



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *Athanasius' contra arianos iv: a reconsideration*

Cathleen S.W. Walbrodt,

#### How to cite:

---

Cathleen S.W. Walbrodt, (1993) *Athanasius' contra arianos iv: a reconsideration*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5522/>

#### 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.

CATHLEEN S. W. WALBRODT, ESQUIRE,  
ATHANASIUS' CONTRA ARIANOS IV: A RECONSIDERATION

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to provide a through reconsideration of the treatise *Oratio IV Contra Arianos* (hereinafter referred to as *CAR IV*), which historically is attributed to St. Athanasius. This reconsideration addresses three main areas of inquiry:

1. Is it defensible to consider Athanasius to be the author of *CAR IV* in terms of linguistics and theology?
2. Since the Athanasian premise is not universally accepted, what other authors are suggested by patristics scholars?
3. Regardless of authorship, what theological value does *CAR IV* hold for the contemporary reader?

It is this author's contention that *CAR IV*, though a lesser-known writing of the Nicene period, is a very significant treatise. *CAR IV* offers a valuable insight into the theologically rich and complex world of the fourth century church. In *CAR IV*, by way of refutation, we are introduced to a view as radical and persistent as Arianism but less often discussed -- modalistic monarchianism. An understanding of all the varied doctrines that did battle at Nicea leads to a greater appreciation for the endurance of the tradition expressed in the Nicene creed.

In conclusion, the present author finds the argument that *CAR IV* is genuinely Athanasian but separate from the other three Orations to be the most convincing theory yet expounded. *CAR IV* would be more properly titled *Contra Marcellum*. Perhaps Athanasius never gave this title to the work in deference to Marcellus. Only Athanasius, Marcellus' friend, would demonstrate this consideration. It is also suggested that *CAR IV* was an incomplete rough draft. The author of this thesis agrees with this reasoning also, and after contemplation would further this explanation by hypothesizing that *CAR IV* was an incomplete text of Athanasius that was collected and arranged in its current form posthumously by students of the Bishop.

ATHANASIUS' CONTRA ARIANOS IV:

A RECONSIDERATION

VOLUME 1 OF 2

CATHLEEN S. W. WALBRODT

DOCTOR OF JURISPRUDENCE

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

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.

MASTER OF ARTS DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

1993



30 JUN 1994

ATHANASIUS' CONTRA ARIANOS IV: A RECONSIDERATION

VOLUME ONE

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	iii
PART I: THE HISTORY OF CRITICISM . . . . .	1
1. Pre-Nineteenth Century Scholars . . . . .	1
2. Cardinal John H. Newman . . . . .	2
3. Anton Stegmann . . . . .	6
4. The Patrologists . . . . .	10
5. Conclusions and Assessments . . . . .	11
PART II: THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP . . . . .	13
1. The Athanasius Hypothesis . . . . .	13
a) Style and Discourse Construction . . . . .	13
b) Biblical Exegesis . . . . .	15
c) Vocabulary . . . . .	71
2. The Apollinaris Hypothesis . . . . .	89
3. The Eustathius Hypothesis . . . . .	95
PART III: THE QUESTION OF DOCTRINE . . . . .	98
1. The Contents . . . . .	98
2. The Addressee . . . . .	103
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	110
APPENDIX : COMMON VOCABULARY LIST . . . . .	115
ENDNOTES . . . . .	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	130

VOLUME TWO

THE FRAGMENTS OF MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA

This thesis presupposes a knowledge of Greek. The interpretations of the passages and vocabulary words presented here are my own work. I fulfilled a minor concentration in Greek and was the Tanner Award recipient for the Outstanding Greek Scholar of the Class of 1989 at the University of Richmond, Virginia.

Alexander Walbrodt (a visiting student at the University of Durham) was the primary translator of the German language materials used in this thesis. He was assisted by Johannes Klingmann (also a student at the University of Durham) who translated the Opitz article. My most heartfelt thanks go to Mr. Walbrodt for his excellent and conscientious translations.

The vocabulary lists were prepared on the University of Durham mainframe computer system with the patient advice of the Computer Center staff members, especially David Thornton.

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

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to provide a thorough reconsideration of the treatise *Oratio IV Contra Arianos* (hereinafter referred to as CAR IV), which is historically attributed to St. Athanasius. This reconsideration addresses three main areas of inquiry:

1. Is it defensible to consider Athanasius to be the author of CAR IV?
2. Since the Athanasian premise is not universally accepted, what other authors are suggested by patristics scholars?
3. Regardless of authorship, what theological value does CAR IV hold for the contemporary reader?

It is this author's contention that CAR IV, though a lesser-known writing of the Nicene period, is a very significant treatise. CAR IV offers a valuable insight into the theologically rich and complex world of the fourth century church. In CAR IV, by way of refutation, we are introduced to a view as radical and persistent as Arianism, but less often discussed -- modalistic monarchianism. An understanding of all the varied doctrines that did battle at Nicaea leads to a greater appreciation for the endurance of the tradition expressed in the Nicene creed. Therefore, a study of CAR IV is a useful exercise for any scholar who would know the whole background of our notions of orthodox faith, as the doctrines of the modern era cannot be understood apart from their full patristic heritage.

All matters of style conform with A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, by Kate L. Turabian.

## PART I: THE HISTORY OF CRITICISM

### 1. Pre-Nineteenth Century Scholars

Prior to the nineteenth century there was scholarly consensus concerning CAR IV: that it was 1) indisputably Athanasian, and 2) part of the set of anti-Arian disputations, although not necessarily conceived of as such. This viewpoint can be found in the writings of Petavius, Tillemont, Ceillier, and Montfaucon.<sup>1</sup>

During the Renaissance, Dionysius Petavius (1583 - 1652)<sup>2</sup> unequivocally affirmed the Athanasian authorship of this text in his treatise de Incarnatione.<sup>3</sup> Petavius was a Jesuit historian who specialized in the development of doctrine and was well-known also as a patristics critic. His work influenced Cardinal Newman, a man who would figure prominently in the nineteenth century world of Athanasian studies.<sup>4</sup>

French patristic scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were staunch advocates of the Athanasian authorship of CAR IV. Louis Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont (1637-1698) was a prominent church historian.<sup>5</sup> In *Mem. Eccl.t.* 8 p. 701, he writes in favor of the unity of the four discourses as well as of the Athanasian authorship. Bernard de Montfaucon (1655-1741) concurred with him on these points as did Ceillier. Montfaucon asserted that the unity of this collection was so obvious that any external proofs would be superfluous. He further contended that the anti-Arian discourses were not planned as a set but rather that they represented a continuing response to ongoing, albeit adapting, heretical suppositions. Montfaucon presented this view in his *Praef.* p.xxxv and *Vit. Ath.* p.lxxii.<sup>6</sup> A Maurist, Montfaucon was a member of an order of Benedictine monks who were acknowledged for their literary prowess. He personally was significant because he collected the texts and published editions of many great fathers, among them Origen, Athanasius, and St. John Chrysostom.<sup>7</sup>

Such is the legacy of pre-nineteenth century scholarship, united in its opinion that CAR IV is Athanasian and further that it forms a logical union with *Contra Arianos* I, II, III (hereinafter referred to as CAR I, II, III).



## 2. **Cardinal John H. Newman**

In the nineteenth century, Cardinal Newman made the most definitive statements concerning CAR IV. He maintained 1) CAR IV is indeed genuinely Athanasian (and so he concurred with the judgement of the previous scholars cited), 2) that CAR IV is not written strictly as a response to Arianism and therefore does not form a set with CAR I, II, III, and 3) that CAR IV rather is a collection unto itself, composed of several treatises primarily directed against Marcellism. Thus, Newman's main contribution to the study of this document was his assertion that CAR IV functions independently of the preceding three and is concerned with an altogether separate heresy.

Newman began by examining external references to CAR IV. The only ancient reference to CAR IV that Newman offered is that of Photius in his *Pentabiblus*, codex 140. Photius here merely mentions five anti-Arian Athanasian discourses. This reference is not conclusive; it is nowhere clear that the document now known as CAR IV was indeed one of the treatises in the ninth century Patriarch of Constantinople's collection. The numbering of these discourses in the Benedictine manuscript tradition is haphazard at best. Newman appears justified in asserting that there is no extant ancient tradition that argues cogently for the inclusion of CAR IV in the set of anti-Arian disputations.<sup>8</sup>

Newman based a large portion of his argument on his analysis of the internal and external style of CAR IV. By internal style he referred to the rhetorical presentation as well as the use of terms and phrases within the known Athanasian works.

Internal style will be considered first. Newman's first observation was that CAR IV is fragmented; abrupt transitions exist between chapters and this suggested to Newman that the text was composed in a piecemeal fashion. CAR IV does not exhibit the seamless flow of thought that is the hallmark of a finished Athanasian composition. Thus, the rhetorical style is different and the work does not exhibit the well-composed and premeditated form that is the more typical. A further example of this is the fact that CAR IV does not open with a clear introduction and statement of purpose as do CAR I, II, III. The internal presentation, then, implied to Newman that the text is a composite



of roughly connected subsections lacking introduction and cohesion.<sup>9</sup>

The second aspect of internal style is phraseology and the use of terms. For example, Newman referred to an observation of Montfaucon's in which Montfaucon noted that Athanasius never mentioned Eusebius by name after his death which occurred in 341 AD. Yet in chapter eight of CAR IV, "the ones with Eusebius" are referred to several times. From this Newman concluded that CAR IV must have been written previous to 341 AD, and yet CAR I was not penned until approximately 358 AD. This is further support for the independent composition of CAR IV.<sup>10</sup>

Vocabulary constitutes both an internal and an external characteristic. In CAR IV, specific and important vocabulary words are used in a unique sense. An example of this is the term "arche" which is used extensively to refer to the divine origin. In the other three orations, however, this word is used simply to distinguish "beginning".<sup>11</sup> Significant also is the inclusion of the term "homoousion" which is not employed in Athanasius' previous refutations of the Arians. While the term "homoousion" is included in his argument, the term "autosophia" (self-wisdom) is not. Yet "autosophia" was used in CAR I, II, III; Newman deferred to Petavius, who suggested that "autosophia" was excluded from Athanasius' discussion because of possible Sabellian overtones.<sup>12</sup> If this were the case, the addressee/s were of a Sabellian rather than an Arian orientation. Indeed, the selection and use of such key terms does suggest this. In general then, Newman did not detect a relationship between CAR IV and the preceding three treatises in terms of vocabulary or mode of argument.

An examination of Newman's analysis of the contents of CAR IV is in order. As noted previously, the structure of the text is fragmented and the transitions between blocks of material are abrupt or nonexistent. Newman divided the body of the text into nine separate sections. Within these nine sections there are five different topics. The treatment of these various topics was not arranged in an orderly fashion; sections of material are juxtaposed and thus Athanasius' arguments are constantly interrupting each other.<sup>13</sup>

The first topic or subject is that of the monarchia or divine origin. This subject is addressed in three sections: chapters 1-5, 9-10, 25. These three sections of chapters are quite spread out within the body of the document. In the first section of material Athanasius argues that God is a monarchia, a sole principle. This being the case, the Logos cannot represent a second beginning or origin because then the monarchia would be confounded and the Godhead compounded. Such a second origin would reduce the Logos to the status of a mere attribute, an adjective describing God that is temporal instead of a substantive noun that is of the Father's essence. Likewise, in chapters nine and ten, Athanasius reiterates that in order for the monarchia to be upheld, the Father and the Son must be consubstantial. If they are not coessential, Athanasius argues that either ditheism will be the result or it will be necessary to admit that They are two parts (and as parts, imperfect) of a larger whole that is the true God. Chapter twenty-five is the displaced conclusion to this subject, and it is another resounding refutation of the Sabellian doctrine that the Logos exists in name only and is not a distinct consubstantial hypostasis.<sup>14</sup> This first topic serves both as a condemnation of Arians who would designate the Son as a work and of Sabellians who misinterpret the doctrine of the divine monarchia, thus confounding the Trinity.

The second subject is unique and is addressed only in chapters six and seven; that is, the distorted Arian understanding of the humiliation of the Incarnate Son. The Son was subject to human emotions and frailties but He was not overcome by them as a mere creature would have been. He assumed these weaknesses for us in order to destroy them. The exaltation of the Son does not imply that He once lacked these divine gifts of grace; rather, as our Mediator, he allows our humanity to be blessed and exalted also through Him.<sup>15</sup>

After this diversion, the next topic, the comparison of the christology of the Arians and the Photinians, is introduced in chapters six and seven. This discussion is found in chapters eight, eleven and twelve. The Arians, who designate a beginning to the Logos, are demonstrated to be inconsistent in claiming that His kingship is eternal. The King and His kingdom cannot be separated in such a manner. These adherents quarrel with the Photinians who do not distinguish the Logos within the Godhead. Since

the Photinians do not accept the integrity of the Logos' personal existence, the Arian Logos actually predates the Photinian. Chapters eleven and twelve continue the comparison. These two heretical groups concurred in their belief that the Logos was issued forth for the purpose of creation. This implies that before the issuing of the Logos, God was silent and inactive, and also that, like the creative mission, the Logos is temporal. Thus, the Father was incomplete without the Logos, the Logos itself was temporary and mutable, and imperfection was introduced into the Godhead.<sup>16</sup>

The fourth topic identified by Newman addresses the Sabellian doctrine of the expansion and contraction of the divine monad. This is a corollary to the Photinian assertion mentioned above: that the Logos was issued forth for the economic purpose of creation. Chapters thirteen and fourteen, then, are Athanasius' response to this problem. If the monad expands to a Trinity in time, it is only a Trinity in name, an illusion.<sup>17</sup> If the mission of the Logos is temporal and He is reabsorbed into the Monad after He has served His purpose, then creation cannot be maintained. To Athanasius, such consequences are proof of the absurdity of this doctrine.

Chapters fifteen through thirty-six (with the exclusion of chapter twenty-five) form the fifth and final topic which is a lengthy refutation of the Photinian and Samosatean doctrine which separates the Logos from the Son. This belief occurs in three variant forms: 1) that Sonship is located only in the man Jesus of Nazareth, 2) that the Son is an entity composed of the Logos and this man Jesus together, and 3) that the Logos was granted Sonship at the Incarnation. Athanasius disputes these theories through scriptural proof and reasoned logic.<sup>18</sup>

Newman's contributions to the study of CAR IV are substantial. He has suggested that the treatise is separate from the first three and that CAR IV is directed primarily against the doctrines of Marcellus of Ancyra and his followers (Photinus being chief among them). This is a significant observation because the unfinished elements of CAR IV do not present a convincing argument in favor of its isolation from CAR I, II, III. Its wholly different subject matter, however, argues for separation. Whereas Athanasius openly names and accuses the Arians, the opponents in this writing remain

anonymous. This approach suggests that the relationship between Athanasius and the people referred to in CAR IV was a delicate one and that the lines of heresy and opposition were not yet fully drawn. That would not have been the case if the addressee/s were blatant Arians. Newman suggested that the Sabellian tendencies ascribed to the opposition provided strong support for his claim of a Marcellian addressee.<sup>19</sup> In order to conclude which heresy is being addressed, it is necessary to examine the views of Marcellus and compare them with those of the adversary in CAR IV. If these views converge, the Marcellian supposition is tenable and serves as further proof of Newman's theory of the independent nature of CAR IV. Such an investigation will be entertained in a following chapter.

This student's only criticism of Newman's highly scholarly work is that he did not devote attention to proving the Athanasian authorship of CAR IV. Newman was concerned with differentiating CAR IV from CAR I, II, III. He accepted the authenticity as one of his constants. Since Newman is such an authority, this omission of a discussion of the authenticity can mean only that the authorship was not in question for him. If Newman saw the authenticity of CAR IV as at all dubious, he would have addressed the issue directly.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, John Kaye<sup>20</sup> and William Bright<sup>21</sup> also wrote statements concerning CAR IV. Both of these scholars were heavily influenced by Newman, and accordingly they concurred with Newman's evaluation of CAR IV: that the text is indeed Athanasian but that it is a treatise separate from the anti-Arian discourses CAR I, II, III and that it is a collection of interwoven subtreatises directed against Marcellism. Both Kaye and Bright have written lucid and helpful analyses, but these are simply a recapitulation of Newman.

### 3. **Anton Stegmann**

Since Newman's mid-nineteenth century writings, Anton Stegmann is the first scholar to give more than a passing glance to CAR IV. Stegmann has written what is to date the definitive book on the subject. This book, Die pseudo-athanasianische "IVte Rede gegen die Arianer," from 1917, is concerned largely with defending Stegmann's

thesis that Apollinaris of Laodicea is the author of CAR IV, if the authorship can ever be determined at all. Apollinaris is Stegmann's focus more than is Athanasius. This Apollinaris hypothesis will be discussed later in this thesis, but here we will ask Stegmann this question: Why not Athanasius? Stegmann begins by examining the history of criticism of CAR IV. He was unconvinced by the assertions and assumptions of Newman, Kaye, and Bright that CAR IV was authentic but simply distinct from CAR I, II, III.<sup>22</sup>

Stegmann later noted that Harnack, Fisch, and Robertson agreed with Newman's theory that CAR IV is abrupt and fragmented and thus possibly a rough draft. These three are more skeptical, however, of the treatise's Athanasian authenticity than was Newman, who held CAR IV to be genuine. Draseke, Hoss, Stülcken, Lippel, Rauschen, Gummerus, and particularly Rettberg were more emphatic in their rejection of the traditional Athanasian authorship than were Harnack, Fisch, and Robertson, who expressed only significant doubts.<sup>23</sup>

Another explanation for the abrupt transitions in CAR IV cited by Stegmann was offered by Loofs who contended that scribes have altered CAR IV in the copying process but that any such changes were very ancient.<sup>24</sup> Hoss and Stülcken agreed that portions of the text have been altered, but this does not affect their decision that even an "original" CAR IV probably would be spurious.<sup>25</sup>

Stülcken, for example asserted that Chapters 1-29 and Chapters 30-36 of CAR IV are separate documents. Stegmann agreed that it is possible that CAR IV is more than one treatise linked together, but this did not affect his analysis of CAR IV or cause Stegmann to say that CAR IV was in part Athanasian. Stegmann did not find any overt inconsistencies in 1-29 when compared with 30-36 and continued to maintain that all of CAR IV is from the pen of the same pseudo-Athanasian author.<sup>26</sup>

Stegmann collected this body of criticism and was not impressed by any of the arguments in favor of the Athanasian authorship of CAR IV. His first reaction, as was Newman's, was to note the fragmented nature of CAR IV. Blocks of chapters lack

transition and cohesion which is typical of a genuine Athanasian writing. Unlike Newman, Stegmann did not explain away contradictions by hypothesizing that CAR IV is unfinished, nor did he hold with Loofs, Hoss, and Stülcken who contended that CAR IV as we know it has suffered alteration of some kind.<sup>27</sup>

Stegmann investigated further into the manuscript tradition to determine CAR IV's status in the Athanasian corpus. The popular Migne edition of CAR IV is taken from the Baselenensis, Cantabridgensis, and Felckmannus I Codices with corrections from Regius I and Seguerianus. This is the same combination previously used in the 1698 Montfaucon compilation of the text of the CAR IV.<sup>28</sup>

Stegmann contended that CAR IV usually is present in later codices, or was mentioned only by title in later indices to previous early codices. Through his research, Stegmann discovered that all the texts of CAR IV are to some degree incomplete. This evidence suggested to Stegmann that CAR IV was inserted into the Athanasian corpus at a later date and that the author of CAR IV or his disciples were trying to associate this treatise with the great Bishop.<sup>29</sup>

Stegmann agreed with the general consensus that CAR IV dates from approximately 340 AD, but gave a range anywhere between 335 and 342 AD as most likely.<sup>30</sup> Certainly it was written before 345 AD when Photinus, one of those refuted in the treatise, was condemned. There would be no need to combat Photinus and name him personally after his condemnation had been secured.<sup>31</sup> Only if Photinus had followers in provinces where his name remained current for some time following his denouncement in Rome would there have been a need to reiterate his condemnation.

As a further argument, Stegmann contended that the internal style is unAthanasian. Parataxis is used rather than the more Athanasian hypotaxis.<sup>32</sup> Dräseke, Hoss, and Stülcken had more difficulty in identifying a typical Athanasian style because they asserted that some of the Bishop's writings are simple, whereas others are complex.<sup>33</sup>

The use of scripture was also deemed unAthanasian by Stegmann, as the mode of interpretation in CAR IV tends to be literal in comparison with Athanasius' usually more allegorical style.<sup>34</sup> Stegmann admitted however, that overall the use of scripture in CAR IV cannot be used satisfactorily either to prove or to refute the Athanasian hypothesis, as there are not striking similarities or differences between such use in CAR I, II, III and CAR IV.<sup>35</sup>

Stegmann did find the theology of CAR IV to be at times Athanasian. In other writings of Athanasius and CAR IV, the Logos is needed to impart grace to mankind, but CAR IV adds that man is unworthy of this gift.<sup>36</sup> Some of the language employed in CAR IV's theology is atypical, such as the emphasis on "homoousion" and "anthropos."<sup>37</sup>

The most compelling argument Stegmann offered against the Athanasian authorship is that the theology of CAR IV is Alexandrian but the terminology is Antiochene.<sup>38</sup> That fact, Stegmann maintained, presents an inherent contradiction of which the author of CAR IV is unaware.<sup>39</sup> The Alexandrian school of thought was marked by a concern for the immanent Trinity, in extreme cases leading to tritheism, and an allegorical approach to scripture.<sup>40</sup> The Antiochenes stressed the economic Trinity, with a strong emphasis on monotheism and on the humanity of Christ. A more literal style of exegesis was preferred. The Antiochene theology was refuted in 431 AD at the Council of Ephesus.<sup>41</sup> Stegmann did not address this supposed dichotomy in CAR IV in a systematic way, but contended that it was such a pervasive and glaring discrepancy that the reader of CAR IV would be able to detect it also.<sup>42</sup> Newman noted some unusual terms in CAR IV, but in his mind it did not rise to the level of an inherent contradiction, as Stegmann so boldly stated. A major evaluation by a linguist of CAR IV and CAR I, II, III would be needed to determine if words such as "homoousion" and "anthropos" necessarily imply an Antiochene influence on the part of the author of CAR IV.

In general, Stegmann dismissed any claim to Athanasian authorship on the following grounds: 1) the traditional association of Athanasius with CAR IV had never

been systemically proven to be anything more than conjecture, 2) the nature of the text of CAR IV is abrupt and fragmented, 3) the manuscript evidence supporting CAR IV's authenticity is weak, 4) the writing style is unAthanasian in its use of parataxis and literal interpretation of scripture and 5) unusual Antiochene terms such as "homoousion" and "anthropos" regularly are employed.

Although Stegmann's comparison of CAR IV to the Apollinaris corpus is very scientific and thorough, the present author has two criticisms of Stegmann. First, he does not properly address the Athanasius hypothesis. Before proving that Apollinaris is the author, Stegmann should have demonstrated in just as methodical a fashion that Athanasius could not have written CAR IV because CAR IV would differ from CAR I, II, III in irreconcilable ways. Second, Stegmann does not give an adequate discussion of Newman. Newman was one of the foremost scholars of the nineteenth century, and as he did not die until 1890, his work was contemporary with Stegmann's world.<sup>43</sup> Newman, in his introduction to CAR IV in the 1844 A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, has written thirteen critical pages on CAR IV that are the most detailed work to date. Nowhere in this work does Newman question the authenticity of CAR IV; he does not find any inherent contradiction between the theology and the vocabulary. Stegmann should not have dismissed Newman in a cursory fashion. Newman's name is listed simply with a string of other scholars, but Stegmann needed to devote at least a chapter to Newman.

A German contemporary of Stegmann was Opitz. He dismissed CAR IV, stating that the text of CAR IV gives insufficient data for critique.<sup>44</sup> This did not amount to a rejection of the Athanasian authorship of CAR IV on the part of Opitz.

#### 4. **The Patrologists.**

Bardenhewer - In his 1908 patrology predating the work of Stegmann, Bardenhewer provided a positive Athanasian evaluation of CAR IV. For Bardenhewer, the question of authorship was not an issue. He further asserted that the four books all were complementary and anti-Arian in nature.<sup>45</sup>



Cayre - Cayre took a much more critical approach in 1940: "The three first discourses are certainly authentic, but the fourth is probably apocryphal."<sup>46</sup> His assessment could have been influenced by Stegmann's analysis.

Altaner - CAR IV received only a one-line mention in this 1958 work, declaring CAR IV to be anonymous.<sup>47</sup>

Quasden - For Quasden, writing his patrology in 1960, CAR IV definitely was a spurious text. He based this decision on three factors: address, content, and style. Quasden maintained that the addressee/s were Marcellian and supported this theory by referring to the chapter contents. Except for a few diversions, the body of CAR IV is concerned with a heresy of a Sabellian/Samosatean orientation, namely Marcellism. Further, Quasden contended that the style and phraseology separate CAR IV not only from the other three Orations, but from the genuine Athanasian corpus as well.<sup>48</sup> His proofs are no more specific than those outline above, but Quasden seemed to be following Newman's rationale.

Except for Quasden, the work of the cited modern scholars concerning CAR IV appears to be inadequate. The investigations are superficial, cursory, and conclusory. Bold statements are made either in favor of or against Athanasian authorship with no supporting evidence. Neither Cayre nor Altaner discuss the doctrinal issues in CAR IV at all. Bardenhewer and Quasden at least venture their respective theories on the identity of the addressee, but without any analysis. Thus, the modern patrologists are not a useful resource for studying CAR IV.

## 5. **Conclusions and Assessments**

A reconsideration of CAR IV, in terms of both authorship and doctrine, is fully warranted. The earliest critics of CAR IV accepted the Athanasian authorship without serious investigation of the codices to determine the origin and reliability of that traditional association. The nineteenth century saw a methodical approach in Newman. Newman went into the text itself and, for the first time, noted that the style did not build

in a linear fashion and that, contrary to the title, the addressees primarily were of a Marcellian rather than an Arian orientation. This was an enormous contribution to the study of CAR IV. Stegmann did not accept Newman's thesis that CAR IV is authentic but separate from the other three Orations. He contended, without sufficient comparison of CAR IV to CAR I, II, III, that CAR IV is spurious and further is the work of Apollinaris of Laodicea. However, Stegmann's work is very valuable and although he devotes little attention to comparing and contrasting CAR IV with CAR I, II, III, his investigation of the Apollinaris hypothesis still yields much valuable research on CAR IV. Contemporary scholars have accepted Stegmann's premise that CAR IV is spurious as blithely as Renaissance critics accepted the authenticity of CAR IV. Newman's work appears to be little appreciated by modern scholars. It is the business of the second part of this thesis, therefore, to consider the following:

1. How does CAR IV compare with CAR I, II, III in terms of style, biblical exegesis and vocabulary?
2. How does Stegmann compare CAR IV to the works of Apollinaris?
3. What is Hanson's Eustathius hypothesis?

## **PART II: THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP**

### **1. The Athanasius Hypothesis**

#### **a) Style and Discourse Construction.**

There is much debate concerning the definition of "typical Athanasian style." Photius, Erasmus, and later Dräseke, found Athanasius' writing to be plain and without ornament. On the other hand, Hoss and Stülcken maintained that the Bishop had an elaborate style and employed a wide vocabulary. Stegmann was noncommittal and held that Athanasius wrote inconsistently, with some writings being simple and others complex. Thus, Stegmann contended that Athanasius' style cannot be labelled.<sup>49</sup>

In terms of construction, Stegmann argued that Athanasius regularly used the device of hypotaxis.<sup>50</sup> Hypotaxis involves complex clauses and is contrasted with parataxis which relies on strings of simple clauses connected by numerous conjunctions. Stegmann contended that CAR IV exhibits parataxis and not the preferred hypotaxis, and argued that this contributes to CAR IV's spurious status.<sup>51</sup> If Stegmann is correct in this hypothesis, then CAR IV should make more use of conjunctions than CAR I, II, III.

<u>Conjunction</u>	<u>Document</u>	<u>Number of Occurrences of Conjunction in Document</u>	<u>Number of Chapters in Document</u>	<u>Average Frequency of the Conjunction Per Chapter</u>
και	CAR I	1,584	64	24.75
	CAR II	1,976	82	24.10
	CAR III	1,684	67	25.13
	CAR IV	675	36	18.75
δε	CAR I	451	64	7.05
	CAR II	531	82	6.48
	CAR III	415	67	6.19
	CAR IV	260	36	7.22
γαρ	CAR I	336	64	5.25
	CAR II	421	82	5.13
	CAR III	381	67	5.67
	CAR IV	202	36	5.61
ὅτι	CAR I	137	64	2.14
	CAR II	186	82	2.25
	CAR III	190	67	2.84
	CAR IV	65	36	1.75
εἰ	CAR I	166	64	2.59
	CAR II	225	82	2.74
	CAR III	163	67	2.43
	CAR IV	150	36	4.17

In the above examples of common conjunctions, CAR IV and CAR I, II, III make a similar reliance. The only significant differences are the use of εἰ and και. Stegmann has also noted that the use of εἰ is more frequent in CAR IV.<sup>52</sup> However, this is the only conjunction that would argue in favor of a parataxic construction. The basic conjunction και is employed less often in CAR IV than in CAR I, II, III. It seems that a parataxic construction would use και often as a means of stringing simple clauses. This is common in the κοινὴ Greek of the New Testament. If Stegmann is correct, it is odd that CAR IV does not make more use of the conjunction και. Since CAR IV does not employ και even as regularly as do CAR I, II, III, a deeper investigation of the

structure of CAR IV by a linguist would be needed before Stegmann's theory that CAR IV exhibits no hypotaxis could be accepted.

Newman referred to early Athanasian style as "graceful and artistic" even though it was in need of "pruning."<sup>53</sup> He cited Gibbon who contended that Athanasius' writing displayed a "rude eloquence."<sup>54</sup> As for the style of CAR IV in particular, Newman found it to be abrupt, fragmented, and lacking internal cohesion.<sup>55</sup> For this reason, Newman theorized that CAR IV is a rough draft or a collection of notes.<sup>56</sup> Newman found a usual Athanasian writing to be more linear, but in the case of CAR IV he attributed the difference to circumstance and not to outside authorship.

Another troublesome issue is whether or not Athanasius' writing style evidences a knowledge of the pagan classics. Dräseke maintained that Athanasius was largely ignorant of Stoic and classical thought.<sup>57</sup> R.P.C. Hanson shared his opinion. Newman disagreed and proposed that Athanasius had a liberal education and was well schooled in the classics.<sup>58</sup> This is an important issue in deciding the authorship of CAR IV. CAR IV, 29 quotes four lines of Homer's Odyssey. This quote, without Newman's explanation that Athanasius was familiar with Homer and Plato, would otherwise seem out of place.

In conclusion, scholars have found it difficult to generalize concerning Athanasius' writing style. Stegmann was perhaps correct when he wrote that Athanasius' style was inconsistent, but Gibbons' phrase "rude eloquence" captures the paradox in a more sophisticated manner.<sup>59</sup> It is not so much that Athanasius was inconsistent as it is that he freely employed a style to suit a particular writing or subsection. As for the parataxis/hypotaxis dichotomy, further study by a linguist is needed. Athanasius' style is sufficiently complicated, however, that some knowledge of Attic writers would seem likely. CAR IV is difficult to judge because it is so fragmented. It is possible that it was only a draft, and that a final form may have read quite differently.

#### **1. b) Biblical Exegesis**

A thorough investigation of the authorship of CAR IV must include an analysis

of the use of scripture. The analysis presented here is based on the concept of parallel quotes, that is, biblical quotes appearing both in CAR IV and in at least one of the other three disputations. The object is to determine whether or not the author of CAR IV and Athanasius chose the same passages of scripture to quote and, if so, whether or not the passages are quoted consistently in terms of both linguistics and theology.

The amount of scriptural quotes in CAR IV when compared with the other three treatises is consistent. For example, CAR I contains 64 chapters and 227 biblical quotes, resulting in a chapter/quote ratio of 1:3.5. Following this same formula: CAR II = 82/378, 1:4.6; CAR III = 67/274, 1:4.0. CAR IV is very similar; it contains 36 chapters with 148 biblical quotes resulting in a ratio of 1:4.1. It is likely therefore that the author of CAR IV assigned scriptural support a role of equal importance to that assigned by Athanasius in CAR I, II, III.

The quotes in CAR IV, however, are distributed differently throughout the books of the bible as compared to CAR I, II, III. See Chart A. The author of CAR IV selected his verses from a narrower field, and there is an even greater reliance on the fourth gospel, indeed on the whole of the Johannine corpus than in CAR I, II, III.

In the following discussion of parallel quotes (quotes common to both CAR IV and at least one of the other three orations), verses that are alluded to are included in the analysis if the allusions are significant to the argument presented in the texts, and other quoted verses relating to the exposition of the quote at hand are cross-referenced.

Refer to Chart B for a listing of all biblical verses quoted in CAR IV. This is useful in determining which verses the author of CAR IV preferred to combine within an argument.

Refer to Chart C for a listing of all parallel quotes.

The text of CAR I, II, III, IV is from A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church; this edition was edited by Newman who identified the scriptural quotes and allusions. The present author searched the texts of CAR I, II, III, IV and organized the

quotes that Newman identified in his footnotes. The concept of parallel quotes, the compilations, and the analysis are original work.

In the discussion of parallel quotes that follows Charts A, B, and C, the verse at hand is quoted in full in Greek and in English. Each occurrence of the verse in CAR I, II, III, IV is provided then in Greek for comparison. For example, did the two authors use different texts of the scriptures? Did they appear to quote from memory? Then each occurrence of the parallel verse is paraphrased in English. The final evaluation of each verse assesses whether or not the author of CAR IV and Athanasius exegeted it compatibly.

## CHART A: DISTRIBUTION OF QUOTES THROUGHOUT THE BIBLE

Book of the Bible	Number of Occurrences in CAR 1, 2, 3	Number of Occurrences in CAR 4	Percent of all quotes in CAR 1, 2, 3	Percent of all quotes in CAR 4
<b>Old Testament</b>				
Genesis	43	3	4.89	2.03
Exodus	11	-	1.25	-
Leviticus	2	1	0.02	0.07
Deuteronomy	13	5	1.48	3.38
Joshua	1	-	0.01	-
Judges	1	-	0.01	-
I Samuel	-	1	-	0.01
II Samuel	1	-	0.01	-
I Kings	5	-	0.06	-
II Kings	3	-	0.03	-
Job	4	-	0.05	-
Psalms	103	15	11.72	10.14
Proverbs	49	2	5.57	1.35
Eccles.	3	-	0.03	-
Isaiah	32	3	3.64	2.03
Jeremiah	11	1	1.25	0.07
Ezekiel	1	-	0.01	-
Daniel	-	1	-	0.07
Hosea	1	-	0.01	-
Joel	2	-	0.02	-
Micah	1	-	0.01	-
Zechariah	3	-	0.03	-
Malachi	5	-	0.06	-
I Ezdras	1	-	0.01	-
Wisdom	2	-	0.02	-
Ecclsiasticus	3	-	0.03	-
Baruch	5	-	0.06	-
<b>New Testament</b>				
Matthew	69	9	7.85	6.08
Mark	10	-	1.14	-
Luke	19	4	2.16	2.70
John	210	72	23.89	48.65
Acts	13	5	1.48	3.38
Romans	41	1	4.66	0.07
I Corin.	32	4	3.64	2.70
II Corin.	10	3	1.14	2.03
Galatians	9	1	1.02	0.07
Ephesians	17	6	1.93	4.05
Philippians	21	2	2.39	1.35
Colossians	15	-	1.71	-
I Thess.	5	-	0.06	-
II Thess.	3	-	0.03	-
I Timothy	7	-	0.08	-
II Timothy	5	-	0.06	-
Titus	2	-	0.02	-
Hebrews	55	1	6.26	0.07
James	2	-	0.02	-
I Peter	6	-	0.07	-
II Peter	3	-	0.03	-
I John	12	3	1.37	2.03
Revelation	7	5	0.08	3.38

Total number of quotes in CAR 1, 2, 3 = 879

Total number of quotes in CAR 4 = 148



## CHART B: CAR IV - Biblical Quotes by Chapter

### Chapter:

1	John 1:1; Rom. 9:5
2	John 10:30, 14:10
3	-
4	Ps. 104:24; John 1:3, 1:14
5	Deut. 4:4, 4:7, 13:14, Jer. 23:23
6	Matt. 28:18; John 1:14; Eph. 1:20; Phil. 2:9
7	John 17:7-9; Phil. 2:9
8	-
9	John 10:3, 14:10
10	-
11	-
12	John 14:10
13	-
14	Gen. 9:27; II Cor. 6:11-12
15	-
16	Matt. 11:27; John 1:18; 10:32-38
17	Matt. 10:40, John 12:45-48
18	John 1:9, 3:16-19, 12:36, 12:45-47
19	John 1:8, 1:10, 1:18, 10:30, 12:45, 14:9-13
20	Matt. 1:1; John 8:58
21	John 3:36
22	Gen. 6:2; Deut. 32:6; Is. 1:2; John 5:17, 16:28; Gal. 4:6
23	I Sam. 2:27; Matt. 11:27; John 1:18, 10:30, 14:9
24	Gen. 22:2; Ps. 2:7, 9:45, 33:6, 45:1, 93:1, 110:3, Prov. 8:25; Is. 51; Dan. 3:25; Matt. 3:17
25	I Cor. 12:4
26	Deut. 7:18; Ps. 45:title, 74:12, 77:11; Is. 66:2; John 1:1, 1:18, 14:5; I John 1:1-2, 5:20
27	Ps. 110:3, 119:73, 148:5
28	Ps. 22:9; Rev. 22:13-17
29	John 1:1, 1:14, 14:26
30	Acts 10:36; I Cor. 1:7-8
31	Lev. 9:7; John 1:14; I Cor. 1:24
32	Matt. 28:19; Lk. 1:35; II Cor. 5:4
33	Acts 3:20
34	Ps. 127:1; Prov. 9:1; Matt. 7:25, 16:18; John 2:19, 10:33; Eph. 4:20-24; Heb. 3:6
35	Lk. 24:39, 23:42-43; John 10:30, 14:9, 20:27; Acts 2:22, 10:38, 17:3
36	John 8:10, 8:42

## CHART C: Biblical Quotes in CAR IV and Parallels

<u>Quote</u>	<u>Location</u>
Gen. 6:2	IV, 22
9:27	IV, 14
22:2	IV, 24
Lev. 9:27	IV, 31
Deut. 4:4	IV, 5
4:7	IV, 5
7:8	IV, 26
13:4	IV, 5
32:6	IV, 58 (2x); IV, 22
I. Sam. 2:27	IV, 23
Ps. 2:7	IV, 23; II, 57; IV, 24
9:1	IV, 24
22:9	IV, 28
33:6	IV, 31; III, 65; IV, 24
45:1	II, 57; III, 59; III, 67; IV, 24
45:1	IV, 26
74:12	IV, 26
77:11	IV, 26
93:1	IV, 24
104:24	I, 19; I, 56; II, 5; II, 31; II, 32; II, 40; II, 45; II, 71; II, 78; IV, 4
110:3	IV, 24; IV, 27
119:73	II, 57; IV, 27
127:1	IV, 34
148:5	IV, 27
Prov. 8:25	II, 32; II, 56; II, 80; IV, 24
9:1	II, 44; II, 46; II, 50; IV, 34
Is. 1:2	IV, 22
5:1	IV, 24
66:2	II, 71; IV, 26
Jer. 23:23	IV, 5
Dan. 3:25	IV, 24
Matt. 1:1	IV, 20
3:7	I, 10; I, 15; 11, 23; II, 62; III, 59; IV, 24
7:25	IV, 34
10:40	II, 78 (2x); IV, 17
11:27	I, 12; I, 39; II, 22; III, 26; III, 35; III, 44; IV, 16; IV, 23
16:18	IV, 34
28:18	III, 26; III, 36; IV, 6
28:19	I, 59; IV, 32
Lk. 1:35	IV, 32
24:32	IV, 35
24:33	IV, 35
24:39	IV, 35

Jn.	1:1	I, II; I, 24; I, 41; II, 1; II, 32; II, 35; II, 51(2x); II, 53; II, 56; II, 57; II, 62; III, 4; III, 29; III, 59; IV, 1; IV, 26; IV, 29
	1:3	I, 13; I, 19; I, 56; II, 5; II, 24; II, 35; II, 39; II, 51; II, 71; II, 82; III, 9; III, 29; IV, 4
	1:8	IV, 19
	1:9	IV, 18
	1:10	IV, 19
	1:14	I, 41; I, 44; I, 60; I, 64; II, 1; II, 39; II, 44; II, 47; II, 62; II, 81; III, 29; III, 30; III, 43; IV, 4; IV, 6; IV, 29; IV, 31
	1:18	II, 62; IV, 6; IV, 19; IV, 23(2x); IV, 26
	2:19	IV, 34
	3:16	IV, 18
	3:17	I, 60; II, 55; IV, 18
	3:18	IV, 18(2x)
	3:19	IV, 18(2x)
	3:36	IV, 21
	5:17	II, 20; II, 29; IV, 22
	8:10	IV, 36
	8:42	IV, 36
	8:58	I, 13; II, 53; II, 27; IV, 20
	10:30	I, 16; I, 43; II, 33; II, 54; III, 3; III, 5; III, 6; III, 10; III, 16; III, 55; IV, 2; IV, 9; IV, 19; IV, 23; IV, 35
	10:32	IV, 15
	10:33	I, 4; IV, 16; IV, 34
	10:34	IV, 16
	10:35	I, 39; IV, 16
	10:36	II, 15; IV, 16
	10:37	II, 32; IV, 16
	10:38	II, 12; III, 5; III, 55(2x); III, 67(2x); IV, 16
	12:36	IV, 18
	12:45	IV, 17; IV, 18; IV, 19
	12:46	II, 54; IV, 18
	12:47	IV, 17; IV, 18
	12:48	IV, 17
	14:6	I, 12; I, 19; I, 20; I, 36; II, 20; II, 54; II, 61; III, 9; III, 19; IV, 26
	14:9	I, 12; I, 34; I, 61; II, 22; II, 54; II, 80; II, 82; III, 5; III, 16; III, 67; IV, 19; IV, 35
	14:10	I, 34; I, 61; II, 22; II, 33; II, 54; II, 82; III, 1; III, 5; III, 6; III, 10; III, 37; III, 67; IV, 2; IV, 12;
	14:11	IV, 19
	14:12	IV, 19
	14:13	IV, 19
	14:26	IV, 29
	16:28	IV, 22
	17:7	IV, 7(2x)
	17:8	IV, 7(2x)
	17:9	IV, 7

	20:27	IV, 35
	44:47	IV, 18
Acts	2:22	II, 12; IV, 35
	3:20	IV, 33
	10:36	IV, 30
	10:38	I, 47; IV, 35
	17:31	IV, 35
Rom.	9:5	I, 10; I, 11; IV, 1
I Cor.	1:7	IV, 30
	1:8	IV, 30
	1:24	I, 11; II, 32; II, 37; II, 42; II, 62; III, 30; III, 63; IV, 31
	12:4	IV, 25
Gal.	4:6	II, 59; IV, 22
Eph.	1:20	IV, 6
	4:20	IV, 34
	4:21	IV, 34
	4:22	IV, 34
	4:23	IV, 334
	4:24	II, 46; IV, 34
Phil.	2:9	I, 37; I, 40; IV, 6; IV, 7
Heb.	3:6	II, 10; IV, 34
I Jn.	1:1	IV, 26
	1:2	IV, 26
	5:20	III, 9; III, 19; IV, 26
Rev.	22:13	IV, 28
	22:14	IV, 28
	22:15	IV, 28
	22:16	IV, 28
	22:17	IV, 28

### 1. Deuteronomy 32:6.

Ταῦτα Κυρίῳ ἀνταποδίδοτε; οὐτῶ λαὸς μωρὸς καὶ οὐχὶ σοφός; οὐκ αὐτὸς οὐτός σου πατήρ ἐκτίσατό σε καὶ ἐποίησέ σε καὶ ἔπλασέ σε;

Do ye thus recompense the Lord? Is the people thus foolish and unwise? Did not he himself thy father purchase thee, and make thee, and form thee? (LXX)

#### Linguistic Considerations:

II, 58(2): Οὐκ αὐτὸς οὐτός σου Πατήρ ἐκτίσατό σε καὶ ἐποίησε καὶ σε ἔκτισέ σε

IV, 22: οὐκ αὐτός οὐτός σου Πατήρ

LXX uses ἔπλασσε from πλάσσω, to form or mould, whereas Athanasius here uses ἔκτισε, from κτίσῳ to establish, found, or create.

#### Theological Considerations:

II, 58(2): This verse affirms that men are created, made, established beings by nature. It is contrasted with verse 18 of the same Psalm, in which "created" is compared with "begotten." We are called to be sons, but the word is the only-begotten Son; therefore, we are designated "created" (as in verse 6) whereas He is begotten.

IV, 22: The Fatherhood of God in verse 6 implies that men are sons. But since we are sons on account of and through the Word, it follows that the Word too is Son. Moreover, the Word, the Son must be pre-existent for men of old were also known as sons of God. References also to Is. 1:2; Gen. 2:6.

Evaluation: Both texts use this verse as an illustration of man's relationship to God, and then contrast this with the begotten nature of the Son. Thus, these two expositions appear to be related.

**2. Psalm 2:7.**

διαγγέλων τὸ πρόσταγμα Κυρίου Κύριος εἶπε πρὸς με, υἱός μου εἶ  
σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

. . . declaring the ordinance of the Lord: the Lord said to me, Thou art my Son, to-day  
have I begotten thee.

II, 23: Υἱός μου εἶ σύ

II, 57: ἐγέννησα

IV, 24: Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

Theological Considerations:

II, 23: This verse refutes the Arians, for the Word is not described as the epitome of creation but rather as God's own Son. References also to Matt. 3:17.

II, 57: Additional scriptural support for the begotten, not created, nature of the Son. References also to Ps. 45:1; John 1:1.

IV, 24: Word and Son cannot be separated on the grounds that Word is an Old Testament term and Son a New Testament term and that therefore the term Son is expressing a later reality and a separate entity. Athanasius quotes this verse as proof. References also to Ps 9:1; Ps. 45:1; Is. 5:1.

Evaluation: CAR II and CAR IV are focusing on separate aspects and implications of this verse in a very straightforward way, as additional evidence for the begotten status of the Son. CAR IV, 24 is a more subtle exegesis, and a more unusual one: the very word Son is used as proof of the viability of that title in the Old Testament. These two interpretations are not opposed but neither are they corollary.

### 3. Psalm 33:6

Τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πάσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν.

By the word of the Lord the heavens were established; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.

#### Linguist Considerations:

II, 31: Τῷ λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν

III, 65: Τῷ λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν

IV, 24: Τῷ λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν

Note that in all passages the same portion of the verse is quoted exactly, even in CAR IV.

#### Theological Considerations:

II, 31: Unlike creatures, the Word acts upon the will of God without question, as in the act of creation. References also to: Ps. 104:24; I Cor. 8:6.

III, 65: The Word cannot be distinguished from God's "understanding, counsel, wisdom." This verse is used as a companion to Proverbs 3:19 -- creation is attributed to Wisdom and understanding in Proverbs and to the Word in this verse. Thus Athanasius argues that these titles are describing the same entity as well as the same function. References also to: Prov. 3:19; Ps. 135:6; I Thess. 5:18.

IV, 24: The title Son cannot be dismissed as mere prophecy in the Old Testament without also considering the title Word, such as in this Old Testament verse. References also to: Ps. 2:7; Ps. 93:1; Ps. 45:1.

Evaluation: The references in III, 65 and IV, 24 are related, for Athanasius' argument in both of these broader sections is basically the same. The Son is the proper Word of God, his Wisdom and understanding.

#### **4. Psalm 45:1**

Ἐξηρεύσατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν, λέγω ἐγὼ τὰ ἔργα μου  
τῷ βασιλεῖ ἢ γλῶσσά μου κάλαμος γραμματέως ὀξυγράφου.

My heart has uttered a good matter: I declare my works to the King: my tongue is the pen of a quick writer.

II, 57: Ἐξηρεύσατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν

III, 59: Ἐξηρεύσατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν

III, 67: Ἐξηρεύσατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν

IV, 24: Ἐξηρεύσατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν

#### Linguistic Considerations.

Again, this verse is quoted consistently in all passages concerned. Modern translations which render λόγον as matter or theme, etc. cast a slant on the verse that obviously differs from Athanasius' understanding. He takes λόγον to be referring here to the Son. Any translation which does not render λόγον as Word deprives the verse of this potential meaning.

#### Theological Considerations.

II, 57: This verse is used as further proof that the Son was not created. It should be noted that the translation that Athanasius quotes differs from the modern RSV version in a significant fashion: "My heart has burst with a good Word." References also to: Ps. 2:7; John 1:1.



III, 59: Again, this verse is used to illustrate the close relationship between the Father and the Son, and to affirm the uncreated nature of the Son. References also to: Mat 3:17; John 1:1; Ps. 36:9.

III, 67: Another affirmation that the Son is not a creature but has "burst forth" from the Father "as the Radiance from the Light." References also to: John 14:10.

IV,24: CAR IV uses this Old Testament passage to state again that if Old Testament references to the Son are prophetic so are references to the Word as in this verse. References also to: Ps 33:6, 93:1.

Evaluation: CAR IV employs this verse differently from CAR II, III; it is used as further evidence in Athanasius' argument in IV, 24 concerning proper Old Testament titles for the Son. Thus, 45:1 is not used to illustrate the begotten nature of the Son as in CAR II, III. But all the passages do concur in deeming this Psalm to be christological and that fact reveals a fundamental similarity in the mindset of the interpreter(s).

## 5. Psalm 104:24

Ὅς ἐμεγαλύνθη τὰ ἔργα σου Κύριε, πάντα ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας  
ἐπληρώθη ἡ γῆ τῆς κτίσεώς σου.

How great are thy works, O Lord! In wisdom thou hast wrought them all: the earth is filled with thy creation.

## Linguistic Considerations

I, 19: Πάντα ἐν Σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας

I, 56: Πάντα ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας

II, 5: Πάντα ἐν Σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας

II, 31: Πάντα γάρ, φησὶν, ἐν Σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας

II, 32: Πάντα ἐν Σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας

II, 40: Πάντα ἐν Σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας

II, 45: Ἐπληρώθη ἡ γῆ τῆς κτίσεως σου, Κύριε

II, 71: Ὡς ἐμεγαλύνθη τὰ ἔργα σου, Κύριε πάντα ἐν σοφίᾳ  
ἐποίησας

II, 78: Ἐπληρώθη ἡ γῆ τῆς κτίσεώς σου

IV, 4: Πάντα ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐποίησας

## Theological Considerations

- I, 19: God is a Fountain of Wisdom; therefore, if God is eternal so too is His Wisdom, which is referred to here. References also to: Proverbs 3:19.
- I, 56: Creatures are generate only in so far as they participate in the Son, the true Generate. This verse is used as a confirmation of the generative, creative power of the Son, Wisdom. References also to: John 1:3; Job 1:3; Gen 21:5.
- II, 5: Here Wisdom is distinguished from creation. If the Son is rightly recognized as Wisdom it follows that the Son is in no way a creature. Reference also to: John 1:3.
- II, 31: The will of God is perfectly executed by Wisdom as in the act of creation. References also to: Ps. 33:6; I Cor. 8:6.
- II, 32: God was always with Wisdom; Wisdom is essential and eternal. This verse demonstrates the creative function of Wisdom and it is folly to pretend that God was ever bereft of this capacity. References also to: Heb. 1:3; I Cor. 1:24; Ps. 36:9; Jer. 2:1; John 1:1; Luke 1:2; Ps. 107:20.
- II, 40: The Son is to be equated with Wisdom, here recognized as "the Framers of all."

II, 45: Creation is differentiated from Creator. References also to: Rom. 8:22; Rev. 8:9; I Tim. 4:4; Wis. 9:2.

II, 71: The works of God are listed and praised, but the Son or Word is not included because He is not a work. References also to Ps. 33:4.

II, 78: Wisdom fashioned all things.

IV, 4: If Wisdom is said to be the creator of all things, Christ included, this verse does not refer to Christ and Christ is not the one in the bosom of the Father. References also to: John 1:3, 1:14.

Evaluation There is no immediate connection between these examples other than a similar general exegesis of the verse involved: that Wisdom created all things and therefore is not to be counted among the creatures.

## **6. Psalm 119:73**

Αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐποίησάν με καὶ ἔπλασάν με, συνέτισόν με καὶ μαθήσομαι τὰς ἐντολάς σου.

Thy hands have made me, and fashioned me: instruct me, that I may learn thy commandments.

## Linguistic Considerations

II, 57            ἐποίησάν με καὶ ἔπλασάν με

II, 27            Αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐποίησάν με, καὶ ἔπλασάν με

## Theological Considerations

II, 57:            David here refers to himself as made as other creatures, reserving the term begotten for the Lord. References also to: Gen 1:1.

IV, 27:            Work are made by hand; the Son is made by the womb.

Evaluation: There are no conclusive correlations between these sections apart from a general understanding that creation and the son have proper and separate terminologies used to refer to their origins.

## **7. Proverbs 8:25**

Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἐδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν, γεννᾶ με.

Before the mountains were settled, and before all hills, he begets me.

## Linguistic Considerations

II, 32:            Πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾶ με

II, 56: Πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾶ με

II, 80: Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη, καί, πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν, καί, πρὸ τῶν  
ὕδάτων, καί, πρὸ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾶ με

A composite of fragments from 8:23-25. The allusions here are quoted out of order.

IV, 24: Πρὸ δὲ πάντων τῶν βουνῶν γεννᾶ με

### Theological Considerations

II, 56: The generation of the Son from the Father is affirmed uncompromisingly in this verse.

II, 80: Again a straight forward exposition: the Son is preexistent, He is not a creature. References also to: Prov. 8:24, 8:26.

IV, 24: This verse is used as an example of an Old Testament reference to the son. The Son cannot be dismissed as a new entity and thus one alien to the Word and Wisdom of the Old Testament. References also to: Ps. 110:3; Dan. 3:25.

Evaluation: CAR II uses Prov. 8:25 in a more profound and theological way than CAR IV. In Car IV, Prov. 8:25 is used secondarily as a reference to the preexistence of the Son. The primary use is as an addition to a list of Old Testament quotes.

## 8. Proverbs 9:1

Ἡ σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον, καὶ ὑπήρεισε στύλους ἑπτὰ.

Wisdom has built a house for herself, and set up seven pillars.

II, 44: Ἡ Σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον.

II, 46: Ἡ Σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον καὶ ὑπήρεισε στύλους ἑπτὰ.

II, 50: Ἡ Σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον.

IV, 34: Ἡ Σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον.

All of these quotations, including CAR IV, capitalize Σοφία, unlike the LXX.

### Theological Considerations

II, 44: Athanasius takes this quote to be an allusion to the Incarnation. References also to: Prov. 8:22, John 1:14.

II, 46: "House" is interpreted allegorically and so should Prov. 8:22, "He created me." References also to Prov. 8:22.

II, 50: Another mention of the Incarnation. References also to Prov. 3:19.

IV, 34: Again the Incarnation is discussed; the "house" was fashioned in the womb of Mary. References also to: Heb. 3:6.

Evaluation The dominant interpretation of this verse is as an allegorical reference to the Incarnation. Both discourses treat the verse in this same way, and it is quite easy to suppose that one mind was at work in both expositions.

**9. Isaiah 66:2**

Πάντα γάρ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χεὶρ μου, καὶ ἔστιν ἐμὰ πάντα ταῦτα,  
λέγει Κύριος· καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν ταπεινὸν  
καὶ ἡσύχιον, καὶ τρέμοντα τοὺς λόγους μου;

For all these things are mine, saith the Lord: and to whom will I have respect, but to the humble and meek, and the man that trembles at my words?

Literary Considerations

II, 71: Ἡ χεὶρ μου ἐποίησε ταῦτα πάντα

IV, 26: Ἡ χεὶρ σου γάρ, φησὶν, ἐποίησε ταῦτα πάντα

These are both similar rearrangements of the first half of 66:2.



## Theological Considerations

II, 71: Verse 66:2 claims that Word/Wisdom is the creator. But if He is deemed a creature, who then is His creator? References also to: Ps. 102:25, 143:5.

IV, 26: Hand is used as a symbol of the Son. The Right Hand is in the bosom of the Father as in the Son; thus the Hand is indeed the Son, who created all. References also to: Ps. 74:12; Deut. 7:8; Ps. 77:11, 45:1.

Evaluation: These appear to be two separate applications of Isaiah 66:2.

### **10. Matthew 3:17**

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

This my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased. (RSV)

## Linguistic Considerations

I,10: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός

I, 15: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός

II, 23: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα,  
ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα

Note varied spelling of εὐδόκησα

II, 62: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός

III, 59: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός

IV, 24: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός

The first clause of this verse is quoted consistently in all passages concerned.

### Theological Considerations

I, 10: God declares the Son, yet Arians (who say they place their faith in God) contradict Him on this point.

I, 15: This verse implies that the Son is consubstantial with the Father and is not "external" as the Arians suppose.

II, 23: The Son is not described as the epitome of creation but rather as the proper Son of God. References also to: Ps. 2:17.

II, 62: The Son is not described as a creature -- 3:17 is one of a list of quotes asserting this. The Son is only-begotten in His relationship to the Father and is First-born as concerns His "condescension" to creation. References

also to: Ps. 119:89; Mat. 16:16; John 1:1, 1:14; Rom. 8:29; I Cor. 1:24;  
I John 4:9.

III, 59: The Father does not reveal the Son to be a creature called forth by divine will, but rather He calls the Son His beloved. References also to: Ps. 36:9, 45:1; John 1:1.

IV, 24: "Beloved" is another way of expressing "only-begotten." References also to: Ps. 110:3.

Evaluation: The general concern of all these passages is the same, that is, determining which adjectives properly can be used to refer to the Son, and how these titles are to be understood.

#### **11. Matthew 10:40**

Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμέ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με

He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me.

#### Linguistic Considerations

II, 78: Ὁ δεχόμενος με, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμέ δέχεται

Slight variation in word order occurs between CAR II and CAR IV.

IV, 17: Ὁ ἐμέ δεχόμενος, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

### Theological Considerations

II, 78(2): Our knowledge is an "image" given through the Word and Wisdom of God, and when we participate in this Wisdom the Father is revealed to us. The focus is on the second clause of the verse - those who receive men receive Him because we are in His image. References also to: I John 2:25.

IV, 17: If the Son and Word are separated, the Son takes precedence because it is He who makes the Father known. References also to: John 12:45-48.

Evaluation Basically, these are two separate applications of the verse although both recognize the unique revelatory capacity of the Son.

### **12. Matthew 11:27**

Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son

chooses to reveal Him.

### Linguistic Considerations

I, 12: Οὐδείς γινώσκει τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ  
Υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ

Many variations of this quote occur as, it is practically a paraphrase and perhaps was quoted from memory.

I, 39: Οὐδείς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν Πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, καὶ ᾧ  
ἂν ὁ Υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ

Similar to CAR I, 12 except that compound ἐπιγινώσκει is retained.

II, 22: Οὐδείς γινώσκει τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός.

Again the quote in CAR II has been abbreviated and the verb slightly altered.

III, 26: Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου καὶ οὐδείς  
ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν θέλῃ  
ὁ Υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

Here a longer portion of the verse has been quoted. The first clause is exact, the second and third clauses have been combined, and in the third clause βούληται has been

replaced by θέλη.

III, 35: Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου.

III, 44: Οὐδεὶς γάρ, φησί, γινώσκει τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός.

Again, a truncated version of the quote but with no fundamental alternations.

IV, 16: Οὐδεὶς γὰρ γινώσκει τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός

Quote in CAR IV very close to CAR II, 22 and CAR III, 44.

IV, 23: Καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ Υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.

Again, the verse is altered in the same way as in the other three Orations: ἂν replaces βούληται ἔαν and ἀποκαλύψῃ replaces ἀποκαλύψαι.

If all of these verses were quoted from memory they could easily be the products of the same author.

### Theological Considerations

I, 12: Philosophy attempts to discern God in creation without also contemplating the Word, and this is a vain effort for only the Son reveals the Father. References also to: John 14:9.

- I, 39: Men of old could not have been adopted sons unless the Son already existed, the same Son who brings all to God.
- II, 22: No creature could truly know the Father. References also to: Ex 33:20; John 6:46.
- III, 26: Arians, like Samosateans, misinterpret this verse and take it to mean that gifts which were bestowed upon the Son were not His by nature. References also to: Matt. 28:18; John 3:35, 36, 5:22, 6:37.
- III, 35: Reiteration of the argument in CAR III, 26. References also to: John 3:35, 5:30.
- III, 44: As regards the Son's humanity, He had the knowledge of men; but as regards the Son's divinity, He is omniscient and He alone knows God.
- IV, 16: If the Word and Son are separated, the Son is superior for only the Son knows God. References also to: John 1:18.
- IV, 23: If the Word is called Son only after the Incarnation, before the Incarnation the Word did not know God. References also to: John 1:18, 14:9.

Evaluation The arguments in CAR IV are based on the supposition that the Son has a totally unique relationship with the Father. This supposition runs throughout the

arguments in the other passages, but each treatise deals with a different facet of the verse. The fact that CAR IV uses Matthew 11:27 in a unique way is no basis for maintaining that a separate author wrote CAR IV, because CAR I, II, III are focusing also on separate implications of the verse.

### **13. Matthew 28:18**

Καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν· αὐτοῖς λέγων ἐδόθη μοι πάντα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς.

And Jesus came and said to them, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me."

#### Linguistic Considerations

III, 26: Ἐδόθη μοι πάντα ἐξουσία

III, 36: ἐδόθη μοι

IV, 6: Ἐδόθη μοι ἐξουσία

All three fragments focus on the same aspect of the verse.

#### Theological Considerations

III, 26: The close relationship between Father and Son exhibited in 28:18



indicates that they are One substance. References also to: Matt. 11:27; John 3:35, 36, 5:22, 6:37.

III, 36: The attributes of the Father also belong eternally to the Son, but Father and Son should not be equated without distinction because these gifts were "given" to the Son. References also to: . Matt. 11:27; John 3:35, 5:30, 10:18, 17:10, 26:15.

IV, 6: The Son is our Mediator; He is not overcome by human afflictions nor was He ever bereft of divine gifts, for He is the instrument through which these gifts are imparted to us. The notion that the Son was ever without such gifts is an Arian one that is partially derived from a flawed interpretation of verses such as Matt. 28:18. References also to: Eph. 1:20; Phil. 2:9.

Evaluation: The closest parallel exists between CAR III, 36 and CAR IV, 6 although even here the usage is not identical. Both of these passages convey a similar concern for the proper understanding of the humiliation/exaltation of the Incarnate Son.

According to the scriptural index of parallel quotes, an examination of Matthew 28:19 which occurs in CAR I, 59 and CAR IV, 32 should follow here. The reference in CAR I, 59, however, is merely an allusion and not a direct quote. Hence, it does not provide a conclusive basis for comparison with CAR IV, 32 although its inclusion both in CAR I, 59 and in CAR IV, 32 is duly noted.

Due to the copious amount of parallel quotes in the Gospel of John, only several prominent verses are discussed here.

**14. John 1:1**

Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Linguistic Considerations

I, 11: Ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

I, 24: Ἦν ὁ Λόγος

I, 41: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

II, 1: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

II, 32: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος

II, 35: Καὶ Θεὸς γὰρ ἦν, φησὶν, ὁ Λόγος

- II, 51(2): ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν ἦν ὁ Λόγος
- II, 53: Ἐν ἀρχῇ οὖν ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.
- II, 56: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος
- II, 57: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος
- II, 62: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν
- III, 4: καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος
- III, 29: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.
- III, 59: Ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν ὁ Λόγος
- IV, 1: καὶ Θεός ἦν ὁ Λόγος
- IV, 26: καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν
- IV, 29: Ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν ὁ Λόγος

## Theological Considerations

- I, 11: Scripture always speaks of the Son as coeternal with the Father. References also to: Rev. 1:4; Rom. 9:5; 1:20.
- I, 24: God was never Word-less. References also to: Rom. 9:5; Heb. 1:3.
- I, 41: The Word is God; His exaltation does not imply a previously inferior status. References also to: John 1:14; Phil. 2:6.
- II, 1: These heretics need to relearn Christianity, starting with this verse. References also to: Rom. 11:52; John 1:14; Acts 2:36; Prov. 8:22; Heb. 1:4; Phil. 2:7; Heb. 3:7.
- II, 32: Arians contradict scripture by denying the truth of this verse. References also to: Heb. 1:3; I Cor. 1:24; Ps. 36:9, 104:24; Jer. 2:1; Luke 1:2; Ps. 107:20.
- II, 35: The word of man cannot be compared with the Word of God. References also to: Heb. 4:12, 13.
- II, 51(2): The humiliation of the Son does not compromise His divinity. The Word was not created for the sake of creation, as the Word predates the creation of the world. References also to: Ps. 100:2; 1:16; John 1:3.

- II, 53: The Son, like the Father, is ultimately a mystery and we cannot expect to comprehend fully His existence.
- II, 56: The Son is eternal as regards His relationship with the Father, and First-born as regards creation.
- II, 57: The language used to describe the Son is not the same as that applied to creatures.
- II, 62: See II, 56.
- III, 4: The Oneness of Father and Son, asserted in 1:1, is compared to luminary and light.
- III, 29: Orthodox christology demands an understanding of the Son both as very man and as very God. John 1:1 provides a sound introduction to proper thought, and 1:1 should be kept in mind when interpreting other verses.
- III, 59: This verse does not suppose that the Word was brought forth by a divine command.
- IV, 1: 1:1 is used as Athanasius' introductory statement of faith.
- IV, 26: The Word here spoken of is known also as Life.

IV, 29: The Spirit and the Paraclete are one, as even the Son and Word are one, and like the Word, the Spirit is coeternal.

Evaluation: These passages reflect the diverse uses of John 1:1. None of them contradict, but as the subjects addressed are so diverse, it is difficult to say conclusively that they represent the fruits of one mind. There is nothing in these quotes, it should be noted, to refute such a claim.

### **15. John 1:3**

Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.

All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made.

### Linguistic Considerations

I, 13: δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα γέγονε, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν

I, 19: ὡς Ἰωάννης φησὶν, ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν

I, 56: Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν

- II, 5: Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο  
οὐδὲ ἓν
- II, 24: δι' αὐτοῦ μόνου τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ  
ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν
- II, 35: καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν
- II, 39: Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο
- II, 51: καὶ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γέγονε
- II, 71: Πάντα διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο  
οὐδὲ ἓν
- II, 82: δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ  
ἓν
- III, 9: ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ  
ἓν
- III, 29: Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο  
οὐδὲ ἓν
- IV, 4: Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο

## Theological Considerations

- I, 13: Word is prior to time, as time is one of His works.
- I, 19: Wisdom is the same as the Word, the Creator.
- I, 56: Creatures are generate only in so far as they participate in the Son, the true Generate.
- II, 5: The Son is the generative Word and therefore is not a work. Why did God create a Word? Did God weary of sending forth commands Himself?
- II, 35: Again, as with 1:1, Man's word is compared with God's Word.
- II, 39: Scripture deems the Word alone to be the Creator.
- II, 51: As with 1:1, the divine nature of the Son is not confounded by His humiliation in the flesh.
- II, 71: If the Word is a work, how was He created?
- II, 82: Proverbs 8:22 does not contradict John 1:3.
- III, 9: The Father is the "only true God." The existence of His Word does not



contradict this.

III, 29: Refer to treatment of John 1:1 in CAR III, 29.

IV, 4: If Christ is a creature and is not the Word of God, then He lied when He said that He is in the Father. References also to: Ps 104:24; John 1:14.

Evaluation: These expositions are not contradictory. They reveal Athanasius' facility for exegeting complex verses.

#### **16. John 1:14**

Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

And the work became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father.

#### Linguistic Considerations

I, 41: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο

I, 44: ὁ γὰρ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο

I, 60: γὰρ Λόγος . . . σὰρξ ἐγένετο

- I, 64: Ὅτε γὰρ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν
- II, 1: ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο
- II, 39: ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο
- II, 44: ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο
- II, 47: ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο
- II, 62: Ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς Μονογενοῦς παρὰ Πατρός
- II, 81: οὐσα Λόγος, γέγονε σὰρξ
- III, 29: καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἔθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ Πατρός
- III, 30: ὁ Λόγος γάρ, φησί σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν
- III, 43: ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο
- IV, 4: ὁ Λόγος δὲ σὰρξ ἐγένετο

IV, 6: ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο

IV, 29: Καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ  
ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς Μονογενοῦς  
παρὰ Πατρός

IV, 31: Καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, εἰρηκότα, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν  
ἐν ἡμῖν

### Theological Considerations

I, 41: The Incarnation of the coeternal Word is a deep mystery; however, it is certain that the Word was never bereft of any quality and it is rather the human nature that was humiliated and exalted in Christ. The essence of the Word was not exalted because the Word is God. The Word did not need to take on the flesh to acquire exaltation. References also to: Ps. 71:17; Phil. 2:6; Heb. 6:20, 9:24; Ps. 24:9, 88:17-18.

I, 44: Christ, the Incarnate Word, is the second Adam. References also to: Eph. 4:10; Acts 2:24.

I, 60: The fact that the Word became flesh does not imply that the Word had no preexistence and thus is a creature. References also to: Rom. 8:3; John 1:17, 3:17.

- I, 64: Again, the becoming of the flesh does not imply that the Word is generate. The flesh was assumed for the sake of our salvation.
- II, 1: The Arians persist in their heresy and confound scripture with their impious interpretations of verses such as John 1:1, and dare to claim that the Word is a creature. References also to: Prov. 8:22(2x); Heb. 3:2; Rom. 11:32; John 1:1; Acts 2:36; Heb. 1:4; Phil. 2:7.
- II, 39: There is no other Word or Wisdom apart from the Son who became man for our sake. References also to: Jer. 23:29; Prov. 1:23; Ps. 119:101; John 1:3.
- II, 44: The assumption of the flesh does not render the Word a creature. References also to: Prov. 8:22(3x), 9:1; John 16:25.
- II, 47: The flesh of Christ is created but He is not a creature in Himself. References also to: Gal. 3:13(2x); II Cor. 5:21; Is. 53:4; I Pet. 2:24.
- II, 62: The Son is only-begotten, as opposed to first-born, because He is not one of several Sons. References also to: Rom. 8:29; I Jn. 4:9; Ps. 119:89; John 1:1; I Cor. 1:24; Matt. 3:17, 16:16.
- II, 81: The Word took on flesh for the sake of our salvation and enlightenment. References also to: Prov. 8:27; Ps. 119:91; Rom. 1:19-25; I Cor. 1:21; John 17:3.

- III, 29: The scriptures testify to the dual nature of Christ, but the Arians have distorted this message as it is found, for example, in John 1:14. References also to: John 1:1-3, 5:39; Phil. 2:6-8; Gen. 1:3, 6:26; Matt. 1:23.
- III, 30: The prophecies of the Old Testament have been fulfilled. References also to: I Cor. 1:24; Joel 2:28.
- III, 43: If Christ did not appear to be omniscient it was due to the ignorant nature of the flesh which He assumed. References also to: Rom. 11:34; Prov. 8:27; John 17:1.
- IV, 4: If the Word which is coeternal with the Father is not Christ, but the Word by which Christ was created, then the Word did not become flesh, but rather some other word. References also to: John 1:3; Ps. 104:24.
- IV, 6: Through the assumption of the flesh our humanity was exalted. The humiliation and exaltation of Christ properly refers to His human nature and not to His divine nature which did not need perfecting. References also to: Matt. 28:18; Phil. 2:9; Eph. 1:20.
- IV, 29: The Son and the Word are the same, even as the Spirit and the Paraclete are the same, for there can be but one only-begotten of the Father. References also to: John 1:1, 14: 26.

IV, 31: The Word cannot be separated from the man as the Samosateans suppose.

References also to: Lev. 9:7; I Cor. 1:24; II Cor. 5:4.

Evaluation: There is nothing contradictory in these expositions. In fact, there is an interesting corollary between CAR I, 41 and CAR IV, 6. Both arguments deal with the proper understanding of the humiliation and exaltation of Christ. Further, both passages employ John 1:14, the quintessential verse attesting to the Incarnation, to illustrate the fact that only the human nature was subject to humiliation and in need of exaltation. This is an unusual use of John 1:14 and it seems unlikely that two different authors would exegete it in this manner.

#### 17. Acts 2:22

ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους. Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις οἷς ἐποίησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, καθὼς αὐτοὶ οἶδατε.

Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know.

#### Linguistic Considerations

II, 12: ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους.

Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεδει

γμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι, καὶ τέρασι, καὶ σημείοις,  
οἷς ἐποίησε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, καθὼς  
αὐτοὶ οἶδατε.

IV, 35: 'Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ', ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ  
ἀποδεδειγμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς

### Theological Considerations

II, 12: The Word is manifested not made. His works bear witness to Him.  
References also to: John 5:16, 18, 10:38.

IV, 35: The body of Christ, the man, cannot be separated from the "subsistence of God, the Word". Words such as attested, approved, or anointed do not hint at such a meaning, they are simply other terms for expressing the hypostatic union. The Son does not refer to His body as "this Man" but rather as "me." References also to: Luke 24:59; John 10:30, 14:9; Acts 10:38, 17:31.

Evaluation: These two passages attempt to guard against two different heresies: CAR II, 12 refutes the theory that the Son is a creature; whereas, CAR IV, 35 rejects the separation and polarization of the two natures of Christ.

## 18. Acts 10:38

Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ  
καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διήλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς  
καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ

How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; how he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him.

### Linguistic Considerations

I, 47: Ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

IV, 35: Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ', ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ Θεὸς Πνεύματι  
ἁγίῳ

ὡς is replaced by ὃν.

### Theological Considerations

I, 47: At His baptism in the Jordan, the Son received the Spirit for our sake because he bears our body, not because He was in need of sanctification. Again, the Son is seen in the Mediator role. References also to: Luke 24:39; John 10:30, 14:9; Acts 2:22, 17:31.

Evaluation: Two separate, albeit not opposed, uses of this verse.



**19. Romans 9:5**

Ἦν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

To them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. Amen.

Linguistic Considerations

I, 10: ἐπὶ πάντων εὐλογημένος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

I, 11: Ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

IV, 1: Ἦν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

The Greek and English versions of 9:5 differ in a significant way. In the Greek, the intervening punctuation between the two clauses is a semi-stop, and thus the second clause could be seen as an apposition. This appears to be Athanasius' understanding, particularly in CAR IV, 1. However, the English translation places a full-stop between "Christ" and "God who is over all." The choice of punctuation limits the meaning of this verse. Athanasius clearly takes "God who is over all" to be a description of Christ and not a separate statement of praise referring perhaps to the Father only as the English version could imply.

## Theological Considerations

I, 10: If the Son is truly God, these (Arian) heretical claims cannot be maintained. If He is not God, all have leave to spread their own opinions and the validity of them does not matter. Using Rom 9:5 here supports the orthodox tenet as an affirmation of the divinity of the Son, but it is employed mainly as an adjectival phrase of adoration and is not the subject of exegesis.

I, 11: The eternity of the Son is everywhere confessed in scripture, as in this verse. The Arian position is not scripturally based.

IV, 1: Athanasius begins his discourse with this ringing endorsement of the coeternal nature of the Son.

Evaluation: A conclusion concerning how this verse is used in CAR CAR I and CAR IV is difficult to draw because in CAR IV it is not used as part of an argument, rather, it is stated at the opening as a declaration of Athanasius' principles.

### **20. I Corinthians 1:24**

Αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλήσιν Χριστὸν Θεοῦ  
δύναμιν καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν.

But to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.

### Linguistic Considerations

I, 11: Χριστὸς Θεοῦ δύναμις, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία

II, 32: Χριστὸς Θεοῦ δύναμις, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία

II, 37: τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφία

II, 42: Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία

II, 62: Χριστὸς Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία

III, 30: Χριστὸς Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία

III, 63: Χριστὸς γὰρ Θεοῦ δύναμις, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία

IV, 31: Χριστὸς Θεοῦ δύναμις, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία

The quote in CAR IV is identical to the most common paraphrase of 1:24 in CAR I, II, III.

### Theological Considerations

I, 11: The Power of God is synonymous with the Wisdom of God. References also to: Rom 1:20.

- II, 32: Arians ignore the true meaning of verses such as this. Thus they contradict God when they do not recognize the Son to be Wisdom. References also to: Ps 36:9, 104:24, 107:20; Jer 2:1; Luke 1:2; John 1:1; Heb 1:3.
- II, 37: Arians adulterate this verse when they read it as strictly referring to the Father's Power and Wisdom, and not the Power and Wisdom natural to the Son.
- II, 42: By denying the Son, the Jews have likewise denied the Father. They have turned from the Wisdom written of by Baruch, namely Wisdom the Son. References also to: Bar 3:12; John 19:15.
- II, 62: The Son is not called a creature in scripture but rather He is called Word and Wisdom. He is only-begotten by nature and first born as regards creation. References also to: Ps. 119:89; Matt. 3:17, 16:16; John 1:1, 14; Rom. 8:29; I John 4:9.
- III, 30: The cross is a source of God's Power and Wisdom for the Christians, but it is a reproach for the Jews because they do not accept the Incarnation. References also to: John 1:14.
- III, 63: The Son, God's Power and Wisdom, is also God's Will. The Son was not brought forth by the will of God for He is that very Will. References also to: Prov. 8:14; Is. 9:6.

IV, 31: The Word is not other than Christ, as the Samosateans suppose, for Christ is God's Power and Wisdom. References also to: John 1:14.

Evaluation: This verse has been incorporated into many discussions. In general it has been employed in two ways: 1) as an affirmation of the divine status of the Son and the identity of the Son as Wisdom and Word (CAR I, 11; CAR II, 62; CAR III, 63; CAR IV, 31), and 2) as a reproach for those who do not hold the above view (CAR II, 32; CAR II, 37; CAR II, 42; CAR III, 30).

## **21. Galatians 4:6**

Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, κράζον· ἄββᾶ ὁ πατήρ.

And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, "Abba! Father!"

### Linguistic Considerations

II, 59(2x): Εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἑαυτῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ  
κράζον, Ἄββᾶ, ὁ Πατήρ.

ἑαυτῶν replaces αὐτοῦ.

Only the last phrase is a direct quote.

Κράζον με, Ἄββᾶ, ὁ Πατήρ.

Κράζον με replaces Κράζον.

IV, 22: 'Απέστειλε γὰρ, φησί τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, κράζον, 'Αββὰ, ὁ Πατήρ.

ἀπέστειλε replaces ἐξαπέστειλε; ὁ Θεός is omitted.

Again, the word order has been rearranged and word choice slightly modified.

### Theological Considerations

II, 59(2): We are creatures by nature who became adopted sons through the Word.  
References also to: Gen 1:26; Mal 2:10.

IV, 22: The Word became flesh so that we could be sons. Men of old were sons too, so the Word existed prior to the Incarnation and granted them sonship also. References also to: Gen. 6:2; Deut. 32:6; Is. 1:2; John 5:17, 16:28.

Evaluation: These two passages definitely are related -- they share the common theme of the adopted sonship of men versus the inherent sonship of the Word.

### **22. Ephesians 4:24**

Καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

And put on the new nature, created after the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.

## Linguistic Considerations

II, 46: Ἐνδύσασθε τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν κατὰ θεὸν  
κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

Note that ἐνδύσασθε replaces ἐνδύσασθαι

IV, 34: Ἀναλαμβάνοντες δὲ τὸν νέον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν  
δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

## Theological Considerations

II, 46: The word creation also can denote renewal. References also to: Ps. 51:12,  
102:18; Jer. 31:22; Eph. 2:15.

IV, 34: In putting off the old and taking on the new, we have moved from a  
limited Jewish concept of God to the firm truth on which the Church is  
founded -- Jesus Christ.

Evaluation: These are two unrelated applications of the same verse.

## **23. Philippians 2:9**

Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα  
τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα.

Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name.

### Linguistic Considerations

I, 37: Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα.

I, 40: Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα

IV, 6: Διὰ τοῦτο ὑπερύψωμεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός

IV, 7: Ἐχαρίσατο οὖν αὐτῷ καὶ ὑπερύψωσεν

Note that ὑπερύψωμεν replaces ὑπερύψωσεν.

### Theological Considerations

I, 37: Athanasius' opponents have grossly misinterpreted Phil. 2:9-10, for the exaltation of the Son does not presuppose a prior abasement. References also to: Ps. 18:9, 13, 45:9; Prov. 8:30; John 17:5; Phil. 2:8.

I, 40: The Son was not raised from a lower plateau. In fact, the reverse is true as He condescended to humble Himself, taking the form of a servant.



IV, 6: The Son is our Mediator; the exaltation is ours through Him. References also to: Matt. 28:18; John 1:14; Eph. 1:20.

IV, 7: Same argument as CAR IV, 7. References also to: John 17:7-9(2x).

Evaluation: CAR I and CAR IV address two distinct but related issues arising from 2:9. which are: 1) what the exaltation supposes about the status of the Son, and 2) how the exaltation relates to mankind.

#### **24. Hebrews 3:6**

Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος [μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν] κατάσχωμεν.

But Christ was faithful over God's house as a son, and we are his house if we hold fast our confidence and pride in our hope.

#### Linguistic Considerations

II, 10: Πιστὸς εἰς τὸν οἶκον, οὗτος δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον.

More of an allusion than a quote.

IV, 34: οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς

## Theological Considerations

II, 10: Unlike the pagan gods, our God is faithful and so too is His Son.  
References also to: Deut. 32:20, 39; Jer. 9:3, 15:18; Matt. 3:6; I Thess.  
5:24; I Tim. 2:13; Heb. 13:8.

IV, 34: Extension of the discussion of Prov. 9:1. Even as Wisdom has a house,  
the body of Christ, we, also are houses of the Spirit. References also to:  
Prov. 9:1; John 2:19.

Evaluation: These interpretations focus on different aspects of the verse.

### **25. I John 5:20**

Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦκει, καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν  
ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινόν· καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ  
αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς καὶ ζῶν  
αἰώνιος.

And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding to know  
Him who is true; and we are in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the  
true God and eternal life.

## Linguistic Considerations

III, 9: Καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.

III, 19: Οἶδαμεν ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦκει, καὶ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν  
διάνοιαν, ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἐσμέν  
ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. οὗτός  
ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος.

IV, 26: Καὶ ἐσμέν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ  
Χριστῷ. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

### Theological Considerations

III, 9: To say that the Son is true is to say that He is divine; for God is all truth and is not allied with anything false.

III, 19: Our adopted sonship is not akin to that of the only-begotten whose very grace makes our adoption possible. References also to: John 1:12, 14:6, 17:17.

IV, 26: The Eternal Life written of earlier in this epistle is here identified explicitly with the Son the True God. References also to: John 1:1, 14:6; I John 1:1-2.

Evaluation: Three unrelated expositions of the verse are presented. Even the passages in CAR III do not refer to each other, indicating that even within one treatise Athanasius may exegete a verse variously.

In conclusion, the use of scripture in CAR I, II, III when compared to that in CAR IV does not refute the Athanasian hypothesis. The verses are utilized compatibly and differences appear to be due to the various subject matters of the treatises, rather than the presence of different authors. Scholars who reject the Athanasian authorship cannot rely on the use of scripture in CAR IV for conclusive support of their position.

## 1. c) Vocabulary

In his Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, Newman identifies key vocabulary words from CAR I, II, III.<sup>60</sup> The text of CAR IV has been searched to determine whether any of these important terms appear there as well. The frequency of their occurrence in each of the four treatises is included for comparison. A brief evaluation will follow.

For the benefit of future scholars and linguists who will study CAR IV, all of the vocabulary words occurring both in CAR IV and in CAR I, II, III are listed as the Appendix. Only one form of each word is represented. For example, if λογος and λογον both appear as words common to CAR IV and CAR I, II, III, only λογος will be in the list. It is therefore to be understood that one word in the list Appendix is usually representative of a family of words with one root. There are 1,295 common words, all of which are included in the 687 root words listed.

### General Statistics Concerning Vocabulary

CAR I contains 4,129 vocabulary words and is 64 chapters long, resulting in a word/chapter ratio of 1:64.5. Following this same formula: CAR II=1:55.9. CAR III=1:68.8, CAR IV: 1:55.9. Thus, for their respective lengths, all four documents use a similarly varied vocabulary.

<u>Document</u>	<u>Number of Vocabulary Words</u>	<u>Number of Chapters</u>
CAR I	4,129	64
CAR II	4,536	82
CAR III	3,938	67
CAR IV	2,014	36

There are 1,295 common vocabulary words that occur both in CAR I, II, III and in CAR IV. These common words represent 10.3% of the combined total vocabularies of CAR I, II, III and 64.3% of the total vocabulary of CAR IV.

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Vocabulary Words</u>	<u>Number of Common Words</u>	<u>Percentage of Vocabulary Held In Common</u>
CAR I,II,III	12,603	1,295	10.3
CAR IV	2,014	1,295	64.3

Thus, the vocabulary of CAR IV is largely included in the broader vocabulary of CAR I, II, III and is not alien to the established Athanasian set of words.

In the following list of key words and in the common word list of the Appendix,  
the Greek alphabet is represented in English typeset thusly:

$\alpha$	A =	A	$\iota$	I =	I	$\rho$	P =	R
$\beta$	B =	B	$\kappa$	K =	K	$\sigma$	$\Sigma$ =	S
$\gamma$	$\Gamma$ =	G	$\lambda$	$\Lambda$ =	L	$\tau$	T =	T
$\delta$	$\Delta$ =	D	$\mu$	M =	M	$\upsilon$	Y =	U
$\varepsilon$	E =	E	$\nu$	N =	N	$\phi$	$\Phi$ =	F
$\zeta$	Z =	Z	$\xi$	$\Xi$ =	C	$\chi$	X =	X
$\eta$	H =	H	$\omicron$	O =	O	$\psi$	$\Psi$ =	Y
$\theta$	$\Theta$ =	Q	$\pi$	$\Pi$ =	P	$\omega$	$\Omega$ =	W

These key words have been identified by Newman.<sup>61</sup> Numbers in the following list represent the occurrences of the specific word in the particular text over the length of the text in chapters. This is original research.

1. AGENNHTON

CAR I: 41/64

CAR II: 13/82

CAR III: 8/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

2. AQEOS

CAR I: 2/64

CAR II: 1/82

CAR III: 2/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

3. AIWN

CAR I: 35/64

CAR II: 34/82

CAR III: 12/67

CAR IV: 7/36



4. AKRATOS

CAR I: 1/64

CAR II: 3/67

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

5. ALHQEIA

CAR I: 44/64

CAR II: 84/82

CAR III: 25/67

CAR IV: 23/36

6. ALOGOS

CAR I: 12/64

CAR II: 7/67

CAR III: 7/82

CAR IV: 8/36

7. ANQRWPOS

CAR I: 157/64

CAR II: 195/82

CAR III: 96/67

CAR IV: 78/36

8. APARALLAKTON

CAR I: 1/64

CAR II: 1/82

CAR III: 6/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

9. APAUGASMA

CAR I: 18/64

CAR II: 19/82

CAR III: 34/67

CAR IV: 2/36

10. APORROH

CAR I: 2/64

CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

11. AREIOMANITAI

CAR I: 48/64

CAR II: 24/82

CAR III: 23/67

CAR IV: 10/36

12. ARXH

CAR I: 22/64

CAR II: 134/82

CAR III: 10/67

CAR IV: 27/36

13. ATREPTOS

CAR I: 25/64

CAR II: 1/82

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

14. BOULH

CAR I: 11/64

CAR II: 43/82

CAR III: 138/67

CAR VI: 6/36

15. GENNHMA

CAR I: 257/64

CAR II: 314/82

CAR III: 155/67

CAR IV: 69/36

16. GENHTON

CAR I: 257/64

CAR II: 257/82

CAR III: 257/67

CAR IV: 257/36

17. DHMIOURGOS

CAR I: 34/64

CAR II: 73/82

CAR III: 15/67

CAR IV: 5/36

18. DIABOLIKOS

CAR I: 6/64

CAR II: 10/62

CAR III: 6/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

19. EIDOS

CAR I: 16/64

CAR II: 11/82

CAR III: 57/67

CAR IV: 2/36

20. ENERGEIA

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: 8/82

CAR III: 5/67

CAR IV: 3/36

21. ENSARKOS

CAR I: 5/64

CAR II: 3/82

CAR III: 2/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

22. ECAIRETON

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: 2/82

CAR III: 1/67

CAR IV: 1/36

23. EPINOIA

CAR I: 11/64

CAR II: 13/82

CAR II: 5/67

CAR IV: 8/36

24. EPISPEIRAS

CAR I: 4/64

CAR II: 1/82

CAR III: 1/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

25. EUSEBEIA

CAR I: 8/64

CAR II: 7/82

CAR III: 11/67

CAR IV: 3/36

26. QEOMAXOS

CAR I: 2/64

CAR II: 3/82

CAR III: 9/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

27. QEOTHS

CAR I: 12/64

CAR II: 20/82

CAR III: 49/67

CAR IV: 8/36

28. QEOTOKOS

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR III: 4/67

CAR IV: 1/36

29. IDIOS

CAR I: 89/64

CAR II: 100/82

CAR III: 77/67

CAR IV: 8/36

30. KATAPETASMA

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: 1/82

CAR III: 1/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

31. KURIOS

CAR I: 90/64

CAR II: 168/82

CAR III: 91/67

CAR IV: 27/36

32. LOGOS

CAR I: 206/64

CAR II: 329/82

CAR III: 235/67

CAR IV: 255/36

33. METOUSIA

CAR I: 2/64

CAR II: 1/82

CAR III: 2/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

34. MONARXIA

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: 1/36

35. MONOGENHS

CAR I: 3/64

CAR II: 78/82

CAR III: 5/67

CAR IV: 25/36



36. OMOION

CAR I: 36/64

CAR II: 41/82

CAR III: 49/67

CAR IV: 4/36

37. OMOOUSIOS

CAR I: 1/64

CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: 3/36

38. ONOMATA

CAR I: 17/64

CAR II: 12/82

CAR III: 6/67

CAR IV: 12/36

39. ORGANON

CAR I: 2/64

CAR II: 4/82

CAR III: 3/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

40. ORQOS

CAR I: 3/64

CAR II: 2/82

CAR III: 4/67

CAR IV: 2/36

41. OUSIA

CAR I: 69/64

CAR II: 85/82

CAR III: 35/67

CAR IV: 10/36

42. PAROUSIA

CAR I: 7/64

CAR II: 6/82

CAR III: 3/67

CAR IV: 1/36

43. PERIBOULH

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR III: 1/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

44. PHGH  
CAR I: 15/64  
CAR II: 3/82  
CAR III: 4/67  
CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

45. PROBOLH  
CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND  
CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND  
CAR III: 1/67  
CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

46. PRWTOTOKOS  
CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND  
CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND  
CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND  
CAR IV: 1/36

47. REUSTOS  
CAR I: 1/64  
CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND  
CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND  
CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

48. SUGKATABASIS

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: 8/82

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: 1/36

49. SUMBEBHKOS

CAR I: 2/64

CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: 1/36

50. TELEION

CAR I: 10/64

CAR II: 20/82

CAR III: 21/67

CAR IV: 7/36

51. TRIAS

CAR I: 9/64

CAR II: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: 8/36

52. FUSIS

CAR I: 23/64

CAR II: 32/82

CAR III: 4/67

CAR IV: 3/36

53. XRISTOMAXOS

CAR I: 3/64

CAR II: 6/82

CAR III: 15/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

The following two words were identified as key terms by the present author.

54. AUTOSOPHIA

CAR I: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR II: 3/82

CAR III: WORD NOT FOUND

CAR IV: 3/36

55. YUCH

CAR I: 2/64

CAR II: 7/82

CAR III: 12/67

CAR IV: WORD NOT FOUND

Of the foregoing 55 key words, 37 words or 67% of them occur in CAR IV as well. This 33% discrepancy may be in part explained by the fact that CAR I, II, III address Arianism whereas CAR IV addresses Marcellism. Also, CAR IV was written at an earlier date when some of the "key" words may not have been incorporated into discussions of the controversy.

As for Stegmann's theory that the vocabulary of CAR IV is Antiochene and not Alexandrian, this comparison has provided some contrary evidence. Stegmann argues that the use of *ἄνθρωπος* in CAR IV to refer to Christ was un-Athanasian.<sup>62</sup> However, *ἄνθρωπος* was used more often in CAR I, II than in CAR IV.

<u>Document</u>	<u>Number of Occurrences of <i>ἄνθρωπος</i></u>	<u>Number of Chapters</u>	<u>Average Frequency of the word Per Chapter</u>
CAR I	157	64	2.45
CAR II	195	82	2.34
CAR III	96	67	1.43
CAR IV	78	36	2.17

Newman contends that *ἄνθρωπος* was frequently used by both Greek and Latin fathers to "signify our Lord's manhood."<sup>63</sup> This is a direct contradiction of Stegmann. Newman cites as examples CAR I, 41 and CAR IV, 7, 35.<sup>64</sup>

In his analysis of these key terms, Newman finds several parallels in usage between CAR I, II, III and CAR IV.

6. ALOGOS. God was never Word-less. CAR I, 24; CAR IV, 4, 14.<sup>65</sup>

41. ORQWOS. Athanasius is always concerned with assuring that doctrine is orthodox or sound. CAR I, 37, 46; CAR II, 1,9,12,44,53; CAR III, 1, 18, 19, 35, 37, 53; CAR IV, 30, 31.<sup>66</sup>

49. SUMBEBHKOS. If Wisdom is a mere attribute, that attribute is of itself a substance, and thus the Godhead would be compounded. CAR I, 36; CAR IV, 2.<sup>67</sup>

In general, the vocabulary of CAR IV is consistent with the other three Orations. The expertise of a linguist would be required to refute in depth Stegmann's contention that the vocabulary is Antiochene. The fact that Newman found the vocabulary of CAR IV harmonious with that of CAR I, II, III argues that vocabulary cannot be held against the authenticity of CAR IV.

## **2. The Apollinaris Hypothesis**

As noted earlier in this thesis, Anton Stegmann contended that Apollinaris of Laodicea was the true author of CAR IV. The salient points of his theory will be presented and then critiqued.

First, Stegmann maintained that the dating of CAR IV favors Apollinarian authorship. He argued that CAR IV has the enthusiasm and approach of a young man.<sup>68</sup> According to the Stegmann, Apollinaris would have been thirty-five years old if CAR IV was written in 340 AD. Thus, Apollinaris would fit the youthful image of CAR IV. Further, a thirty-five year old should have been mature enough to have written a treatise of this theological depth. Athanasius wrote *Contra Gentes* at the age of twenty-eight.<sup>69</sup> This reasoning of Stegmann's is not totally convincing. If the age of Apollinaris is used to support the theory that he is the author of CAR IV, this argument could apply equally well to Athanasius. If Stegmann maintained that Apollinaris was thirty-five years old in 340 AD, then he was born in 305 AD. The usual dating of Athanasius' birth is 296 AD, making him only nine years older than Apollinaris.<sup>70</sup> The notion that Apollinaris was much more youthful in 340 AD than was Athanasius does not hold. A thirty-five year old man and a forty-four year old man are not so different in age that Stegmann can justifiably argue that Apollinaris' age but not Athanasius' suits the dynamic temperament of CAR IV. Also, Athanasius is a known quantity in that he was intellectually sophisticated enough to write *Contra Gentes* at age twenty-eight.<sup>71</sup> There is no doubt then that he was advanced enough in 340 AD to have written CAR IV. How "theologically" advanced was the young Apollinaris? The answer is far less

certain. The argument that CAR IV evidences the work of a youthful writer could just as easily be used to support the Athanasian authorship.

Second, Stegmann argued that the style of CAR IV suits Apollinaris' background. The author of CAR IV was well-educated and possessed a thorough knowledge of the classics.<sup>72</sup> Apollinaris had such training. He was a sometime follower of the pagan sophist Epiphanius and was well schooled in philosophy.<sup>73</sup> It is also the position of Stegmann that the use of parataxis in CAR IV, as he identified it, is un-Athanasian and rather is more typical of the writing style of Apollinaris.<sup>74</sup> Apollinaris' style can be divided into two stages. In the early stage, Apollinaris was writing primarily for his students and he used prose form. After 378 AD, his works underwent a change. This later style was strictly poetical and reflected a sophisticated Attic influence. These writings were intended for the public and not for his private students alone. An example of this new style was his rendering of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek metre. All the writings of this period of his life were metred poetry.<sup>75</sup> If CAR IV is by Apollinaris, logic dictates that it would have been a work of his early stylistic period.

Third, it is Stegmann's position that the vocabulary of CAR IV has more in common with the works of Apollinaris than with the works of Athanasius. Part II, Section 1)c of this thesis addresses the relationship between the vocabulary of CAR I, II, III and CAR IV and finds them to be complimentary. Stegmann himself has provided a list of Apollinarian words that he finds evidenced in CAR IV.<sup>76</sup> Words that Stegmann has identified are included at the end of this discussion as Chart A. The texts of CAR I, II, III, IV have been searched to determine if these words occur only in CAR IV or whether the same words are used comparably in CAR I, II, III, and IV. If the latter is the case, it can be argued that the words Stegmann had identified as typically Apollinarian are Athanasian as well but relied upon to a lesser degree. Chart A reveals that the majority of the Apollinarian words that Stegmann identified are used by Athanasius. Of these ninety-six words, only eighteen are unique to CAR IV. Perhaps these words are more common to the Alexandrian tradition than to Apollinaris in particular.



Dräseke had noted also that "light" is frequently employed by Apollinaris as an analogy for the Trinity. Three words, αὐγή, ἄκτις, ἥλιος are used to express Father, Son and Holy Spirit. None of these key vocabulary words occur in CAR IV.<sup>77</sup> In terms of vocabulary then, there is no overwhelming connection between CAR IV and the works of Apollinaris.

Finally, Stegmann found the theology of CAR IV to be suspiciously monophysitic. The main characteristic of Apollinaris' theology is his insistence that there is only one nature in Christ and that Christ's nature is divine. To Apollinaris, Christ possessed no human soul and His humanity was incomplete.<sup>78</sup> Is this monophysitism truly evidenced in CAR IV as Stegmann claimed? The word ψυχή does not appear in CAR IV although it occurs two times in CAR I, seven times in CAR II, and twelve times in CAR III. The author of CAR IV, therefore, does not express an interest in the concept of souls. This could be due to the nature of the argument in CAR IV, as the soul of Christ was not an issue on which the orthodox criticized Marcellians, the adversaries of CAR IV. Moreover, there is a general emphasis in the Alexandrian school of thought on the λογος - σαρξ model for the Incarnation.<sup>79</sup> The λογος - ανθρωπος model was preferred by Antiochenes. The present issue is:

Did Athanasius advocate a merely verbal λογος - σαρξ or a real one? While the former framework would indeed ignore the soul of Christ it would in fact tacitly assume its presence. The later, on the other hand, would regard the soul as non-existent.<sup>80</sup>

Scholarly opinion on whether or not Athanasius understood a human soul in Christ is mixed. Baur, Hoss, Stülcken, and Grillmeier contended that Athanasius had no doctrine of a soul in Christ. Voisin, Weigl, Harnack, Lietzmann, and Dragas detected no such "latent Apollinarianism" in Athanasius.<sup>81</sup> The absence of the word λογος - σαρξ in CAR IV is inconclusive. For example, Eusebius of Caesarea and Apollinaris both used many ανθρωπος-based words but at the same time denied a soul in Christ, and St. Cyril used the λογος - σαρξ framework but strongly supported the concept of a soul in Christ.<sup>82</sup> Thus, the presence or absence of the word λογος - σαρξ is not conclusive. Further, the word σαρξ is not used as often in CAR IV as in CAR I, II,

III. Words based on the root σαρξ occur thirty-nine times in CAR I, eighty times in CAR II, one hundred and twenty-two times in CAR III, and only thirty-eight times in CAR IV. It appears unjustified to exclude CAR IV from the Athanasian corpus simply because it does not make a definitive statement on the soul of Christ. The use of the σαρξ model in CAR IV does not suggest monophysitism. Athanasius utilized σαρξ terminology much more often in his other three orations which are decidedly genuine.

Stegmann may have failed to note an important discrepancy between CAR IV and the works ascribed to Apollinaris. Dräseke observed patterns in the biblical exegesis of Apollinaris. Ephesians 3:17, I Corinthians 5:47-48, and John 3:13 were Apollinaris' favorite verses. According to Dräseke, every Apollinarian writing contained Ephesians 3:17.<sup>83</sup> None of these verses occur in CAR IV. This is a major argument against the Apollinaris hypothesis, especially as every work of Apollinaris quotes Ephesians 3:17. In the present author's opinion, this use of Ephesians 3:17 is a secret signature that Apollinaris left on his writings. If Dräseke is correct, this verse should appear at least once in CAR IV. The Apollinaris hypothesis remains unproven.

**CHART A: Words Important to Apollinaris' Vocabulary with Their Occurrences in CAR I, II, III, IV**

These Apollinarian words have been identified by Stegmann.<sup>84</sup> The occurrence of these words in CAR I, II, III, IV has been determined by the present author using the computers at the University of Durham.

Apollinarian Words that Occur in CAR I, II, III, and CAR IV

AGIOS	ENOTHS	SUNAFEIA
AKOLOUGON	ENWSIS	SUNODOS
AKOLOUQWS	EPEI	SXHMA
ALLOTRIOS	EPIDHMIA	TAUTOTHS
ANADEXOMAI	EPIFANEIA	TOIGAROUN
ANAEWSIS	QEIOS	TOINUN
ANATREPTW	QEOTOKOS	TOLMAW
ANQRWPINOS	KHROGMA	FRONEW
ANQRWPOS	LOGISMOS	FRONHMA
APANTAW	MAKARIOS	FWNH
APISTOS	MENTOI	YEUDOS
APREPHS	MONOGENHS	WSAUTWS
ARA	NAOS	WSTE
ARXH	OQEN	
ASEBHS	OIKONOMEW	
ATOPOS	OLOKLHROS	
AXWRISTOS	OLWS	
BEBAIOW	OMOOUSIOS	
GENNHMA	OUKOUN	
GOUN	PANTWS	
DH	PARAOUSIA	
DHMIOURGOS	PERITTOS	
DIANOIA	PROSKEIMA	
DIAFEREI	PRWTOTOKOS	
EIKWN	RHMA	
ENANQRWPEW	SARKOW	
ENNOIA	SUNARIQMEW	

Apollinarian Words that Occur Only in CAR I, II, III

EPIDHMEW

KOINWNEW

PROSLAMBANW

SUNAPTW

Apollinarian Words that Occur Only in CAR IV

AMERISTOS

ANANTIRRHTWS

ANUPOSTATOS

APAIDEUTOS

GNWRIZW

GRAMMA

EISAGW

ENOW

ECAIRETOS

EPIKALEW

QESBESIOS

OIKEIWSIS

OMOLOGEW

PROODOS

PROSAGOREUW

SARKWSIS

SUSTASIS

FLUAREW

Apollinarian Words that do not Occur in CAR I, II, III, or CAR IV

ANQRWPEIOS

(SUG)KERANNOMI

ASEREW

XRIZW

AFRWN

BOAW

KATEUTELIZW

### 3. The Eustathius Hypothesis

In 1988, R.P.C. Hanson wrote a short article on CAR IV for the theological journal Vigiliae Christianae. Hanson's article is the most recent work on the subject.

Hanson begins his investigation by stating in the very first sentence that CAR IV is spurious. Like Stegmann, Hanson notes that the manuscript tradition for CAR IV is incomplete and Hanson further contends that CAR IV is not cited in any other ancient writings. Severus of Antioch (465 AD - 538 AD), for example, referred to only three orations. Hanson has overlooked Gregory of Nazianzus, who mentioned a fourth oration of Athanasius in his own Oration 38:8.<sup>85</sup> Hanson contends that the style of CAR IV is too sophisticated and reveals too deep a knowledge of the classics for CAR IV to be authentically Athanasian. These arguments, combined with CAR IV's use of the word ὁμοουσιος, indicate to Hanson that CAR IV is not Athanasian. He considers that possibility closed.<sup>86</sup>

Hanson does admit that the theology of CAR IV is of an Athanasian "flavor." For example, the discussion of the proper understanding of the exaltation and humiliation of Christ in CAR IV is:

doctrine exactly like that of Athanasius and expressed in the kind of language which he used in the first three orations. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the author knew of these.<sup>87</sup>

Further, the author of CAR IV's christology is Athanasian and is based on the notion of the hypostatic union. Hanson's own examples refer to CAR IV 6, 7, 18, 20, 23, 35.<sup>88</sup> These are significant theological parallels. Perhaps Hanson does not give enough weight to his own research.

Newman's theory that CAR IV is a draft or a collection of thoughts is not accepted by Hanson. Hanson does agree, however, with Newman that the addressee of CAR IV is of a Marcellian orientation.<sup>89</sup> All of the modern scholars the present author has researched concur in this opinion which was first put forward by Newman.

In addition to offering a concise history of modern thought on CAR IV, Hanson makes a real contribution to the subject with his theory that CAR IV actually was written by a disciple of Eustathius of Antioch. Having rejected the Athanasius hypothesis, Hanson searched for a group or individual of the period "who might be expected to be friendly towards Athanasius and capable of reproducing some of his thought while not wholly absorbing it."<sup>90</sup> He settled upon the Eustathians for several reasons.

First, Hanson's dating of the treatise is compatible with Eustathian authorship. Hanson rejects the commonly held theory that CAR IV was written in approximately 340 AD. Montfaucon had originally suggested this date because in CAR IV Eusebius is referred to by name, and Montfaucon contended that Athanasius never used Eusebius' name after his death in 341 AD.<sup>91</sup> Hanson disagrees with Montfaucon, and cites Athanasius' *De Decretis* 13:2, written in 356 or 357 AD, and which names Eusebius. Hanson contends that no date prior to 339 AD is feasible because Athanasius was not an established and mature theologian until that time his style and theology would not be known well enough to be imitated before 339 AD. CAR IV could not be written later than 360 AD according to Hanson because it does not evidence any knowledge of the events of the Council of Alexandria in 362 AD nor does it address Neo-Arianism or the status of the Holy Spirit, both of which were important issues by 360 AD. Thus, Hanson dates CAR IV between 350 and 360 AD. This dating coincides with the period of the continuing Eustathians. Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, was condemned as a heretic in 331 AD, but his disciples kept a school of his thought alive in Antioch for many years.<sup>92</sup>

Second, a treatise such as CAR IV would have been politically useful to the continuing Eustathians. Eustathius had been a Nicene and a strong supporter of the term hypostasis.<sup>93</sup> It was this zeal that led to his conflict with Eusebius of Caesarea, and ultimately to his banishment.<sup>94</sup> The disciples of Eustathius were anxious to distinguish themselves from the followers of Marcellus who were also championing the notion of one hypostasis. Marcellism was a movement of some force during this time, as evidenced by three of the Antiochene Creeds of 341 AD: the record of the gathering at Serdica 343 AD, the Macrostich of 345 AD, and the Sirmian Creed of 351 AD. All of

these documents contain anti-Marcellian language.<sup>95</sup> Antioch was also the home of the continuing followers of Paul of Samosata.<sup>96</sup> The continuing Eustathians wanted to clarify their position and differentiate it from that of the various Sabellian sects flourishing in their midst.

So they produced this useful little treatise, designed to distinguish their doctrine from the kind of Arianism current in Antioch in the mid-fourth century, but much more to make it clear, without actually mentioning Marcellus' name, that they were not Marcellians. It is not surprising that it was later attached to the works of Athanasius.<sup>97</sup>

This Eustathius hypothesis of Hanson's is interesting and not without merit. However, in such a brief article he could not begin to present his theory systematically. It is supposed that this recent article is the prelude to a forthcoming book that will discuss issues such as the theology of the continuing Eustathians, and will compare CAR IV to the established Athanasian corpus in detail. Hanson, of course, is not attempting to name the author of CAR IV, but it would have been useful for him to assemble known writings of the Eustathian school and compare them with CAR IV in terms of style, exegesis, vocabulary, and theology. Also, Hanson should have devoted attention to actively refuting the Athanasian authorship, if his argument in favor of the Eustathians is to be complete and convincing.

## **PART III: THE QUESTION OF DOCTRINE**

### **1. The Contents**

In Part III of this thesis the theological significance of CAR IV will be considered separately from the question of authorship. First, a synopsis of the contents of CAR IV will be provided. Section Two will introduce the addressee of CAR IV, with a comparison of the views of the adversary of CAR IV and the doctrines of Marcellus of Ancyra.

The following summary of the Chapter contents of CAR IV serves as a precis of that text's message and theology.

#### **Brief Outline of CAR IV.**

Chp.1: Statement of the nature of the Son.

Chps. 2-5: Heretical consequences of the rejection of the proper nature of Christ are refuted.

Chps. 6,7: Christ is the great Mediator.

Chp. 8: The King and His Kingship cannot be separated.

Chps. 9-12: The Father and the Son are One yet distinct.

Chps. 13,14: Refutation of Stoic influences on the heretics.

Chps. 15-24: Arguments refuting the separation of the Word and the Son.

Chp. 25: The notion of dilation is rejected.

Chps. 26-36: The identity of the Word and the Son is affirmed through scripture and argument.



## **Chapter Contents:**

Chapter 1: The Word is consubstantial with the Father; thus They are distinct and yet One in essence. There is no new beginning within the Godhead as the Son is not a creature or other being. Because the Son is not a creature, the salvation He offers is efficacious.

Chapter 2: The Father and the Son share the same essence even though They are distinct; the Son is not His own Father or any other such Sabellian absurdity.

Chapter 3: The Son is coeternal with the Father; He did not join the Father nor was He created or derived from any outside source.

Chapter 4: Wisdom and Word must be an eternal facet of the nature of God, for if They were created then there was a time when God possessed no Wisdom or Word, and that is unthinkable.

Chapter 5: Even the term Son suggests the intimacy of the relationship between the first two Persons of the Trinity; for a son by definition is from the father. Rather, it is we created beings who must be adopted into sonship.

Chapter 6: The fact that Christ received heavenly gifts and was exalted in no way suggests that He was previously lacking these qualities; on the contrary, it is our humanity that He raises and therefore makes the impartation of such gifts of grace possible for men.

Chapter 7: Christ is, then, our Mediator in all things. By assuming our form He took on our needs and sufferings in order to destroy and eradicate them. The fact that He is not overcome by our infirmities gives witness to His divine status.

Chapter 8: Heretics are misguided when they argue over the eternal nature of the King and of His Kingship; one faction contends that the King is not eternal and thus received a beginning of being, whereas the others deny that His Kingdom endures forever.

Chapter 9: The Oneness of the Father and Son is being grossly misinterpreted -- They are not one without distinction nor are They two incomplete parts of a previous whole. The fact that They are one in essence does not result in mathematical equality.

Chapter 10: The above distinction does not result in polytheism for such distinction of the Persons is not akin to a radical separation of essence.

Chapter 11: Some heretics claim that the Word was in God and was summoned forth for our sake. This results in a temporal mission for the Son as the Son is "reabsorbed" into the Godhead when His task in the scheme of the economic Trinity is complete. Other heretics argue that the Father was without the Word and created Him for our sake, a notion that already has been refuted.

Chapter 12: The mission of the Son is not temporal, or else creation could not be sustained. God was never without the Word or else by what Word was His Word created?

Chapter 13: The notion of the temporal mission is a fallacy derived from Stoic thought, for the Stoics asserted that God dilates Himself for economic purposes.

Chapter 14: If the Monad dilated to the Trinity, then the Trinity is only an illusion. The missions of the Persons (for example, creation) would cease when the dilation reverted.

Chapter 15: A corollary Stoic doctrine is that the Word and the Son are separate entities. This results in attempts to place precedence of time or essence in one over the other or to make Sonship contingent upon the Incarnation.

Chapter 16: Again, if such separation of Word and Son is insisted upon, either the Word is the same as the Father, or the Word is other, for only the Son can be in the bosom of the Father.

Chapter 17: Oneness is based on a mutual, essential relationship and not on crude equivalency.

Chapter 18: Bible quotes that emphasize the true Sonship of the Word are cited at length.

Chapter 19: If heretics persist in separating the Word from the Son, they must recognize two orders of creation -- one derived from the Word, the other derived from the Son. But of course this is nonsense for the Son and the Word are identical and He is one with the Father.

Chapter 20: It is untenable also to suppose that only the man Jesus is the Son, for a creature cannot make and redeem the world. This view leaves the nature of the Word unresolved, for now it is the man who is one with the Father.

Chapter 21: This separation would result in a Tetrads. This approach leaves the Word with no role, for in sacraments such as baptism it is the Son only, and not the Word, whose name is invoked.

Chapter 22: If the Word is not the Son, then we are sons of God and He is not. The Son must be pre-existent for it is He who allows us to participate in His sonship, and even men in the time of the patriarchs were known as sons of God. Thus the Son pre-exists the event of the Incarnation and His Sonship is likewise eternal and independent of economy.

Chapter 23: Some heretics persist in this belief because they claim that "Word" is an Old Testament term, and "Son" a New Testament term. To them this indicates that Sonship is a new relationship, and that Word and Son are separate, or that Sonship is contingent upon the Incarnation.

Chapter 24: The Old Testament references to the Son in the Psalms and the Wisdom Literature cannot be dismissed as mere prophecy.

Chapter 25: Again, the notion of dilation undermines the doctrine of the Trinity and confounds the Persons.



Chapter 26: In the New Testament the same qualities and particular adjectives are used to describe both the Word and the Son, thus indicating that the authors of the scriptures did not separate the Word from the Son.

Chapter 27: Heretics do not appreciate the subtlety of the language employed in the Scriptures.

Chapter 28: Scripture, and particularly the Psalms, points to the pre-existent nature of the Son.

Chapter 29: Those who separate the Word from the Son do not follow their reasoning to its logical conclusion. Why not likewise separate the Spirit from that which is called Paraclete in the New Testament?

Chapter 30: Heretics also separate the Word/Son from the man, who they claim was merely a mouthpiece, a prophetic instrument.

Chapter 31: Just as Moses speaks of himself, so does Christ speak of the Word. This does not imply otherness or disparity between the two, which would degrade the mystery of the Incarnation.

Chapter 32: The Incarnation points to unity, not diversity; for the Word does not speak through an earthen vessel, rather He dwells within the man and they are united.

Chapter 33: The fact that Christ refers to the Word merely illustrates the dual natures and does not imply separate entities.

Chapter 34: An exhortation to accept the dual natures and uphold the integrity of the Incarnation.

Chapter 35: The fact that human authors choose different words to express the mystery of the Incarnation in no way compromises the doctrine nor does it render it ambiguous.

Chapter 36: A conclusion reinforcing the eternal nature of the Son and the two natures in Christ.

## **2. The Addressee**

CAR IV has integrity in its own right as a theological text of the early church, quite apart from the issue of authorship. CAR IV illuminates a particular time in the life of the church: the years immediately following Nicaea, when members of the Nicene party had an opportunity to turn a critical eye towards each other. The war of words with the Arians continued well beyond Nicaea. The Nicenes did not consider their victory over the Arians complete, however, and they were concerned that the Arian christological definition would continue. They did not want anyone from their own ranks to embarrass them and their cause. Marcellus was useful to the Nicenes as a vehement anti-Arian and as a mature statesman. His method of interpreting the Nicene creed was suspicious to his peers, and he came to be vilified by Nicenes and Arians alike.

Marcellus championed a second century heresy called monarchianism that had threatened to divide the church just as Arianism threatened the church in Marcellus' own day. The Nicene party would lose its credibility if it was perceived that the cost of eradicating Arianism was a return to the monarchian heresy of Sabellianism.

Monarchianism occurred in two different forms -- modalistic monarchianism and dynamic monarchianism. Both philosophies were an attempt to maintain the integrity of monotheism. This end was accomplished, however, at the cost of orthodox trinitarian and christological thought.

Modalistic monarchianism denied the reality of any distinctions within the Godhead. The persons of the Trinity were reduced to modes of action and their consubstantial and eternal status as members of the Godhead was lost.<sup>98</sup> While the existence of Father, Son, and Spirit were not actually denied, they were understood as temporary roles, as "the Father by process of development projected Himself first as Son and then as Spirit."<sup>99</sup> This view, which reduced the mystery of the Trinity to a mere

illusion, relied upon the notion that God "expanded" or "dilated" Himself for economic purposes.<sup>100</sup>

Modalism was presented in a sophisticated manner by Sabellius in the third century. Sabellius held that the members of the Godhead were identical to one another.<sup>101</sup> This is known as the doctrine of the *ὁμοπατριωρ*, that the Father is the Son and the Son is the Father. This belief came to be called patripassianism, the assertion that it was the Father who suffered as Jesus. Further, Sabellius' understanding of the Trinity was purely economic and the term Trinity was used only to express God's activity within the continuum of time.<sup>102</sup>

The second form of monarchianism was termed dynamic monarchianism or adoptionism. This position asserted that Christ was a "mere man upon whom the spirit descended."<sup>103</sup>

Like modalism, adoptionism was motivated by the same concern for monotheism. Instead of equating the Father and Son and offering an Incarnate Father, as did modalism, adoptionism denied the Incarnation. If Christ was "mere man" the concept of the Trinity (which sounded suspiciously polytheistic to adoptionists), was unnecessary. It has been suggested that judaizing Christians, notably Paul of Samosata in the third century, were the first supporters of adoptionism.<sup>104</sup> Paul of Samosata was condemned by the Origenist Council of Antioch in 268 AD.<sup>105</sup>

The debate over modalism in particular caused friction and dissension at the highest levels of the church. The pontificates of Zephyrinus (AD 198-217) and Callistus (AD 217-22) were marred by this controversy. Both of these popes, while they were not true modalists, nevertheless supported the popular criticism of Hippolytus and Tertullian.<sup>106</sup> It has even been suggested that the Praxeas whom Tertullian castigates, is none other than Callistus himself.<sup>107</sup> Hippolytus also took issue with Callistus. Callistus distinguished himself from Sabellianism by maintaining that Father referred to the "divine spirit indwelling the Son" who is the man Jesus.<sup>108</sup> This is a semantic distinction only as no true notion of the Trinity is expressed. Thus, in this early period the line between heresy and orthodoxy was not yet clearly drawn and modalism briefly

enjoyed favor even among those whose task it was to preserve the Christian faith.

It was in this historical context that Marcellus of Ancyra appeared and preached a trinitarian and christological doctrine based on the expanding Monad.

Resting on the doctrine of the Logos like the apologists and Irenaeus, Marcellus abandoned the eternal Sonship - the one solid conquest of the last generation, and brought back the whole question into the old indefiniteness from which a century of toil had hardly rescued it<sup>109</sup>.

In the eyes of such powerful men as Eusebius of Caesarea, Marcellus had resurrected the specter of Sabellianism. But was this accusation wholly just?

Cardinal Danielou saw Marcellus' theology as a reaction against Origenist subordinationism, which it most certainly is, but this reaction has its basis not in an archaic monarchianism of either a modalistic or dynamic kind, but in an economic approach to the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>110</sup>

Danielou thus concurred with Basil and Hilary who also distinguished Marcellus from Sabellius.<sup>111</sup> Marcellus did not subscribe to the Sabellian *ὁμοπατρ* doctrine, rather, he saw the name Father and Son as masks. Nevertheless, his great enemy Eusebius of Caesarea branded Marcellus a Sabellian, and only Marcellus' usefulness to the Nicene party as an anti-Arian shielded him from those such as Eusebius who were crying for his final condemnation.

Some account of the life of Marcellus is in order. The date of his birth is unknown but he was already at mid-life at Nicaea in 325 AD.<sup>112</sup> His death is dated at 373 AD or 374 AD at an advanced age of perhaps one hundred years.<sup>113</sup>

Like many bishops of this period, Marcellus fell in and out of favor as emperors and other authorities with Arian sympathies came and went from power. Marcellus was first exiled by Constantine in 336 AD. Constantine was dedicating his Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and the Emperor invited all the bishops of the East to come as an

expression of unity and tolerance. Marcellus refused to attend and to join hands with the Arian and Arian-sympathizing bishops who would be present. Thus Marcellus lost favor. His views were scrutinized and attacked, and he was summarily exiled in 336 AD.<sup>114</sup>

It was during this period of exile that Marcellus and Athanasius furthered their friendship. Athanasius had been removed from his see in Alexandria in 339 AD when Eusebius of Nicomedia, the vehement Arian leader, became Patriarch of Constantinople. Both Athanasius and Marcellus found refuge with Julius in Rome.<sup>115</sup> (Note Marcellus' Fragment 129 for his plea to Julius to confirm his orthodoxy.) In 341 AD Eusebius died, and Julius exonerated both Athanasius and Marcellus and restored them to their sees.<sup>116</sup>

Marcellus still was viewed with much skepticism in both the Arian and the Nicene camps, although neither group ever secured his final condemnation. Within two years of Marcellus' death, Epiphanius included him in his collection of heretics. Epiphanius questioned an aged Athanasius on the matter of Marcellus, but Athanasius responded with merely a cryptic smile. "Epiphanius interpreted" this famous smile "as meaning that Marcellus had gone as near as possible to the danger-point, and had been obliged to justify himself."<sup>117</sup> The word Athanasius used was *μοχθηριος*.<sup>118</sup> Athanasius never condemned Marcellus, although he did suspend communications between them for a time, due to the unmistakably heretical sentiments of Marcellus' pupil Photinus of Sirmium.<sup>119</sup>

There are several possible reasons for Athanasius' reluctance to condemn Marcellus. First, they were friends. Second, Marcellus was a strong defender of the Nicene definition, and Athanasius had a natural sympathy for any theory that could be used to combat Arianism.<sup>120</sup> A theologian as skilled as Athanasius may have had a deeper understanding of Marcellus' theology than did his opponents.<sup>121</sup>

Marcellus may have played a greater role at Nicaea than was previously thought. Even though Athanasius was only Bishop Alexander's secretary at the Council of Nicaea, it was assumed that the deacon Athanasius had already come into his own as a



theologian. His great works Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione Verbi Dei were usually dated as prior to Nicaea in 325 AD. Cardinal Danielou, however, disagreed with this dating and maintained that the two above mentioned treatises were written during exile in 335 or 337 AD. It is further established that Athanasius' anti-Arian works CAR I, II, III were written after 340 AD. It was Danielou's contention that Athanasius' role at the Council may not have been as great as originally thought, and that Athanasius did not reach maturity as an author until the years following the Council. Danielou then suggested that it was the older Marcellus, already a bishop in 325 AD, who played a large role in refuting the Arians at the Council. Marcellus' contribution to the Council may well have been substantial, and perhaps Danielou was correct in his theory that at 325 AD Marcellus' age and station gave him a great opportunity to influence and control the proceedings of the Council.<sup>122</sup> For Danielou, the battle between Marcellus and Eusebius of Caesarea defines the controversy of Nicaea. It still remains undisputed that Athanasius is the supreme champion of the Nicene cause in the decades following the Council, but Marcellus could have shaped much of the discussion in the years leading up to 325 AD as well as at the Council itself.

Marcellus is a significant figure then for many reasons. He reopened the debate on monarchianism, whether or not he so intended. He represents a noteworthy fringe movement within the Nicene group. He was a major actor at the Council of Nicaea. His theology which elicited a response from Athanasius in CAR IV and Eusebius of Caesarea alike, deserves attention.

Harnack has classified Marcellus' beliefs into four main areas:

- 1) That Marcellus called only the incarnate one "Son of God";
- 2) That he taught no real preexistence;
- 3) That he assumed the Kingdom of Christ would have an end; and,
- 4) That he spoke of an extension of the invisible monad.<sup>123</sup>

These points will be discussed in turn.

The first two points will be examined together under the heading of Marcellus' christology.

First, Marcellus' christology limited the concept of the Son of God. Only the Incarnate Christ could properly be called the Son of God. Prior to the Incarnation there was only Word or Logos. "It was only in virtue of this humiliating separation from the Father" in the event of the Incarnation "that the logos acquired a sort of independent personality."<sup>124</sup> The text of CAR IV is very concerned with refuting this separation of the Word from the Son. Refer to CAR IV chapters 15, 15b, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33. CAR IV, 22, and 28 also reinforce the pre-existent nature of the Son. In the writings of Marcellus, Fragment 19 refers to Christ as predestined to become the Son, as opposed to being the pre-existent Son. Fragment 41 reads: "And this is why he (the evangelist) does not call him Son of God but everywhere he calls him Son of Man, so that .... he might prepare man to become Sons of God by adoption." Fragment 43: "after the assumption he is preached to be Christ." Fragment 48: "before he came down and was born from the virgin he was only logos."

Second, Marcellus' eschatology preached an end to the kingdom of Christ. This was the only tenet of Marcellus' that was ever formally condemned.<sup>125</sup> In Marcellus' understanding of the divine economy, there would come a time when Christ had vanquished all of his enemies and the flesh would no longer be needed. This theory was based largely on Marcellus' reading of I Corinthians 15:24: "Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power" (RSV). Since the flesh profits nothing, it was unimaginable to Marcellus that the logos would be burdened with a servant's form for all eternity.<sup>126</sup> This is a sophisticated form of panentheism.<sup>127</sup> That is, "the world is included in God's being something as cells are included in a larger organism."<sup>128</sup> The Kingdom is therefore absorbed into God when it is delivered by Christ to the Father. Refer to CAR IV, 8 for arguments in favor of the eternal Kingship of Christ. The Fragments of Marcellus 113-121 teach the temporal kingdom. Note especially Fragment 114: "It is the greatest mystery that the apostle reveals here, when he says that there will be an end to the Kingdom of Christ, and that this end will take place when all things will be put under his feet."

Finally, Marcellus' trinitarianism was based on the notion of the expanding Monad. He rejected the Origenist understanding of the logos as a separate hypostasis or ousia.<sup>129</sup> Rather, the logos is the agent of God's "self-activation and self-revelation."<sup>130</sup> Thus, the logos is distinct from the Father only insofar as the Father possesses His own logos. In this way, Marcellus tried to differentiate his views from those of Sabellius who contended that the Father was His own logos.<sup>131</sup> Originally the logos only existed as a potency or δυνάμις whereas after the Incarnation the logos was expressed as ενεργεια δραστηκη through a dilation of the Monad.<sup>132</sup> At first, this distinction may appear Aristotelian but it actually has its basis in Marcellus' understanding of the logos as the "efficacious activity" of Yahweh in the Old Testament. The Monad dilates itself in terms of activity not essence.<sup>133</sup> "The Monad...expands into a Triad in the course of Heilsgeschichte without any separation or division."<sup>134</sup> CAR IV argues strongly against the doctrine of the dilated Monad and the temporal Persons in Chapters 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17. Marcellus undoubtedly professed this view which CAR IV refutes. Fragment 71: "God appears to be expanded only in operation and therefore is truly and obviously an undivided monad." Fragment 78: "these ones wish to create a second God who is divided from the Father with respect to hypostasis and power." Note Fragment 121: "the logos came forth through an active operation."

Thus, the main concern of CAR IV is to combat Marcellism without personally attacking Marcellus. The contents of CAR IV are an excellent exegesis of Marcellism and provide a fuller understanding of the problem than does a reading of the Fragments of Marcellus alone. CAR IV reveals how Marcellism was perceived and combatted in the Nicene party. As Marcellus had a great influence on the development of the creeds, both through his personal condemnation of Arianism and the reaction his theology prompted amongst his fellows, he is an important father and CAR IV has merit as a document that records his doctrines.

## SUMMARY OF RESEARCH AND CONCLUSIONS

The summary of research is an answer to the opening questions that this thesis presented:

1. Is it defensible to consider Athanasius to be the author of CAR IV?
2. Since the Athanasian premise is not universally accepted, what other authors are suggested by patristic scholars?
3. Regardless of authorship, what theological value does CAR IV hold for the contemporary reader?

1. The Athanasius hypothesis is defensible. Scholars are uncertain as to the constituent elements of Athanasian style. There is no consensus on basic issues such as the level of Athanasius' classical education or the grammatical constructions that he favored. The present author prefers Gibbon's description of Athanasius' style as "rude eloquence."<sup>135</sup> The fact that there is such dissension among those learned on the topic implies that the case is not closed, and that CAR IV's style is obviously not radically alien to those accepted Athanasian works or the debate would not exist at all. Reasonable minds can differ on the subject of Athanasius' style and CAR IV's compatibility with that supposed style, and any theory bold enough to dismiss CAR IV for stylistic reasons is pure conjecture.

Further, the use of scripture in CAR IV is not dispositive. There is an unusual reliance on the Johannine corpus in CAR IV. Nevertheless, even though the emphasis in terms of the variety of verses chosen is different, the exegesis is not contradictory. For examples of complimentary exegesis, refer to Part II, Section 1(b) to the discussion of Proverbs 9:1, Matthew 28:18, and John 1:14. Most of the parallel quotes (biblical quotes used in CAR IV and at least one of the other three Orations) are inconclusive. Since that is the case, the character of the scriptural exegesis is not a sound proof that CAR IV is spurious.

Also, CAR IV shares much of its vocabulary with CAR I, II, III. The most substantial criticism of CAR IV's authenticity is Stegmann's theory that CAR IV has Alexandrian theology but Antiochene terminology. Only a linguist would be properly equipped to evaluate this theory. Stegmann's contention that words such as *ἄνθρωπος* bely an Antiochene influence remains unproven.<sup>136</sup> CAR I, II, III employ *ἄνθρωπος* more often than does CAR IV. Newman did not note this Alexandrian/Antiochene dichotomy in CAR IV, and that fact alone offers a challenge to Stegmann. On the contrary, the majority of words that Newman identified as key Athanasian terms occur in CAR IV as well.

This investigation of the style, biblical exegesis, and vocabulary of CAR IV cannot begin to demonstrate definitively that Athanasius is the author of CAR IV. But it is an attempt to fill in the gaps left by the assumptions of previous scholars. It has at least been demonstrated that Athanasius could possibly have been the author of CAR IV, and that this is more likely than the other potential authors suggested by critics. There is nothing in the text of CAR IV that renders the Athanasian authorship an impossibility, and other scholars should investigate the issue more deeply now that the subject has been reopened by this reconsideration.

2. The alternative theories to the Athanasius hypothesis suggested by patristic scholars are interesting theoretically but ultimately unconvincing. Stegmann presents Apollinaris of Laodicea as the true author of CAR IV. He maintains that CAR IV evidences a youthful author and Apollinaris would have been only thirty-five years old in 340 AD when CAR IV was most likely written, and further that the vocabulary is unAthanasian and the theology is monophysitic. However, Athanasius was only nine years older than Apollinaris so the argument that there was a great age discrepancy between the two men does not hold. In fact, the young Athanasius is at least a known quantity in that he wrote *Contra Gentes* as a man of only twenty-eight years.<sup>137</sup> A linguist is needed to refute adequately Stegmann's theory that the vocabulary of CAR IV is Antiochene, but the vocabulary investigation in Part II, Section 1(c) of this thesis has demonstrated that the majority of words used in CAR IV are likewise employed in CAR I, II, III. The words that Stegmann identifies as key Apollinarian terms occur in CAR I, II, III almost as often as in CAR IV. This suggests that there was a general

common vocabulary shared by Alexandrian writers of the period and thus a deeper study would be needed to salvage Stegmann's theory. As for the theology of CAR IV, there is again much scholarly ferment over the issue of Athanasius' understanding of a soul in Christ. It is true that CAR IV does not speak of a soul in Christ, but Stegmann should not have ended his investigation at that point. As Grillmeier noted, the fathers' language is not always dispositive. St. Cyril, for example, did not emphasize the idea of a soul in Christ and made much use of the  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  -  $\sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\xi}$  model for the Incarnation. And yet he was a strong defender of Christ's complete humanity.<sup>138</sup> Stegmann should not be deceived by a cursory reading of Athanasius and suppose that the Bishop was a crypto-monophysite. Stegmann did not comment on Dräseke's observation that Apollinaris always includes Ephesians 3:17 in his writings. Such a discreet but telling discrepancy as this sheds great doubt on the Apollinaris hypothesis.

R.P.C. Hanson suggests that CAR IV is the product of the continuing Eustathian school in Antioch. But his theory is too vague and speculative to supersede the Athanasius hypothesis. Also, Hanson does not agree with the usual dating of CAR IV at 340 AD. In his opinion, this is too early as Athanasius was not established enough at this time to be imitated. His rejection of the 340 AD dating is a consequence of his initial rejection of the Athanasius hypothesis since there is nothing in the text itself that contradicts a 340 AD dating. Hanson only concerns himself with determining the latest date at which CAR IV could have been written. Rather, Hanson argues that CAR IV was written no later than 360 AD because it does not address the problems of Neo-Arianism and the status of the Holy Spirit, both of which were important topics by 360 AD, and further it evidences no knowledge of the events of the Council of Alexandria in 362 AD. Hanson dates CAR IV between 350 and 360 AD, a time when the continuing Eustathians, those who perpetuated Eustathius' teaching after he was condemned in 331 AD, were active and it was a time when several councils were writing documents that contained anti-Marcellian language. Marcellians and continuing Samosateans were a scandal and the Eustathians, who were also strong supporters of the notion of one hypostasis, wanted to distance themselves from any association with those other movements. Thus, Hanson finds that a treatise such as CAR IV would have been politically useful to these followers of the condemned Nicene Eustathius, whose downfall was the result of his disagreements with the Arian-sympathizer Eusebius of

Caesarea. Arians were constantly attempting to discredit the Nicenes for Sabellianism, and the continuing Eustathians wanted to avoid such a labelling.<sup>139</sup> Hanson's theory is interesting but far too speculative. He does not begin to compare CAR IV to any documents of the Eustachian school. It is hoped that Hanson's article is a prelude to a larger work of Hanson's in which he would explore this theory systematically instead of generally.

Neither Stegmann nor Hanson give an adequate discussion of Newman's position. Both of these scholars reject the authenticity of CAR IV and do not devote proper attention to comparing CAR IV with CAR I, II, and III or any other known works of Athanasius. Before proposing their own unique theories, Stegmann and Hanson should have effectively disproved the traditional Athanasian association of CAR IV that is defined by such exemplary Athanasian scholars as Cardinal Newman. Newman does not attempt to prove the Athanasian authorship of CAR IV either, but he accepts its authenticity from the start. Newman's analysis of the doctrine of CAR IV is so extensive and his facility with the text is so obvious that any assumption of Newman's regarding CAR IV needs to be actively refuted. Stegmann and Hanson should not have dismissed Newman without an in depth explanation. The history of criticism of CAR IV is fraught with assumptions. Renaissance scholars accepted the traditional Athanasian authorship. The nineteenth century critics such as Newman, Kaye, and Bright echoed their predecessors but they examined the text of CAR IV in terms of vocabulary and doctrine. Newman made enormous contributions to the study of CAR IV. He noted the treatise's abrupt style that is similar to a rough draft and he discovered that the true addressees were Marcellian and not Arian as the title *Contra Arianos IV* implies. Our own century has brought the study of CAR IV full circle. Once again, assumptions are being made concerning the authenticity of CAR IV but now the text is deemed spurious. The only scientific work being done on CAR IV is in support of other authorship. No comparison of CAR IV to the rest of the Athanasian corpus has been attempted since Newman's day. A reconsideration of CAR IV, that is not based on any preconceived notions concerning its authenticity, is long overdue. It is this author's intention to stimulate interest in CAR IV with this thesis, in the hopes that an established Athanasian scholar will build on this elementary foundation and provide the systematic, linguistic type of analysis that CAR IV deserves.

3. Third, the authorship of CAR IV is a significant issue because CAR IV presents an important though lesser known side of the Nicene controversy, that is, the battle against the Neo-Sabellians that rose up and divided the Nicene camp. The adversaries in CAR IV were of a Marcellian and a Samosatean orientation. Marcellus of Ancyra, his famous pupil Photinus, and their followers were particularly intended. CAR IV presents a useful precise of their doctrines. The Marcellians contended that only the Incarnate Christ was the proper Son of God, and thus they separated the Son from the Word. Marcellus also had a distorted understanding of the Trinity. In his attempt to preserve the integrity of monotheism he denied a real Trinity and contended that the Trinity was not immanent and was only a function of time. Therefore, God is a Monad who dilates Himself for economic purposes such as creation, and when that task is finished, the dilation reverts. The missions of the Son and the Spirit are thus temporal and the Kingdom of the Son will come to an end when this reversion is completed.<sup>140</sup> This is a fascinating heresy and one that influenced the development of the creeds and of orthodoxy generally.

In conclusion, the present author finds Newman's argument that CAR IV is genuinely Athanasian but separate from the other three Orations to be the most convincing theory yet expounded. CAR IV would be more properly titled *Contra Marcellum*. Perhaps Athanasius never gave this title to the work in deference to Marcellus. Only Athanasius, Marcellus' friend, would demonstrate this consideration. Newman also suggested that CAR IV was an incomplete rough draft. The author of this thesis agrees with this reasoning also, and after much contemplation would further this explanation by hypothesizing that CAR IV was an incomplete text of Athanasius that was collected and arranged in its current form posthumously by students of the Bishop. Perhaps elements of CAR IV that seem abrupt or unusual are the result of such redaction. The scholarly community is invited to offer its opinion.



**APPENDIX : Common Vocabulary List, a List of Root Words Occurring in CAR IV and CAR I, II, III.**

Refer to transliteration key on page 73.

- |                  |                  |                    |
|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. AARWN         | 30. AN           | 60. APO            |
| 2. ABBA          | 31. ANAGKH       | 61. APODEDEIGMENON |
| 3. ABRAAM        | 32. ANAGWN       | 62. APOKALUPTWN    |
| 4. AGAQON        | 33. ANADEXOMENOS | 63. APOKALUYH      |
| 5. AGAPHTOS      | 34. ANAIROUNTES  | 64. APOSTOLOS      |
| 6. AGGRELOS      | 35. ANANEWSEWS   | 65. APREPES        |
| 7. AGIOS         | 37. ANASTHSAS    | 66. AR             |
| 8. AGIWN         | 38. ANAFERWN     | 67. ARA            |
| 9. ADAM          | 39. ANDRA        | 68. AREIANOI       |
| 10. ADIARETOS    | 40. ANELABEN     | 69. AREIOMANITAI   |
| 11. ADOU         | 41. ANQRWPINA    | 70. AREIOS         |
| 12. AEI          | 42. ANOHTON      | 71. ARMOZEI        |
| 13. AI           | 43. ANOIAN       | 72. ARNHSQAI       |
| 14. AIDION       | 44. ANTI         | 73. ARNOUNTAI      |
| 15. AISQHSIN     | 45. ANWQEN       | 74. ARTI           |
| 16. AISXUNOMENOI | 46. ACIOS        | 75. ARXAI          |
| 17. AIWNAS       | 47. ADRATOS      | 76. ARXH           |
| 18. AKOLOUQON    | 48. AP           | 77. ASEBES         |
| 19. AKOUONTES    | 49. APAGGELLEI   | 78. ASQENEIAS      |
| 20. ALHQEIAS     | 50. APANTA       | 79. ASQENH         |
| 21. ALLA         | 51. APANTHSEI    | 80. ASOFOS         |
| 22. ALLOS        | 52. APAC         | 81. ASTEROS        |
| 23. ALLOTE       | 53. APARXHN      | 82. ASTHR          |
| 24. ALLOTRIA     | 54. APAUGASMA    | 83. ATELHS         |
| 25. ALOGOS       | 55. APEIRON      | 84. ATOPA          |
| 26. AMARTIAS     | 56. APEKRIQH     | 85. ATOPIAS        |
| 27. AMELEI       | 57. APESTALH     | 86. ATOPON         |
| 28. AMHN         | 58. APESTEILEN   | 87. AUTOS          |
| 29. AMFOTERA     | 59. APLOUN       | 88. AUTOSOFIA      |

89. AF	122. DE DEDEIKTAI	155. DOCAZETAI
90. AXRI	123. DEDWKAS	156. DOCAN
91. AXWRISTOS	124. DEI	157. DOCH
92. BAPTISMA	125. DEIKNUSIN	158. DUNAMIS
93. BASILEIAS	126. DEICAI	159. DUO
94. BEBAIOI	127. DEICH	160. DWREAS
95. BLASFHMEIS	128. DEICON	161. E
96. BLEPE	129. DEIXQH	162. EA
97. BOULONTAI	130. DECIA	163. DAN
98. BOWNWN	131. DECIAS	164. EAUTON
99. GAR	132. DEUTEROS	165. EBASILEUSEN
100. GE	133. DEXETAI	166. EGENETO
101. GEGENNHKA	134. DH	167. EGNWKWS
102. GEGONEN	135. HLON	168. EGW
103. GEGRAMMENON	136. DHMIOURGON	169. EDEI
104. GEGRAPTAI	137. DI	170. EDEIXQH
105. GENEAS	138. DIA	171. EDHLOU
106. GENEI	139. DIABEBAIOUNTAI	172. EDIDOU
107. GENHTA	140. DIAIREIN	173. EDOQH
108. GENNA	141. DIAKONHSAI	174. EDWKEN
109. GENNHMA	142. DIANOIAN	175. EQEASAMEQA
110. GENOMENOS	143. DIATACEI	176. EQNH
111. GENOS	144. DIAFEREI	177. EQOS
112. GHN	145. DIAFORAN	178. EI
113. GINESQAI	146. DIDASKWN	179. EIGE
114. GINOMENOS	147. DIDOASIN	180. EIDWS
115. GNHSION	148. DIDOUS	181. EIEN
116. GNWTE	149. DIDWSIN	182. EIH
117. GOUN	150. DIELEIN	183. EIKONA
118. GRAFEI	151. DIHGOUMENOS	184. EIKOSTW
119. GRAFH	152. DIKAION	185. EIKWN
120. D DABID	153. DIO	186. EILHFENAI
121. DANIHL	154. DIORQWSIN	187. EIMI

188. EINAI	221. EMPROSQEN	354. EPEI
189. EIPA	222. EN	355. EPEIDH
190. EIPATWO	223. ENA	356. EPEITA
191. EIPON	224. ENANQRWPHSIN	357. EPHGAGE
192. EIRHKEN	225. ENANTIA	358. EPI
193. EISELQEIN	226. ENATW	359. EPIDHMIAS
194. EISI	227. ENDEHS	360. EPINOHSEI
195. EITA	228. ENEKA	361. EPINOIAS
196. EIXON	229. ENERGIA	362. EPISTOLH
197. EK	230. ENETEILATO	363. EPIFANEIAS
198. EKATERON	231. ENQUMOUMENOI	364. EPIFEREI
199. EKEINOS	232. ENI	365. EPLASAN
200. EKKLHSIAS	233. ENNOIAN	366. EPOIHSAS
201. EKTISQH	234. ENOMIZON	367. ERGAZETAI
202. EKTOS	235. ENOS	368. ERGON
203. ELABEN	236. ENOTHTA	369. ERESQAI
204. ELABON	237. ENOUSIOS	370. ERMHNEUETAI
205. ELALEI	238. ENTAUQA	371. ERMHNEUWN
206. ELALHSE	239. ENTOLHN	372. ERXOMENON
207. ELAMBANEN	340. ENWPION	373. ERWTW
208. ELATTON	341. ENWSIN	374. ESKHNWSEN
209. ELEGEN	342. EC	375. ESMEN
210. ELEGXON	343. ECAGAGEIN	376. ESOMEQA
211. ELHLUQEN	344. ECAFANISQH	377. ESTEREWQHSAN
212. ELQONTA	345. ECESTI	378. ESTI
213. ELQWN	346. ECHGAGE	379. ESXATH
214. ELLHNES	347. ECHLQEN	380. ETAPEINWSEN
215. ELWI	348. ECHREUCATO	381. ETEROS
216. EMAQOMEN	349. ECOUSIA	382. ETI
217. EMAUTOU	350. ECW	383. ETUGXANON
218. EME	351. ECWQEN	384. EUAGGELIWN
219. EMOI	352. EP	385. EUQUE
220. EMPALIN	353. EPAGEI	386. EULOGHTOS

387. EUREQHSETAI	420. HN	453. KAQWS
388. EUREIN	421. HNWTAI	454. KAI
389. EURHSEI	422. HRCATO	455. KAINH
390. EUSEBWS	423. HRWTA	456. KAIPER
391. EFANERWQH	424. HIS	457. KAITOI
392. EFH	425. HSAIA	458. KAKEINOS
393. EFORESE	426. HSAN	459. KAKWS
394. EXARISATO	427. THIS	460. KAN
395. EXEIN	428. Q	461. KARDIAS
396. EXETE	429. QAUMASTHN	462. KAT
397. EXH	430. QAUMASTON	463. KATA
398. EXOMEN	431. QEIA	464. KATABOLHS
399. EXONTA	432. QELWN	465. KATESKEUASEN
400. EXRISEN	433. QEOS	466. KEITAI
401. EXWN	434. IDEIN	467. KENA
402. EWRAKEN	435. IDIOS	468. KEPT
403. EWS	436. IHSOUS	469. KHRUGMA
404. ZHTEIN	437. IN	470. KHRUSSEI
405. ZWH	438. INA	471. KHRUTTEI
406. H	439. IORDANH	472. KLHQEIH
407. HGAPHSEN	440. IOUDAIOUS	473. KOINOS
408. HDH	441. ISAAK	474. KOLPOIS
409. HDUNATO	442. ISASIN	475. KOPIAN
410. HQELE	443. ISON	476. KORINQIOI
411. HKOUSAMEN	444. ISRAHL	477. KOSMOS
412. HQELE	445. ISWS	478. KRAZON
413. HKOUSAMEN	446. IWANNHS	479. KREITTWN
414. HLQON	447. K	480. KRINEI
415. HMAS	448. KAGW	481. KRISIS
416. HMEN	449. KAQ	482. KRUPTOMENOUS
417. HAMERA	450. KAQAPER	483. KTIZEIN
418. HMETEROS	451. KAQOLOU	484. KTISH
419. HMIN	452. KAQOTI	485. KTISIS

486. KTISMA	523. MEINH	556. NWE
487. KTISMATA	524. MEN	557. CULOU
488. KUNES	525. MENEI	558. O
489. KURIOS	526. MEROS	559. OQEN
490. L	527. MESITHS	560. OIDEN
491. LABEIN	528. MESOU	561. OIKOS
492. LALEIN	529. MESTON	562. OIKOUMENHN
493. LAMBANWN	530. META	563. OION
494. LAON	531. MH	564. OLIGA
495. LEGEIN	532. MHD	565. OLOKLHROS
500. LEIPETAI	533. MHDE	566. OLON
501. LEKTEON	534. MHKETI	567. OMIA
502. LECEIS	535. MHN	568. OMOION
503. KEUKOTERON	536. MHPW	569. OMOOUSIOS
504. LEXQEIH	537. MHTE	570. ON
505. LIQOUS	538. MIA	571. ONOMA
506. LOGOS	539. MIAS	572. ONOMAZEI
507. LOIPON	540. MISEIN	573. ONOMATA
508. LUQHNAI	541. MNHMONEUEI	574. ONTOS
509. MAQHTHS	542. MOI	575. OPER
510. MAINETAI	543. MONAS	576. OPOTERON
511. MAKARIOS	544. MONH	577. ORAN
512. MALISTA	545. MONOGENES	578. ORQON
513. MALLON	546. MONOS	579. ORWMENOS
514. MANQANEIN	547. MWSEWS	580. OS
515. MANIXAIWN	548. NEKRWN	581. OSA
516. MARIA	549. NOEIN	582. OSIOTHTI
517. MARTUREITAI	550. NOMW	583. OSON
518. MATHN	551. NOOUSIN	584. OT
519. ME	552. NOUN	585. OTAN
520. MEGA	553. NUKTOS	586. OTE
521. MEQ	554. NUN	587. OTI
522. MEIZWN	555. NUC	588. OU

589. OUD	622. PAUSEI	655. PROSKITAI
590. OUDEIS	623. PEMYAS	656. PROSKUNHSIS
591. OUDEMIAN	624. PEPAUTAI	657. PROSPOIOUNTAI
592. OUK	625. PEPOIHKE	658. PROTERONPROFASIN
593. OUKOUN	626. PERI	659. PRWTW
594. OUN	627. PERIQEMENOS	660. PULAI
595. OUPW	628. PERITTON	661. PUROS
596. OURANON	629. PETROS	662. PWPOTE
597. OUS	630. PISTEUWN	663. PWS
598. OUSIA	631. PISTIN	664. RHMATA
599. OUTOS	632. PLASMA	665. RHTON
600. OUX	633. PLEION	666. SABELLION
601. OUXI	634. PLEON	667. SABELLIOS
602. PAQOS	635. PLEURAN	668. SAMOSATEWS
603. PALIA	636. PLHN	669. SARKOS
604. PANTOS	637. PNEUMA	670. SARC
605. PAR	638. POIEIS	671. SE
606. PARA	639. POIHMA	672. SHMAINEIN
607. PARADEIGMA	640. POION	673. SHMERON
608. PAREXONTOS	641. POLIN	674. SKIA
609. PARQENOU	642. POLLA	675. SKOTOS
610. PAROIMIAIS	643. POLLAKIS	676. SOI
611. PAROUSIAS	644. PONHRA	677. SOLOMWN
612. PAS	645. POREUOMAI	678. SOU
613. PASA	646. POTE	679. SOFIA
614. PASHS	647. POTERON	680. SOFOS
615. PASIN	648. POU	681. SPERMATOS
616. PATERA	649. PREPON	682. SRKA
617. PATHR	650. PRIN	683. SU
618. PATRI	651. PROBALLESQAI	684. SUGGNWMHN
619. PATRIKHN	652. PRODHILON	685. SUGKATABASIN
620. PATROS	653. PROEIRHMENA	686. SUMBEBHKOS
621. PAULOS	654. PROS	687. SUN

688. SUNARIQMEIN	721. TOTE	754. FHMI
689. SUNAFQEIS	722. TOUS	755. FHSOUSIN
690. SUNESTIN	723. TOUTOS	756. FQANOUSAN
691. SUNH	724. TREPTOS	757. FQEGGONTAI
692. SUNHMMENA	725. TRIAS	758. FILLIPPON
693. SUNODOS	726. TRITON	759. FILONETKOUNTES
694. SUNORWSI	727. TRIWN	760. FILWN
695. SXHMATI	728. TROPON	761. FRONHMA
696. SWZEIN	729. TUGXANON	762. FUSEI
697. SWQH	730. UIOQESIAN	763. FWNHS
698. SWMA	731. UION	764. FWS
699. SWMATOS	732. UIOPOIOUMENOS	765. FWTIZON
700. SWSAI	733. UIW	766. X
701. SWTHR	734. UMIN	767. XARIS
702. TA	735. UMWN	768. XARISMATA
703. TAUTON	736. UP	769. XARITI
704. TEQEMELIWTAI	737. UPARCEWS	770. XEIR
705. TEKNON	738. UPARXEIN	771. XEIROΣ
706. TELEIOS	739. UPEMEINE	772. XREIAS
707. TELOS	740. UPER	773. XRH
708. TESSARAKOSTW	741. UPERUYWSEN	774. XRISEI
709. TETARTW	742. UPESTH	775. XRTSMA
710. TH	743. UPO	776. XRISTOS
711. THS	744. UPONOEION	777. XRONOI
712. TI	745. UPOSTASIN	778. XRW MENOS
713. TINI	746. UYISTOU	779. YALLEI
714. TOI	747. UYWQH	780. YALMWDOS
715. TOIAUTA	748. FANERWTERON	781. YILOS
716. TOIGAROUN	749. FANHSETAI	782. WDH
717. TOLMWN	750. FASI	783. WKODOMHSEN
718. TON	751. FASKONTES	784. WN
719. TOPOUS	752. FATE	785. WNOMASEN
720. TOSOUTON	753. FERE	786. WRA

787. WS

788. WASUTWS

789. WSPER

790. WSTE

791. WFQH



## ENDNOTES

1. John Henry Newman, A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844), p. 498.
2. E. A. Livingstone, ed., The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 394.
3. Newman, p. 498.
4. Livingstone, p. 394.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 514.
6. Newman, p. 498.
7. Livingstone, p. 329.
8. Newman, p. 498-499.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 499-500.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 501.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*, p. 500.
13. *Ibid.*, p. xxi-xxiv.
14. *Ibid.*, p. xii-xiv.
15. *Ibid.*, p. xiii.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*, p. xxi.
18. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 502.
20. John Kaye, Some Account of the Council of Nicaea (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1853), p. 268.
21. William Bright, The Orations of St. Athanasus Against the Arians (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884), p. 74.

22. Anton Stegmann, Die pseudoathanasianische "IVte Rede gegen die Arianer" als κατά Ἀρειανῶν λόγος ein Apollinarisgut (Rottenburg a. N.: Wilhelm Bader, 1917), p. 3.
23. Ibid., p. 118.
24. Ibid., p. 5.
25. Ibid., p. 114.
26. Ibid., p. 116.
27. Ibid., p. 5.
28. Ibid., p. 6.
29. Ibid., p. 8-9.
30. Ibid., p. 120.
31. Ibid., p. 121-122.
32. Ibid., p. 134.
33. Ibid., p. 136-137.
34. Ibid., p. 184.
35. Ibid., p. 140.
36. Ibid., p. 143.
37. Ibid., p. 150.
38. Ibid., p. 193.
39. Ibid.
40. Livingstone, p. 14-15.
41. Ibid., p. 26.
42. Stegmann, p. 193.
43. Livingstone, p. 356.
44. Hans-Georg Opitz, Untersuchungen Zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1935), p. 139.

45. Otto Bardenhewer, Patrology (Freiburg: Bitterder, 1908), p. 254.
46. A. Cayre, A Manual of Patrology and History of Theology ( Paris: Desclee & Co., 1936), p. 345.
47. Berthold Altaner, Patrologie (Freiburg: Herder, 1951), p. 232.
48. Johannes Quasden, Patrology (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960), p. 27-28.
49. Stegmann, p. 136.
50. Ibid., p. 134.
51. Ibid., p. 180.
52. Ibid., p. 136. .
53. John Henry Newman, Select Treatises of St. Athanasius (1842, rpt. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903), p. 58.
54. Ibid.
55. Newman, A Library of Fathers, p. 499.
56. Ibid., p. 500.
57. Stegmann, p. 138.
58. Newman, Select Treatises, p. 58.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., p. 345-346.
61. Ibid.
62. Stegmann, p. 150.
63. Newman, Select Treatises, p. 366.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., p. 364.
66. Ibid., p. 453.
67. Ibid., p. 468.

68. Stegmann, p. 177.
69. Stegmann, p. 175.
70. Livingstone, p. 28.
71. Stegmann, p. 175.
72. Stegmann, p. 150.
73. Johannes Dräseke, Apollinaris von Laodicea, Sein Leben und Seine Schriften (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1892), p. 8.
74. Stegmann, p. 180.
75. Dräseke, p. 78.
76. Stegmann, p. 178-179.
77. Dräseke, p. 162.
78. Stegmann, p. 190.
79. Aloys Grillmeier, S. J., Christ in Christian Tradition (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1965), p. 175.
80. Ibid.
81. George Dion. Dragas, St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem (Athens, 1985), p. 290.
82. Grillmeier, p. 195.
83. Dräseke, p. 171.
84. Stegmann, p. 178-179.
85. Stegmann, p. 87.
86. R. P. C. Hanson, "The Source and Significance of the Fourth Oratio Contra Arianos Attributed to St. Athanasius," Vigiliae Christianae, September, 1988, p. 257.
87. Ibid., p. 258.
88. Ibid., p. 262.
89. Ibid., p. 257.

90. Ibid., p. 263.
91. Newman, A Library of Fathers, p. 501.
92. Hanson, p. 264.
93. Ibid.
94. Livingstone, p. 182.
95. Hanson, p. 265.
96. Ibid., p. 264.
97. Ibid., p. 265.
98. Van A. Harvey, A Handbook of Theological Terms (New York: Collier Books, 1964), p. 152.
99. J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 122.
100. Ibid.
101. Bertrand de Margerie, S. J., The Christian Trinity in History (Still River, Massachussetts: St. Bede's Publications, 1975), p. 73.
102. Ibid.
103. Rusch, p. 8.
104. Michael O'Carroll, C. S., Sp., Trinitas: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Holy Trintiy (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987), p. 4.
105. G. L. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought (London: S. P. C. K., 1952), p 115.
106. Kelly, p. 123.
107. Kelly, p. 126.
108. Henry Chadwick, The Early Church (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 88.
109. Henry Melvill Gwatkin, Studies in Arianism (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900) p. 86.
110. T. Evan Pollard, "Marcellus of Ancyra, a Neglected Father," Epektasis (Beachesne, 1972), p. 191.
111. Ibid.

112. Gwatkin, p. 79.
113. Adolf Harnack, History of Dogma (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961), p. 66.
114. Chadwick, 135.
115. David Christie-Murray, A History of Heresy, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 55.
116. Ibid., p. 50.
117. Louis Duchesne, Monsignor, Early History of the Christian Church (1912; rpt. London: John Murray, 1957), p. 161.
118. Hanson, p. 220.
119. Newman, Select Treatises, p. 203.
120. Prestige, p. 213.
121. Pollard, p. 191.
122. Ibid., p. 188.
123. Harnack, p. 66.
124. Gwatkin, p. 83.
125. Pollard, p. 192.
126. Gwatkin, p. 84.
127. Pollard, p. 195.
128. Harvey, p. 172.
129. Kelly, p. 240.
130. Ibid., p. 241.
131. Ibid.
132. Ibid., p. 240.
133. Pollard, p. 190.
134. Ibid., p. 194.

135. Newman, Select Treatises, p. 58.
136. Stegmann, p. 150.
137. Stegmann, p. 175.
138. Grillmeier, p. 195.
139. Hanson, p. 264.
140. Harnack, 66.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aland, Black, eds. The Greek New Testament. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1966.

Altaner, Berthold. Patrologie. Freiburg: Herder, 1951.

Bardenhewer, Otto. Patrology, The Lives and Words of the Fathers of the Church. Trans. Thom. J. Shanahan. Freiburg: Bitterder, 1908.

BIBΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΩΝ ΕΓΓΡΑΦΕΩΝ.  
ΤΟΜΟΣ ΤΡΙΑΚΟΣΤΟΣ, ΜΕΓΑΣ ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΣ (ΜΕΡΟΣ Α'), ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ ΤΗΣ  
ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗΣ ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ. ΑΘΗΝΑΙ, 1962.

Bright, William. The Orations of St. Athanasius Against the Arians. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884.

Cayre, A. Manual of Patrology and History of Theology. Trans. H. Howitt. Paris: Desclee & Co., 1936.

Chadwick, Henry. The Early Church. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967.

Christie-Murray, David. A History of Heresy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

De Margerie, Bertrand, S.J. The Christian Trinity in History. Still River, Massachusetts; St. Bede's Publications, 1975.

Dragas, George Dion. St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem. Athens, 1985.

Duchesne, Louis, Monsignor. Early History of the Christian Church from its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century. Vol. I. 1912; rpt. London: John Murray, 1957.

Gerhardt, Harnack, eds. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur. Vol. XIV, Part 3/4, Apollinarios von Laodicea, Sein Leben und Seine Schriften, By Johannes Dräseke. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1892.

Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte, Vierter Band. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.

Grillmeier, Aloys, S. J. Christ in Christian Tradition. Trans. J.S. Bowden. Longon: A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1965.

Gwatkin, Henry Melvill. Studies of Arianism. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900.

Hanson, R.P.C. "The Source and Significance of the Fourth Oratio Contra Arianos



- Attributed to Athanasius." Vigiliae Christianae, September 1988, Volume 42, No. 3, pp. 257-266.
- Harnack, Adolf. History of Dogma. Vol. 4,5. Trans. Neil Buchanan. New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1961.
- Harvey, Van A. A Handbook of Theological Terms. New York: Collier Books, 1964.
- Hirsch, Lietzmann, eds. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte. Vol. 23, Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius, by Hans-Georg Opitz. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1935.
- The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1972.
- Kaye, John. Some Account of the Council of Nicaea, in Connexion with the Life of Athanasius. London: Francis & John Rivington, 1853.
- Kelly, J.N.D. Early Christian Doctrines. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Liddell, Scott, eds. Greek-English Lexicon. 1871; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Livingston, E.A., ed. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Newman, John Henry, Cardinal. A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church Anterior to the Division of East and West. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844.
- Newman, John Henry, Cardinal. Select Treatises of Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians, Vol. II. 1842; rpt. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903.
- O'Carroll, Michael, C.S., Sp. Trinitas: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Holy Trinity. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.
- Pollard, T. Evan. "Marcellus of Ancyra, A Neglected Father." Epektasis, Melange Patristiques Offres au Cardinal Jean Canielou. Beachesne, 1972, pp. 1987-196.
- Prestige, G.L. God in Patristic Thought. London: S.P.C.K., 1952.
- Quasden, Johannes. Patrology. Vol. III. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960.
- Rusch, William G., ed., trans. The Trinitarian Controversy. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Stegmann, Anton, Die pseudoathanasianische "IVte Rede gegen die Arianer" als Κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος. ein Apollinarisgut. Rottenburg a.N.: Wilhelm Bader, 1917.

Wand, J.W.C. A History of the Early Church to A.D. 500. London: Methuen, 1937.

