ἡ γὰρ διδομένη χάρις καὶ δωρεὰ ἐν Τριάδι δίδοται παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. ... Τούτου γὰρ μετέχοντες, ἔχομεν τοῦ Πατρὸς τὴν ἀγάπην, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὴν χάριν, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πνεύματος τὴν κοινωνίαν. Μία ἄρα καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἡ τῆς Τριάδος ἐνέργεια δείκνυται. Οὐ γὰρ ὥς παρ' ἐκάστου διάφορα καὶ διηρημένα τὰ διδόμενα σημαίνει ὁ Ἀπόστολος. ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ διδόμενα ἐν Τριάδι δίδοται, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐξ ἐνὸς Θεοῦ ἐστὶ, SER1: 30 PG 26: 600A3-601A2.

(38) Ἡ γὰρ διδομένη χάρις ... δίδοται παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, SER1: 30, PG 26: 600 C6-7.

(39) SER1: 30, PG 26: 600 C12.

(40) cf. SER1: 22.

(41) τὸ χρίσμα τοῦτο πνοή ἐστὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, SER3: 3, PG 26: 628C12.

(42) Ἡ σφραγὶς δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκτυποῖ, SER3: 3, PG 26: 629A1. The term 'ἐκτυποῖ' is not a biblical word and seems to be used here to convey the same meaning as the biblical expression 'form of Christ', τὴν

τοῦ χριστοῦ μορφήν, SER3: 3, PG 26: 629A2, which is taken from Gal. 4:19.

(43) cf. also SER4: 3.

(44) Οὐ γὰρ ἐκτός ἐστι τοῦ Λόγου τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ὄν, ἐν τῷ Θεῷ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. ὥστε τὰ χαρίσματα ἐν τῇ Τριάδι δίδοσθαι. Ἐν γὰρ τῇ τούτων διαιρέσει, ὡς Κορινθίοις γράφει, τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Θεός ἐστίν ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι ἐνεργεῖ καὶ δίδωσι τὰ πάντα, SER3: 5, PG 26: 633A13-B4.

(45) SER1: 28.

(46) Ἀμέλει, ἐπευχόμενος Κορινθίοις, ἐν τῇ Τριάδι ἠῤυχετο λέγων. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Τοῦ γὰρ Πνεύματος μετέχοντες, ἔχομεν τὴν τοῦ Λόγου χάριν, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀγάπην. Ὡς δὲ μία τῆς Τριάδος ἡ χάρις, οὕτως ἀδιαίρετος ἡ Τριάς. Τοῦτο δ' ἂν τις ἴδοι καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας (12). Ὁ γὰρ ἄγγελος Γαβριήλ, ἀποσταλεὶς ἀπαγγεῖλαι τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐσομένην τοῦ Λόγου κάθοδον, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, εἶρηκεν, ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, εἰδὼς, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἦν τὸ Πνεῦμα. εὐθὺς γοῦν συνῆψε. Καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι. Χριστὸς γὰρ Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία. Τοῦ δὲ Πνεύματος ὄντος ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ, δῆλον ἂν εἴη, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἦν διὰ τοῦ Λόγου τὸ Πνεῦμα. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος γενομένου ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐλεύσεται ὁ Υἱός, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ μονὴν ποιήσουσιν ἐν ἡμῖν. Ἀδιαίρετος γὰρ ἡ Τριάς, καὶ μία ταύτης ἡ θεότης. καὶ εἷς Θεὸς ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν. Αὕτη τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἡ πίστις. ἐν Τριάδι γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐθεμελίωσε καὶ ἐρβρίζωσεν ὁ Κύριος, εἰρηκῶς τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Κτίσμα δὲ εἰ ἦν τὸ Πνεῦμα, οὐκ ἂν συνέταξεν αὐτὸ τῷ Πατρί. ἵνα μὴ ᾖ ἀνόμιος

ἐαυτῇ ἡ Τριάς ξένου τινὸς καὶ ἀλλοτρίου συντασσομένου αὐτῇ. Τί γὰρ ἔλειπε τῷ Θεῷ, ἵνα ἀλλοτριούσιον προσλάβηται, καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ δοξάζεται; Μὴ γένοιτο! Οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτως. Πλήρης, αὐτὸς εἶπεν, εἰμί. Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτὸ συνέταξεν. ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ διαφόρων, τουτέστιν ἐκ κτίστου καὶ κτίσματος, συνέστηκεν ἡ ἁγία Τριάς. ἀλλὰ μία ταύτης ἡ θεότης ἐστί. Τοῦτο μαθὼν ὁ Παῦλος, ἐδίδασκε μίαν εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ διδομένην χάριν, λέγων. Εἰς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα. Ὡσπερ δὲ ἓν βάπτισμα, οὕτως καὶ μία πίστις. ὁ γὰρ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν Πατέρα, οἶδεν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, οὐκ ἐκτὸς τοῦ Υἱοῦ. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πιστεύει καὶ εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. ἐπειδὴ καὶ μία τῆς Τριάδος ἡ θεότης, ἐξ ἑνὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς γινωσκομένη, SER3: 6, PG 26: 633B5-636B1.

(47) Shapland notices correctly that here the Spirit is in the Logos for the descent of the Logos to Mary. But there in SER1:31 the Logos is said to be in the Spirit for the creation of the sacred humanity. The alteration is natural in the light of the different angle from which the Incarnation is viewed. Cf. SHAPLAND *Concerning the Holy Spirit* pp. 145, 175 n3.

(48) Cf. PRESTIGE *God* p. 284 and SHAPLAND *Concerning the Holy Spirit* p. 145.

(49) cf. Col. 3:9, 10, Οὐδὲ γάρ, εἶπεν, ἀδύνατον μετανοεῖν. ἀλλ' ἀδύνατον προφάσει μετανοίας ἀνακαινίζειν ἡμᾶς. Ἔχει δὲ πολλὴν τὴν διαφοράν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ μετανοῶν παύεται μὲν τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν, ἔχει δὲ τῶν τραυμάτων τὰς οὐλάς. ὁ δὲ βαπτιζόμενος τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν ἀπεκδιδύσκειται, ἀνακαινίζεται δὲ ἄνωθεν γεννηθεὶς τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι, SER4: 13, PG 26: 656A14-B4.

(50) cf. INC 7.

(51) cf. SER1: 3; SER3: 6; CAR2: 41ff.

(52) Ἐγίνετο δὲ ταῦτα οὐ διηρημένως κατὰ τὴν τῶν γινομένων

ποιότητα, ὥστε τὰ μὲν τοῦ σώματος χωρὶς τῆς Θεότητος, τὰ δὲ τῆς Θεότητος χωρὶς τοῦ σώματος δείκνυσθαι. συνημμένως δὲ πάντα ἐγίνετο, καὶ εἰς ἣν ὁ ταῦτα ποιῶν Κύριος παραδόξως τῇ ἑαυτοῦ χάριτι, SER4: 14, PG 26: 657A~~3~~-8.

(53) Cf. SER4: 14 PG 26: 657A9-10.

(54) Athanasius considers giving sight to this blind man as grace in SER4:16 and 21. In the first instance he says that the Saviour granted the blind to see (Τοῦ γὰρ Σωτῆρος δεικνύοντος τὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔργα, ... τυφλοῖς ἐχαρίζετο τὸ βλέπειν, SER4:16, PG 26: 660B1-2).

(55) ᾧ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ ἀναβλέπειν χάριν διδόασι, SER4: 21, PG 26: 672B10.

(56) Καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες. "Τίς ἔδωκε στόμα ἀνθρώπῳ; Καὶ τίς ἐποίησε δύσκωφον καὶ κωφόν, βλέποντα καὶ τυφλόν;" καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις, μανέντες πάλιν εἴπωσι τοῦ Βεελζεβοῦλ εἶναι καὶ ταύτας τὰς φωνάς. Ὡ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ ἀναβλέπειν χάριν διδόασι, τούτῳ καὶ τὴν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦς ἀνάγκη διδόναι ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν ποιεῖν εἶρηκεν ὁ Λόγος, SER4: 21, PG 26: 672B6-11.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Apostoliki, Diaconia ed., Ἀθανάσιος. Βιβλιοθήκη Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων καὶ Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Συγγραφέων. 30-37, Athens, 1962-1968.

Bright, W. *St. Athanasius' Orations Against the Arians*. Introduction, edition, and translation. Oxford, 1884.

Camelot, P.T. *Discours Contre les Paiens*. Edited and translated. SC (18) 2nd. ed., Paris, 1977.

Cattaneo, E. *Atanasio. Lettere a Serapione lo Spirito Santo*. Translation, introduction, and notes. Rome, 1986.

Chadwick, H. *Contra Celsum*. Translated, introduction and notes. Cambridge, 1953.

Crouzel, H. and Simonetti, M. eds. *Origen's de Principiis (I-V)* SC Paris, 1978.

Egan, G.A. *The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop Serapion Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Edited and translated. Studies and Documents. Salt Lake City, 1968.

Gregg, R.C. *The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus*. Classics of Western Spirituality. New York, 1980.

Kannengiesser, C. *Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe*. Critical text, translation, introduction, notes, and index. SC (199) Paris, 1972.

Lebon, J. *Lettres a Sérapion sur la Divinité du Saint-Esprit*. Edited and translated. SC (15) Paris, 1947.

Lightfoot J.B. *Apostolic Fathers: Hermas' Mandata Pastoris*. London,

1898.

Meyer, R.T. The Life of St. Antony. Translated. *Ancient Christian Writers 10*. Westminster, Md., 1950.

Migne, J.P. S.P.N. Athanasii Archiepiscopi Alexandrini. Opera Omnia Quae Exstant. *Patrologiae Graecae*. 25-28. Paris, 1857.

Newman, J.H. *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*. 2 vols. 2nd. ed., London, 1881.

Norris, R.A. Orations against the Arians. The Christological Controversy. Translated and edited. *Sources of Early Christian Thought*. Book III, 26-41. Philadelphia, 1980.

Opitz, H.G. Werke, hrsg. im Auftrage der Kirchenvater Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. ed., *Die Apologien*. Vol. II (1) 1-280, Berlin, 1935.

Palamas, Gregorios ed., Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. Ἑλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. 1-12, Salonica, 1973-1977.

Pruche, B. ed. Basil of Caesarea's De Spiritu Sancto. SC 2nd., ed., Paris, 1968.

Robertson, A. Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria. ed., *LNPF*. 2nd. series, vol. 4 Reprint ed., G. Rapids, Mich., 1980.

Rusch, W.G. Athanasius' Orations Against the Arians, Book I. Translated and edited. *Sources of Early Christian Thought*. Philadelphia, 1980.

Shapland, C.R.B. *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Translated. London, 1951.

Smulders, P. *Hilary of Poitiers' De Trinitate*. Turnholti, 1979.

Szymusiak, J.M. Apologie à l'Empereur Constance et Apologie pour sa Fuite. Introduction, critical text, translation and notes. SC (56) Paris, 1958.

Thomson, R.W. *Athanasiana Syriaca*. Edited and translated. 4 vols. CSCO 257-258, 272-273, 324-325, 386-387. Louvain, 1965-77.

_____. *Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*. Edited and translated. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford, 1971.

Secondary Sources

Alevizatos Hamilcar, S. The Orthodox Church and Sacramental Grace. *The Doctrine of Grace* (1). ed., W.T. Whitley, 247-277, London, 1932.

Arnold, D. *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*. London, 1991.

Azkoul, M. *The Meaning of History According to the Greek Fathers*. Michigan, 1968.

Altaner, B. *Patrology*. Translated by Hilda C. Graef (Based on the fifth German edition). Edinburgh/London, 1960.

Armitage, E. Why Athanasius Won at Nicea. *ByZ*, 1910, 599.

Armstrong, C.B. The Synod of Alexandria and the Schism at Antioch in AD362. *JThS* (22) 1921, 206-221, 347-355.

Arnou, R. Arius et la Doctrine des Relations Trinitaires. *Gregorianum* (14) 1933, 269-272.

Bagster, S. *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament with an English Translation*. London, 1896.

Bardy, G. *Saint Athanase (296-373)*. 2nd. ed., Paris, 1914.

_____. *Athanase. Dictionnaire de la Spiritualité*. (1) Paris, 1937, cols. 1047-1052.

_____. *The Arian Crisis. The Church in the Christian Roman Empire*. Palanque et al., vol. 1. London, 1949.

_____. *Alexandrie, Antioche et Constantinople (325-451). L'Eglise et les Eglises*. ed., O. Rousseau, vol. 1, 183-207. Chevetogne, 1954.

_____. *Athanase d' Alexandrie (saint). DHGE(4)*, col. 1313-1340.

Barnard, L.W. *The Antecedents of Arius. VC (24) 1970*, 172-188.

_____. *Athanase et les Empereurs Constantin et Constance. Politique et Théologie*. ed., C. Kannengiesser, 127-143. Paris, 1974.

_____. *The Date of S. Athanasius' Vita Antonii. VC (28) 1974*, 169-175.

_____. *Athanasius and the Meletian Schism in Egypt. JEA (59) 1975*, 183-189.

_____. *Some Liturgical Elements in Athanasius. Festal Epistles. StP (13) 1975*, 337-342.

_____. *Some Notes on the Meletian Schism in Egypt. StP (12), TU (115) 1975*, 399-405.

_____. *Two Notes on Athanasius. 1. Athanasius' Election as Archbishop of Alexandria. 2. The Circumstances Surrounding the Encyclical Letter of the Egyptian Bishops (Apol-CAR 3:1-19:5). OrChP (41) 1975*, 344-356. Reprinted in *Studies in Church History and Patristics*. Ἀναλέκτα Βλατάδων (26), Salonica, 1978, 329-340.

_____. Athanasius and the Roman State. *Latomus*. (36) 1977, 422-437. Reprinted in *Studies in Church History and Patristics*. 'Αναλέκτα Βλατάδων (26) 1978, 312-328.

_____. Edward Gibbon on Athanasius. *Arianism*. ed., R.C. Gregg, 361-369, Philadelphia, 1985.

Barnes, T.D. *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire*. London. 1984.

_____. Angel of Light or Mystic Initiate? The Problem of the Life of Antony. *JThS*, NS (37) 1986, 353-368.

Barnes, W.E. Arius and Arianism. *Expository Times* (46) 1934, 18-24.

Baudrillart, A. edl. *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*. Paris, 1912.

Bauer, W. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia, 1971.

Baynes, N.H. Athanasiana. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*. (11) 1925, 58-69.

_____. Athanasius. Review of the Study of St. Athanasius by F.L. Cross Oxford, 1945. *Journal of Roman Studies* (35) 1945, 121-124.

_____. St. Antony and the Demons. *JEA* (40) 1954, 7-10.

Bell, H.I. Athanasius: A Chapter in Church History. *Congregational Quarterly* (2) 1925, 158-176.

Berchem, J.B. L'Incarnation dans le Plan Divin d'après Saint Athanase. *Echos d'Orient* (33) 1934, 316-330.

Bernard, R. L'Image de Dieu d'après Saint Athanase. *Théologie* (25), Paris, 1952.

_____. The Significance of Athanasius. *Irish Theological Quarterly* (48) 1981, 181-195.

Bouyer, L. *L'Incarnation et l'Eglise-corps du Christ dans la Théologie de Saint Athanase*. Paris, 1943.

Brachelet, X. Athanase. *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. (1) Paris, 1901.

Breckenridge, J. *Julian and Athanasius - a Study in the Implications of the Doctrine of Creation*. (Ph.D. Thesis) University of Southern California, 1968.

_____. Julian and Athanasius: Two Approaches to Creation and Salvation. *Theology* (76) 1973, 73-81.

Brennan, B.R. Dating Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*. *VC* (30) 1976, 52-54.

Bright, W. *St. Athanasius' Historical Writings*. Oxford, 1881.

_____. *The Orations of St. Athanasius Against the Arians*. Oxford, 1884.

_____. *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Augustine*. London, 1890. Revised in *Church Quarterly Review*. London (31) 1890, 480-485.

_____. *The Age of the Fathers*. 2 vols. London, 1903.

_____. Athanasius. *Murray's Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature*. 53-65, London, 1911.

_____. Athanasius. *Dictionary of Christian Biography Literature*,

Sects, and Doctrines (1). eds., W.Smith and H.Wace, London, 1877-1887, 179-203.

Brock, S. A Baptismal Address Attributed to Athanasius. *Oriens Christianus*. (61) 92-102, 1977.

Brown, David, W. *The Divine Trinity*. London 1985.

Brunner, E. *Man in Revolt*. London. 1939.

Budge, E.A.W. *The Paradise of the Holy Fathers*. 2 vols. London, 1907.

_____. ed., *Coptic Homilies in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*. London, 1910.

Burnish, R.F.G. *The Doctrine of Grace from Paul to Irenaeus*. (M.A. Thesis) Glasgow, 1972.

Bush, R.W. *St. Athanasius: His Life and Times*. London, 1888.

Campbell, T.C. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. Translated by S. Godman. New York, 1959.

von Campenhausen, H. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius. *SJTh* (27) 1974, 408-440.

Casey, R.P. The Athens Text of Athanasius' *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*. *HTR* (23) 1930, 51-89.

_____. *The De Incarnatione of Athanasius*. Part 2: The Short Recension. *Studies and Documents* 14. London, 1946.

Chadwick, H. *The Early Church*. Pelican History of the Church 1. New York, 1976.

_____. *History and Thought of the Early Church*. London, 1982.

Christou, P. Uncreated and Created, Unbegotten and Begotten in the Theology of Athanasius of Alexandria. *Augustinianum* (13) 1973, 399-409.

_____. Ἄκτιστον καὶ Κτιστόν, Ἀγέννητον καὶ Γεννητὸν εἰς τὴν Θεολογίαν τοῦ Μ. Ἀθανασίου, Salonica, 1974, 11-22.

Clarke, F.S. Last and found: Athanasius' Doctrine of Reconciliation. *SJTh* (29) 1976, 435-450.

Clercq, V.C. de. Athanasius. *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. (1) 996-999, New York, 1967.

Coiderakis, H. Τί Διδάσκει ὁ Μ. Ἀθανάσιος Περὶ Ἀρείου καὶ Ἀρειανισμοῦ. Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος (29) 1930, 496-516.

Constantinides, M. Ὁ Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος καὶ ἡ Ἐποχὴ αὐτοῦ. Athens, 1937.

Crouzel, H. Review of Athanase d'Alexandrie Evêque et Écrivain. C. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1983, *Bull Literature Ecclesiastique* (86) 1985, 229-230.

Cross, F.L. *The Study of Athanasius*. Oxford, 1945.

_____. and Livingstone E.A. eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd. ed., London, 1974.

Crum W.E. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Reprint. ed., Oxford, 1979.

C.S.M.V. *St. Athanasius on the Psalms*. ed., A.R.Mowbray. London, 1949.

Cureton, W. *The Festal Letters of Athanasius*. London, 1848.

Dale, R.W. *The Atonement: The Congregational Union Lecture for 1875*. London, 1887.

Daujat, J. *The Theology of Grace*. London, 1959.

Demetropoulos, P.Ch. Ἡ Ἀνθρωπολογία τοῦ Μεγ. Ἀθανασίου. Athens, 1954.

_____. Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας ὁ καὶ Μέγας Πατριάρχης Ἀλεξανδρείας. Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια (1) 1962, 521-544.

Disdier, M. Le Pélagianisme au Concile d' Ephèse. *Echos d'Orient* (34) 1931, 314-333.

Dragas, G.D. The Two Treatises of St. Athanasius 'Contra Apollinarem': Second Thoughts on the Research of the Critics. *Abba Salama* (6) 1974, 84-96.

_____. Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, Ἡ Λησμονηθεῖσα Ἀποψις τῆς Χριστολογίας τοῦ Μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου. Θεολογία. (47) 1976, 85-106.

_____. A Note Concerning Athanasius' Soteriology. Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος (61) 1979, 210-220.

_____. Holy Spirit and Tradition: the Writings of St. Athanasius. *Sobornost* (1.1) 1979, 51-72.

_____. The Eternal Son: An Essay in Christology with Special Reference to St. Athanasius. *Proceedings of the Academie Internationale des Sciences Religieuses*, *Abba Salama* (9) 1979, 18-54.

_____. Same article in *The Incarnation*, ed. by T.F.Torrance, Edinburgh, Handsel Press 1981, 16-57.

_____. *Athanasiana*. Vol. 1, London, 1980.

_____. Conscience and Tradition: Newman and Athanasius in the Orthodox Church. *Internationale Cardinal Newman Studien*. Nurnberg, 1980.

_____. John Henry Newman's rediscovery of the catholicity of the Fathers, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Boston, (24) 1980, 273-295.

_____. Same article in *One in Christ*, London, (17) 1980, 46-68.

_____. *The Meaning of Theology. An Essay in Greek Patristics*, Darlington, 1980.

_____. Nature and Grace According to St. Athanasius. *Church and Theology* (1) 1980, 513-554.

_____. The Doctrine of the Trinity in early Patristic Times, *Church and Theology*, (3) 1982, 1082-1096.

_____. The Incarnation according to St Athanasius, *Greek Review*, (25) 1983, 12-14.

_____. The ὁμοούσιον in Athanasius' *Contra Apollinarem I*, in *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments*, papers from the IXth Oxford Conference on Patristic Studies, 5-10 Sept. 1983, ed. by R.C.Gregg, The Philadelphia Patristic Monograph Series, No. 11 Cambridge Mass. USA 1985, 233-242.

_____. He Became Man, the ~~Forgotten~~ ~~Aspect~~ of Athanasius' Christology", *Studia Patristica* (Akademie Verlag, Berlin), (16) 1985, 281-294.

_____. The Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ ~~A~~According to St. Athanasius, *Greek Review*, July 1985, 12-14.

_____. *St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem*. Athens, 1985.

_____. Ἡ ἐνανθρώπηση τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Ἀθανάσιον Ἀλεξανρείας, *Ἐκκλησία*, 1986, 31-35.

_____. St. Athanasius on Christ's Sacrifice. *Sacrifice and Redemption*. Durham Essays in Theology, ed., S.W. Sykes, 73-100. Cambridge, 1991.

Gray, H.D. *The Christian Doctrine of Grace*.

Drewery, B. *Origen and the Doctrine of Grace*. London, 1960.

Egan, G. *The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop Serapion Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Studies and Documents 37. Salt Lake City, 1968.

Ellis, E.K. *St. Athanasius*. Cambridge. 1952.

Every, E. Nature and Grace in the Eastern Orthodox Tradition. *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* (8) 1949, no. 3, suppl. on *Nature and Grace*, 21-28.

Feidas, V. Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία, vol. 1 Ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐποχῆς μέχρι τῆς Εἰκονομαχίας. Athens, 1978.

Ferguson, E. Attitudes to Schism at the Council of Nicaea. *Schism, Heresy, and Religious Protest*. 57-63. ed., D. Baker. Cambridge, 1972.

Florovsky, G. *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*. Paris, 1931.

_____. The Idea of Creation in Christian Philosophy. *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* (8) 1949, 53-77.

_____. *Aspects of Church History*. Belmont, Mass. 1976.

_____. *Creation and Redemption*. (vol. 3 in the collected works) Belmont, Mass. 1976.

_____. The Fourth Century: An Introduction. *Sobornost* (7) 1977, 241-252; no. 6, 1978, 432-447.

Forbes, F.A.M. *St. Athanasius*. London, 1919.

Fouyas, M. Ἡ περὶ τῶν Δύο φύσεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ Διδασκαλία τοῦ Ἀγ. Ἀθανασίου. Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος (46) 1974, 589-595.

_____. When was the *ad Epictetum* Written? Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος (58) 1976, 193-197.

Frend, W.H.C. Athanasius as an Egyptian Christian Leader in the Fourth Century. *New College Bulletin* (8) 1974, 20-37.

Galtier, P. St. Athanase et l'Ame Humaine du Christ. *Gregorianam* (36) 1956, 553-589.

Gaudel, A. La Théologie du Logos chez St. Athanase. *Revue des Sciences religieuses* (11) 1931, 10-14.

Gavin, F. *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought*. London, 1937.

Gesche, A. L' Ame humaine de Jesus dans la Christologie du IVe Siècle. *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (54) 1959, 385-425.

Gloubokwsky, N. Grace in the Greek Fathers (to St. John of Damascus) and Inter-church Union. *The Doctrine of Grace*. ed., W.T. Whitley. 61-105. London, 1932.

Goltz, E. Λόγος Σωτηρίας πρὸς τὴν Παρθένον (De Virginitate). eds., O. Gebhardt and A. von Harnack. *TU* (29), Leipzig, 1905.

Gore, C. Apollinarianism. *Church Quarterly Review* (98) 1924, 120-134.

Gosevitch, S. Ἡ Περί Θείας Χάριτος Διδασκαλία Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου (Ph.D. Thesis) Athens, 1956.

Grant, R.M. Miracle and Natural Law. *Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought*. Amsterdam, 1952.

Gray, H.D. *The Christian Doctrine of Grace*. London, 1949.

Grébaut, S. A Propos de Anaphore de St. Athanase. *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* (18) 100-101, 1913.

Gregg, R.C. Arianism. *Dictionary of Christian Theology*. 1983.

_____. ed. *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments: Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies*. 5-10, 1983. Oxford, Patristic Monograph Series 11. Philadelphia, 1985.

Grillmeier, A. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. London, 1965.

_____. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. 2nd ed., London, 1975.

_____. Jesus Christ, the Kyriakos Anthropos. *Theological Studies*. (38) 275-293, 1977.

Groh, D.E. New Directions in Arian Research. *Anglican Theological Review* (68) no. 4, 1987, 347-355.

Gross, J. *La Divinisation du Chrétien d'après les Pères Grecs*. (Ph.D. Thesis) Université de Strasbourg, 1938.

Gundry, R.H. *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. Cambridge, 1976.

Gwatkin, H.M. *The Arian Controversy*. London, 1889.

_____. *Studies of Arianism*. 2nd. ed., Cambridge, 1900.

Halleux, A. Review of Athanase d'Alexandria Eveque et Ecrivain, C. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1983. *Rev. Theologique de Louvain* (16) 1985, 222-224. and *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* (80) 1985, 297-298.

Hamilton, A. Narrative in the Theology of St. Athanasius. *Colloquium* (10) 1977, 6-13.

_____. *The Relationship between God and Created Reality in the Theology of Saint Athanasius of Alexandria*. (D. Phil Thesis) Oxford, 1977.

_____. Athanasius and the Simile of the Mirror. *VC* (34) 1980, 14-18.

Hanson, R.P.C. The Doctrine of the Trinity Achieved in 381. *SJTh* (36) 1983, 41-57.

_____. The Arian Doctrine of the Incarnation. *Arianism*. ed., R.C. Gregg, 181-211. Philadelphia, 1985.

_____. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh, 1988.

Hardman, D. *The Christian Doctrine of Grace*. Reprinted. London, 1946.

Hardy, E.R. *History of Dogma*. (3 and 4) Translated by E.B. Spiers and J. Millar. London, 1897-1898.

_____. *Christology of the Later Fathers*. London, 1954.

Haugaard, W.P. Arius: Twice a Heretic? *ChH* (29) 1960, 251-263.

Haykin, M.A.G. The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of I Cor. 2:10-12 by Origen and Athanasius. *SJTh* (35) 1982, 513-528.

Heron, A. Two Pseudo-Athanasian Dialogues against the Anomoeans. *JTS* (24) 1973, 101-122

Hodges, G. *Saints and Heroes to the End of the Middle Ages*. New

York, 1911.

Holland, J.A.B. *The Development of the Trinitarian Theology of Athanasius in His Conflict with Contemporary Heresies*. (Ph.D. Thesis) University of Edinburgh, 1963.

_____. Athanasius versus Arius: What Now? *Reformed Theological Review* (28) 1969, 16-27.

_____. Athanasius and Arius II: Why the Impulse to Reduce? *Reformed Theological Review* (30) 1971, 33-41.

Holt, B.P. *Perspectives on the Self in Devotional Writing: Athanasius, Ruysbroeck and Arndt*. (Ph.D. Thesis) Yale, 1973.

Honscheid, J. ed., *Didymus the Blind's de Trinitate*. Book I. London, 1975.

Hoss, K. *Studien uber das Schriftum und die Theologie des Athanasius*. Freiburg, 1899.

Jauncey, E. *The Doctrine of Grace: up to the End of the Pelagian Controversy*. London, 1925.

Kannengiesser, C. Logos et Nous chez Athanase d'Alexandrie. *StP* (11), *TU* (108), 1972, 199-202.

_____. Athanase, édité par R.W. Thomson. *RSR* (61) 1973, 217-232.

_____. Athanasius of Alexandria and the Foundations of Traditional Christology. *ThSt* (34) 1973, 103-113.

_____. Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie (Actes du Colloque de Chantilly 23-25, Septembre 1973). *Théologie Historique* (27) Paris, 1975.

_____. Athanasius of Alexandria and the Holy Spirit between Nicaea I and Constantinople I. *Irish Theological Quarterly* (48) 1981, 166-180.

_____. Athanasius of Alexandria—Three Orations against the Arians: A Reappraisal. *StP* (18) 1982, 981-995.

_____. *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis*. Colloquy 41 of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture. Berkeley, 1982.

_____. Arius and the Arians. *ThSt* (44) 1983, 456-475.

_____. Athanase d'Alexandrie 'Evêque et 'Ecrivain: Une Lecture des Traité Contre les Ariens. *Théologie Historique*. (70) Paris, 1983.

_____. The Blasphemies of Arius': Athanasius of Alexandria De Synodis 15. *Arianism*. ed., R.C. Gregg, 59-77. Philadelphia, 1985.

_____. *Athanasius of Alexandria Rediscovered: His Political and Pastoral Achievement*. Paper presented at the Catholic University of America. Washington D.C., 22 Oct. 1987.

_____. St. Athanasius of Alexandria Rediscovered: His Political and Pastoral Achievement. *Coptic Church Review* (9, 3) 1988, 68-74.

Karakoles, K. 'Η 'Εκκλησία κατὰ τὸν Μ. 'Αθανάσιον. ed., Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς. Salonica, (48) 1965, 277-289 and 354-366.

_____. 'Η 'Εκκλησιολογία τοῦ Μεγάλου 'Αθανασίου. Salonica, 1968.

Kaye, J. *Works of John Kaye*. London, 1876.

_____. *The Council of Nicaea in Connection with the Life of Athanasius*. London, 1888.

Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 4th. ed., London, 1965.

_____. *Early Christian Creeds*. 2nd. ed., London, 1967.

Kolp, A.L. *Participation: A Unifying Concept in the Theology of Athanasius*. (Ph.D. Thesis) Harvard University, 1975.

_____. Partakers of the Divine Nature: The Use of II Peter 1:4 by Athanasius. *StP* (17) 1982, 1018-1023.

Lake, K., and Casey, R.P. The Text of the De Incarnatione of Athanasius. *HTR* (19) 1926, 259-270.

Lambert, E. The Orthodox Church's Teaching of Grace. *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* (6) 1945-1946, 248-258.

Lampe, G.W.H. *The Seal of the Spirit*. London, 1951.

Lander, G.B. *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers*. Cambridge, Mass. 1959.

Larentzakis, G. Einige Aspekte des hl. Athanasios zur Einheit der kirche. *Κληρονομία*. (6) 1974, 242-260.

Lawson, J. *The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus*. London, 1948.

Lebon, J. Pour une Edition Critique des Oeuvres de S. Athanase. *RHE* (3) 1925, 524-530.

_____. Une Ancienne Opinion sur la Condition du Corps du Christ dans la Mort. *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (23) 1927, 209-241.

_____. S. Athanase a-t-il Employé l'Expression ὁ Κυριακός ἄνθρωπος? *RHE* (31) 1935, 307-329.

Lefort, L.T. Athanase Ἐcrivain Copte. *Le Muséon* (42) 1933, 1-33.

_____. Athanase, Ambroise et Chenoute sur la Virginité. *Le Muséon* (48) 1935, 55-73.

_____. St. Athanase: Letters Festales et Pastorales en Copte. *CSCO* (150, 151) *Scriptores Coptici* (19) Louvain, 1955.

_____. Athanasiana Coptica. *Le Muséon* (69) 1956, 233-241.

Liddel, H.G. and Scott, R. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th. ed., Oxford, 1940.

Lietzmann, H.G. *A History of the Early Church*. 4 vols. New York, 1961.

Louth, A. Reason and Revelation in Saint Athanasius. *SJTh* (23) 1970, 385-396.

_____. The Concept of the Soul in Athanasius' *Contra Gentes*--De Incarnatione. *StP*, (13), 1975, 227-231.

_____. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*. Oxford, 1981.

_____. Athanasius' Understanding of the Humanity of Christ. *StP* (16) 1985, 309-318.

Lyman, R.J. *Christology and Cosmology: Will and Substance Models in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius*. (D. Phill. Thesis) Oxford University, 1983.

Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae*. Tom. (6:1) Rome, 1853.

Maritch, D. *The Christology of St. Athanasius*. (B. Litt. Dissertation) Oxford, 1921.

Matsoukas, N. Theology and Anthropology in Saint Athanasius. Τόμος Ἑόρτιος (1600ης Ἐπετείου Μ. Ἀθανασίου 373-1973) 47-128. Salonika, 1974.

McHugh, J. *The Exaltation of Christ in the Arian Controversy*. (Ph.D. Thesis) Pontifica Universitas, Rome, 1959.

Meijering, E.P. *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Synthesis or Antithesis?* Leiden, 1968.

_____. Ἦν Ποτὲ Ὅτε Οὐκ Ἦν ὁ Υἱός. A Discussion on Time and Eternity. VC (28) 1974, 161-169.

_____. *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Synthesis or Antithesis*. 2nd. ed., Leiden, 1974.

_____. *Athanasius Contra Gentes: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Leiden, 1984.

_____. *God Being History: Studies in Patristic Philosophy*. Amsterdam and Oxford, 1975.

Meinardus, O. *Christian Egypt, Ancient and Modern*. Cairo, 1965.

Meredith, A. Orthodoxy, Heresy and Philosophy in the Latter Half of the Fourth Century. *Heythrop Journal* (16) 1975, 5-21.

_____. Emanation in Plotinus and Athanasius. *StP* (16) 1985, 319-323.

Merendino, P. *Paschale Sacramentum: Eine Untersuchung uber die Osterkatechese des hl. Athanasius von Alexandrien in ihrer Beziehung zu den fruhchristlichen exegetisch-theologischen Uberlieferungen*. Munster, 1965.

Mersch, E. *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*. (1) 2nd. ed., Paris, 1936,

374-409.

_____. *The Whole Christ*. Milwaukee, 1938, 263-287.

Meyer, R.T. Athanasius, Vita S. Antonii. *Ancient Christian Writers* (10) London, 1950.

Moeller, C. and Philips, G. *The Theology of Grace and the Ecumenical Movement*. London, 1961.

Montfaucon, B. Animadversiones in Vitam et Scripta, S. Athanasii. *Collectio Nova Patrum II*. Paris, 1706.

Moutsoulas, E.D. Ἡ πρὸς Ἐπίκτητον Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ Μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου. Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος (55) 1973, 390-409.

_____. Ὁ Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. Athens, 1974.

_____. Τὸ Πρόβλημα τῆς Χρονολογήσεως τῶν Τριῶν κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν Λόγων τοῦ Μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου. Θεολογία (47) 1976, 543-557.

_____. Ἡ Ἀρειανὴ Ἔρις καὶ ὁ Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. Athens, 1979.

Newman, J.H. *Catholic Sermons of Cardinal Newman*. London, 1857.

_____. *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*. London, 1874.

_____. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. London, 1878.

_____. *The Arians of the Fourth Century*. London, 1883.

Nock, A.D. The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo. *Conversion*. Oxford, 1933.

Nordberg, H. A Reconsideration of the Date of Athanasius' *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*. *StP* (3) 1961, 262-266.

_____. *Athanasius and the Emperor*. *Commentationes Humanorum Litterarum*. 30:3 Helsinki, 1963.

Norman, K.E. *Deification: the Content of Athanasian Soteriology* (Ph.D. Thesis) Duke, 1980.

Norris, R.A. *Manhood and Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Oxford, 1963.

Olsen, V.S. *St. Athanasius' Use of Scripture with Special Reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity*. (M.Th. Dissertation) St. Andrews, 1967.

Opitz, H.G. *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius*. *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 23. Berlin und Leipzig, 1935.

Papaconstantinou, T. *Athanasius the Great and His Dogmatic Teaching Against Arius*. Athens, 1911.

Papadopoulos, C.H.R. Ὁ Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. Ἱστορία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας. 180-204, Alexandria, 1935.

Papadopoulos, Stylianos. Ἀθανάσιος Ἀλεξανδρείας: Περὶ Ἁγ. Πνεύματος. Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος (43) 1971, 67-105.

_____. Ὁ Ἅγιος Ἀθανάσιος Ἀλεξανδρείας Σταθμὸς Μέγας ἐν τῇ Θεολογίᾳ. Θεολογία (45) 1974, 102-126.

_____. Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Μέγας καὶ ἡ Θεολογία τῆς Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου. Athens, 1975.

de Pauley, W.C. The Idea of Man in Athanasius. *Theology* (12) 1926, 331-338.

Pelikan, J. *The Light of the World: A Basic Image in Early Christian Thought*. New York, 1962.

_____. *The Shape of Death: Life, Death, and Immortality in the Early Fathers*. London, 1962.

_____. *The Emergence of the Catholic Development of Doctrine: The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (1) London, 1972.

Pettersen, A.L. *The Humanity of Christ in the Theology of Athanasius of Alexandria*. (Ph.D. Thesis) Durham, 1981.

_____. A Reconstruction of the Date of the *Contra Gentes--De Incarnatione* of Athanasius of Alexandria. *StP* (17) 1982, 1030-1040.

_____. The Questioning Jesus in Athanasius' *Contra Arianos* III. *Ariansim.* ed., R.C. Gregg, 243-255. Philadelphia, 1985.

_____. Did Athanasius Deny Christ's Fear? *SJTh* (39) 1986, 327-340.

Pollard, T.E. Logos and Son in Origen, Arius and Athanasius. *StP* (2) 1957, 282-287.

_____. The Origins of Arianism. *JThS* NS(9), 1958, 103-111.

_____. *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*. Cambridge, 1970.

Prestige, G.L. Ἀγέν(ν)ητος and Cognate Words in Athanasius. *JThS* (34) 1933, 258-265.

_____. *Fathers and Heretics*. London and New York, 1940.

_____. *God in P^lristic Thought*. 2nd. ed., London, 1964.

Quasten, J. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Antwerp and Utrecht, 1975.

Rahner, K. *Theological Investigations*. (1) London, 1965.

Ranken, H. *St. Athanasius*. Edinburgh, 1911.

Relton, M. *A Study in Christology: The Problem of the Relation of the Two Natures in the Person of Christ*. London, 1917.

Reynolds, H.R. *Athanasius: His Life and Work*. London, 1889.

Riall, R.A. *Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria: The Politics of Spirituality*. (Ph.D. Thesis) University of Cincinnati, 1987.

Richard, M. Saint Athanase et la Psychologie du Christ Selon les Ariens. *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* (4) 1947, 5-54.

Ritschl, D. Athanasius Source of New Questions. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* (1) 1964, 319-322.

_____. Athanasius, Source of New Questions. *Konzepte: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, vol. 1: Patristische Studies, 74-77, Bern, 1976.

Roldanus, J. Le Christ et l'Homme dans la Théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie: Etude de la Conjonction de sa Conception de l'Homme avec sa Christologie. *History of Christian Thought* (4) Leiden, 1968.

Rondet, H. *Original Sin: the Patristic and Theological Background*. Shannon, Ireland, 1972.

Roussa, G.A. Ὁ Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. Athens, 1960.

Rusch, W.G. Some Comments on Athanasius' Contra Apollinarem 1,3. *Arianism*. ed. R.C. Gregg, 223-231. Philadelphia, 1985.

Ryan, G.J. *The Relationship of the Manuscripts of Athanasius' De Incarnatione*. (Ph.D. Thesis) Michigan, 1934.

Sample, R.L. The Messiah as Prophet. *The Christology of Paul of Samosata*. Evanston, Illinois, 1977.

Sansbury, C.J. Athanasius, Marcellus and Eusebius of Caesarea: Some Thoughts on their Resemblances and Disagreements. *Arianism*. ed., R.C. Gregg, 281-285. Durham, North Carolina, 1985.

Scott, M. *Athanasius on the Atonement*. Stafford, 1914.

Seeberg, A. *Der Katechismus*. Leipzig, 1903, 219.

Seiler, I. ed. *Didymus the Blind's de Trinitate*. Book II, London, 1975.

Sharpe, N.W. Athanasius the Copt and His Times. *Bibliotheca Sacra* (72) 1915, 618-640.

Singer, C.G. Athanasius. *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* (2) 1975, 163-178.

Slusser, M. Review of Athanase d'Alexandrie Evêque et Ecrivain. C. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1983, *Theological Studies* (46) 1985, 144-146.

_____. Athanasius, *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*: Place and Date of Composition. *JThS* (37) 1986, 114-117.

Smythe, H.R. The Interpretation of Amos IV: 13 in St. Athanasius and Didymus. *JThS*, NS (2) 1950, 158-168.

_____. *An Examination of the Doctrinal Opinions of the Pneumatomachi, Together with the Answer by the Orthodox Father in the Fourth Century... Constructing a Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (D. Phil Thesis) Oxford, 1952.

Sparks, J.N. *The Resurrection Letters, St. Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria from 328-373 A.D.* Nashville, 1979.

Spiegel, J. Der Pelagianismus auf dem Konzil von Ephesus. *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum*. 1969, 1-14.

Stead, G.C. The Significance of the Homousios. *StP* (3) 1961, 397-412.

_____. The Platonism of Arius. *JThS*, NS (15) 1964, 16-31.

_____. 'Homousios' dans la Pensée de Saint Athanase, *Politique et Théologie*. ed., C. Kannengiesser, 231-253. Paris, 1974.

_____. The Concept of Divine Substance. *VC* (29) 1975, 1-14.

_____. *Divine Substance*. Oxford, 1977.

_____. The Thalia of Arius and the Testimony of Athanasius. *JThS*, NS (29) 1978, 20-52.

_____. Athanasius' De Incarnatione: An Edition Reviewed. *JThS*, NS (31) 1980, 378-390.

_____. The Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy. *Platonismus und Christentum: Festschrift für Heinrich Dorrie*. eds., H.D. Blume and F. Mann. *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*. Supplement vol. (10) 1983, 245-257.

_____. Review of Athanase d'Alexandrie Evêque et Ecrivain. C. Kannengiesser, Paris, 1983. *JThS* (36) 1985, 220-229.

_____. Athanasius' Earliest Written Work. *JTS*, NS (39) 1 1988, 76-91.

Stinger, C.L. *Humanism and the Church Fathers*. Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance. Albany, 1977.

Stockmeier, P. Review of Athanase d'Alexandrie 'Evêque et 'Ecrivain, C. Kannengiesser, Paris, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (79) 1986, 58-59.

Strange, C. Athanasius on Divinization. *StP* (16) 1985, 342-346.

Swete, H.B. *Patristic Study on Athanasius*. London, 1902.

Telfer, W.R. Review of F.L. Cross, Inaugural Lecture, The Study of St. Athanasius. *JThS* (47) 1946, 88-90.

Thilo, J.C. Sancti Athanasii Alexandriae Archiepiscopi Opera Dogmatica Selecta. *Bibliotheca Patrum Graecorum Dogmatica I*. Leipzig, 1853.

Thomson, R.W. A Syriac Corpus of Athanasiana. *StP* (3) 1961, 142-145.

_____. *Inedita Athanasiana*. (Ph.D. Thesis) Cambridge, 1962.

_____. Some Remarks on the Syriac Version of Athanasius' De Incarnatione. *Le Muséon* (77) 1964, 17-28.

Torrance, T.F. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edinburgh, 1948.

_____. The Roman Doctrine of Grace from the Point of View of Reformed Theology. *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*. (16) 1964, 290-312. Reprint. P. Fransen, *Intelligent Theology* (1) Darton, 1969, 46-77.

_____. Spiritus Creator: A Consideration of the Teaching of St. Athanasius and St. Basil. *Theology in Reconstruction*. 209-228, London, 1965.

_____. The Hermeneutics of Saint Athanasius. Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος (52) 1970. 89-106, 237-249, and 446-468. (53) 1971, 133-149.

_____. *Theology in Reconciliation*. ed., G. Chapman, Edinburgh, 1975.

_____. ed., *The Incarnation: Ecumenical Studies in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed A.D. 381*. Edinburgh, 1981.

_____. *The Trinitarian Faith: The Evangelical Theology of the Ancient Catholic Church*. Edinburgh, 1988.

Tsirpanlis, C.N. Aspects of Athanasian Soteriology. Κληρονομία (8) 1976, 61-76.

Unger, D. A Special Aspect of Athanasian Soteriology. *Franciscan Studies* (6) 1946, 30-53, 171-194.

de Urbina, I.O. L'Anima Umana di Cristo Secondo S. Atanasio. *OrChP* (20) 1954, 27-43.

Vogt, H.J. Parties in the History of the Church: Athanasius and His Contemporaries. Translated by F. McDonagh. *Concilium*. 1973-1979, Pt. 1, 37-49.

Voisin, G. La Doctrine Christologique de Saint Athanase. *RHE* (1) 1900, 226-248.

Wahba, M. *The Doctrine of Sanctification in St. Athanasius' Paschal Letters*. (M.A. Thesis) Ottawa University, 1985.

Walker, J.B. Convenance Ἐπιστέμολογική de l'Homéousion dans la Théologie d'Athanase. *Politique et Théologie*. ed., C. Kannengiesser, 255-275. Paris, 1974.

Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. *The Greek Patristic View of Nature*. New York,

1968.

Wand, J.W.C. *The Greek Doctor*. London, 1950.

Watson, P.S. *The Concept of Grace*. London, 1959.

Wiles, M.F. In Defence of Arius. *JThS*, NS (13) 1962, 339-347.

_____. *The Making of Christian Doctrine*. Cambridge, 1967.

Wiles, M. and Santer, M. *Documents in Early Christian Thought*. Cambridge, 1975.

Wilken, R.L. The Interpretation of the Baptism of Jesus in the Later Fathers. *TU* (108) 1972, 268-277.

Williams, N.P. *The Grace of God*. London, 1930.

Williams, R.D. The Logic of Arianism. *JThS*, NS (34) 1983, 56-81.

_____. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. London, 1987.

van Winden, J.C.M. On the Date of Athanasius' Apologetical Treatises. *VC* (29) 1975, 291-295.

Wingen, G. *Man and the Incarnation. A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus*. London, 1959.

Wolfson, H.A. Philosophical Implications of Arianism and Apollinarianism. *DOP* (12) 1958, 5-28.

_____. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. Vol. 1: *Faith, Trinity and Incarnation*. 2nd. ed. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

Yanney, R. The Church Behind Saint Athanasius the Great. *Coptic Church Review* (2,9) 1988, 35-44.

Yarnold, E. *The Second Gift-A Study of Grace*. Slough, 1974.

Yesbaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology*. Nijmegen, 1962.

Young, F.M. *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to St. John Chrysostom*. Cambridge, Mass. 1979.

_____. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*. London, 1983.

Zaphiris, G. Connaissance Naturelle de Dieu d'après Athanase d'Alexandrie. *Κληρονομία* (6) 1974, 61-96.

*

* *

