

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

Mr. Vernon S. Olson submitted this thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The Senatus Academicus, however, at its meeting on 13th January, 1967, could not see its way to awarding Mr. Olson the Degree of Ph.D. but agreed to award him the Degree of Master of Theology.

Secretary and Registrar.

27th January, 1967.

ATHANASIUS' USE OF SCRIPTURE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

ATHANASIUS' USE OF SCRIPTURE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

A thesis by
Vernon Solomon Olson
Presented to
The University of St. Andrews



In application for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

October, 1966

M. Thel. awarded

18/1/67

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following Thesis is based on the results of research carried out by me, that the Thesis is my own composition, and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree.

The research was carried out in St. Mary's College, the University of St. Andrews.

Vernon Solomon Olson

CERTIFICATE

I certify that Vernon Solomon Olson has spent nine terms in Research Work in St. Mary's College in the University of St. Andrews, that he has fulfilled the conditions of Ordinance No. 16 (St. Andrews), and that he is qualified to submit the accompanying Thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert McL. Wilson

Matthew Black

ACADEMIC CAREER

I matriculated in Bethel College, St. Paul, Minnesota, in 1942 and followed a course leading to graduation in 1949 with a degree of Bachelor of Arts. I also attended Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado, and the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. I spent 1943-1946 in the United States Army.

In 1949 I matriculated in Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, and followed a course leading to graduation in 1952 with a degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

In 1963 I matriculated in Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Oakbrook, Illinois, and followed a course leading to graduation in 1964 with a degree of Master of Theology.

In 1964 I commenced research on "Athanasius' Use of Scripture with Special Reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity" which is now being submitted as a Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

PREFACE

I would like to express my appreciation to Principal Matthew Black for suggesting the title of this Thesis. This suggestion followed my expressed interest in the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel which was of crucial importance in the Arian controversy of the fourth century. I am grateful to Dr. Robert McL. Wilson, and also to Principal Black, for constructive criticism, helpful suggestions, and generous allowance of time for consultation. I would also like to thank the Librarian and Staff of St. Andrews University Library for procuring the necessary books and articles not in the University Library and for their courteous service. My thanks are also due Dr. John Frame who proofread the final copy of the thesis. I am greatly indebted also to all those who have in any way provided for this opportunity for me to study in St. Mary's College of the University of St. Andrews. Finally, I especially wish to express my gratitude to my wife Trudy who assisted with proofreading and typing, and whose fortitude, encouragement, and inspiration made possible this rewarding period of study. To her and to my children, Debbie and David, I dedicate this thesis.

Dedicated

With Love and Appreciation to

Trudy

and

Debbie and David

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	v
ABBREVIATIONS	x
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I. ATHANASIUS AND THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY	
Chapter	
I. ARIANISM	7
The Origins of Arianism	
The History of Arianism	
The Tenets of Arianism	
II. ATHANASIUS AND ARIANISM	33
The Life and Writings of Athanasius	
Athanasius' Doctrine of the Trinity	
PART II. ATHANASIUS' CONCEPTION OF SCRIPTURE	
III. THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE	55
Scripture as the Basis for Doctrine	
The Inspiration of Scripture	
The Old Testament as a Christian Book	
IV. THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE	75
The Canon of the Old Testament	
The Canon of the New Testament	
The Deutero-canonical Literature	
V. SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION	111
The Relationship of Scripture and Tradition	
The Sufficiency of Scripture	
VI. THE SIGNIFICANT BOOKS AND PASSAGES	132
The Use of the Old Testament	
The Use of the New Testament	

ABBREVIATIONS

- AAPF = Arctos: Acta Philologica Fennica
- AJT = American Journal of Theology
- ATR = Anglican Theological Review
- BJRL = Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
- CE = The Catholic Encyclopedia. Edited by Charles G. Hebermann, et al. 15 vols. London: Caxton Publishing Company, 1907-1912.
- CH = Church History
- CQ = The Classical Quarterly
- CQR = Church Quarterly Review
- CTM = Concordia Theological Monthly
- DAC = Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. Edited by James Hastings. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915, 1918.
- DCB = A Dictionary of Christian Biography. Edited by William Smith and Henry Wace. 4 vols. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1877-1887.
- DCG = A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906, 1908.
- ECQ = The Eastern Churches Quarterly
- ERE = Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. 13 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-1926.
- ET = The Expository Times
- HDB = The Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898-1904.
- HJ = The Hibbert Journal

PART III. ATHANASIUS' METHODS OF EXEGESIS

VII. WISDOM-HAND-WORD CHRISTOLOGY 147

Christ as the Wisdom of God
 The exegesis of Prov. 8:22
 Christ as Wisdom in Athanasius
 The background of the conception of
 Wisdom
 The New Testament conception of Christ
 as Wisdom
 Christ as the Wisdom of God in the
 Church fathers.

Christ as the Hand of God
 Athanasius' conception of Christ as the
 Hand of God
 The history of the conception of Christ
 as the Hand of God

Christ as the Word of God
 Athanasius' conception of Christ as the
 Word of God
 The background of the "Word" Christology
 Christ as the Word of God in the New
 Testament
 The conception of Christ as the Word of
 God in the Church fathers

VIII. CHRIST AS LORD AND AS ANGEL OF THE LORD . . . 206

Christ as Lord
 The background of the title "Lord"
 Christ as Lord in the New Testament
 Athanasius' application of the title
 "Lord" to the Son

Christ as Angel of the Lord
 Christ as Angel of the Lord in Athanasius
 The background and history of the conception
 of Christ as Angel of the Lord

IX. THE COMMON ACTIVITIES AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE
 PERSONS OF THE TRINITY 230

Creation
 The Inspiration of Prophets and Apostles
 The Work of Sanctification
 The Declarations Made of the Father, of the
 Son, and of the Holy Spirit

The Worship of Father, Son, and Spirit	
The Divine Attributes	
The Unity of Father, Son, and Spirit Ex- pressed in Baptism, Benediction, and Gifts	

X. OTHER SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCES OF THE TRINITY	261
--	-----

Christ as God's Son	
The Eternity of the Son	
The Eternity of the Holy Spirit	
The Unity of the Father, Son, and Spirit	
The Double Account of the Son	
Comparing Scripture with Scripture	
The Exegesis of Various Scripture Passages	
Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22)	
John 10:30; 17:11, 20-23	
Amos 4:13	
I Tim. 5:21	
Some unusual interpretations	

PART IV. ATHANASIUS' PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

XI. BASES OF INTERPRETATION	307
---------------------------------------	-----

The Relationship of Christ to the Old Testament	
Methods of Interpretation in the Post-New Testament Period	
The Literal Use of Scriptures	
The Doctrine of the Trinity in Scripture	

XII. RULES OF INTERPRETATION	352
--	-----

The Scope of Scripture	
The Determination of the Meaning of a Passage of Scripture	
The Context of Scripture	
The Spiritual Qualifications of the Interpreter	

EPILOGUE	374
--------------------	-----

The Doctrine of the Trinity	
The Interpretation of Scripture	

BIBLIOGRAPHY	390
------------------------	-----

- HTR = Harvard Theological Review
- IB = The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Buttrick, et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952-1957.
- ICC = The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910-1920.
- IDB = The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George Buttrick, et al. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature
- JBR = The Journal of Bible and Religion
- JR = The Journal of Religion
- JRH = Journal of Religious History
- JTS = The Journal of Theological Studies
- LQHR = London Quarterly & Holborn Review
- NT = Novum Testamentum
- NTS = New Testament Studies
- NZST = Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie
- RE = Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Edited by Albert Hauck. 24 vols. Leipzig, 1896-1913.
- RHPR = Revue d'Historie et de Philosophie Religieuses
- RL = Religion in Life
- RTR = Reformed Theological Review
- SJT = Scottish Journal of Theology
- ST = Studia Theologica
- TL = Theologische Literaturzeitung
- TS = Theological Studies
- TU = Texte und Untersuchungen

- TWNT = Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.
Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Vols. I-VII-. Stuttgart, 1933-1964-.
- VC = Vigiliae Christianae
- VT = Vetus Testamentum
- ZATW = Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
- ZNTW = Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
- ZTK = Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

INTRODUCTION

In his discussion of Athanasius' conflict with Arius Samuel Laeuchli indicates the value of an investigation of Athanasius' use of Scripture in that:

Every age must restate the events of history because in every age these events appear in a specific focus. The contemporary theological discussion concerning ontological and existential knowledge, the essence of Biblical faith, and the meaning of language in Christian theology make the controversy of the fourth century a highly modern issue. Indeed, the 20th century has to state its Christological position afresh. It cannot simply repeat the fathers between Nicaea and Constantinople. Yet it can learn a great deal from these fathers by seeking to understand, sine ira et studio, the case of Athanasius versus Arius.¹

Athanasius occupies a position of special prominence in the history of the early Church, because he was largely responsible for saving Christian monotheism from extinction.² "If ever in human history there was a man divinely raised up and endowed to meet and deal with a special emergency it was Athanasius."³

The special truths for which Athanasius contended in the Arian controversy were the deity of the Son and of the

¹Samuel Laeuchli, "The Case of Athanasius against Arius," CTM (30, 1959), p. 403.

²G. L. Prestige, Fathers and Heretics: Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue: The Bampton Lectures for 1940 (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1940), p. 157.

³William P. Du Bose, The Ecumenical Councils (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897), p. 123.

Holy Spirit.¹ Therefore both the doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation of the Son were involved. The task of formulating and defending the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, and thus the deity of the Son and the Spirit, and the unity of the Trinity, devolved upon Athanasius.² This he did with unswerving fidelity and unrelenting determination for most of his career. It was, indeed, his life work.³

For Athanasius the Scriptures themselves provided the evidence for the truths for which he contended, as he explicitly states.⁴ Wiles suggests that:

There is no title that the Fathers would have coveted more for themselves than that of Biblical theologians. Later scholars may point with justice to the influence of Greek metaphysical thought upon their writings and their understanding of the Gospel, but in conscious aim and intention their overriding purpose was to interpret the message of the Bible.⁵

In knowledge of the Greek Bible Athanasius was second to

¹J. W. C. Wand, The Four Great Heresies (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1955), p. 37.

²Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, pp. 139, 140.

³Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity: From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great (new ed., rev. and enlarged; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884), II, 890.

⁴See, e.g., De Dec. 17; and C. Ar. I.10.

⁵Maurice F. Wiles, The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), p. 158.

none of the Church fathers.¹ Athanasius was remarkably careful to give the correct Bible text. As Henric Nordberg points out, Athanasius' quotations from Scripture are given with extraordinary word for word accuracy.²

With special reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, then, Athanasius' use of Scripture will be examined: the Biblical passages which are used, the manner in which they are employed, the exegesis of these passages, and the rules that govern their interpretation. The works of Athanasius that are considered genuine and have been examined for this purpose are: Contra Gentes; De Incarnatione Verbi Dei; Epistola Encyclica ad Episcopos; In Illud, Omnia, etc.; Apologia contra Arianos; De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi; De Sententia Dionysii; Ad Amun; Ad Dracontium; Vita Antoni; Ad Episcopos Aegypti et Libyae Epistolae; Apologia ad Constantium; Apologia de Fuga Sua; Historia Arianorum ad Monachos; Epistola ad Serapionem de Morte Arii; Orationes contra Arianos I-III; De Synodis; Epistolae ad Serapionem I-IV; Tomus ad Antiochenos; Ad Jovianum; Ad Afros; Ad Epictetum; Ad Adelphium; Ad Maximum; and Epistolae Heortasticae.³ It should be noted

¹W. Emery Barnes, "Athanasius," ERE, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), II, 168.

²Henric Nordberg, "On the Bible Text of St. Athanasius," AAPF (N.S., III, 1962), p. 121.

³For a discussion of the authenticity of the writings attributed to Athanasius see: K. Hoss, Studien über das Schriftum und die Theologie des Athanasius (Freiburg, 1899),

that Athanasius' writings were, for the most part, occasional tracts written to meet a special emergency or particular need. He had neither time nor opportunity, Florovsky points out, for a "dispassionate and systematic exposition."¹

Athanasius' use and interpretation of Scripture will be considered against the background of the fourth century especially in relation to the Arian controversy. His conception of Scripture will also be examined. The historical antecedents of Athanasius' conception, use, and interpretation of Scripture will be considered, but the writings of his contemporaries and of later writers will not be taken into consideration. Though a distinction is sometimes made between interpretation and exegesis, this distinction will be disregarded, and the two terms will be used as equivalent.² The Scripture passages Athanasius used will be given in

pp. 1-3, 104-130; Alfred Stülcken, Beiträge zur Athanasius-Frage: Inaugural-Dissertation (Leipzig, 1899); F. Loofs, "Athanasius von Alexandria," RE, ed. Albert Hauck (Leipzig, 1897), II, 194-205; Johannes Quasten, Patrology: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon (Utrecht/Antwerp, 1960), III, 22-66; Otto Bardenhewer, Patrology: The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church, trans. from 2nd ed. Thomas J. Shahan (Freiburg, 1908), pp. 254-258; and Friedrich Lauchert, Die Lehre des Heiligen Athanasius des Grossen (Leipzig, 1895), IV, IX-XIII.

¹Georges Florovsky, "The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius," Studia Patristica, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin, 1962), VI, 53.

²See Robert M. Grant, A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible (rev. ed.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1965), p. 3.

translation from his works, and it should be noted that Athanasius' Old Testament was the Septuagint.¹ The Old Testament passages will not, therefore, be indicated as coming from the Septuagint. Passages that are quoted, but not directly from Athanasius' works, are taken from The Holy Bible Revised Standard Version Containing the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha of the Old Testament (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd, 1959) and are so designated. In matters of style Kate L. Turabian, A Manual For Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955), is generally followed. American spelling is used throughout except in quotations and in titles. Finally, an epilogue will briefly delineate recent thought on the main themes considered in this study.

¹Robert M. Grant, "History of the Interpretation of the Bible: I. Ancient Period," IB (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), I, 106; T. E. Pollard, "The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy," BJRL (41, 1958-59), p. 425.

PART I. ATHANASIUS AND THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY

CHAPTER I

ARIANISM

The Origins of Arianism

One of the most powerful and tenacious heresies in the history of the Church, Schaff affirms, was Arianism.¹ Arianism concerned the question of Christ--his deity and his relationship to the Father. It included also the question of the Holy Spirit and involved, therefore, the whole doctrine of the Trinity. Thus it entered the very heart of the Christian religion.

Arianism derives its name from Arius who was a priest in Alexandria. Arius had been made a deacon by Peter, bishop of Alexandria from 300 to 311, and had been demoted from the diaconate when he had allowed himself to become implicated with the intrigues of Meletius. It was the misfortune of Achilles, bishop of Alexandria in 311-312, not only to restore Arius to the diaconate but to advance him to the priesthood and to put him in charge of the parish church at Baucalis which was the oldest church in Alexandria.²

¹Philip Schaff, "Arianism," DCB, eds. William Smith and Henry Wace (London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1877), I, 155.

²B. J. Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D. 461 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), II, 11, 12; J. G. Davies, The Early Christian Church (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965), p. 176.

Arius has been depicted as tall of stature and as having a crafty bearing. It appears that he had a reputation for ability and strictness of life going about clad with a sleeveless tunic and a scanty cloak. Apparently his conduct was unimpeachable, as he was held in honor by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (313-328). He went about from house to house propagating his views and gaining a following in Alexandria.¹ Fisher states that "Arius was possessed of logical acumen, was skilful as a disputant, and his austere life helped to draw to him respect and sympathy."² It must be said as well that "of his sincerity there can be no doubt, nor of his high moral character."³

The origins of Arianism are shrouded in obscurity. T. E. Pollard avows that "the question of the origins of Arianism is, at the present time, still wide open."⁴ It cannot be definitely determined whether Arianism is to be traced to Antioch or to Alexandria, nor can it be decided how

¹Kidd, op. cit., II, 14.

²George Park Fisher, History of Christian Doctrine (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897), p. 135. See also Louis Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church: From Its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century, trans. from the 4th ed. (London: John Murray, 1912), II, 99.

³Alexander V. G. Allen, The Continuity of Christian Thought: A Study of Modern Theology in the Light of Its History (new ed.; London: Ward, Lock & Bowden, Limited, 1895), p. 86.

⁴T. E. Pollard, "The Origins of Arianism," JTS (N.S., 9-10, 1958-59), p. 103.

influential the teaching of Origen was on it. Pollard argues for an Antiochene influence on both the doctrine and Scriptural exegesis of Arianism.¹

Du Bose suggests that the genealogy of Arianism is to be sought in the history of Ebionite Monarchianism which was Jewish in origin. After the teaching of Theodotus and Artemon, Du Bose says, Ebionite Monarchianism appeared in its most conspicuous form in the teaching of Paul of Samosata who was the metropolitan of Antioch. From Paul it is supposed to have extended through Lucian to the Lucianists, and thus to Arius himself. Arianism was, in Du Bose's view, developed mainly through antagonism to Sabellianism.²

Harnack also traces the origin of Arianism to Antioch and the school in Antioch of which Lucian was the head. Here Arius had been a pupil of Lucian. Lucian, Harnack asserts, was "the Arius before Arius."³ Lucian's doctrine included the affirmation that God is One and none is equal to him, for all else has been created including the Logos.

¹Ibid.

²Du Bose, op. cit., pp. 91, 92. Du Bose, ibid., p. 91, believes that Sabellianism was motivated by monarchianism even as Arianism was at the opposite extreme. Both attempted to safeguard the unity of the "Divine Principle": Sabellianism by denying any real distinction in it, and Arianism by widening the distinction of persons into one of nature.

³Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, trans. from the 3rd German ed. by James Millar (London: Williams & Norgate, 1897), IV, 3.

With the doctrine that the Logos is a creature, Lucian combined adoptionism. This form of doctrine, Harnack states, was developed by the aid of Aristotelian philosophy with its basis on the critical exegesis of the Bible.¹ Lucian's theology, Hardy affirms, was a left-wing development of Origen's doctrine of the Trinity which stressed the subordination of the Son to the Father, and to a greater extent the subordination of the Holy Spirit.²

In Fisher's estimation the sources of Arianism can easily be seen in one class of Origen's statements when these statements are dissociated from his teaching as a whole. The import of these statements is also reflected in Dionysius of Alexandria (bishop, 247-265).³ Though Origen and Dionysius must be acquitted of heresy, Gwatkin says, their language leaned to Arianism quite as much as did Lucian's.⁴ There are two streams of thought, Latourette

¹Ibid., IV, 4-7. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), p. 246, asserts that Lucian departed radically from the teaching of Paul of Samosata by thus combining Paul's adoptionism with the Logos Christology. Paul himself had zealously opposed the Logos Christology.

²Edward Rochie Hardy, Christian Egypt: Church and People: Christianity and Nationalism in the Patriarchate of Alexandria (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 52.

³Fisher, op. cit., p. 135.

⁴Henry Melvill Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism: Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction Which Followed the Council of Nicaea (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900), p. 17.

maintains, that find their source in Origen: (1) the Son is co-eternal and equal with the Father; and (2) the Son is a creature, and as the image of the Father he is secondary and subordinate to him. The latter stream is represented in Dionysius. In the second half of the third century Dionysius had expressed himself against Sabellianism in such terms concerning the nature of God that the Arians adopted some of his phrases to use in defense of their own position. This second stream, in Latourette's view, also found a channel through Antioch, that is, through Lucian, and thus found an outlet in the activity of Arius.¹

Though Arius appropriated one side of Origen's complicated system, the cosmological system, this system was not peculiar to Origen. Though certain expressions used by Arius, as "pre-existent Son of God" and "Logos," are those of Origen, they are only an accommodation by the Arians. The doctrine of Origen does not constitute the basis of the Arian system in its Christological conception. What it has in common with the orthodox system is not what is characteristic of it but what is secondary.² Arius made a distinction between the Logos and Son. For Arius the Logos is not

¹Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of Christianity (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Limited, n.d.), p. 152; Hans Leitzmann, A History of the Early Church. Vol. III: From Constantine to Julian, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (2nd ed., rev.; London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 94.

²Harnack, op. cit., IV, 40.

a pre-existent divine being, but an attribute of God through which the Son was created in order that the Son might be God's instrument in creation. This distinction, Pollard asserts, is contrary to Origen and to his "left-wing" successors.¹

Hardy suggests that Arius was intellectually a stranger at Alexandria. Arius, he says, drew on elements that were Greek, non-Egyptian, and even largely non-Alexandrian.² It may be said that "it is a matter of considerable doubt whether Arianism is to be traced to Antioch or to Alexandria, and also how far it is due to the teaching of Origen."³ Against Sabellianism Origen, Dionysius, and other Church fathers had insisted in very strong terms upon the distinction of Persons in the Trinity. Sometimes this distinction had been expressed in terms which, when taken literally, appeared to destroy the identity of nature of the Persons of the Trinity. These expressions were seized upon and employed in the service of erroneous ideas with which Origen, and the others, would not have been in sympathy. Though this is true, it does not follow that the origins of Arianism are necessarily to be traced to Alexandria. The influence of Origen and Dionysius on Arianism cannot be

¹Pollard, JTS, loc. cit., pp. 106, 107.

²Hardy, Christian Egypt, pp. 51, 53.

³Pollard, JTS, loc. cit., p. 103.

accurately assessed, yet the expressions used by Origen and others provided the Arians with arguments for their position.¹ Wiles criticizes the conclusion that Arianism must be traced to Antioch. He argues that Arius and his followers could have picked up and used ideas current in Alexandria and traceable to Origen and Dionysius, and also to the ordinary believers in Alexandria.²

The origins of Arianism cannot be definitely traced, but influences, at least, of the teaching of Origen, Lucian, and others on Arianism are evident. It may be concluded with Gwatkin that Arianism was no historical accident but was the direct result of earlier movements and thought.³ Arianism raised problems with which the Church would have to come to grips at sometime or other.

The History of Arianism

The beginnings of the Arian controversy and its early chronology are obscure. Harnack suggests that its beginning may possibly be traced to an incident in 315 in which Arius expressed an opinion on a certain passage of Scripture when he was questioned by Alexander. Arius stubbornly adhered to

¹Du Bose, op. cit., p. 92.

²Maurice Wiles, "In Defence of Arius," JTS (N.S., 13-14, 1962-63), pp. 339-342. See also Florovsky, Studia Patristica, loc. cit., VI, 43.

³Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, p. 16.

his opinion, and thus the controversy began.¹ In Barnes's opinion the point of beginning for the controversy was in an accusation by Arius against Alexander of introducing Sabellianism into a discourse Alexander was delivering on the Trinity. Barnes reckons that this incident occurred about 318.²

Arius probably began to propagate his views in about 319, and perhaps in the following year his activity began to try the patience and good will of Alexander. Thus, Kidd believes, the beginnings of the controversy may be placed about 319-323.³ Under Alexander's presidency Arius' doctrines were discussed in the assemblies of the Alexandrian clergy, and it appears that Alexander directed these discussions with considerable moderation and kindness. On the point of principal importance--the deity of Christ--the leading clergy of Alexandria were divided with most of them loyal to their bishop, but others aligned themselves with Arius.⁴ This state of affairs could not continue. Alexander first sought to remonstrate with Arius in a private

¹Harnack, op. cit., IV, 8.

²W. Emery Barnes, "The Heretics of the Church and Recurring Heresies: Arius and Arianism," ET (XLVI, 1934-1935), p. 19.

³Kidd, op. cit., II, 14. For a discussion of the chronology of the Arian controversy until 328 see Hans-Georg Opitz, "Die Zeitfolge des arianischen Streites von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 328," ZNTW (XXXII-XXXIII, 1933-1934), pp. 131-159.

⁴Duchesne, op. cit., II, 103.

interview, but Arius was unyielding in his views. Alexander wrote a letter to Arius and his supporters exhorting them to submit themselves to the orthodox faith. This produced no results, so Alexander, who had been accused of indecision, summoned a synod of the bishops of Egypt and Libya--about 100 in number--which met in 321.¹

Apparently the synod elicited from Arius and his friends a candid statement of their doctrinal views. On the basis of these statements the synod excommunicated Arius and his followers.² On his condemnation as a heretic Arius, with his partisans, left Egypt and settled in Caesarea. In the East Arius sought and won support from those who had been fellow students of Lucian, many of whom were in positions of prominence.³ The three documents written by Arius which have survived were composed between 321-323. These include a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, a fellow Lucianist, requesting protection; a letter to Alexander of Alexandria; and the Thalia, or "Convivial Songs." Only fragments of the latter survive.⁴ These songs, written in popular meter and expressing the doctrines of Arius, were intended to appeal

¹Kidd, op. cit., II, 14-16. ²Ibid., II, 16.

³Leitzmann, op. cit., III, 107.

⁴Kidd, op. cit., II, 16, 17. For the texts of the letters see Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites, in Athanasius Werke, ed. Hans-Georg Opitz (Berlin, 1934), Dritter Band, Urkunde 1 and 6. For the Thalia see C. Ar. I. 5, 6; and De Syn. 15.

to the populace of Alexandria but were never, Hardy thinks, very successful in this intention.¹

After his victory over Licinius, Constantine, in the interests of harmony and peace within the Church and the Empire, wrote to both Arius and Alexander urging them to withdraw their charges against one another.² On the failure of his effort at conciliation, Constantine intervened and summoned a council to meet at Nicaea in order to deal with this, in his opinion, "trivial" matter.³ This first Ecumenical Council convened in 325 and was ecumenical in that it had a representative character though it met in the East.⁴

Arius had been summoned to the Council by the command of Constantine and in the Council proceedings was asked to give an account of his views which he did frankly and openly.⁵ Alexander had no difficulty, then, in proving how well-founded his decision had been to excommunicate Arius for his opinions. The outcome of the Council was the anathematizing

¹Edward Rochie Hardy, "Introduction to Athanasius: Background and Ideas," The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. III: Christology of the Later Fathers, ed. Edward Rochie Hardy (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1954), pp. 219-220. See also F. J. Foakes-Jackson, "Arianism," ERE, I, 777.

²Du Bose, op. cit., p. 116.

³Kidd, op. cit., II, 20-22.

⁴Ibid., II, 22-24.

⁵Duchesne, op. cit., II, 115, 116; Kidd, op. cit., II, 28, 29.

of Arius and the formulation of the Nicene Creed.¹ In his evaluation of the Nicene Council Harnack states that:

Never again in the history of the Church has there been a victory so complete and so quickly secured as that at Nicaea, and no other decision of the Church approaches it in importance.²

In Bethune-Baker's opinion "the victory over Arianism achieved at the Council was really a victory snatched by the superior energy and decision of a small minority with the aid of half-hearted allies."³ It should not be overlooked, however, that it was without doubt Constantine who secured the acceptance of the Creed at Nicaea, though he probably did not understand its shades of meaning.⁴

The decision of the Nicene Council did not prove to be the demise of Arianism. As Barnes observes, Arianism was defeated, but it was not crushed at the Nicene Council.⁵ There followed years of intrigue and misrepresentation with

¹Kidd, op. cit., II, 28-32. See J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1950), pp. 215, 216, for the Greek text and the translation of the Nicene Creed.

²Harnack, op. cit., IV, 59. Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church, rev. Cyril C. Richardson, et al. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1959), p. 108, notes that the Nicene Council has always lived in Christian tradition as the most important Council in the history of the Church.

³J. F. Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine: To the Time of the Council of Chalcedon (London: Methuen & Co., 1903), p. 171.

⁴Walker, op. cit., p. 117.

⁵Barnes, ET, loc. cit., p. 21.

various attempts to get rid of the offensive Creed. The Nicene Council proved to be a prelude to a violent battle that stretched across the fourth century. Wilken points out that "the dismal procession of orthodox, semi-Arian and Arian councils stretching from Nicaea to Constantinople is a striking reminder that Arianism was very much alive."¹

The Arians recognized that they were in a hopeless minority and set about to circumvent the decision of the Council and to evade its consequences. They did this by mingling with the "doubtful and dissatisfied conservatives" whose dissatisfaction and doubts they sought to foster.²

Du Bose asserts that:

What gave Arianism a vitality as well as a prominence and importance that it would never have acquired by itself was the accident of its civil and political power and influence. Just when the controversy was well under way in Alexandria the first Christian emperor Constantine the Great was by his victories over his colleague Licinius making himself sole master of the Roman empire and so of the world. It was not Arius and his associates but Constantine and his successors that lifted the Arian discussion into a world-wide and historical significance such as attaches to no other heresy.³

¹Robert L. Wilken, "Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies," CH (June, 1965), p. 125. See Kidd, op. cit., II, 50ff., for the details of the history of Arianism subsequent to the Nicene Council.

²Du Bose, op. cit., pp. 148, 149.

³Ibid., p. 105. See George Huntston Williams, "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," CH (20, 1951), No. 3, 3-33 and No. 4, 3-26, for a discussion of the relationship of the two contending Christologies (Arian and orthodox) to the Roman Empire. Williams, ibid., III, 9,

At this juncture it should be observed that not only the Arians assigned creaturehood to the Holy Spirit, which was concomitant with their view of the Son, but also the "Tropici"¹ denied the deity of the Spirit. The Tropici, who admitted the deity of the Son, came to be known as "Macedonians" or as Pneumatomachi.² Swete calls them "Arians" of the Spirit.³

Kidd observes that Arianism was triumphant in 356. In the development of Arianism there came to be three groups within the movement: the Semi-Arians, who were close to orthodoxy; the Homoeans or Acacians, who used Scriptural

points out that Christology in the broadest sense of the word, was, without question, a matter of political concern in the fourth century. Latourette, op. cit., p. 160, states that the Arians would have the Church submit to the Emperor, but the Nicene party, however, insisted on the autonomy of the Church. See also S. L. Greenslade, Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1954), pp. 18-30; and 39-50 (especially pp. 46-50).

¹The name "Tropici" is apparently derived from the practice of the Tropici of an ingenious use of "tropes" in their interpretation of Scripture--hence, "trope-mongers." Apparently "tropes" refer to the explanation of words in Scripture, which went against the Tropici's views, as figures of speech, and so an unnatural sense was imported into them. See C. R. B. Shapland, The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit: Translated with Introduction and Notes (London: The Epworth Press, 1951), pp. 31, 32; Henry Barclay Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1912), p. 172; and H. N. Bate, "Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis," JTS (XXIV, 1923), p. 65.

²Kidd, op. cit., II, 255, 256.

³Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, p. 172.

language but only to obscure the truth; and Anomoeans, who were the ultra-Arians and disowned all concealment. Original Arianism, Kidd states, was no longer held by anyone.¹ Kelly points out that between Athanasius and his followers and the small but determined minority of those who were definitely Arian, there was the great majority who were as far from Arianism as those of the Athanasian party were from Sabellianism.² In the period of 356-362 many of the Semi-Arians came to support the Nicene statement. Thus despite its outward victory disintegration set in, and the collapse of Arianism came in 362.³ The Arian controversy virtually ended in the complete rejection of Arianism at the Council of Constantinople in 381.⁴

The Tenets of Arianism

It has been noted that little of Arius' writings has been preserved.⁵ The major source for ascertaining the

¹Kidd, op. cit., II, 148-154.

²J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), p. 239.

³Kidd, op. cit., II, 148.

⁴Foakes-Jackson, ERE, loc. cit., I, 782; and Schaff, History of the Christian Church, II, 619. See Barnes, ET, loc. cit., pp. 21-24, for a brief sketch and evaluation of the re-emergence of Arianism at various times in the history of the Church since the Council of Constantinople.

⁵Supra, p. 15.

beliefs of Arianism is the writings of Athanasius.¹ Kidd says that Arianism was the first great heresy to spring from a Christian root: "I believe in one God."² Arianism thus drew its vitality from laying exclusive strength on the divine unity which is the basic Christian and theistic statement. Arius developed his constructions from the assumption of an absolute monotheism and with it the principle of a pure causality behind this monotheistic idea. Thus, as Laeuchli points out:

He insisted that whatever is taught in Christian Churches concerning incarnation, salvation, mediation, must fit into the structure of a world view which has as the peak of its pyramid the transcendental God.³

The Arian syllogism, which probably was in use at an early period in Arius' teaching, states that what is true of human fatherhood is true of the relationship between the Father and Son; in human fatherhood the father is prior in existence, and therefore this priority is also true of the Father's relationship to the Son.⁴ In other words Arius declared that the Son once did not exist but was created by

¹Ep. Episc. Aeg. 12; De Sent. Dion. 23; C. Ar. I. 5, 6, 9; De Syn. 22-30; etc.

²Kidd, op. cit., II, 40.

³Laeuchli, CTM, loc. cit., p. 404.

⁴Kidd, op. cit., II, 15; see Documents of the Christian Church, ed. Henry Bettenson (2nd ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 56, 57.

the Father. This syllogism is related to Arius' conception of an absolute monotheism. As Kidd points out, the conclusion is contained in the premise, and this premise is either suppressed or taken for granted. The syllogism reflects the "manner of the expert logician" and is, indeed, essentially rationalistic.¹

In his evaluation of the doctrine of Arius, Harnack notes that Arius taught that God is One, and beside him there is no other who is unbegotten, without beginning, and eternal. He is inexpressible, incomprehensible, and has absolutely no equal. God has created all things out of his free will, and he alone is uncreated. "To beget" is a synonym for "to create," and therefore God has not always been "Father," for then that which has been created would be eternal and not created.² The main interest of Arianism, Du Bose observes, was theological rather than Christological. Its essence may be discerned in a deistic conception of God which separates him from both the world and humanity. It stressed the nature of God rather than the value and significance of Christ's person and work.³

Arius affirmed that Wisdom and Logos dwell within

¹Kidd, op. cit., II, 15.

²Harnack, op. cit., IV, 15. Athanasius denies this identification. See infra, pp. 152 ff. and 278 f.

³Du Bose, op. cit., pp. 95, 96.

this God as the powers, not persons, which coincide with the substance of God. These powers are, by their very nature, inseparable from God's substance, and besides these powers--Wisdom and Logos--there are many created powers.¹

Related to this conception of God and his powers, is the doctrine that before the world existed, God, of his free will, created an independent substance or hypostasis as an instrument by which all other creatures were created. Without this intermediary other creatures could not have endured contact with the Godhead. In Scripture this intermediary is given such names as "Wisdom" and "Son." Like all creatures this intermediary in creation was himself created and, therefore, had a beginning, and thus there was a time when he was not. He is pre-existent, but he is not eternal. The word "begotten" is not peculiar to him.² For Arius God is too exalted and transcendent to be related to the universe except through an intermediary. This intermediary, who was incarnate in man, could not be the most high God himself.³

From the time of Philo to that of Origen and Plotinus, Duchesne declares, all religious thinkers formulated their

¹Harnack, op. cit., IV, 16. Philo speaks of the "powers" of God using the term in the sense of ideas and in the sense of a property of God. Logos and Wisdom are two of the "powers." See e.g., De Cher. 31.106; 9.27, 28; De Conf. 27.136; De Spec. Leg. 1.8, 45, 47; De Opif. Mund. 6.23; De Fug. 19.101; Leg. All. 2.21, 86.

²Harnack, op. cit., IV, 16. ³Du Bose, op. cit., p. 96.

idea of the Logos with "cosmological prepossessions" in their minds. There was no means of passing from this abstract, ineffable, and inaccessible God to the world of sense, for this was absolutely opposed to this "Being in itself" except through an intermediary who would participate in both God and the world. Though the Word proceeded from God, he fell within the category of the created.¹ The Arian controversy presupposed the Logos Christology which was never questioned by Arius nor by his opponents. Arius, however, denied the deity of the Logos.² Florovsky contends that the basic problem of the Arian controversy was that of time and eternity and with it the problem of creation. Within Origen's system there were opposite options--to reject the eternity of the world or to oppose the eternity of the Logos. Arius opted for the latter. The problem of creation would have to be settled, therefore, in order to determine the doctrine of God. For Arius God was primarily Creator, and thus there was no room for "theology" in his system, for the real problem was that of cosmology.³

In regard to the substance of the Son Arius considered the Son to be an unrelated and independent being totally separated and different from the substance and nature

¹Duchesne, op. cit., II, 101.

²McGiffert, op. cit., p. 250.

³Florovsky, Studia Patristica, loc. cit., VI, 44.

of the Father. The Son was neither of one and the same substance with the Father, nor was his nature and constitution similar to that of the Father. If the Son were of one substance with the Father, there would then be two Gods. Like all rational creatures the Son has a free will and is capable of change, and, indeed, he might subsequently have been good or bad. He made up his mind, however, to follow good, and thus by his own will he came to be unchangeable.¹

The Son, then, is not truly God and therefore does not have by nature the divine attributes. He is only called Logos and Wisdom. He is not eternal and does not have absolute knowledge of God.² "Arius utterly repudiated any and every attempt to make the Son equal to the Father, to declare Him eternal, or to regard Him as God in substance."³ That the Son was not eternal and was not uncreated were the two original elements in Arian doctrine.⁴

In Arius' conception, however, the Son is not a creature and a product like other creatures, for he is a perfect creature and the intermediary in the creation of all things. He thus stands in a special relationship to God, but this is a relationship which is conditioned by grace and by adoption.

¹Harnack, op. cit., IV, 17. ²Ibid., IV, 17, 18.

³Leitzmann, op. cit., III, 109.

⁴William Bright, The Age of the Fathers: Being Chapters in the History of the Church during the Fourth and Fifth Centuries (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903), I, 58.

Arius held that by the bestowal of God's grace and by his own progress the Son has become God, so that such terms as "only-begotten God" can be applied to him.¹ Jesus' sonship was not one of nature or essence but of freedom and choice. It was personal and moral and not a proper and essential sonship.² Arius believed that all that the Scriptures and tradition assert in reference to the incarnation and the humanity of this being holds good, for he truly took a human body. Thus the Son is capable of suffering. He is not an absolutely perfect being, but one who attains absolute perfection by effort.³

A real part of Arianism, Du Bose points out, was that this secondary God who was not God, this divine Son of God who was neither Son of God nor divine, became incarnate in a humanity which was not humanity. The material or bodily part of the Son was alone human; but the rational and spiritual, which is alone essential and real manhood, was, in the Son, not that of humanity but of the higher incarnate person. Thus the early life, experiences, sufferings, and death of Jesus were neither those of man nor those of God.⁴ Arianism lost even the true humanity of the Son in a theory of the

¹Harnack, op. cit., IV, 18, 19.

²Du Bose, op. cit., p. 98. ³Harnack, op. cit., IV, 19.

⁴Du Bose, op. cit., pp. 98, 99.

incarnation which refused him a human soul.¹ The Arian conception of Christ was that he is a demi-god--neither God nor man and so neither able to save nor needing to be saved.²

The bald logic of Arius, Barnes affirms, involved him in a great contradiction, for Arius began by basing his argument on the title "Son of God," but he ended by emptying the title of all meaning. "The Son was not a Son, but only a favoured creature of God."³

In Arius' system of thought the Holy Spirit was of the number of created powers but was placed as a second, independent substance or hypostasis beside the Son.⁴ Thus the Christian, in Arius' view, believes in three separate and different substances or persons--Father, Son, and Spirit. The Spirit was considered to be a being created by the Son and subordinate to him.⁵ Thus it can be stated that in the thought of Arius:

The Trinity could be described by the formula of "three hypostases," i.e., in this case, three independent beings and persons, of whom only one, viz., the Father, was substantially and truly God from all eternity.⁶

¹Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, p. 3. On this aspect of Christology in Athanasius' thought see infra, p. 50, n. 3.

²Kidd, op. cit., II, 18, 19; Du Bose, op. cit., p. 99; and Walker, op. cit., p. 107.

³Barnes, ERE, loc. cit., II, 171. ⁴C. Ar. I.6.

⁵Harnack, op. cit., IV, 19; Fisher, op. cit., p. 144.

⁶Leitzmann, op. cit., III, 110.

Arianism cannot be understood, Harnack affirms, unless the two entirely disparate parts of which it consists are considered. First, Arianism has a Christ who gradually becomes God, and this Christ is Savior insofar as he has conveyed to men the divine doctrine and has given them an example of goodness which was perfectly realized in the exercise of freedom. Second, united with this conception of Christ is the Arian metaphysic which has its basis solely in cosmology with absolutely no connection with soteriology. This metaphysic was dominated by the idea of the antithesis of the one inexpressible God to creation, for God is remote from the world and from creatures. Thus as a cosmologist Arius was a strict monotheist, but as a theologian he was a polytheist.¹ Arianism, Foakes-Jackson affirms, may be defined as:

A theory of the mutual relations of the Persons in the Trinity based nominally on the words of Scripture, but arrived at really by the methods of the heathen philosophers. It led either to polytheism by allowing the existence of the Logos as a secondary God, or to Judaic Unitarianism by denying his proper Divinity.²

The attractions of Arianism were many, Kidd suggests, and it appealed to quite different types of thought: (1) it

¹Harnack, *op. cit.*, IV, 39, 40. Wiles, in *JTS*, "In Defence of Arius," pp. 345, 347, criticizes this view which posits this dichotomy between cosmology and soteriology in the thought of Arianism.

²Foakes-Jackson, *ERE*, *loc. cit.*, I, 777.

was essentially rationalistic: (2) it professed to be logical; (3) it claimed that it alone did justice to monotheism; (4) in that it maintained degrees of Godhead, it attracted the half-converted heathen of the empire and afterwards the heathen invaders; (5) it provided an escape from Sabellianism and thus was attractive to theologians; (6) it appealed to pious people who, from a mistaken reverence, feared the materializing notions of the Godhead which were implied in such terms as homousios and "generation"; and (7) it made much of "proof texts" and thus posed as the only Scriptural form of the Christian religion.¹

By making the Son a creature and essentially distinct from God, the Arians thought to save monotheism and the personality of the pre-existing Christ. "The philosophical difficulty was eliminated, but with it had disappeared the very essence of Christianity."² As a system, Gwatkin avers, Arianism was completely illogical and unspiritual, and a clear step back to heathenism. It was, he contends, heathen to the core. It began by attempting to establish Christian positions and ended by subverting each and all of them.³

¹Kidd, op. cit., II, 37-39.

²Duchesne, op. cit., II, 102.

³Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, pp. 2, 3; and Henry Melvill Gwatkin, The Arian Controversy (2nd ed.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891), p. 7. See Wiles, JTS, "In Defence of Arius," pp. 343 ff., for a valid criticism of the contention that Arianism was entirely illogical.

Arian theology represented a deadly attack on the doctrine of redemption--the heart of Christian life and thought.¹ Arius' controlling interest was essentially intellectual rather than religious--he was more of a rationalist than a mystic.² Du Bose observes that:

The true value of Arianism was negative; it acted as a foil for the truth in that bringing out in itself all that Christianity is not it forced the Church to bring into consciousness and expression all that it is.³

Apparently the Arians and Athanasius shared the same view of Scripture, for, in relation to Scripture, Athanasius' criticism was directed not against the Arians' conception of Scripture but against their interpretation of various texts.⁴ Both Alexander and Athanasius indicate that the Arians appealed to Scripture for the support of their doctrine.⁵ The Arians, Bethune-Baker asserts, professed entire allegiance to the teaching of Scripture.⁶ At least in its early stages the Arian controversy was fought out primarily on questions of Biblical exegesis. The Arians, Turner affirms, defended their system as at least in harmony with the Biblical tradition by the construction of a formidable supporting argument

¹Laeuchli, CTM, loc. cit., p. 405; see also Harnack, op. cit., IV, 42.

²McGiffert, op. cit., p. 247.

³Du Bose, op. cit., p. 100. ⁴E.g., C. Ar. I.8.

⁵See C. Ar. III.8. ⁶Bethune-Baker, op. cit., p. 165.

from Scripture. Their array of proof texts appeared impressive if judged by fourth century standards, for, as Turner observes, neither side in the controversy doubted the legitimacy of interpreting much of the Old Testament in a "Christological and Trinitarian" manner.¹

Arianism was quick to press into its service all the passages of Scripture which implied in any way that Christ was a creature--his sufferings, lack of knowledge, etc. Such passages as Prov. 8:22, Luke 2:52, and Acts 2:36 seem to place Christ on a level with the creature.² Gwatkin avows that the Arians scarcely referred to Scripture except in quest of isolated texts to confirm their conclusions which they had reached without the help of Scripture.³ This, however, does not seem to do justice to the evidence of the use of Scripture by the Arians. As Wiles points out:

It would be a mistake to regard Arianism as based on nothing more than the forced interpretation of a few isolated texts. It had a far broader exegetical basis than any of the earlier heresies. Its appeal to the Fourth Gospel was a considerable and not unreasonable one.⁴

¹H. E. W. Turner, The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church: Bampton Lectures, 1954 (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1954), pp. 189, 192.

²See Schaff, DCB, loc. cit., I, 156.

³Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, p. 20.

⁴Wiles, Spiritual Gospel, p. 121. Harnack, op. cit., IV, 41, says that in an important respect Arianism is really Hellenism tempered by the constant use of Scripture.

However, in their use of Scripture the Arians pressed the strictly grammatical meaning of a text without considering either the text's immediate context or the wider frame of reference in the teaching of the Bible as a whole. With great assiduity the Arians collected proof texts, but they neglected to pay due regard, on the whole, to Scriptural principles. Thus, "notwithstanding their dexterous use of the grammatical letter of the Biblical text, the Arians merely succeeded in cutting the ground from under their own feet by their appeal to Scripture."¹

¹Turner, op. cit., p. 194.

CHAPTER II

ATHANASIUS AND ARIANISM

The Life and Writings of Athanasius

The story of Athanasius' life, Davies believes, is in effect the history of the Arian controversy.¹ Among the great Church teachers of the fourth century Athanasius' position is unique. As a champion and as an expounder of the Nicene faith he easily stands first.² Hardy avows that Athanasius so completely dominates the history of Egypt and its Church for fifty years in the fourth century that the story of the Egyptian Church may be said to be primarily the story of his career.³

Athanasius was born in Alexandria about 296.⁴ He was old enough to remember the days of persecution of the Church but was too young to have suffered in it.⁵ Athanasius was taken into the household of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and eventually became Alexander's deacon and secretary.⁶

¹J. G. Davies, op. cit., p. 165; also Edward Caldwell Moore, The New Testament in the Christian Church (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), p. 184.

²Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, p. 211.

³Hardy, Christian Egypt, p. 47.

⁴William Bright, "Athanasius," DCB, I, 179.

⁵Hardy, Christian Egypt, p. 47.

⁶Kidd, op. cit., II, 12.

Athanasius was a Greek and in his education probably studied philosophy, rhetoric, grammar, and Roman Law.¹ He grew up in daily contact with every existing form of religion or philosophy and from his earliest youth was an observer, student, and thinker. Above all, however, he was a student of the Scriptures, and his writings exhibit everywhere his familiarity with them and his ability to employ them to prove his position.²

During his pre-Nicene years Athanasius produced his first two literary works: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione Verbi Dei. These two works are closely connected, perhaps forming a single work, and are usually acknowledged to have been written about 318.³

In the conflict that arose between Arius and Alexander in about 319-323, Athanasius no doubt gave Alexander effective assistance. The greatness of the issue involved was never absent from Athanasius' mind, and this issue was the motivation in Athanasius' subsequent career rather than

¹Bright, DCB, loc. cit., p. 180.

²Du Bose, op. cit., p. 123.

³Bright, DCB, loc. cit., I, 181; and Kidd, op. cit., II, 14. Stulcken, Beiträge zur Athanasius-Frage, p. 25, gives the date of these two works as about 323. Henric Nordberg, in "A Reconsideration of the Date of St. Athanasius' Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione," Studia Patristica, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin, 1961), III, 262-266, argues for 362 or 363 as the date of their composition.

loyalty to Alexander as his superior.¹

In the Council assembled in Nicaea by order of Constantine in 325, Athanasius was not a constituent member but was present as a deacon in attendance on Alexander his bishop. Du Bose suggests that though Athanasius went to the Council nominally as Alexander's private secretary, in reality he was present as "the controlling spirit and genius of all its proceedings."² It is quite probable that in the preliminary discussions of the Council Athanasius quickly took a leading part.³ The statement of Nicaea was based on the Caesarean Creed with some alterations, the most notable being the inclusion of *ὁμοούσιος*.⁴ The objection to this term was that it was not taken from Scripture, but, its proponents believed, it clearly expressed what the Council intended to express and, more important, what the Scriptures taught concerning the Son's relationship to the Father.⁵

¹Bright, *DCB*, *loc. cit.*, I, 181.

²Du Bose, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

³*Ibid.*; see also Kidd, *op. cit.*, II, 22, 23.

⁴Kidd, *op. cit.*, II, 30. Du Bose, *op. cit.*, p. 126, suggests that the Emperor himself suggested the simple amendment of the creed proposed by Eusebius of Caesarea by the insertion of *homousios* but at the behest of Hosius his adviser who was from the West. Other less significant changes were made as well. See also Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 121. See Kidd, *op. cit.*, II, 32, 33, for the history of the use of *homousios*.

⁵Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 121.

Throughout the conflict that followed over the Nicene Creed, Athanasius defended the validity of the use of this term.¹ For Athanasius homousios expressed the Son's undivided and unbroken unity of ousia with the Father.²

Kidd declares that it is not too much to claim for the Nicene Council that it saved not only Christianity but Theism as well.³ The Nicene victory was a surprise, however, rather than a solid conquest and a reaction was inevitable.⁴ Reflection came at the end of the Council, and the decision of the Council was given at the beginning of the age of speculative reflection rather than at the end.⁵ The remainder of Athanasius' life, Barnes says, is coincident in the main with the history of the Arian controversy. In this conflict Athanasius was the chief protagonist on the Catholic side.⁶ With reference to Athanasius' struggle with Arianism von Campenhausen asserts that:

For forty-five years he continued to wage it with unvarying tenacity, agility, and energy, showing versatility in his methods and formulations, unshaken and relentless on the essential issues, reassured by no partial success, and discouraged by

¹E.g., De Dec. 25, 27. ²Du Bose, op. cit., p. 146.

³Kidd, op. cit., II, 37, 41.

⁴Gwatkin, The Arian Controversy, p. 50.

⁵Du Bose, op. cit., p. 135, 136.

⁶Barnes, ERE, loc. cit., II, 168.

no failures.¹

In Athanasius "the orthodoxy of Nicaea had found its representative."²

In the ensuing reaction to the Nicene Council the renewed struggle centered upon persons. The long series of councils that followed Nicaea were controlled by the Arian leaders, though the councils consisted largely of the "conservatives." The Arians almost succeeded in gradually destroying Nicenism by the personal overthrow and ruin of Nicaea's chief representatives and advocates. "Nothing indeed seemed to save it but the superhuman vitality, indomitableness and faithfulness of one man."³

In 328 Alexander's death occurred, and Athanasius was elected as his successor.⁴ The attack of the Arians on Athanasius was not on doctrinal grounds but on the basis of alleged disobedience to the imperial commands as well as general acts of supposed ecclesiastical and official tyranny and severity. These increased rapidly into personal charges

¹Hans von Campenhausen, The Fathers of the Greek Church, English trans., rev. L. A. Garrard (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1963), p. 70.

²Duchesne, op. cit., II, 133.

³Du Bose, op. cit., p. 150.

⁴Kidd, op. cit., II, 50; Bright, DCB, loc. cit., I, 183, gives the year of Athanasius' accession in Alexandria as 326.

against him.¹ In that Athanasius had jurisdiction over the bishops of his "patriarchate," the solidarity of Egypt was ensured with the consequence that Arianism quickly disappeared within its borders. Athanasius' position as bishop in Alexandria was thus one of power and influence. "So great a personality as Athanasius, occupying a place of such importance, would certainly be marked down for attack."²

Athanasius' chief opponent came to be Eusebius of Nicomedia who later was bishop of Constantinople. Eusebius and Arius had been fellow pupils of Lucian of Antioch, and at Nicaea Eusebius had loyally supported his friend Arius. Arius had been banished as a result of the Nicene Council, and three months after the Council Eusebius was also banished. Eusebius' exile was not of long duration, for he had sufficient influence to secure his own recall. By 329 he was in high favor with the Emperor, and Arianism steadily regained power. Arius' recall was probably effected in about 330.³

The reaction to Nicaea and the influence of the Arians gained strength until the Arians were able to bring about the banishment of Athanasius to Treves in Gaul in 336. This exile had followed a series of accusations and councils culminating in a Council at Constantinople in 336 in which

¹Du Bose, op. cit., p. 151.

²Kidd, op. cit., II, 52.

³Ibid., II, 52-54.

the Emperor banished Athanasius.¹ Previous to this banishment and for many years following it there occurred an almost uninterrupted series of accusations, harassments, intrigues, and councils. Athanasius was banished from Alexandria five times in all.² By their machinations and by their influence in the court the Arians were able to attain their ends until the zenith of their power was reached in 356.³

Hardy states that, with the exception of the two pre-Nicene works, almost all of Athanasius' writings were produced in response to some immediate need or as a blow for the faith in the course of his struggles with successive emperors and with Arianism. Even his historical writings are, in fact, personal defenses.⁴ In Contra Gentes Athanasius attempts to vindicate the reasonableness of the Christian religion. The De Incarnatione Verbi Dei is a theological

¹Ibid., II, 54-64.

²The approximate dates of Athanasius' exiles and the places in which he lived in exile are: 336-337, in Treves; 339-346, in Rome; 356-362, in the monasteries in the deserts of Egypt; 362-363 or 364, in Memphis and Thebaid in Egypt; and 365-366 in Egypt. See Loofs, RE, loc. cit., II, 198, and Kidd, op. cit., II, 64 ff. It should be pointed out that Athanasius' exile in Rome had two great historical results: (1) the Latin Church became his scholar as well as his supporter, adhering to his orthodoxy though not imbibing his theological spirit; and (2) the introduction into the West of the knowledge and practice of the monastic life. See Kidd, op. cit., II, 74, and Bright, DCB, loc. cit., I, 189.

³Kidd, op. cit., II, 67 ff., and Bright, DCB, loc. cit., I, 182 ff.

⁴Hardy, Christian Classics, loc. cit., III, 43.

treatise on the restoration of corrupt human nature by the coming in flesh of the Word of God. Epistola Encyclica ad Episcopos describes the outrages which broke out at the accession of Gregory, an Arian, as bishop in Alexandria in place of the exiled Athanasius. It was probably written in 339.¹ In it he appealed for sympathy. In Illud, Omnia, etc., written about 336-340, is an exposition of Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22). The "Golden Decade" of Athanasius is said to be 346-356, for he had an impregnable position because of the support of the monks. Monasticism, when Athanasius was bishop of Alexandria, was at its prime, and Athanasius himself was a disciple and heir of Antony.² During this "Golden Decade" Athanasius wrote several important works. The Apologia contra Arianos appeared about 351 and provides the most authentic source of the history of the Church in the first half of the fourth century.³ De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi was probably written the following year. In it, in order to assist a friend in his dispute with Arians, Athanasius defends the inclusion of non-Biblical terms in the Nicene Creed. De Sententia Dionysii was written the same year

¹For the dating of Athanasius' writings see Kidd, op. cit., II, 73 ff.; Loofs, RE, loc. cit., II, 194-205; Stülcken, Beiträge zur Athanasius-Frage; Stülcken, Athanasiana: Litterar-und Dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen, in TU (Neue Folge; Leipzig, 1899), IV, 1-80; and Quasten, op. cit., III, 22-66.

²Kidd, op. cit., II, 104, 105.

³Ibid., II, 108.

as a vindication of some of the statements that had been made by his predecessor, Dionysius of Alexandria--statements that the Arians were employing to defend their own position.

Ad Amun and Ad Dracontium were probably written about 354 and deal with personal matters. Vita Antoni was written sometime in the period of 356-362 but probably about 357 and, as the title indicates, is an account of the life and activities of Antony. It not only shows the character of the monastic movement but also Athanasius' connection with it.

Seven anti-Arian works belong to the period of Athanasius' third exile (356-362): Ad Episcopos Aegypti et Libyae Epistolae, written in 356 to the bishops of his province as a warning against a statement which was to be circulated for their acceptance on pain of banishment; Apologia ad Constantium, about 356, and for the most part a defense to the Emperor; Apologia de Fuga Sua, in 357, a justification of his flight from Alexandria because of a charge of cowardice against him by the Arian party; Historia Arianorum ad Monachos, in 357 or 358, comprising a history of Arianism from 335 and forming a continuation of Apologia contra Arianos; Epistola ad Serapionem de Morte Arii, about 358, giving the details of the death of Arius; Orationes contra Arianos I-III, about 358¹; and De Synodis, in 359. The Orationes

¹Loofs, RE, loc. cit., II, 200, 201, gives 338 or 339 as the date for the Orationes contra Arianos, as does also Stülcken, Athanasiana, IV, 44-50.

contra Arianos are Athanasius' most famous and important doctrinal work. In 359 or 360 (also of this period) Athanasius addressed four letters, Epistolae ad Serapionem I-IV, to Serapion, a bishop in Egypt, who had requested assistance in dealing with certain men who accepted the deity of the Son but referred to the Spirit as a creature. In Contra Arianos Athanasius deals especially with the deity of the Son and his unity with the Father; and in Ad Serapionem he deals especially with the deity of the Holy Spirit and also the unity of the Trinity. De Synodis is an account of the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia and also constitutes an attempt to win over the "conservatives."

Tomus ad Antiochenos was written in 362 and conveyed the decisions of the Council of Alexandria to the Church at Antioch. Ad Jovianum, a synodal letter, was written in 363 and contained a statement of the Church's faith--apparently in response to the Emperor's request. Ad Afros was composed in 369 and is an attempt to counteract the efforts to set aside the authority of Nicaea and replace it with that of the Council of Ariminum. Three letters were written in 371: Ad Epictetum, on the incarnation; and Ad Adelphium and Ad Maximum, on errors concerning Christ's humanity. The Epistolae Heortasticae were letters addressed to the Alexandrian Church at Easter with the first letter written in 329 and the last one in 373, though there are not letters for all of

the intervening years. His Festal Letters, Barnes observes, show that Athanasius was a great Christian pastor, though he may not have been a speculative theologian.¹

Wand states that Athanasius was not in any sense a professional writer who was writing for the love of it. He was a practicing pastor and administrator and entered the ranks of writers for the practical necessity of the spiritual welfare of men. For this reason the defense of the orthodox faith was a necessity for Athanasius. Thus Athanasius' attitude and purpose in writing preserved him, Wand suggests, from the cultivation of any "conscious artifice of style" and kept his writing "firm and direct" in a manner which possessed a pleasing quality.² Athanasius had an unusually lucid and direct mind and, McGiffert says, possessed the ability, which is by no means common among theologians, of distinguishing the essential from the unessential and of going to the heart of the matter discussed.³

Athanasius was not an author by choice, for, with the exception of his two earliest writings, all his writings were produced by the necessity of his circumstances or by

¹Barnes, ERE, loc. cit., II, 170. See F. L. Cross, The Study of St. Athanasius (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), pp. 15 ff., for a discussion of the dates of the Festal Letters.

²Wand, op. cit., pp. 44, 45.

³McGiffert, op. cit., p. 251.

the necessity of his work as a pastor. He neither wrote a systematic treatise on doctrine nor a commentary on Scripture though his writings contain much doctrine and exegesis. Athanasius never wrote for effect but simply to make his meaning clear and to impress it on others. Though he is often prolix and repetitious in his writing, his style is nonetheless direct and natural.¹

Athanasius' Doctrine of the Trinity

It has been noted that Arianism constituted a denial of the deity of Christ and consequently a denial of the deity of the Holy Spirit as well.² In Arian thought the Son was only God in a derivative sense. Thus it was a strict monotheism that precluded a Trinitarian conception of God. Wand believes that the issue involved in the Arian controversy was fundamentally Trinitarian rather than Christological.³ However, the issues involved are interrelated in such a way that a particular conception of Christ, as well as the Holy Spirit, involves the doctrine of God. In a sense, therefore, the issues involved in the Arian controversy are of one piece. The central problem of the Trinity is that of the deity of Christ and the relationship of Christ to the

¹See Archibald Robertson, St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters, in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (Oxford: Parker and Company, 1892), IV, lxvi.

²Supra, pp. 21 ff.

³Wand, op. cit., p. 38.

Father.¹ As Wand points out, one cannot decide about the nature of God, unless one also determines in what sense Christ is God.² Arianism actually proposed a theory of one Supreme Being and two inferior deities.³ The early Christians repeated the affirmation of Mk. 12:29 (RSV) (Dt. 6:4), "The Lord our God, the Lord is one," and never questioned it. In the New Testament writings the Fourth Gospel, in particular, raises the problem of the nature of God especially in its affirmations of the Son (e.g., John 1:1; 14:9, 10, 11; 20:28) but also, to some extent, of the Spirit (e.g., John 14:26). Though its statements pose the difficulty of the relationship of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, there is no attempt to examine and resolve the problem involved in its statements.

The Arian controversy forced the Church to express herself on these issues of the nature of God, the deity of Christ, and the deity of the Holy Spirit, and, as a consequence, the relationship of the Father, Son, and Spirit. Athanasius' conception of the doctrine of the Trinity is not only evident throughout his writings, but he gives summary statements of what he considers to be the orthodox teaching of Scripture concerning the Trinity.

¹ Arthur W. Wainwright, The Trinity in the New Testament (London: SPCK, 1962), p. 53.

² Wand, op. cit., p. 38. ³ Ibid., pp. 42, 43.

In Contra Arianos Athanasius asserts that Christ is the true Son of the Father, only-begotten Wisdom, the true and only Word of God and is not a creature nor a work but an offspring of the "essence" (οὐσία)¹ of the Father. Therefore, Athanasius says, the Son is true God who exists in the "one essence" (ὁμοουσιος) of the Father. All other beings, to whom God said, "I said, you are gods" (Ps. 8:6), have this grace from the Father only in their participation of the Word through the Spirit. The Son is the expression of the Father's person (Heb. 1:3) and is the very image of God's essence, for the Son himself expressed this when he said, "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14:9). Christ is eternal, and there was never a time when he was not. As the Father is eternal, so his Word and Wisdom must also be eternal.²

In his first letter to Serapion Athanasius gives a concise statement of his doctrine of the Trinity. There is

¹Latourette, op. cit., p. 161, states that in the thought of the Nicene party ousia came to be regarded as the equivalent of the Latin substantia ("substance") and hypostasis as translatable into Latin by persona ("person"). Hypostasis, he says, was a term found in both Platonic and Stoic philosophy and could be used as an alternative word for ousia. The Synod of Alexandria seems to have regarded the two terms as interchangeable. See also Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, pp. 180, 181, who states that hypostasis and ousia mean very much the same. Though hypostasis and the Latin translation, substantia, are very close in meaning, they are not identical.

²C. Ar. I.9.

a "Triad" (Τριάς), he says, which is holy and complete and is confessed to be God in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. There is nothing foreign or external in the Trinity, and so it is not composed of a creator and creature. The Trinity is consistent and in its nature is indivisible, and its activity is one. The Father performs all things through the Word in the Holy Spirit thus preserving the unity of the Trinity, and therefore one God is preached in the Church. It is a Trinity not only in name or as a form of speech but is truly and actually a Trinity. Even as the Father exists, so also the Word and Spirit exist and have true being. This, Athanasius declares, is the faith of the Church.¹

It is clear, then, that Athanasius' doctrine of God, with his doctrine of the Son and Holy Spirit, is almost diametrically opposed to that of the Arians though there were certain assumptions which both sides shared. Both Athanasius and the Arians agreed that there is one God who is beyond suffering and death and who is unchangeable and incapable of ignorance. All agreed that the accounts of Jesus in the Gospels are reliable and had to be taken into account in answering the problems which were involved in the conflict.²

Athanasius, as did Alexander before him, held tenaciously to the doctrine of the absolute deity of the Word though it seemed to be at the risk of appearing to be in

¹Ad Serap. I.28. ²Wilken, CH, loc. cit., p. 127.

agreement with Modalism. He disregarded the asserted necessities of cosmology and maintained the distinction of Persons as best he could, preserving first and foremost the identity of the ousia of the Word, and of the Holy Spirit, with God.¹

Athanasius did not deny the Logos doctrine but thought of the Logos after the pattern of the Fourth Gospel--as a divine Person, the Son of God. The Logos, though he was the agent in creation, was separate from creation. For Arius the line of demarcation between Creator and creation passed between the Father and the Son, but for Athanasius the line was drawn between the Father and Son on one side and creation on the other. The Son is Creator because he is fully divine. He is not the instrument of creation but is creation's immediate efficient cause.² Arius, like Origen, thought of the Logos after a philosophical pattern as a cosmic principle--the divine reason who permeates the world.³ Athanasius was more interested in the problem of redemption than in that of creation.⁴ He does not differentiate

¹Duchesne, op. cit., II, 103.

²C. Ar. II.31. See Florovsky, Studia Patristica, loc. cit., VI, 47.

³Wand, op. cit., p. 46.

⁴R. V. Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies: A Study in the Christological Thought of the Schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the Early History of Christian Doctrine (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1940), p. 10.

between "Logos" and "Son," as Arius did, but makes them identical with each other and identical with Jesus Christ.¹

The Logos, in Athanasius' thought, is to be considered from the perspective of redemption. Thus, as Harnack points out, "the theology and Christology of Athanasius are rooted in the thought of redemption, and his views were not influenced by any subordinate considerations."² Athanasius based his doctrine on the Christian experience of salvation, so that all of his teaching was determined by soteriological considerations.³ The basic error of Arianism was that it gave no basis for a real redemption.⁴ Thus the Arian teaching not only destroyed the doctrine of God but also the Christian scheme of salvation.⁵

For Athanasius the religious aspect was dominant. If the Son was not of the essence of the Father, he would not be God at all. He who was incarnate in Jesus Christ must be God without qualification, and not approximately so or as a way of speaking, or otherwise he could not be the Savior.⁶ In order to effect redemption the Son must be of the essence

¹T. E. Pollard, "Logos and Son in Origen, Arius and Athanasius," Studia Patristica (Berlin, 1957), II, 286.

²Harnack, op. cit., IV, 26.

³J. G. Davies, op. cit., p. 192.

⁴Walker, op. cit., p. 118. ⁵Wand, op. cit., p. 47.

⁶Duchesne, op. cit., II, 103.

of the Godhead and one with it--this is Athanasius' fundamental thought, and it is constantly repeated. Athanasius, Laeuchli suggests, was involved in the Arian controversy in terms of faith rather than witness or philosophy. He was totally involved, for "his whole existence was at stake," and therefore he could not speak about the phenomenon of Arianism in a "detached philosophical-ontological manner but only from a total commitment of faith."¹

Von Campenhausen concludes that:

Athanasius saved the Church from becoming entangled in the idea of cultural progress and from the snares of political power. Through him it again became an institute of salvation, that is, a Church in the strict sense of the Word, with the preaching of Christ as its essential purpose.²

Athanasius conceived his Trinitarian doctrine (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit who were of one essence but yet three Persons) from the perspective of redemption, for only thus could man's redemption be made effective. The contrast of Arianism and the teaching of Athanasius at this point is concisely stated by Laeuchli:

Theology cannot be based on a method which quotes prooftexts at random; the Scriptural proof for its formulations must proceed from an understanding of the central Scriptural event, the incarnation of the Word.

¹Laeuchli, CTM, loc. cit., pp. 405, 406.

²Van Campenhausen, op. cit., p. 81.

³Laeuchli, CTM, loc. cit., p. 412. Kelly, Doctrines, pp. 286-289, discusses the problem of Athanasius'

Athanasius sought to base his doctrines on Scripture, as did also the Arians.¹ Athanasius, Turner states, "prefers to fight the battle on the ground of Scripture which he uses with consummate skill."² It is immediately evident from Athanasius' writings that he possessed an extensive knowledge of Scripture and could copiously quote passages appropriate to the point of discussion. The Scriptures were authoritative for Athanasius and for the Arians, and all the protagonists in the Arian controversy were also primarily interested in the literal interpretation of Scripture. In its

Christology, that is, whether Athanasius regarded Christ's humanity as including a human, rational soul and concludes that Athanasius' thought permitted no room for a human soul. He also states that it is improbable that Athanasius tacitly presupposed the existence of a human mind in Christ as some have suggested on the basis that he nowhere expressly denied its existence. There is, however, the possibility of a change in Athanasius' attitude about 362 so that from about that time he recognized a "normal psychology" in Christ (see Ad Ant. 7 and Ad Epict. 2, 7, 12). Charles E. Raven, Apolinarianism: An Essay on the Christology of the Early Church (Cambridge: University Press, 1923), refers to the De Incarnatione and also Ad Afros as writings in which the Logos-theology and the denial of a human soul to Christ are put forward by Athanasius as the catholic faith. On the basis of the De Incarnatione Stülcken, Athanasiana, IV, 81 ff., also concludes that Athanasius denied a human soul to Christ. See also Quasten, op. cit., III, 73-75, who also points out that Athanasius follows a Logos-Sarx Christology; Robertson, op. cit., IV, lxxvii, lxxviii; and Wolfhart Pannenberg, Grundzüge der Christologie (Gütersloh, 1964), pp. 264 ff., who states that for Athanasius Jesus' body was the instrument of the Logos with the Logos taking the place of the human soul.

¹See Part II for Athanasius' conception of Scripture.

²Turner, op. cit., p. 436.

early stages, at least, the conflict was waged primarily on questions of Biblical exegesis.¹ The basis of the theological formulations of both sides, acknowledged by all the participants in the conflict, was the interpretation and use of the Scriptures themselves. With reference to the use of Scripture in the controversy Barnes states that "on the whole, it must be said that Athanasius shows a great grasp of Scriptures, and that his interpretations are sounder than those of his opponents."²

Though Athanasius was a Greek and endowed with a speculative capacity of high order:

At the same time he was before all and most of all a student of the Scriptures, and none of his adversaries or antagonists could surpass him in love for these or reverence for their authority. Having to stand for freedom from their mere letter,³ he was a true interpreter of their mind and spirit.³

In 363, Kidd points out, Athanasius could, with pardonable exaggeration, refer to the Nicene doctrine as the faith of the Christian world.⁴ Though it fell to Athanasius to be the chief protagonist for orthodoxy in the Arian controversy, he did not live to see the final triumph of his

¹Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 415; Turner, op. cit., p. 189.

²Barnes, ERE, loc. cit., II, 172. See Parts III and IV for Athanasius' interpretation and use of Scripture.

³Du Bose, op. cit., p. 123.

⁴Kidd, op. cit., II, 218.

own cause and the eclipse of Arianism, though he stood on the brink of victory.¹ Athanasius died in 373 with the last seven years of his life spent in peace--pursuing his duties in Alexandria. In 381, with the Council of Constantinople, the controversy virtually ended with the complete rejection of Arianism.² With Prestige it can be concluded that:

The theological greatness of Athanasius is revealed, more than by anything else, by the fact that he understood the need to find a direct and inclusive explanation of Christian monotheism, and that he not only grasped the necessity, but fulfilled the obligation.³

¹J. G. Davies, op. cit., p. 166.

²Foakes-Jackson, ERE, loc. cit., I, 782; and Schaff, History of the Christian Church, II, 619.

³Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, p. 180.

PART II. ATHANASIUS' CONCEPTION OF SCRIPTURE

CHAPTER III

THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE

Scripture as the Basis for Doctrine

The attitude of the Church fathers toward the authority of Scripture is succinctly summed up by Prestige: "The Fathers were nothing if they were not sticklers for Biblical authority."¹ To the two Testaments was ascribed a unique authority, and out of these Testaments every doctrine was to be proved. For the Church fathers the validity of any opinion depended on whether or not it was supported by the teaching of the Scriptures.²

Athanasius continually refers to the Scriptures as authoritative in establishing his teaching. To Macarius Athanasius writes that though he will set forth a few points of the faith of Christ, yet these points can be readily found in Scripture by Macarius himself.³ Athanasius declares that the Greeks can be refuted from the Scriptures though they can also be refuted by human reason itself. Testimony about the folly of image worship is furnished by Scripture. Though experience may teach the truths which Athanasius expounds, yet Scripture also teaches these with greater

¹G. L. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1936), p. 72.

²Barnack, op. cit., III, 192, 193. ³C. Gen. 1.

clarity and with more authority.¹ Men may be assured by the witness of the writers of Scripture of redemption by Christ.²

Athanasius asserts that the proof of his statements concerning the Son is not from external sources but that it is from the Scriptures.³ In his refutation of the Arian heresy he states that he will "take from the Scriptures" and that these Scriptural proofs will be cast at the heretics from all sides.⁴ Conversely, he contends that heresies have nothing in common with Scripture.⁵ In defending the Nicene statement he avers that the teaching set forth in it is not novel but apostolic, for it originates from the teaching of the apostles themselves. Those who read the Nicene doctrine, he says, can only be reminded by it of that which is announced in Scripture.⁶

In writing to Serapion on the Holy Spirit, Athanasius avows that his teaching conforms with Scripture and that he cites it as proof of his statements. He asserts that the terms that he employs are derived from the apostles, and that this may be judged by anyone in his own examination of Scripture.⁷

Ramsey concludes that Athanasius, in his concept of the authority of Scripture, stands in the tradition of Jesus,

¹Ibid., 6, 14, 45. ²De Inc. 10. ³De Dec. 17.

⁴C. Ar. I.10. ⁵Ad Epis. Aeg. 4. ⁶De Syn. 6.

⁷Ad Serap. I.33; II.8.

the apostles, and the early Church. Though there is a decided difference between the Lord's use of Scripture and a literalistic exegesis, yet the Scriptures were for him the Word of God possessing divine authority (Matt. 4:3-10; Mk. 12:10, 26; etc.).¹

It is also pointed out by Ramsey that the apostolic Church accepts the books of the Old Testament as sacred Scripture, and that every New Testament writer cites them or alludes to them as having divine authority. For the early Church it was the doctrinal norm.² Aland concludes "dass das Alte Testament von den Anfängen der Kirche, von Jesus selbst an, heilige Schrift ist, bedarf keines Beweises."³

Ellis notes that all of Paul's important doctrines are buttressed by an appeal to the Old Testament and that for Paul "the Scripture is adduced as final authority and one divinely planned whole whose significance is bound up inseparably with the New Covenant Community of Christians."⁴ Richardson states that "the NT writers regard the Scriptures of the OT as completely authoritative." He points out,

¹A. M. Ramsey, "The Authority of the Bible," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962), p. 3.

²Ibid., pp. 3, 4.

³Kurt Aland, "Das Problem des Neutestamentlichen Kanons," NZST (4, 1962), p. 221.

⁴E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 20, 21.

however, that no official doctrine of Biblical authority was put forward during the whole period from the apostolic age to the nineteenth century.¹

In the period subsequent to that of the New Testament the apostolic and Church fathers were content to regard the Bible as a "textbook of Revealed Truth whose propositions could be used as proof-texts to support their own doctrinal inferences."² In this period not only the Old Testament was a doctrinal norm, but also the apostles were authoritative because of their relationship to Christ and the first-hand character of their testimony to the Gospel. "As evidence of the testimony of the apostles the Books which were believed to have been written by them or their immediate followers . . . were recognized to possess authority."³

Sanday affirms that the books of the New Testament acquired canonical value when they came to be placed on the same footing with those of the Old as the authoritative norm

¹Alan Richardson, "Scripture, Authority of," IDB (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), R-Z, 248. Richardson also notes that the authority of the Scriptures was accepted by all parties to Christological and other controversies of the ancient Church, loc. cit., p. 249. A. G. Hebert, in The Authority of the Old Testament (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1947), p. 201, points out that the attitude of the New Testament to the Old shows a humble deference to its authority though its attitude toward it is a highly critical one.

²Turner, op. cit., p. 259.

³Ramsey, Peake's Commentary, loc. cit., p. 4.

for the Church.¹ Lampe affirms that:

Primitive Christianity is a religion of a book, the Septuagint version of the Scriptures. That the Old Testament was held to be both absolutely authoritative and directly relevant to every aspect of Christian faith and life needs no argument.²

In the ensuing history of the Church there emerged the three-fold authority of the prophets, Christ, and the apostles which eventuated in the authority of the writings which came to form the New Testament, though they were not yet "canonized," along with the Scriptures of the Old Testament.³

The Inspiration of Scripture

Closely associated with the concept of Biblical authority is the idea of inspiration. Sanday asserts that "the authority of the Bible is derived from what is commonly

¹William Sanday, Inspiration: Bampton Lectures for 1893 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1894), p. 71. The rise to canonical status of the writings which came to form the New Testament and came to be authoritative for the Church will be subsequently noted. See infra, pp. 91 ff.

²G. W. H. Lampe, "The Early Church," Scripture and Tradition, ed. F. W. Dillistone (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), p. 27.

³Ibid., p. 28. R. P. C. Hanson, Tradition in the Early Church (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962), pp. 200-207, in his discussion of the ascription of the appellation "Scripture" to the New Testament as well as to the Old, concludes that some of the second century writers did refer to the New Testament books as "the Scripture" or "the Scriptures." It is difficult, however, to determine the exact force the term had for them. In most cases, he says, the use of "Scripture" for the New Testament indicates an increasing respect for these writings and a movement towards their canonization.

called its 'inspiration.'¹

Athanasius repeatedly refers to Scripture in terms which indicate that he considered it of divine origin: "the holy Scriptures" (αἱ ἅγια . . . Γραφαί),² and "the divine Scriptures" (αἱ θεῖαι Γραφαί).³ He also speaks of the Scriptures as "oracles" (λόγια)⁴ and "divine Writings" (θεῖοι λόγοι).⁵

Athanasius refers to Scripture as "inspired" (θεόπνευστος),⁶ and uses the same expression of the writers of Scripture⁷ who are also described as "sacred" (ἅγιος).⁸ He states that the Spirit speaks in Scripture in Old Testament predictions of the coming of the Son.⁹ He also refers to the "divinely speaking" (θεοσπέσιος) prophets.¹⁰ His attitude toward the "inspiration" of Scripture is indicated by the construction of an argument on the exact wording in a particular Scripture passage.¹¹ However, he nowhere explicitly draws out the implications of his view of "inspiration" in its bearing on the literal exactness of Scripture.¹²

¹Sanday, op. cit., p. 71.

²E.g., C. Gen. 1.

³E.g., De Inc. 37.

⁴E.g., C. Ar. I.4.

⁵E.g., ibid., III.21.

⁶E.g., C. Gen. 1.

⁷E.g., De Inc. 10.

⁸E.g., C. Ar. II.3.

⁹E.g., ibid., II.52. ¹⁰E.g., In Illud, Omnia, etc., 6.

¹¹E.g., C. Ar. II.60 and Ad Serap. I.3 ff.

¹²See Robertson, op. cit., IV, lxxiii.

The attitude of Athanasius toward the origin and nature of Scripture is consistent with the attitude of the entire preceding period, including that of the New Testament writers, toward the Old Testament. In the New Testament the Old Testament Scriptures are referred to as "holy writings" (Rom. 1:2; II Tim. 3:15), and as God-given (Matt. 22:43, 44; Acts 4:24, 25; II Tim. 3:16).¹ The attitude of the whole apostolic Church, Richardson asserts, is epitomized in II Tim. 3:15-17 which explicitly speaks of the inspiration of Scripture.²

Kelly observes that:

From Judaism Christianity inherited the conception of the divine inspiration of Holy Scripture. Whenever our Lord and His apostles quoted the Old Testament, it is plain that they regarded it as the word of God.³

This concept provided the impetus toward crystallization of the apostolic Church's attitude to the Old Testament and also to the New Testament after it had been canonized as an authority co-ordinate with the Old. "It goes without saying that the fathers envisage the whole of the Bible as inspired."⁴ It may also be observed that the Jews of the New

¹See Arthur Jeffrey, "The Canon of the Old Testament," IB (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), I, 37.

²Richardson, IDB, loc. cit., R-Z, 248-249.

³Kelly, Doctrines, p. 60.

⁴Ibid., p. 61. See Ch. IV on Athanasius' place in the history of the canon.

Testament period interpreted inspiration as the equivalent of divine dictation, and thus they attributed to the Scriptures verbal authority and infallibility, interpreting them with a "perverted literalism."¹

In the unquestioning adoption of this concept of the inspiration of Scripture no distinction was made between the divine revelation accorded to the prophets and its preservation in writing.² Also the young Gentile Church viewed the Greek Bible, the Septuagint, as immediately inspired and not merely as derived from an inspired original.³ In turn the Church fathers accepted this Jewish conception of the Old Testament and extended it to include the books of the New Testament. They maintained the same divine origin for both Testaments.⁴ As Sanday points out, it is not surprising that this form of the doctrine sometimes took the form of asserting the absolute perfection and infallibility of the

¹Charles Gore, in "The Bible in the Church," A New Commentary on Holy Scripture including the Apocrypha, ed. Charles Gore, et al. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1928), Part I, p. 4. Gore, ibid., Part I, p. 5, says that the apostles accepted this view of Scripture from the Lord and passed it on, unquestioned, to the catholic Church.

²E. von Dobschütz, "Bible in the Church," ERE, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914), VII, 588.

³Ibid., VII, 581.

⁴Henry Austryn Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956), I, 91.

Scriptures.¹ They were reduced to a dead level with equal value and significance.

Westcott concludes that:

The Christian fathers with one consent affirmed in the most complete manner the Inspiration of the Scriptures placing the writings of the New Testament on the same footing with those of the Old, as soon as it was possible that the Apostolic records could rise with clear pre-eminence above the oral tradition of the Apostolic teaching.²

The view that this rigid concept of a verbally dictated Scripture prevailed from the second to the eighteenth century is challenged by Reid as being too general. There has been a recurring movement, he asserts, from living authority to literal authority.³ There are isolated passages indicating a greater insight into the real facts of the case, and Sanday suggests that these would have formed a wholesome corrective to the prevailing view if more attention had been paid to them.⁴ Kelly concludes that it is unfortunate that few if any of the fathers attempted to probe the deeper

¹Sanday, Inspiration, p. 36.

²Brooke Foss Westcott, An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, (6th ed.; Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1881), pp. 19, 20.

³J. K. S. Reid, The Authority of Scripture (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1957), p. 25.

⁴Sanday, Inspiration, p. 42. See also Wolfson, Philosophy of the Church Fathers, I, 93; and Gore, New Commentary, loc. cit., Part I, p. 10.

problems which were involved by their doctrine of inspiration.¹

This conception of the inspiration of Scripture may be seen in early Jewish and Christian writers. Philo refers to the Jewish Scriptures as "holy Scriptures." He regards the prophets as agents of the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture and being merely dictaphones.² Chadwick asserts that Philo's concept influenced the attitude not only of Clement of Alexandria and Origen but also Ambrose so that Philo's influence was also felt in the West.³ Hanson states that the parallels of Philo's doctrine are clearly pagan.⁴ Philo explained the experience of the prophets as being seized by God's Spirit so that they lost consciousness and no longer knew what they were saying. They no longer spoke, but God spoke through them.⁵ Josephus' language is equally explicit at this point. He denies that there is any discord or discrepancy in the Hebrew Scriptures and claims for them

¹Kelly, Doctrines, p. 63.

²Quis Rer. Div. Her. 31.495; De Spec. Leg. 4.8.49. An evidence of this concept of Scripture is the use of Scripture for purposes of allegory which implies a sacred text. See Sanday, Inspiration, p. 79.

³Henry Chadwick, "The Bible and the Greek Fathers," The Church's Use of the Bible: Past and Present (London: SPCK, 1963), p. 37.

⁴R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959), p. 194.

⁵Quis Rer. Div. Her. 51.249; De Spec. Leg. 4.8.48, 49.

an advantage over all other books.¹

Justin Martyr calls the Septuagint translation "Scripture" and maintains the translation's truthfulness in all points.² Thus it is apparent that Justin considered the translation to be as inspired as the original.³ Justin declares that the words of the Old Testament were not spoken by the writers themselves but by the divine Word who prompted them.⁴

Theophilus of Antioch speaks of the prophets as being inspired and made wise by God and thus instruments of God. He asserts that the utterances of the prophets and of the Gospels were spoken by inspiration, and he refers to the Epistle to the Romans as the divine word.⁵

Irenaeus believes that the Septuagint version itself was the production of the inspiration of God. He declares that the Scriptures are complete and perfect, for they were spoken by God's Word and by his Spirit. He also speaks of the Apostles as being fully assured about all things and possessing perfect knowledge after they were clothed with

¹C. Apion. 1.8.

²Dial. 68.7.

³Willis A. Shotwell, The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr (London, SPCK, 1965), p. 7. Shotwell, ibid., p. 4, asserts that Justin held to a completely verbal doctrine of inspiration. A. Stewart, "Bible," HDB (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900), I, 296, says that Justin is the first Christian writer to propound a concept of inspiration which involved a total suspension of human faculties.

⁴I Apol. 36.1, 2.

⁵Ad Aut. 2.9; 3.12, 14.

the Spirit's power.¹

Tertullian describes the writers of the books of Scripture as having their minds flooded with the Holy Spirit.² Clement of Alexandria says that John composed his Gospel by the inspiration of the Spirit.³ Because of Clement's wide ranging concept of the Word's activity in teaching and inspiring in all ages, Hanson cautions against accepting this as a formal definition of the New Testament Scriptures.⁴ Sanday affirms that the word θεόπνευστος applied to the New Testament appears first in Clement.⁵

Origen asserts that the Scriptures were written by inspiration of the Holy Spirit by God's will through Jesus Christ. He also applies the word θεόπνευστος to Scripture. Origen's concept of inspiration is also evidenced in his statement that all the words of the prophets are inspired with the Spirit's fullness and that there is nothing in prophecy, law, Gospel, or apostle which is not from the fullness of the Spirit.⁶ Hanson concludes that it is first in Origen that a "considered and uninhibited" doctrine of the

¹Adv. Haer. 3.21.2; 2.41.2; 3.1.1. ²Apol. 18.2.

³Cited by Eusebius, H.E., 6.14.7.

⁴Hanson, Tradition, p. 212.

⁵Sanday, Inspiration, p. 33. See Strom. 7.16.101, 103; etc.

⁶De Prin. 4.2.2; 4.2.1; Hom. on Jer. 21.2.

inspiration of the New Testament can be found. For Origen the New Testament is on a level with the Old--inspired and inerrant. Though it has errors, these errors have been deliberately inserted for a sacred purpose by the Holy Spirit. Every word and letter has been carefully placed in order by the Spirit.¹

The Jewish conception of Scripture as divinely inspired was adopted by the Church fathers who eventually extended it to include the books of the New Testament. They maintained the same divine origin for both Testaments. Neither the New Testament nor the fathers gave a particular theory or definition of inspiration, nor did they examine the nature of the Scriptures' inspiration.² No doctrine of inspiration was formulated by the Church.³ Wolfson suggests that the question of whether all the books which are now included in the Hebrew canon are divinely inspired or equally inspired was a matter of discussion among the fathers.⁴

¹Hanson, Tradition, p. 212.

²A. H. McNeile, The Old Testament in the Christian Church (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1913), pp. 21, 22.

³G. Wildeboer, The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament, trans. Benjamin Wisner Bacon (2nd ed.; London: Luza and Co., 1895), p. 2.

⁴Wolfson, Philosophy of the Church Fathers, I, 91. On the question of the Alexandrian and Hebrew canons see Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., The Old Testament of the Early Church, in Harvard Theological Studies XX (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964). This study is a reworking of

However, few, if any, of the fathers attempted to probe the deeper problems raised by their doctrine of inspiration.¹ Their concept of inspiration indicates their view of Scriptural authority.

It is evident that Athanasius' concept of inspiration stands in the tradition of the patristic period. His view of the origin of Scripture and its production indicates the authority of Scripture for him and conditions his use of it as the source for his formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity.²

The Old Testament as a Christian Book

One of the basic problems that the early Christians faced was the relationship of Jesus Christ to the Old Testament. Lampe points out that at a very early date the attitude and understanding of the Christian Church toward Old Testament Scripture underwent a "remarkable revolution."³ The Old Testament came to be regarded as a Christian book. "Primitive Christianity is a religion of a book. . . ."⁴

a doctoral dissertation of the same title, Harvard University, 1957. See also by the same author, "The Old Testament of the Early Church (A Study in Canon)," HTR (51, 1958), pp. 205-226, which is a summary of the same dissertation. See also infra, pp. 87 ff.

¹Kelly, Doctrines, p. 63. ²See Parts III and IV.

³G. W. H. Lampe, "Inspiration and Revelation," IDB, E-J, 714.

⁴Lampe, Scripture and Tradition, loc. cit., p. 27. R.

Kelly states that the doctrinal authority ascribed to the Old Testament was based on the apparently unquestioning assumption that, correctly interpreted, it was a Christian book and that the prophets were really testifying to Jesus Christ. The early Christians were convinced that all of the Old Testament pointed to Christ and that the Old Testament was, in fact, fulfilled in the words and deeds of Christ.¹ For at least the first hundred years of its history the Church's Scripture, in the strict sense of the word, consisted only of the Old Testament, and "for the Church as a whole it was a Christian book which spoke of the Savior on every page."²

The initial impulse for this conception of the Old Testament apparently came from the Lord, for, in the account of the conversation on the Emmaus road, Luke writes that Jesus expounded to the two disciples concerning himself beginning at Moses and including all the prophets (Luke 24:27). That this concept was continued in the apostolic Church is evidenced in the speeches in Acts. David is said to have

H. Pfeiffer, "Canon of the OT," IDB, A-D, 511, states that it was the Septuagint that became the official Christian Bible of the early centuries through Paul.

¹Kelly, Doctrines, p. 32.

²Ibid., p. 52. H. Wheeler Robinson, "Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems: II. Canonicity and Inspiration," ET (XLVII, 1935-36), p. 122, asserts that it was the Gnostic criticism of the Old Testament that compelled the Church to defend it as Christian and not simply Jewish.

spoken of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 2:25-35); the sufferings of Christ had been shown by God through his prophets (Acts 3:18); when all that had been written of him was fulfilled he was buried (Acts 13:29); and the promise was made to the fathers, but it was fulfilled to their children in the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 13:33-37).

These correspondences between the Old Testament and Jesus Christ are also evident in the epistles. Paul states, for instance, that the events of the Old Testament are to serve as examples for the Church (I Cor. 10:6). The author of Hebrews finds in Christ the fulfillment of the Old Testament--such as the image of priesthood and sacrifice (Heb. 8-10).

In I Clement the Old Testament is considered the source book for Christian behavior and also as providing the prototype of the Christian ministry and liturgy.¹ Justin Martyr insists to Trypho the Jew that the Jewish Scriptures do not belong to the Jews but to the Christians and that Scripture is much more the Christian's book than Trypho's book. Justin acknowledges that the Lord himself set the precedent for interpreting the Scriptures Christocentrically. Justin appears to speak of the Gospels and also the Old Testament as "our writings."²

Origen habitually read the pre-incarnate Logos into

¹E.g., I Clem. 43. ²Dial. 29.2; I Apol. 50.12; 28.1.

the Old Testament. It was by a typological exegesis that the Jewish Scriptures could be transformed into a Christian book.¹ In the Alexandrian school, especially with Clement and Origen, allegorism provided the key for the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. The Old Testament events and words were images, types, and figures that found their ultimate fulfillment in Jesus Christ. All of the Old Testament was regarded as pointing to Christ. The criterion for understanding and interpreting it was the person of Christ. According to typological exegesis the Old Testament is wholly Christian if it is correctly interpreted. It expresses the same truth as the New Testament but differs in its use of imagery and symbolism.² Van den Eynde observes that:

Et elle fera des Écritures juives, jusque dans leurs moindres détails, une immense prophétie du christianisme: l'Évangile n'est pas juif, l'Ancien Testament est chrétien.³

Integrally related to the conception of the Old Testament as a Christian book is the idea of the unity of the Old and the New Testaments which emerged with the canonizing of

¹Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 200.

²Chadwick, Church's Use of the Bible, loc. cit., pp. 25, 29. On the influence of Philo on the allegorical interpretation of Clement and Origen, see Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 117, 248, 249.

³Damien van den Eynde, Les Normes de l'Enseignement Chrétien dans la Littérature patristique des trois premiers Siècles (Gembloux, 1933), p. 320.

the New Testament. Kelly affirms that though the Old Testament and the apostolic testimony were formally independent of each other the Church fathers seem to have treated their contents as virtually coincident. All that the apostles saw and proclaimed had been testified to beforehand in minutest detail by the prophets.¹

Irenaeus says that one and the same God bestowed the law of Moses and the grace of the New Testament with both being given for the benefit of the human race though adapted to different sets of conditions.² Theophilus of Antioch points out that the unity of Scripture is based on the fact that both the prophets and the evangelists were inspired by one and the same divine Spirit.³ Tertullian speaks of the peace that existed between the Law and the Gospel.⁴ Origen says that the dogmas common to the Old and New Testaments formed a symphony.⁵

Hanson observes that Origen's account of the relation of the Old and New Testaments is so extreme that the reader is constantly tempted to conclude that for Origen there was no fundamental distinction between the revelation of the Old Testament and that given in the New.⁶ Origen's belief in one divine purpose overruling the whole content of the Bible

¹Kelly, Doctrines, p. 34. ²Adv. Haer. 4.18.1.

³Ad Aut. 3.12. ⁴C. Marc. 1.19. ⁵In Ioh. 5.8.

⁶Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 202.

continued to be accepted in the fourth century.¹

Athanasius adopted these concepts of the Old Testament as a Christian book and the unity of the two Testaments. He states that the New Testament arose out of the Old and bears witness to it. Paul was an apostle of the Gospel "which God promised beforehand by his prophets in the holy Scriptures" (Rom. 1:2). He asserts that the Lord himself indicated this when he said, "Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me" (John 5:39). How can Christ be confessed, Athanasius asks, unless men first search the Scriptures which are written concerning him? The disciples themselves testified that they had found him "of whom Moses and the prophets wrote" (John 1:45). If the Jews had believed the writings of Moses, Athanasius declares, they would have believed the words of the Lord, for Jesus said that "he wrote of me" (John 5:46). Athanasius says that both the Old and the New Testaments declare the Word of God and his incarnate presence. Therefore the Scriptures can be of no use to those who assert that the Word of God is a creature.²

In reference to the "scope" (οὐδότης) of Scripture Athanasius explicitly extends this concept throughout "inspired

¹W. Telfer, "The Fourth Century Greek Fathers as Exegetes," *HTR*, (50, 1957), p. 96.

²Ad Ep. Aeg. 4.

Scripture" on the basis of Christ's words, "Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me" (John 5:39).¹

The attitude of Athanasius to the Old Testament and its relationship to the New is also evident in his interpretation of the Old Testament as a witness to the Son.² He affirms that what the Law proclaimed and revealed was only a "type" (τύπος), but now the truth has been manifested.³ Athanasius also declares that the orthodox faith is right, begins from the teaching of the apostles and tradition of the fathers, and is confirmed by both Testaments.⁴

Telfer concludes that:

The fourth-century Greek fathers . . . regarded the writings of the Old and New Testaments as one literature of one people of God, evolving from the dawn of human history under inspiration of one divine Spirit.⁵

This statement succinctly represents the view of Athanasius in his conception of the Old Testament as a Christian book and its relationship to the New. This may be readily observed in his exegesis of Scripture in setting forth the doctrine of the Trinity.

¹C. Ar. III.29. See Ch. XII for a discussion of the meaning and significance of σλόκος.

²This will be seen in Part III.

³C. Ar. I.59. See also Ep. Heort. I, V, XII, XLVI, and Ad Adelph. 7 in which Athanasius refers to institutions and events in the Old Testament as types which are fulfilled in the New. See Ch. XI for Athanasius' use of typology.

⁴Ad Adelph. 6. ⁵Telfer, HTR, loc. cit., p. 93.

CHAPTER IV

THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE

In a pastoral letter¹ to Alexandria in 367 A.D. Athanasius enumerates the books of both Old and New Testaments which he considered canonical. He also includes a list of deuterocanonical books. The books which are included in the canon are those which are said to have been handed down and accredited as divine. He lists these books so that those he addresses will not mix the apocryphal books with the divinely inspired Scriptures. He expresses his concern with the malevolent influence of these apocryphal books on the simple believers, and the danger that the latter will thus be led astray by the similarity of the names of these books with those of the true books. The apocryphal books are the invention of heretics, he says, which were written to deceive the simple. No one is to add to nor subtract from the canonical books.

He enumerates with these canonical books those not included in the canon but which have been appointed by the fathers only for reading by those who have recently joined the Church.

¹Ep. Heort. XXXIX. See New Testament Apocrypha, ed. E. Hennecke, English ed. Robert McL. Wilson (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), I, 59, 60, for the translation of this letter.

The first use of the word "canon" (κανών)¹ as a term to denote the list of writings acknowledged by the Church to be documents of the divine revelation is found in Athanasius.² The word "canon" means a "measuring rod" or "rule"³ and came to have two basic meanings: (1) a rule of conduct, belief, etc.; and (2) a list or catalog.⁴ Schneemelcher states that among the Greeks the word canon "denotes the norm, the finished condition which represents the end, the standard or the criterion which as regards their ends can be applied to all things."⁵ The word came to be used in the Church with the meanings "norm" and "standard of judgment." Thus "canon" indicates the standard against which everything

¹In Ep. Heort. XXXIX the participial form of the verb occurs (κανονίζόμενα), but the noun form in De Dec. 18.

²Herbert Oppel, "KANON. Zur Bedeutungs-geschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula-norma)," Philologus (Supplementband, XXX, 1937), pp. 70, notes that Origen may have used "canon" in the sense of the list of the divinely inspired books, though Athanasius is the first of the Church fathers known to have done so. The first use of this word in this sense is also attributed to Origen in "Canon of Scripture," The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. F. L. Cross (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 229. In Origen's Doctrine of Tradition (London: SPCK, 1954), p. 133, R. P. C. Hanson concludes that Origen never uses "canon" in this sense.

³Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, loc. cit., p. 229.

⁴J. N. Sanders, "The Literature and Canon of the New Testament," Peake's Commentary, p. 680.

⁵W. Schneemelcher, "General Introduction," New Testament Apocrypha, I, 21.

had to be measured.¹ "Canon" is used only four times in the New Testament (Gal. 6:16; II Cor. 10:13, 15; and Phil. 3:16), but only in Gal. 6:16 is it used as a standard of judgment.² Though the word itself is first used by Athanasius in the sense of a list of accepted books, the idea of a canon of Scripture is much older. Indeed it goes back to Old Testament times. The idea of a canon or list of authorized books was inherited by the Church from Judaism.³

Christie points out that there never seems to have been a formal canonizing of any portion of either the Old or New Testaments by any judicial authority. By a gradual process the books came to be universally accepted in the synagogue and in the Church. In the disputes on the part of individuals or schools the process may be seen in operation.⁴ Lagrange concludes that there is canonicity by reason of inspiration and that canonicity is the sign of inspiration. He concludes that the principle of apostolic origin and the

¹Ibid., pp. 23, 24.

²Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and rev. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (4th rev. and augmented ed.; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 403; and Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., p. 22. See also Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, "κανών," TWNT, III, 600-606.

³Sanders, Peake's Commentary, loc. cit., p. 679.

⁴W. M. Christie, "The Jannia Period in Jewish History," JTS (XXVI, 1925), pp. 347-357.

fact of ecclesiastical usage co-operated in fixing the canon. The Church, he says, imposes or guarantees the canon by its own tradition.¹ Robinson, however, warns that there is a danger in defining canonicity in terms of inspiration and inspiration in terms of canonicity. He observes that the growth of the literature that came to be acknowledged as canonical was slow and often piecemeal, and by ordinary means. He concludes that there was a historical process in which were produced writings of so distinct a quality that they have come to hold a unique place in the synagogue and the Christian Church.² Josephus' contention that inspiration, and hence canonicity, was to be restricted to the period bounded by Moses and Artaxerxes is no longer tenable.³

The Canon of the Old Testament

Athanasius reckons the number of books of the Old Testament as twenty-two in conformity with the letters in the Hebrew alphabet. He lists them by name in the following order: Genesis; Exodus; Leviticus; Numbers; Deuteronomy; Joshua, the son of Nun; Judges; Ruth; four books of Kings:

¹M. Lagrange, Historie Ancienne du Canon Nouveau Testament (Paris, 1933), pp. 171-179. Ludwig Diestel, in Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der Christlichen Kirche (Jena, 1869), p. 69, states that the books are canonical not so much for their character of inspiration but in their authentic worth and so their reception on the part of the Church.

²Robinson, ET, loc. cit., p. 119. ³C. Apion. 1.7, 8.

first and second reckoned as one book and third and fourth as one book; also first and second Chronicles are reckoned as one book: Ezra, the first and second (Nehemiah) are one book; then Psalms; Proverbs; Ecclesiastes; Song of Songs; Job; then the Prophets, with the Twelve counted as one book; Isaiah; Jeremiah with Baruch, Lamentations, and the Epistle (Baruch VI) as one book; Ezekiel; and Daniel.¹ It should be noted that Esther is omitted but included with the deuterocanonical list. These books, he says, constitute the Old Testament.

Wildeboer suggests that a beginning of canonization of the Old Testament may be traced to the period before the exile in the covenant which was concluded by Josiah in 621 B.C. on the basis of the newly discovered scroll (II Kings 23:2, 3). This Law of Deuteronomy was Israel's first "holy Scripture."² Though it was regarded as "holy Scripture," it was not regarded as the complete and final transcript of divine revelation. The canonization of the Pentateuch was completed by Ezra about 400 B.C.³ From this time onward the

¹Daniel includes three additions: Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, and Song of the Three Children.

²Wildeboer, op. cit., p. 101.

³Wildeboer, op. cit., p. 101, precisely dates it 444 B.C. R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941), p. 57, says that the date of the canonization of the Pentateuch is conjectural, but apparently it was certainly the "Bible" of Judaism by 250 B.C. His conclusion is that the date is about 400 B.C.

entire Torah has been Israel's "holy Scripture."¹

It is difficult to determine the canonization of the other two divisions of the Old Testament. According to tradition the canon of the entire Old Testament was fixed completely at one time.² However, this is improbable, for it is clear that the canon was the result of a gradual historical process. This is indicated in the prologue of the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus (about 132 B.C.) which speaks of the Law and the Prophets and also the other books. The third division evidently was still not fixed, and thus "there is here a true recollection of the gradual canonization of the OT."³

Though the foundations for the later canonization of the Prophets were already laid in the sixth century B.C., there is no proof to be found in the Old Testament that such a collection, considered as authoritative, already existed in the exile.⁴ Metzger states that by the time of the high priesthood of Simon II (219-199 B.C.) the Prophets were

¹Wildeboer, op. cit., pp. 105, 106.

²Alexander Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, rev. C. S. C. Williams (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1954), p. 137.

³Pfeiffer, IDB, loc. cit., A-D, 499. Wildeboer, op. cit., pp. 33, 34, 42-46, also refers to the manner of translating the books of the Old Testament and Josephus' use of apocryphal books as indicating the gradual process of canonization.

⁴Wildeboer, op. cit., pp. 25, 26.

considered to be Scripture and occupied a rank after the Law and above all other books.¹ The "Former Prophets" can hardly have been canonical as early as 250 B.C., and the "Latter Prophets" may be placed about 200 B.C., though canonization occurred later.²

At the close of the first century A.D. following the fall of Jerusalem and the disorganization of Judaism which resulted, the Council of Jamnia (c. 90 A.D.) fixed "for all times" the canon of Scripture.³

The underlying and real cause which in course of time forced the idea of forming a Canon to arise was Greek culture and the growth of Greek literature; the more immediate cause--which was, however, to a large extent an outcome of this--was the spread of apocalyptic books written by and circulating among the Jews.⁴

Judaism of Palestine rigidly fixed the limits of its canon. The Hebrew canon as it exists today was thus an accomplished fact by about 100 A.D.⁵

This Palestinian canon held to the tripartite

¹Bruce Metzger, An Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 7.

²Souter, op. cit., p. 137.

³Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 64.

⁴W. O. E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1934), p. 7. Pfeiffer, in Introduction, p. 64, ascribes the cause for canonization to the controversy with Christians who accepted writings which were not included in the Hebrew canon.

⁵Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., p. 7.

division of the Old Testament writings which, Buhl maintains, Palestinian Judaism held from the beginning. This canon was limited to twenty-four books: five in the Law of Moses, eight in the Prophets, and eleven in the Writings (counting Ezra and Nehemiah as one book and I and II Chronicles as one book).¹

However, though this limitation of the canon and its supreme authority were axiomatic in normative Judaism from the Council of Jamnia, these strict notions of the limits of the canon did not prevail everywhere.² Jepsen points out that it is evident that this determination did not obtain its purpose everywhere as seen in the fact that even in the third and fourth centuries the Jewish canon was not entirely defined in all places.³ Both at Jamnia and before and after, Christie affirms, there were eight books in question: Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Ruth, Ezekiel, Proverbs, Jonah, and Chronicles. They were questioned on the basis of external evidence rather than that of authorship or date.⁴

In connection with the extent of the Old Testament

¹Frants Buhl, Canon and Text of the Old Testament, trans. John Macpherson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892), pp. 4, 19.

²Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 65.

³Alfred Jepsen, "Zur Kanongeschichte des Alten Testaments," ZATW (71-72, 1959-60), p. 132.

⁴Christie, JTS, loc. cit., pp. 353-356.

canon as evidenced in the New Testament, Wildeboer concludes that this evidence annuls the hypothesis of the existence of a fixed canon from the days of Ezra which was recognized by Jesus and his apostles. That a three-fold division was recognized (Luke 24:44) does not prove the existence of a fixed canon.¹ On the basis of the lack of quotations from some Old Testament books as well as from reminiscences and quotations from apocryphal books Wildeboer concludes that the New Testament writers recognized no canon of the Old Testament agreeing with the later Hebrew canon. He asserts, in fact, that they gave an even wider range to "sacred Scripture" than most Alexandrians.² Jepsen concludes that in both forms of the canon--that of the synagogue and that of the Church--most of the writings originated in the same collection, and concludes that:

Jesus und die Urgemeinde kennen wohl die "Schrift" oder die "Schriften", d.h. das Zeugnis der Gemeinde von den Taten Gottes in ihrer Geschichte, aber nicht den Kanon.³

In distinction to the Jews of Palestine who rigidly limited their canon, the Jewish communities outside Palestine tended to be more elastic. The Pentateuch was given a

¹Wildeboer, op. cit., pp. 47, 54.

²Ibid., pp. 51, 56. See infra, pp. 87 ff., for a discussion of the extent of the canon in the first century, and the form the Old Testament took in the Church.

³Alfred Jepsen, "Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments," TL (74, 1949), p. 67.

unique place, but the later Old Testament books were treated with considerably more freedom with some containing additions, others being rewritten, and entirely new books added to the list.¹ In this "Greek Old Testament" the following additional books were included: I (III) Esdras, Judith, Tobit, I-IV Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the three additions to Daniel, and the Prayer of Manasseh.² Kelly asserts that in the first two centuries, at

¹Kelly, Doctrines, p. 53. J. W. Weaver, "Septuagint," IDB, R-Z, p. 273, states that the date of the composition of the Septuagint is unknown but that it was probably translated first and most faithfully as Wildeboer, op. cit., p. 35, points out. Paul Kahle, in The Cairo Geniza (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), pp. 209, 210, says that the Greek translation of the Law became a necessity for the Jewish communities in Egypt as many of them no longer understood Hebrew. The translation was made by Jews familiar with the Greek language as spoken in Egypt. Kahle, ibid., pp. 215-217, refers to the testimony of the grandson of Ben Sira in his prologue to the translation of Wisdom as evidence that the translation of the prophecies and the rest of the books must have immediately followed the translation of the Law. Aage Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (Copenhagen, 1948), I, 37, 38, concludes that the books outside the Law were never brought together in a canonical collection among the Jews in Egypt. The Septuagint as it is now known is a creation of the Church and was based on older material which came from Jewish sources. The Greek canon of the Church is mainly the work of the Church which enlarged the Jewish Alexandrian canon. S. Jellicoe, in "The Septuagint To-day," ET (December, 1965), p. 68, points out that the Septuagint was essentially the source of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament and also that it was the Old Testament Scriptures of the Church fathers both of the East and the West. "Hence for Patristic studies too, the LXX is the Old Testament source-book par excellence."

²See H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1900), pp. 265 ff., for various extant lists of these books.

any rate, the Church seems to have accepted all or most of these additional books as inspired and to have treated them as their Scripture.¹

Josephus refers to twenty-two books in the canon, though in practice he refers to the Greek Bible with its greater range of books.² This canon, which was not to be enlarged, diminished, or altered, consisted of the five books of Moses, thirteen books of the Prophets, and four books of hymns and moral teaching. Ryle suggests that Josephus' canon contains twenty-two books instead of the twenty-four in the Hebrew tradition by counting Ruth with Judges and Lamentations with Jeremiah. With this observation his canon coincides with the contents of the later Hebrew canon.³ Josephus disregarded the three-fold division of the Hebrew canon and followed the topical arrangement in the Greek version.⁴ Sundberg, however, believes that Josephus seems to reflect a tripartite division of the Scriptures, though these divisions are highly irregular. It cannot be deduced that Josephus and Alexandrian Judaism had abandoned the division

¹Kelly, Doctrines, p. 54.

²C. Apion. 1.8. See Jeffrey, IB, loc. cit., I, 38.

³Herbert Edward Ryle, The Canon of the Old Testament (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892), pp. 147, 148, 164.

⁴Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 64.

between Prophets and Writings.¹

To Philo and to the Alexandrian Jews the Law alone was in the highest sense the canon of Scripture, Ryle asserts, and it alone partook of divine inspiration in the most absolute degree.² Philo's theory of inspiration is wholly different from that which lies at the basis of the construction of the Palestinian canon. Philo holds that inspiration was not confined to any particular period. All truly wise and virtuous men are inspired and enabled by God's Spirit for expressing what is hidden to the common gaze.³ Georgi points out that for Philo it is only the wise and righteous man who is guided as one possessed and inspired. Thus the wise man is the sounding instrument of God. Philo considered Abraham especially as the spiritual man and as having received a divine superiority. Abraham represents the possibility that is open for all men.⁴ The Law was the principal source for Philo's references to the Scriptures.⁵ Josephus apparently regarded additional

¹Sundberg, Old Testament, pp. 69-71.

²Ryle, Canon, p. 148.

³De Cherub. 9.27; De Mig. Abrah. 7.35; Quis Rer. Div. Her. 52.258 ff. See Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 67.

⁴Dieter Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964), pp. 78 ff.

⁵Wildeboer, op. cit., p. 36.

material in the Septuagint, such as I Esdras, as on a par with the books of the Hebrew canon; Philo, however, never quoted or alluded to a book in the Apocrypha.¹ Sundberg suggests that Philo seems to witness to a canonical practice in Egypt in the first century A.D. which was closely parallel to that intimated in the prologue of Sirach. "The Law and the Prophets appear as closely defined collections; a third collection is mentioned that has not yet been clearly defined and has no definitive name."²

Pfeiffer points out that the Septuagint Greek version is generally considered to be the Bible of the Jews at Alexandria, though copies and fragments of it, and all lists of books in it, are Christian.³ It must be concluded, in Wildeboer's opinion, that the Alexandrians had no officially fixed canon nor order though it may be inferred that the official Palestinian canon was known there.⁴ Pfeiffer notes that it has been generally assumed that the Old Testament of the Christian Church is that of the Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria but that this cannot be proved.⁵

The hypothesis of an Alexandrian canon as the solution to the problem of how the Jewish canon and the Old

¹Sundberg, Old Testament, p. 5.

²Ibid., pp. 68, 69. ³Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 68.

⁴Wildeboer, op. cit., p. 35.

⁵Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 67.

Testament of the early Church came to differ is questioned by Sundberg. He bases his argument on the differences in the various early Church lists of the Old Testament books as well as in the usage of the early Church; on the question of the varied linguistic origin of the extra-canonical literature; and also on the fact that the evidences proposed for the Alexandrian hypothesis of the canon are open to question.¹

The hypothesis put forward by Sundberg is that the Jewish Scriptures during the time of the earliest Christians, who were Palestinian Jews, included closed collections of the Law and Prophets but also other writings that were not yet brought together in a definitive collection. Many of the latter writings had been translated into Greek as well, and the third group of undefined proportions existed throughout Judaism. About the close of the first century A.D. certain writings comprising the third group were gathered out of it, and thus the canon of Scripture was closed by Palestinian Jews. This closed canon soon was recognized throughout Judaism. Christianity arose before the restriction of the third group by Judaism, and consequently the Scriptures included the Law and the Prophets but also the undefined writings of the third group. This hypothesis, Sundberg maintains, obviates certain difficulties in the hypothesis of an Alexandrian canon. It is also supported by the use of Greek

¹Sundberg, Old Testament, pp. 60 ff.

in Palestine which suggests the circulation of the Septuagint there. The latter contention is supported by various factors including the presence of Septuagint fragments at Qumran. Numerous apocryphal books have been found at Qumran as well. Thus, Sundberg concludes, there was no legally closed canon in Judaism whether in Palestine or elsewhere.¹

Eusebius includes the Old Testament canonical list of Melito of Sardis (c. 170 A.D.) who went to Palestine in order to investigate the number and order of the Old Testament books.² He was apparently satisfied that the Hebrew canon was the authoritative one.³ Melito appears to enumerate the twenty-two books in the order of the Greek Bible rather than in the order of the Hebrew canon⁴: five books of Moses; Joshua; Judges; Ruth; four books of the Kingdoms (as one book); two books of Chronicles (as one book); Psalms; Proverbs; Ecclesiastes; Canticles; Job; Isaiah; Jeremiah; the Twelve; Daniel; Ezekiel; and Esdras (Ezra and Nehemiah).⁵ Lamentations was probably omitted from the list inadvertently.⁶

¹Ibid., pp. 82, 83, 86-89, 107. Jepsen, TL, loc. cit., pp. 68-71, postulates that the Church determined the content of its Old Testament for itself with each Church province determining its own canon.

²Eusebius, H.E., 4.26. ³Wildeboer, op. cit., p. 76.

⁴Ryle, Canon, p. 214. ⁵Eusebius, H.E., 4.26.

⁶Sundberg, Old Testament, p. 133.

Origen's enumeration of the Old Testament canon is also included in Eusebius: five books of Moses; Joshua; Judges (Ruth included with Judges as one book); Kingdoms, first and second; Kingdoms, third and fourth; Chronicles, first and second; Ezra (with Nehemiah); Psalms; Proverbs; Ecclesiastes; Canticles; Isaiah; Jeremiah (Lamentations and the Epistle included with it in one book); Daniel; Ezekiel; Job; and Esther.¹ The omission of the Twelve is apparently inadvertent.² Including the Twelve then, Origen also lists twenty-two books in the Alexandrian order omitting all books not included in the Palestinian canon, with the Epistle which is united with Jeremiah as the only exception.³ Both Melito and Origen disregard the three-fold division of the Hebrew canon and attempt to group the books according to their subject matter into the divisions of narrative, poetical, and prophetical books.⁴

In his list of Old Testament books Athanasius follows the Hebrew canon in the enumeration of twenty-two books, but in their order he follows Alexandrian practice. Melito, Origen, and Athanasius thus follow the same pattern with minor variations in order and in grouping and with the exception that Origen includes Esther. Their lists are in conformity

¹Eusebius, H.E., 6.25.

²Wildeboer, op. cit., pp. 78, 79.

³Ryle, Canon, p. 215.

⁴Ibid., p. 213.

with the Hebrew canon, but the variations in ordering and grouping indicate that there was no rigid pattern. This suggests, in Sundberg's judgment, that the tradition of a twenty-two book canon was received from Palestine, but no clear tradition of the manner of the Jewish arrangement of Scripture impressed itself on the Eastern Church. He also observes that Athanasius went further than Origen in insisting that the Christian Old Testament is to be confined to the Jewish canon, though he did not confine himself to it in his own writings. Sundberg concludes that:

It would appear, therefore, that the period of transition from a fuller to a more restricted Old Testament is to be observed among the Eastern fathers beginning with Athanasius.¹

The canonical list of Athanasius, with that of Origen, is perhaps the earliest witness to the acceptance of the canon of Jamnia by Alexandrian Jews. Athanasius went beyond Origen in that he supported the Hebrew canon as fixing the correct limits of the Church's Old Testament.²

The Canon of the New Testament

Souter considers this pastoral letter³ of Athanasius the most interesting fourth century document with reference to the canon.⁴ Its special significance is in the fact that

¹Sundberg, HTR, loc. cit., p. 221.

²Sundberg, Old Testament, pp. 140, 141.

³Ep. Heort. XXXIX. ⁴Souter, op. cit., p. 171.

this is the earliest instance of an enumeration of twenty-seven books as canonical and as alone comprising the New Testament. His list includes: four Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles; seven Epistles (called Catholic): James, Peter (two), John (three), Jude; fourteen epistles of Paul: Romans, Corinthians (two), Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians (two), Hebrews, Timothy (two), Titus, Philemon; and the Revelation of John.

The decisive period in the history of the New Testament canon is from about 140 to 200 A.D.¹ The history of the canon, of course, goes back much earlier, and there is "more or less difficulty" in ascertaining the details of its beginnings and early growth.² The source of authority for the early Christian community was the Lord and his apostles. When the accredited eyewitnesses and their immediate followers ceased to be available, the answer to the need for authority "lay inevitably in written records. With the appeal to 'the Lord and apostles' begins an inevitable process of development leading to accredited writings."³

¹Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., I, 31.

²Brooke Foss Westcott, A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament (5th ed.; Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1881), pp. 6, 7.

³C. F. D. Moule, The Birth of the New Testament (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962), p. 182.

The story of the formation of the New Testament, as Moule notes, is a story of the demand for authority.¹ The authority of the first witnesses rested especially on the fact that they were witnesses of the Lord and his words. With the termination of this genuine authority, with the discontinuance of the prophetic charism, and with the growth of Christian churches, it became necessary "to fix this proclamation and put it down in writing."² Schneemelcher points out that:

Here lies the proper starting point of the formation of the canon, but here there must also be seen the beginnings of the association of the problem of the canon with that of apostolicity. The need of genuine authority and of certainty in the proclamation led to the formation of a canon. Only what in the opinion of the churches in the 2nd century had authority was canonized, and this authority was determined by apostolicity.³

The history of the treatment of the New Testament canon from the time of Ignatius to the time of Origen is a history of increasing authority being conferred upon it. This authority gradually pushed it "onto a lonely peak of

¹Ibid., p. 178.

²Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., pp. 36, 37.

³Ibid., p. 37. Moule, op. cit., p. 189, asserts that the criteria the Church applied to test the authenticity of its writings were apostolicity (written by an apostle or a close associate), usage, and that it was, in fact, a Gospel and not fragmentary. Ellen Flesseman-van Leer, in Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church (Assen, 1953), p. 416, affirms that in the West the chief distinguishing mark was canonicity, but in the East it was inspiration.

eminence shared only by the Old Testament."¹ The collection of writings in the first place were "read and loved" in the churches and only then were combined in a canon. This process was completed without reflection, for the canon grew and was not made.²

Westcott states that in the earliest stages of the process of the formation of the canon the apostolic fathers occupy an important place. In their writings they show that the writings of the apostles were regarded as invested with singular authority and, in fact, mark the beginnings of a written canon. Their writings not only recognize several types of Christianity, but "they confirm the genuineness and authority of the books themselves."³

Clear traces are discernible in the apostolic fathers of a knowledge of Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, I and II Timothy, Hebrews, James, I Peter, and I John.⁴ With reference to the Gospels, Westcott concludes that the main testimony of these fathers is to the substance and not to the authority of the Gospels.⁵

¹Hanson, Tradition, p. 212.

²Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., p. 36.

³Westcott, History of the Canon, pp. 20, 21, 47.

⁴Ibid., pp. 48, 49.

⁵Ibid., p. 52. See also Moule, op. cit., p. 197.

The traces of Epistles and Gospels indicate their existence in this period but not a canonical status.

Justin Martyr speaks of the memoirs of the apostles and states that they are called the Gospels. These are read along with the prophets in the Christian worship service.¹ Souter concludes that Justin evidently knew the four Gospels, Apocalypse, Acts, I Peter, Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, II Thessalonians, Hebrews, and also the Didache.² Tradition, to which Papias appealed as a further and indeed superior source of information, is set aside by Justin. Justin's writings mark the era of transition from the oral to the "written Rule."³

Marcion has been credited with the first closed New Testament canon of which there is knowledge.⁴ This canon consisted of one Gospel (Luke's with various excisions) and ten Pauline Epistles (the Pastoral Epistles were excluded). Blackman states that it is necessary to differentiate between the idea of a canon and the fixation of a canon.⁵

Harnack refers to the sudden emergence of a New Testament canon which came as a result of the Church's conflict

¹I Apol. 66.3; 67.3. ²Souter, op. cit., p. 154.

³Westcott, History of the Canon, pp. 109, 173.

⁴E.g., E. C. Blackman, Marcion and His Influence (London: SPCK, 1948), p. 23.

⁵Ibid.

with Marcion and the Gnostics.¹ This is an extravagant claim, however, for the Church already possessed collections of writings which it was beginning to treat as Scripture.² Schneemelcher suggests that it was natural that the discussions with gnostics, Marcion, and Marcionism were instrumental in the formation of a New Testament, but, he notes, they were by no means decisive. In these conflicts the Church became judicious in its judgment of particular writings which were in use.³ "The actual process of selection and elimination took place in the period which preceded that of the primitive form of the canon."⁴ Chadwick seems to agree with Harnack in suggesting that there was a sense in which the idea of the New Testament canon was created overnight by the magnitude of the gnostic crisis. "In churches like Rome, where the impact of heresy was sharpest, the idea of prescribing a fixed number of books was no gradual growth."⁵

¹Harnack, History of Dogma, II, 43-46.

²Kelly, Doctrines, pp. 43, 57. See also Blackman, op. cit., p. 24, who states that this judgment is a "part of Harnack's exaggerated estimate of Marcion's significance in the history of Christianity." Blackman, ibid., p. 34, believes that the struggle with Montanism was the decisive factor in producing the conception of a closed canon.

³Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., p. 36.

⁴Chadwick, Church's Use of the Bible, loc. cit., p. 34.

⁵Ibid.

Chadwick maintains that it was the crisis of the second century, that is, the crisis of Gnosticism, that led to the formation of the New Testament as a closed canon and that there can be no doubt of the benefits of this development.¹ It appears that though the development of the canon was gradual, the impetus for defining its limits came from heretical movements in the second century. Before these movements, however, a canon was in the process of formation. Before Marcion's canon the Church had taken over from Judaism its Scripture for use in the Churches. Following this there were collections of the words of Jesus and narratives of his life and ministry. The Gospels came to be treated as Scripture in the citations of ecclesiastical writers and in the liturgy for use in worship. The Epistles of Paul then came to be associated with the Gospels in the same usage. The earliest Christian document to cite passages from the Gospels as holy Scripture is II Clement,² and Justin Martyr states that in the services of Christian worship memoirs of the Apostles or writings of the Prophets were read.³ With these Epistles and Gospels there came to be other epistles and also a history of the deeds of the Apostles. The presence of these writings, however, proves that they were read and valued, but not that they were recognized as

¹Ibid. See also Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, p. 144.

²II Clem. 4.

³I Apol. 67.

authoritative, as the Old Testament was recognized.¹

In an article in The Jung Codex van Unnik,² in an examination of the Gospel of Truth (written by Valentinus of Rome), concludes that its author used practically the same books as constitute the present New Testament canon. He asserts that the manner in which these documents are treated proves that they were authoritative for its author. Therefore, he concludes, about 140-150 A.D. there was a collection of writings known and accepted as authoritative in Rome which was virtually identical with the New Testament as it is today. Before they could be used in the way in which they are used in the Gospel of Truth:

They must have already enjoyed authority for a considerable time. To treat them as a collection was not a discovery of a few months before. Moreover, we should notice that this all took place before the condemnation of Marcion.³

Though there are no exact quotations, van Unnik purports to find parallel passages or echoes from the following New Testament books: the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, and Revelation. There are also traces from Acts, I John, and I Peter. The author, therefore, knew these books and

¹Blackman, *op. cit.*, pp. 24, 25; F. W. Beare, "Canon of the NT," IDB, A-D, 522-525.

²W. C. van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament," The Jung Codex, trans. and ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1955), pp. 81-129.

³Ibid., p. 125.

interpreted them in his own way. For him, van Unnik says, they were the language of the Church.¹ However, van Unnik's assertions are not conclusive, for the writing of the Gospel of Truth may have been later than that which van Unnik proposes. Thus a later stage of development in the canon of the New Testament may be reflected. It is also possible that the Gospel of Truth may show knowledge of these New Testament writings rather than canonization.²

The Muratorian Canon is the earliest list of books of the New Testament regarded as authoritative. It is usually reckoned to come from the Church of Rome somewhere near the end of the second century.³ It includes the following books: the four Gospels, Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul, three

¹Ibid., p. 122. See also G. Quispel, in "The Jung Codex and Its Significance," The Jung Codex, p. 49, who makes the same point.

²Hans Jonas, in "Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation," Studia Patristica (Berlin, 1962), VI, 96-111, argues for the possibility of a later date for the Gospel of Truth by a comparison of a passage with a parallel in Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 1.14.3). He finds that this suggests that the Gospel of Truth implied a doctrine that was available explicitly elsewhere whose knowledge was taken for granted. This militates against van Unnik's contention that the Gospel of Truth represents the incipient stage of the formation of Valentinianism. Therefore an early date, such as van Unnik suggests, could not be supported. See also Hans Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist: Die mythologische Gnosis (Göttingen, 1954), I, 206, n. 2; 374, 375, where Jonas had earlier made this same observation.

³Hanson, Tradition, p. 187. See also Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., I, 34. Westcott, History of the Canon, p. 214, dates the Muratorian Canon no later than 170 A.D.

Catholic Epistles, and Revelation. It also includes the Wisdom of Solomon and the apocalypses of John and Peter. The Shepherd of Hermas is also mentioned.¹

It is asserted by van Unnik that an anti-Montanist in Asia Minor about 192 A.D. referred to "the list of the New Testament of the Gospel" by which he must have meant a written and determined Testament, that is, a collection of writings. Van Unnik states that on this basis this is the first certain use of the phrase "New Testament" in this sense.²

Irenaeus unequivocally speaks of a "New" Testament parallel to the Old.³ Beare asserts that Irenaeus' writings indicate that his canon coincides with the present one except for the addition of the Shepherd, the omission of James and Jude, and with II Peter and Hebrews given a lower place.⁴ Irenaeus⁵ was the first orthodox writer to recognize certainly the authority of four Gospels and of four only.⁶

Hanson concludes that from about 170 A.D. the New Testament, substantially in the form in which it is known today,

¹See Westcott, History of the Canon, pp. 214-220 and 521-538.

²W. C. van Unnik, "De la Règle M^hte προσεῖναι μ^hτε ἀφελεῖν dans l' Histoire du Canon," VC (3-4, 1949-50), p. 5.

³Adv. Haer. 4.18. Kelly, Doctrines, p. 56, considers Irenaeus the first writer to refer to the New Testament in this way.

⁴Beare, IDB, loc. cit., A-D, 528.

⁵Adv. Haer. 3.11.11. ⁶Hanson, Tradition, p. 191.

was widely recognized in the Church as authoritative Scripture comparable to the Old Testament.¹

No catalog of New Testament books occurs in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, but Eusebius supplies information concerning Clement's recognized books, and there are also indications in his writings of the books recognized by him. It appears that he recognized as canonical all the New Testament books except James, II Peter, and III John.²

The evidence for Origen's canon is found in his writings and in Eusebius. The acknowledged books are the four Gospels, fourteen Pauline Epistles (including Hebrews), Acts, I John, I Peter, and the Revelation; the disputed books are James, Jude, II Peter, II and III John, and apparently the Shepherd of Hermas. The Didache and Epistle of Barnabas are not specifically classified but are considered to possess high authority. Origen made use of three categories to which he assigned writings: ὁμολογούμενα, universally recognized writings; ψευδῆ, lying writings forged by heretics (such as the Gospel of the Egyptians, etc.); and ἀμφιβαλλόμενα, writings concerning which there are doubts whether they are genuine and apostolic or not.³ Except for the

¹Ibid., p. 9.

²Eusebius, H.E. 6.14. See Westcott, History of the Canon, pp. 357, 358.

³Eusebius, H.E. 6.25. See Beare, IDB, loc. cit., A-D, 529, 530; and Westcott, History of the Canon, pp. 358-365.

finality of the four Gospels the conception of an official list which the word "canon" connotes is entirely absent from Origen as it is from Clement.¹ Origen, however, shows considerably more definiteness about the New Testament canon than Clement does.²

In 325 A.D., Jülicher says, many Greek churches believed themselves to possess the complete New Testament with twenty-six books with the Revelation excluded.³ Otherwise it was a decision between this twenty-six book canon or a canon with twenty-one books.⁴

The place of Athanasius in the history of the canon in the East is that he was the first to lay down a twenty-seven book canon as the New Testament stands today. Athanasius accepted all seven Catholic Epistles without hesitation and also included the Revelation. He had perhaps learned to place a higher value on the Revelation during his exile in the West.⁵ Moore thinks that "undoubtedly the personal influence of Athanasius did much to carry through this

¹Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., I, 38.

²Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, pp. 138, 142.

³Adolph Jülicher and Erich Fascher, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (7th ed.; Tübingen, 1931), p. 522.

⁴Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., p. 40.

⁵Jülicher, op. cit., p. 546.

decision in the eastern church."¹ The fixing and standardizing of the list by Athanasius is suggested as perhaps the result of the influence of Western tradition on him.²

The Deutero-canonical Literature

Athanasius also includes in this letter³ to Alexandria a list of writings in addition to those included in the Old and New Testament lists. This he claims to do by necessity and in the interests of greater exactness. These books, he says, are not included in the canon but are appointed by the fathers to be read by those who are recent converts and who wish instruction in godliness. These include the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Esther, Judith, Tobit, and also the Teaching of the Apostles, and the Shepherd. These are distinctly separated from the canon with no authority for doctrine. The additions that were included with Daniel and Jeremiah should also be noted again at this point.⁴

Schneemelcher points out that it is only against the background of the history of the canon that the phenomena of the apocryphal literature can be "appreciated and understood." The history of the canon is at the same time the

¹Edward Caldwell Moore, op. cit., p. 184.

²E. von Dobschütz, "The Abandonment of the Canonical Idea," AJT (XIX, 1915), p. 420.

³Ed. Heort. XXXIX.

⁴Supra, p. 79.

history of the status of the apocryphal literature. In the same period in which the writings which later formed the canonical New Testament came into being, the writings which were termed "apocryphal" and were subsequently rejected also came into being.¹

Schneemelcher affirms that the process of forming a canon was not so much a process of elimination, but rather it appears that in the canon's formation there was an adherence to that which was traditional and had gained an authoritative place in public worship. He avers that generally this "actual process of selection and elimination took place in the period which preceded that of the primitive form of the canon."² The tradition of the canon is one that is historically conditioned. It enshrines a historical judgment made at a certain period in history.³

In Oesterley's judgment there is reason to believe that some of the New Testament books reflect the thought of much that occurs in the Old Testament apocrypha though this in itself does not prove that the New Testament writers regarded the books of the apocrypha as Scripture. That the Septuagint was the Bible of the Church and that most of the Old Testament quotations are from it rather than from the

¹Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., p. 41.

²Ibid., pp. 37, 38. ³Hanson, Tradition, p. 224.

Hebrew Old Testament makes it certain, Oesterley concludes, that these books were held to be Scripture by the New Testament writers. At least during the first two centuries the early Church in both the East and the West, as represented by Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, accepted all the books of the apocrypha as inspired, that is, as Scripture.¹

There is a considerable difference of opinion with reference to the use of apocryphal literature in the New Testament. Ellis concludes that Paul's use of uncanonical Jewish literature is very doubtful at best.² Metzger, however, concludes that the Christian writers were influenced directly or indirectly by the intertestamental literature with Paul, James, and the author of Hebrews displaying the greatest number of coincidences with the apocrypha.³ It is difficult to decide whether the parallels are merely coincidences or literary reminiscences. Filson, however, concludes that:

We can say plainly that no New Testament writer ever quotes one of the Apocrypha as Scripture. . . . they have references to Jewish writings outside of the canon, yet they never refer to one of the Apocrypha as a Biblical authority.⁴

¹W. O. E. Oesterley, An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1935), pp. 125, 126.

²Ellis, op. cit., p. 77. ³Metzger, op. cit., p. 158.

⁴Floyd V. Filson, Which Books Belong in the Bible? A Study of the Canon (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), p. 86.

Traces of the apocrypha appear in such New Testament passages as Jude 14 (Enoch); Heb. 11:35, 36 (II Maccabees); and Jude 9 (Assumption of Moses).¹

In his writings Irenaeus refers to Wisdom, History of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, and Baruch.² He seems to have regarded I Clement and the Shepherd as Scripture.³ Clement of Alexandria considers I Clement, the Shepherd, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Didache as Scripture.⁴

Origen apparently remained certain of the genuineness of the History of Susanna to the end of his life and used it because it was received in the churches.⁵ Origen also quotes from or mentions the Gospel of Peter, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Preaching of Peter, the Acts of Pilate, the Clementine Recognitions, I Clement, and the Epistle of Barnabas.⁶ He also refers to the Shepherd and the Acts of Paul, though later he apparently became uncertain

¹See Buhl, op. cit., p. 51; and also Sundberg, Old Testament, pp. 54, 55, for suggested New Testament references to apocryphal literature.

²Adv. Haer. 4.63.3; 4.41.1; 5.5.2; 5.35.1.

³Ibid., 3.3.2; 4.24.2.

⁴Strom. 4.17.105; 1.29.181; 2.6.31; 1.20.100. Hanson, Tradition, p. 226, notes that Clement quotes apocryphal works and agrapha in abundance.

⁵Letter to Africanus and Comm. on Matt. 2.61.

⁶Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, pp. 133-141. Hanson points out that reference to these works in Origen does not in itself imply that he accepted them as authoritative or genuine.

about the authority of these two writings.¹ Origen rejects the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the Gospel of the Twelve, the Gospel according to Thomas, and the Gospel according to Matthias.² Origen, Hanson observes, was stricter in his attitude to apocryphal works than Clement was.³ Schneemelcher speaks of the process of eliminating the apocrypha as still going on for Origen.⁴

Though Athanasius relegates the extra-canonical books to this secondary position in his enumeration in this pastoral letter, in practice he uses some of them as Scripture. He refers to the Shepherd as an edifying book through which God speaks, though, as he recognizes, the book is not in the canon.⁵ He speaks of having proof from Scripture and then proceeds to refer to Wisdom.⁶ The words of Ecclesiasticus are said to be the words of the Spirit.⁷ He refers to Esther and Judith as "blessed."⁸ The formula "it is written" introduces one of several references to Baruch,⁹ and in one

¹Hanson, Tradition, p. 227.

²Hom. on Luke 1. See Hanson, Tradition, p. 227.

³Hanson, Tradition, p. 227.

⁴Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., p. 39.

⁵De Inc. 3; De Dec. 18. See supra, pp. 99, 100, for the place of the Shepherd in the Muratorian Canon.

⁶De Sent. Dion. 9.

⁷Ad Ep. Aeg. 3.

⁸Ep. Heort. IV.

⁹C. Ar. I.19.

reference the Word is said to chide Israel through Baruch.¹ Athanasius also refers to Susanna in a series of Scripture passages.² In a reference to the Song of the Three Children he summons the three martyrs to arraign Arianism.³ There is also a reference to Bel and the Dragon.⁴ A quotation from Tobit is introduced with the formula "what is written."⁵ He refers to I Esdras 4:40 as an evidence of the deity of Christ.⁶ Athanasius refers to all of these writings in arguments from Scripture without distinguishing them from the books he listed as comprising the canon--with the exception of the Shepherd. It should also be noted that all of these books, but again with the exception of the Shepherd, are Old Testament apocryphal books.

Athanasius also refers to the agraphon, "be approved money-changers," without any indication of its source.⁷ Jeremias refers to the extreme popularity of this saying in the early Church. It is quoted more often than any other extra-canonical dominical saying. It is sometimes quoted as a saying of Jesus, sometimes as a word of Scripture, or as a word

¹De Dec. 12.

²C. Ar. I.12, 13.

³Ibid., II.71.

⁴Ibid., III.30.

⁵Ap. C. Ar. 11.

⁶De Sent. Dion. 25.

⁷In De Sent. Dion. 9; Ad Serap. I.21.

of the Gospel.¹ Clement² and Origen³ both quote it as do many other Church fathers.⁴

Aland ascribes the influence of the West on Athanasius as the cause of his inclusion of this apocryphal literature as writings to be read.⁵ In a discussion of the canon of Athanasius, Ruwet, on the basis of Athanasius' citations of the deuterocanonical books as Scripture, concludes that his true view was that these are inspired Scriptures also. He admits that it is impossible to confirm this conclusion.⁶ It appears, however, that it is better to ascribe Athanasius' use of these books as standing in the tradition of the Alexandrian school and accept his explicit statements of the extra-canonical literature. Though Athanasius recognized the limits of the Hebrew canon in enumerating his canon of the Old Testament and listed the present twenty-seven book canon of the New Testament, he reflects the influence of the

¹Joachim Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus, trans. Reginald H. Fuller (2nd English ed.; London: SPCK, 1964), p. 101.

²E.g., Strom. 1.28.177. ³E.g., Hom. on Luke 1:1.

⁴See Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 101-104.

⁵Aland, NZST, loc. cit., pp. 227, 234.

⁶Jean Ruwet, "Le Canon Alexandrin des Écritures. Saint Athanase," Biblica (33, 1952), pp. 7, 8. This represents the Roman Catholic view and that of the Council of Trent with its unequivocal pronouncement of the canonicity of the books of the Old Testament apocrypha. See Metzger, op. cit., pp. 189, 190.

Alexandrian school in his practice of using extra-canonical literature.

Flesseman-van Leer concludes that Athanasius wrote to end all doubts about the canon and also observes that:

Seine persönliche Autorität war in der Tat gross genug, so dass sein Kanon im grossen und ganzen der Kanon aller östlichen Kirchen wurde; mehrere provinzielle Kirchenversammlungen übernahmen ihn für ihren Machtbereich.¹

The place of Athanasius in the history of the canon is thus assessed by Nordberg:

As is well known, St. Athanasius assumes a key position in the Bible Canon . . . he was the first to demarcate the number of the canonical writings and their mutual sequence in a way which became, and still is, the norm for the Church.²

¹Ellen Flesseman-van Leer, "Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons," ZTK (61, 1964), p. 416.

²Nordberg, AAPF, loc. cit., p. 119.

CHAPTER V

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

The Relationship of Scripture and Tradition

Hanson gives this succinct definition of "tradition":

Christian tradition is . . . primarily that which is handed down from the very beginning of the Christian faith, the Christian teaching and gospel, the method by which it is handed over, and the sources from which it is derived.¹

The word "tradition" is used in a variety of ways including:

- (1) a piece of historical information independent of Scriptural sources handed down from an early period in the Church;
- (2) a separate and recognizable source of Christian information and doctrine presumably existing from the very beginning of Christianity and deriving from Christ and his Apostles which supplements the New Testament authoritatively;
- (3) the doctrine of the Church as it has been taught and developed from the earliest times--not the Gospel itself but its interpretation by the Church;
- (4) the whole teaching of the Church including both the things taught and the manner of teaching;
- (5) it can be applied to the Bible alone; and
- (6) within the Bible itself various traditions may be

¹Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, p. 31. See G. L. Prestige, "Tradition," Theology (XIII, July Dec., 1926), pp. 7-10; and Kristen Ejner Skydsgaard, "Scripture and Tradition," SJT (9, 1956), pp. 350-352.

detected that have been handed on.¹

Cullmann refers to I Cor. 11:23, "I received it from the Lord," as pointing not only to the historical Jesus as the chronological beginning and the first link of the chain of tradition, "but to the exalted Lord as the real author of the whole tradition."² Riesenfeld asserts that the only explanation of the fact that in the first age of the Church the tradition about Jesus already possessed its special character as holy Word is that this tradition, qua tradition, was derived from Jesus himself. He is the beginning of the Gospel tradition.³ Riesenfeld affirms that:

Jesus is not only the object of a later faith, which on its side gave rise to the growth of oral and also written tradition, but, as Messiah and teacher, Jesus is the object and subject of a tradition of authoritative and holy words which he himself created and entrusted to his disciples for its later transmission in the epoch between his death and the parousia.⁴

The sources and depositories of this knowledge are the Lord himself, and the evidence of apostles, disciples,

¹Hanson, Tradition, p. 7.

²Oscar Cullmann, The Early Church, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, trans. A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956), p. 62.

³Harold Riesenfeld, "The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings," Studia Evangelica, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin, 1959), I, 59.

⁴Ibid., I, 65. See also Berger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity (Uppsala, 1961), pp. 193 ff.

and eyewitnesses of the Word. "Any authoritative tradition must ultimately derive from these."¹ The tradition can be described as apostolic from those who were its original recipients or ecclesiastical from the society which received it and transmitted it institutionally.² Cullmann says that the fact must be emphasized that the early Church itself distinguished between apostolic tradition and ecclesiastical tradition. It subordinated the latter to the former, or, in other words, it subordinated itself to the apostolic tradition.³

Before the New Testament was written, the sources of the Christian faith were the Old Testament and the oral tradition.⁴ By tradition the fathers usually mean doctrine which the Lord or his apostles committed to the Church whether it was handed down orally or in documents.⁵ Twice Paul refers to the fact that he delivered that which he had

¹Hanson, Origen's Tradition, p. 31. Cullmann, Early Church, p. 621, points out that Jesus and the early Church lived in an atmosphere that was entirely permeated with the concept of tradition. Rabbinic interpretation of Scripture constituted a norm that was placed alongside and even above Scripture. Jesus had rejected this "tradition of the rabbis" (see Mk. 7:3, 4 and Matt. 15:2).

²Turner, op. cit., p. 309.

³Cullmann, Early Church, p. 87.

⁴R. P. C. Hanson, "The Church and Tradition in the Pre-Nicene Fathers," SJT (12, 1959), p. 27.

⁵Kelly, Doctrines, pp. 30, 31.

received--I Cor. 11:23 (the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper) and I Cor. 15:3, 4 (the essential facts of the proclamation of the Gospel). Cullmann states that the content of tradition for Paul was: (1) moral rules which concern the life of the faithful (e.g., I Cor. 11:2); (2) a summary of the Christian message expressed as a formula of faith and uniting the facts of the life of Jesus and their theological interpretation (e.g., I Cor. 15:3, 4); and (3) single narratives from the life of Jesus (e.g., I Cor. 11:23). The primitive tradition probably consisted of a summary of the kerygma, but by Paul's time the tradition had advanced a step and included words of Jesus and narratives from his life.¹

It was when the whole tradition of the Church was threatened with a lapse into uncertainty about the tradition that the writings that came to comprise the New Testament were set apart and subsequently canonized.² Cullmann states that in fixing the canon the Church itself traced a clear and definite line between apostolic tradition and ecclesiastical tradition, or otherwise the canon's formation would be meaningless.³ Thus Cullmann concludes that:

By establishing the principle of a canon the Church

¹Cullmann, Early Church, pp. 64, 65.

²Hanson, SJT, loc. cit., p. 23.

³Cullmann, Early Church, p. 89.

recognized that from that time the tradition was no longer a criterion of truth. It drew a line under the apostolic tradition. It declared implicitly that from that time every subsequent tradition must be submitted to the control of the apostolic tradition which constituted the Church, which forced itself upon it.¹

At this point arises the problem of the relation of Scripture and tradition. Rather than accepting the conclusion that the Gospel tradition coincides with the collection of writings constituting the New Testament, Bonnard objects that this precludes any subsequent work of the Holy Spirit in the Church.² Tavard defines tradition as "the overflow of the Word outside Sacred Scripture."³ Hanson recognizes that some of this oral tradition may have survived outside the New Testament.⁴ Tradition, L'Huillier affirms, is to be understood to include both Scripture and that which is now specifically called tradition, but the Bible, especially the New Testament, constitutes the heart of the tradition of the Church.⁵

For the apostolic fathers tradition is the "preaching

¹Ibid., p. 90.

²Pierre Bonnard, "La Tradition dans le Nouveau Testament," RHPR (40, 1960), pp. 27, 28.

³George H. Tavard, Holy Writ or Holy Church (London: Burns & Oates, 1959), p. 8.

⁴Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, p. 32.

⁵Peter L'Huillier, "The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and Magisterium," Sobornost (Ser. 4, no. 1, Autumn, 1959), pp. 20, 21.

of the church as the way in which revelation reaches man."¹ Congar states that though the word "tradition" is employed by the apostolic fathers only a few times, the idea which it signifies is frequent. He says that it is comprised of three elements: (1) a deposit transmitted; (2) a living magisterium; and (3) a transmission by succession.² Prestige, however, concludes that for the fathers the Bible is identified with tradition; therefore when the fathers invoked the authority of tradition, they meant ultimately the authority of the Bible.³

The earliest reference to the "rule of faith" is found in Irenaeus.⁴ In addition to indicating a list or catalog (as of Scripture),⁵ κανόν also indicates a rule of faith, rule of ecclesiastical law, canon of behavior, or liturgical order.⁶ Schneemelcher points out that the word came to designate unmistakably that which has become obligatory. It served quite generally to set in relief what the

¹Flesseman-van Leer, Tradition and Scripture, p. 186.

²Y. Congar, La Tradition et les Traditions: Essai historique (Paris, 1960), p. 27.

³Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, p. 27.

⁴Hanson, Tradition, p. 75.

⁵See supra, pp. 76, 77, for its use in reference to a list or catalog.

⁶A Patristic Greek Lexicon, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. 701, 702.

"hard and fast ecclesiastical norm" was to be and was used in this sense in a threefold connection: "rule of truth" (κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας; "rule of faith" (κανὼν τῆς πίστεως); and "rule of the Church" (or ecclesiastical rule) (κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, or ἐκκλησιαστικὸς). In the rule of faith the Church is the subject creating the "normalizing standard," which also "fixes and formulates" the rule.¹ Some of the fathers describe the rule of faith as tradition.² In his discussion of the rule of faith Hanson makes the observation that:

We cannot recognize the rule of faith as original tradition, going back by oral continuity independently of Scripture to Christ and his Apostles. But we can recognize it as the tradition in which the Church was interpreting Scripture under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and as such claim it as an essential ingredient of historical Christianity.³

In the New Testament and the apostolic fathers κανὼν is used in reference to a rule or pattern of life (e.g., II Cor. 10:13, 15; Gal. 6:16; I Clem. 7:2).

Van den Eynde states that between the years 180-300 A.D. the word παράδοσις meant three things: (1) the teaching of the apostles in contrast with the preaching of the prophets and Christ; (2) the doctrine transmitted by succession in the churches beginning with the apostles in contrast with the Scriptures; and (3) the rites of the cult and other

¹Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, loc. cit., p. 23.

²Hanson, Tradition, p. 94.

³Ibid., p. 129.

ecclesiastical practices which are transmitted by custom.¹

The content of the rule of faith is indicated especially in the lists of these rules reproduced by Irenaeus,² Tertullian,³ and Origen.⁴ Wolfson⁵ summarizes these rules in two parts: (1) Christian presuppositions consisting generally of the Trinity, Incarnation, Resurrection, Ascension, and Second Coming; and (2) those which can be identified with six topics out of the eight in Philo's⁶ Scriptural presuppositions. Hägglund regards the rule as a history of the interpretation of the Christian faith, and that ultimately it was to defend or explicate the faith.⁷

Irenaeus emphasizes that the whole Church everywhere teaches the rule of faith, neither more nor less, and he

¹Van den Eynde, op. cit., p. 158.

²Adv. Haer. 1.2; 3.4.1; 4.53.1.

³Adv. Prax. 2; De Praesc. Haer. 13.1-6; De Virg. Vel. 1.3.

⁴De Prin., praef., 4-10.

⁵Wolfson, Philosophy of the Church Fathers, I, 80.

⁶De Opif. Mund. 61.170-172; De Spec. Leg. 1.11.60; 1.60.27; 1.63.344; De Decal. 4.15; De Mos. 2.3.14. See Harry Austryn Wolfson, Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy, in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (rev. ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), I, 164, 165.

⁷Bengt Hägglund, "Die Bedeutung der 'regula fidei' als Grundlage theologischer Aussage," ST (11-12, 1957-58), p. 44. Hanson, Tradition, p. 256, avers that it is perhaps an overstatement to say that tradition is interpretation of the Bible. It would be better to say that tradition is "created and formed by interpretation."

describes this rule as "tradition" (παράδοσις).¹ In another passage he refers to the rule of faith in speaking of the tradition which is from the apostles and which is preserved through the succession of the Church's presbyters.² Irenaeus believes that the Church preserved the tradition which it inherited from the apostles and passed it down. He considers this to be a living tradition, and he seems to regard it to be in principle independent of written documents--public and open in contrast to the secret tradition of the Gnostics. For practical purposes he regards this tradition as finding expression in what he calls "the canon of truth."³ Correct exegesis of Scripture is the prerogative of the Church where the apostolic tradition or doctrine, which was the key to Scripture, had been kept intact.⁴ Irenaeus' real defense of orthodoxy is founded on Scripture.⁵ He also considers tradition to be confirmed by Scripture, for it is the foundation and pillar of the faith.⁶

Irenaeus seems to regard the identity of oral tradition with the original revelation to be guaranteed by the unbroken succession of bishops in the great sees going back lineally to the apostles.⁷ He suggests that firm grasp of

¹Adv. Haer. 1.3.

²Ibid., 3.2.2.

³Ibid., praef., 5; 3.38.1. ⁴Ibid., 4.41.2-42.1; 4.49.1.

⁵Ibid., 2.58.2; 3.2.1; praef., 3; 3.51.

⁶Ibid., praef., 3; 3.1.1. ⁷Ibid., 3.2.2; 3.3.1-3; 3.4.1.

the canon of truth received at baptism would prevent a man from distorting the sense of Scripture. He insists that the rule of faith is faithfully preserved by the apostolic Church and has found its various expressions in the canonical books.¹

Hanson² points out that because most of Irenaeus' work does not survive in the original Greek the vocabulary he employed cannot be certainly ascertained, but Irenaeus used the phrase "rule of truth" (κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας) which survives in one Greek fragment. He also uses the words "preaching" (κήρυγμα), "the faith" (ἡ πίστις),³ and "construction" (ὑπόθεσις).⁴ Hanson states that Irenaeus' translator seems to have translated all words used for the rule of faith by the phrase "rule of truth" (regula veritatis).⁵

It seems best to conclude that Irenaeus regarded the rule of faith, or perhaps the creed considered as its summary, as part of the whole inheritance which might be called traditional Christianity.⁶ He regarded the rule as simply a condensation of Scripture and said that the Church's unwritten tradition and Scripture were identical in content, both being vehicles of revelation.⁷

¹Ibid., 1.1.20; 2.41.4. ²Hanson, Tradition, p. 75.

³Adv. Haer. 1.1.20; 1.3. ⁴Ibid., 1.1.20.

⁵Hanson, Tradition, p. 75. ⁶Ibid., p. 96.

⁷Kelly, Doctrines, p. 39.

Tertullian frequently referred to the rule of faith usually using the phrase regula fidei.¹ He considers the rule to have come down from Christ himself, handed down through his companions.² By tradition the Church transmitted the rule which it received from the apostles.³

Flesseman-van Leer points out that Tertullian had two separate conceptions of the rule of faith--as the authentic content of original Christian doctrine and as customs which had been long carried on in the Church.⁴ Tertullian insists that the apostolic authors faithfully recorded what they received from Christ, and nothing is to be added to this deposit of faith. He holds that if a practice lacks Scriptural warrant, good reason must be assigned for it, and, if it is contrary to Scripture, it must be abandoned.⁵

For Tertullian, as for Irenaeus, Scripture was apostolic tradition in written form.⁶ Both of them, Flesseman-van Leer concludes, appealed to Scripture to substantiate their assertions in matters of faith, and both denied "most

¹Hanson, Tradition, p. 77. E.g., Adv. Prax. 3.

²Apol. 7.10.

³De Praescr. Haer. 37.1.

⁴Flesseman-van Leer, Tradition and Scripture, pp. 146-150.

⁵De Praesc. Haer. 6.3-5; De Jej. 10.

⁶Flesseman-van Leer, Tradition and Scripture, p. 191. Hanson, Tradition, p. 111, states that for Tertullian the contents of the rule of faith and the Bible were identical.

decidedly the existence of extra-Scriptural tradition."¹

Clement of Alexandria occasionally uses the word "canon" for the rule of faith employing it in several different expressions: "the ecclesiastical rule" (ἐκκλησιαστικὸς κανὼν)²; "the rule of the Church" (ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας)³; "the rule of truth" (ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας)⁴; and "the rule of faith" (ὁ κανὼν τῆς πίστεως).⁵ Clement claims to possess a secret and authentic tradition which was unwritten and independent of Scripture and which was derived by a succession of teachers from Christ and from his apostles. He calls it a γνῶσις or παράδοσις which includes quasi-Gnostic speculations.⁶ Prestige asserts that Clement claimed the authority of Scriptural texts and thus disclaimed the idea of possessing any private or secret doctrine. He understands Clement to claim that he drew all his arguments from Scripture.⁷ Hanson, however, observes that this should be understood as "Scripture rightly interpreted."⁸ Clement frequently uses the word "tradition" (παράδοσις) for the rule.⁹ He insists that Scripture is to

¹Flesseman-van Leer, Tradition and Scripture, p. 191.

²Strom. 7.7.41. ³Ibid., 1.19.96. ⁴Ibid., 7.16.94.

⁵Ibid., 4.15.98. ⁶Ibid., 1.1.11-12; 6.7.61; 6.8.68.

⁷Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, p. 29.

⁸Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, p. 48.

⁹E.g., Strom. 1.12.56; 6.15.131.

be interpreted according to the rule of faith in the Church.¹

Origen belonged to the same school of thought as Clement, and Clement was, in fact, Origen's main source in his doctrine of tradition.² Origen often refers to the rule of faith, and his usual word for it is κανών.³ He speaks of "the ecclesiastical rule" (ὁ κανὼν ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς)⁴ and identifies the rule with "the purport of sound teaching" (τὴν πρόθεσιν τῆς ὑγιοῦς διδασκαλίας).⁵ For Origen the rule is the body of beliefs currently accepted by ordinary Christians.⁶ By the time of Origen the possibility of oral tradition of any kind surviving was virtually ignored.⁷

Origen, Hanson notes, never made the least attempt to offer the rule of faith as an alternative to the Bible as Irenaeus and Tertullian did, nor did he appeal to a source of knowledge which is unwritten and independent of the Bible as Clement did. It may be concluded that when Origen spoke of the rule of faith, he meant the Christian faith as it was preached and taught by the Church of his day, and as it had been preached and taught since the time of the apostles. The rule's content was identical with that of the Bible and

¹Ibid., 3.10.70; 6.15.124.

²Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, p. 48.

³Hanson, Tradition, p. 78.

⁴Comm. on I Cor. 84.

⁵Hom. on Jer. 5.4.

⁶In Joh., 13.16.98.

⁷Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, p. 192.

was proved from it.¹ The rule, however, was not identified with the Bible.² Hanson observes that Origen believed that there were a number of traditions connected with Christian institutions and worship which derived from the Lord or his apostles and which had come down to his own day independently of the Bible. This view of Origen's is modified in that these traditions are unimportant and do not involve significant modifications of the Bible. It cannot be ascertained that what Origen considered an apostolic institution really is one.³

In Athanasius the infrequent references to tradition are usually made in close relation to his appeal to Scripture. In accusing the Arians of misinterpreting Scripture, he speaks of considering and using the "scope" (σκόπος)⁴ of the faith of Christians as a "rule" (κανών) in the reading and interpretation of Scripture by Christians.⁵ Athanasius' appeal to the scope of Scripture in this instance is for the purpose of establishing that Scripture contains a double account of Christ--his deity and his incarnate life. He seems to consider the scope of Scripture and the scope of faith to be identical. He considers his interpretation of

¹Hanson, SJT, loc. cit., p. 28.

²Hanson, Origen's Doctrine, p. 113. ³Ibid., p. 180.

⁴See Ch. XII for the meaning of "scope" in Athanasius.

⁵C. Ar. III.28.

Phil. 2:9, 10 as having a very "ecclesiastical" (ἐκκλησιαστικῶς) meaning.¹ If the Arians had recognized the ecclesiastical scope, they would not have made shipwreck of their faith.²

Athanasius also declares that the orthodox faith, in contrast to Arianism, is right, for it finds its source in the teaching of the apostles and "tradition" (παράδοσις) of the fathers which is confirmed by both the New Testament and the Old.³ He then proceeds to cite Scripture and states that "the apostolic tradition" (ἡ ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις) so teaches in the words of Peter (I Pet. 4:1). Here tradition and teaching are equated.

Also in his first letter to Serapion Athanasius states that he has "delivered the tradition" (παράδωμι) in accordance with the apostolic faith which was transmitted from the fathers.⁴ In a pastoral letter Athanasius states that the heretics indeed refer to Scripture but do not hold such opinions as the saints have handed down. Paul justly praised the Corinthians, Athanasius says, because their opinions were in accordance with his tradition. The saints (that is, the New Testament writers) imparted without alteration that which they had received. To these teachers only, he asserts, is it necessary to give heed, for they were

¹Ibid., I.44.

²Ibid., III.28.

³Ad Adelph. 6. See Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 424.

⁴Ad Serap. I.33.

eyewitnesses of the Word. That which they heard from the Lord they have handed down.¹

Athanasius² also states that he has invented nothing extraneous to the apostolic faith and that his teaching is also in conformity with the Scriptures. He had previously stated that he summoned them to look at the very "tradition" (παράδοσις), "teaching" (διδασκαλία), and "faith" (πίστις) which the Lord gave, the apostles preached, and the fathers³ kept. Here Athanasius equates tradition, teaching, faith, and the preaching of the apostles, and it is this which the Nicene fathers preserved.⁴ Athanasius professes to express the faith in terms which are derived from the apostles through the fathers.⁵

For Athanasius, then, tradition was not an indefinite source of knowledge which is independent of Scripture. Pollard understands Athanasius' concept of tradition, or the regula fidei, to be a summary of the teaching of Christ and the preaching of the apostles which was used in the instruction of catechumens and based on the baptismal formula of Matt. 28:19. Thus it is also a summary of the New Testament message which is the "precipitate of the Apostolic preaching

¹Ep. Heort. II.6, 7.

²Ad Serap. I.28.

³That is, the fathers of Nicaea. See Shapland, op. cit., p. 133, n. 2.

⁴Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 420. ⁵Ad Serap. II.8.

of the Gospel of Jesus Christ."¹

In connection with a statement on the sufficiency of Scripture Athanasius refers to the compositions of his readers' teachers as media by which they could gain some knowledge of the interpretation of the Scriptures.² In a reference to the confession of faith by the fathers at Nicaea, Athanasius declares that it is in accordance with Scripture.³ In their statement the Nicene fathers acknowledged that their sentiments were not novel but apostolic, for they did not discover them. They are the same as that which was taught by the apostles. If the statement of the Nicene fathers is read honestly, Athanasius asserts, it will be a reminder of the religion toward Christ which is announced in Scripture.⁴ He urges his readers to remain on the foundation of the apostles and to hold fast the tradition of the fathers.⁵

Athanasius also states that those who met at Nicaea handed down the sound faith which Christ gave and which the apostles preached. The fathers of Nicaea are said to breathe the spirit of Scripture. They wished to set down in

¹Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 421. See also Shapland, op. cit., pp. 133, 134, n. 2.

²C. Gen. 1. Robertson, op. cit., IV, 4, n. 3, suggests that this reference may be to works from the Alexandrian school such as Origen's De Principiis.

³Ad Epict. 1. ⁴De Syn. 5, 6. ⁵Ibid., 54.

writing the acknowledged language of Scripture and collected from Scripture appropriate figures and texts.¹ Athanasius also asserts that his view has been handed down from father to father, but the Arians cannot appeal to any father for their terms.² It is evident that for Athanasius the statement of Nicaea was valid, because it was based on Scripture. The Nicene formula did not complicate the faith but safeguarded the Scriptures.³

In the defense of Athanasius and in opposition to those wishing to depose him in his absence, it is asserted that his enemies could appeal for their action to no "ecclesiastical canon" (ἐκκλησιαστικὸς κανὼν). No such "tradition" (παράδοσις) has been transmitted from the fathers who in their turn received tradition from the apostle Peter.⁴ Athanasius declares that Gregory of Alexandria had not received his ordination according to "ecclesiastical rule," nor had he been called to be a bishop by "apostolic tradition" (ἀποστολικὸς παράδοσις).⁵ When he refers to the festival of Passover which Paul delivered, Athanasius defends his announcement of its seasons, for this has been received from the fathers. Thus he keeps the apostolic tradition.⁶ Here there seem to be clear references to ecclesiastical practices

¹Ad Afr. 1, 4-6.

²De Dec. 27.

³Hanson, Tradition, p. 179.

⁴Hist. Ar. 36.

⁵Ibid., 14.

⁶Ep. Heort. II.7.

which were derived from the apostles by tradition without direct Scriptural sanction. It is apparent that Athanasius subscribed to the view that customs and practices relating to the life of the Church which were known to be of long standing could be confidently regarded as instituted by the apostles themselves.¹

Y. Congar's² conclusion that tradition "est formel et abondant chez S. Athanase" is not warranted by the references to tradition in Athanasius. It is evident that Athanasius did not regard tradition as a second source of doctrine parallel with Scripture. In its contents he seems to have regarded tradition as identical with Scripture as did the fathers who preceded him.³ It is clear, (Hanson concludes), that Athanasius took the same attitude to tradition, the rule of faith, in relation to Scripture as that which was normal with the fathers of the second half of the second century and of the third century.⁴ All of them regarded the rule as subject to proof from the Bible.⁵ ^{We may} Kelly concludes that throughout the third and fourth centuries Scripture and tradition ranked as complementary authorities--different in form but coincident in content.⁶

¹See Hanson, Tradition, p. 181.

²Congar, op. cit., p. 60.

³Hanson, Tradition, p. 125. ⁴Ibid., p. 180.

⁵Ibid., p. 125. ⁶Kelly, Doctrines, p. 47.

The Sufficiency of Scripture

Integrally related to the concept of tradition is the principle of the sufficiency of Scripture. Athanasius explicitly declares that the Scriptures are sufficient for the declaration of the truth.¹ In commenting on the councils called by the Arians, he declares that Scripture is "sufficient above all things" (ἱκανωτέρα πάντων).² In concluding his list of the books of the Old and New Testaments, Athanasius states that these are "fountains of salvation" so that those who thirst may be satisfied with their living words. In these alone, he asserts, is proclaimed the doctrine of godliness. No man is to add to or subtract from them.³ When Athanasius writes to Serapion concerning the Holy Spirit, he declares that the illustrations which Scripture contains are "sufficient" (αὐτάρκης) and "suitable" (ἱκανός), and therefore Serapion is to learn only that which is in Scripture.⁴ Athanasius recommends to those who wish to know more about the matters of which he writes that they read the Scriptures which are most sufficient of all things.⁵

The sufficiency of Scripture is implicit in his declaration that proofs from Scripture will be directed at the Arians to disprove their teaching.⁶

Athanasius' concept of the sufficiency of Scripture

¹C. Gen. 1. ²De Syn. 6. ³Ep. Heort. XXXIX.6.

⁴Ad Serap. I.19. ⁵Ad Episc. Aeg. 4. ⁶C. Ar. I. 10.

is readily evident in his constant recourse to Scripture in establishing his teaching. As Robertson points out, Athanasius follows up precept by example, for his works are a continuous appeal to Scripture.¹ Bright refers to a statement by Keble in which he states that Athanasius was ready "to commit his cause to the witness of Scripture, and to follow the voice of Scripture wherever it should lead him."² The emphasis of Athanasius on the sufficiency of Scripture, in the opinion of Pollard,³ is in itself the refutation of van den Eynde's assertion that Scripture is insufficient to maintain the faith and to resolve controversial questions and that therefore the Scriptures must be explained by tradition.⁴

Gore concludes that when the canon of the New Testament was formulated:

It was taken for granted that the apostolic doctrine had been expressed once for all in the books now canonized and that the final reference was to the books. So it was laid down peremptorily by Origen, by Athanasius, by the Fathers generally without any hesitation. . . . The Fathers certainly affirm that nothing can be orthodox which is not scriptural.⁵

¹Robertson, op. cit., IV, lxxiv.

²Bright, The Age of the Fathers, I, 87.

³Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 422.

⁴Van den Eynde, op. cit., p. 280.

⁵Gore, New Commentary, loc. cit., Part I, p. 16.

CHAPTER VI

THE SIGNIFICANT BOOKS AND PASSAGES

The writings of Athanasius abound with direct quotations from the Scriptures, and also contain a large number of references and allusions that cannot be readily identified. His language is filled with Biblical turns of phrase and lengthy pronouncements which are taken directly from Scripture. With the exception of Contra Gentes Athanasius' quotations are usually short, comprising only one or two verses. In his use of Scripture he is consistently meticulous in giving exactly the correct Scripture text.¹ Athanasius, Nordberg affirms, was a Biblicist in the sense that he made abundant use of direct quotations.²

The Use of the Old Testament

It has been observed that in common with the writers of the New Testament and the early fathers Athanasius read the Old Testament as a Christian book.³ Consequently, in establishing the doctrine of the Trinity and especially in his discussion of the doctrine of Christ, he could turn to the Old Testament for proof almost as readily as to the New. His view of the Old Testament as well as the whole Bible was

¹Nordberg, AAPF, loc. cit., pp. 120, 121.

²Ibid., p. 121.

³Supra, pp. 68 ff.

Christocentric.

In his use of the Old Testament as a basis for the doctrine of the Trinity, Athanasius used three of its books far more extensively than the others: Genesis, Psalms, and Isaiah.¹ The references to the Psalms predominate. This may be compared with the use of the Old Testament in the New. Swete finds that there are approximately one hundred sixty Old Testament passages directly quoted in the New. Of these, forty are from the Psalms and thirty-eight are from Isaiah. Thus almost half of the citations are from these two books. The Pentateuch accounts for fifty-one--mostly from Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy.²

This, in turn, may be compared with Paul's quotations from the Old Testament which comprise one third of all Old Testament quotations in the New.³ Ellis states that Old Testament quotations in the Pauline Epistles are taken from sixteen books with thirty-three from the Pentateuch, twenty-five from Isaiah, and nineteen from the Psalms. The quotations

¹Following these three books in their number of references, though not as copiously referred to, are Deuteronomy, Proverbs, and Jeremiah. His concept of the Son as Wisdom and his refutations of certain Arian texts in Proverbs account for the majority of references from Proverbs.

²Swete, op. cit., pp. 381-392.

³Ellis, op. cit., p. 11. It should be noted that Swete speaks of the Old Testament passages found in the New, and that Ellis refers to Paul's quotations of the Old Testament. Ellis enumerates each use of a single passage found in more than one place.

from these three sources comprise three fourths of Paul's quotations from the Old Testament.¹ Bonsirven corroborates Ellis' statements in affirming that, in both his implicit and explicit Old Testament citations, Paul had a preference for Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Psalms, and Isaiah.² The majority of references in Athanasius to Genesis are to chapters 1, 18, 19, 26, 28, 31, and 32.³

In the Psalms there are a number of significant passages to which frequent references are made: Ps. 33:6, 9; 24; 45:1, 6, 7; 102:25-27; 104:24, 29, 31. Of these passages from Psalms, Ps. 33:6 seems to be echoed in Heb. 11:3 and in II Pet. 3:5. The author of Hebrews (in 1:8, 9) quotes Ps. 45:6, 7 as an ascription to the Son. He also quotes Ps. 102:25-27 as a reference to the Son (Heb. 1:10-12). Ps. 110:1 is either quoted and ascribed directly to the Son, or forms the basis of, or is apparently alluded to in the following passages: Matt. 22:44 (parallels in Mk. 12:36 and Luke 20:42, 43); Matt. 26:64 (parallels in Mk. 14:62 and Luke 22:69); Acts 2:34; I Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3, 13; and 12:2. Stendahl notes the great significance that Matt. 22:44 has had for the Christian

¹Ibid.

²Joseph Bonsirven, Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne (Paris, 1939), pp. 284-290.

³See Part III for Athanasius' use and interpretation of these and the following passages.

interpretation of the Old Testament.¹

The principal passages in Isaiah that Athanasius employed in establishing the doctrine of the Trinity are 7:14; 9:6; 44:24; and 66:2. Of these passages from Isaiah the following are used in the New Testament: Is. 7:14 in Matt. 1:23; and Is. 66:(1), 2 in Acts 7:49, 50. The latter passage, however, does not refer to the Son.

The well-known hypothesis of a testimony book propounded by Rendel Harris includes Athanasius in its scope. On the basis of Athanasius' use of Num. 24:5-7, 17 (and its ascription to Moses); Gen. 49:10; and Is. 35:1-6;² Harris affirms that Athanasius, in common with other Church fathers, used a "book of testimonies."³

Dodd⁴ concludes that Harris carried his hypothesis to too great lengths--his theory outran the evidence. Dodd adopts the hypothesis that there were some parts of

¹Krister Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament (Uppsala, 1954), p. 211.

²In De Inc. 33, 38, 40.

³Rendel Harris with the assistance of Vacher Burch, Testimonies (Cambridge: University Press, 1916 and 1920), I, 87-93.

⁴C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology (London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952), pp. 23-27, 60 ff., 126, 130. He gives fifteen instances where there are strong grounds for believing that the New Testament writers were working on a tradition in which certain passages of the Old Testament were treated as "testimonies" to the Gospel facts. Ibid., pp. 31-37. See infra, pp. 137, 138, for Sundberg's criticism of Dodd's view.

Scripture which were early recognized as appropriate sources from which the testimonies might be drawn. From these sections, which were drawn from Isaiah, Jeremiah, certain minor prophets, and the Psalms, verses or sentences were quoted as pointers to the whole context rather than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves. In their use of these passages the New Testament writers remained true to the main intention of their writers, but in the transposition into a fresh situation a certain shift in the nature of an expansion of the passage's original scope is apparent. He suggests that it was Jesus himself who was the creative thinker who initiated this process of rethinking the Old Testament.

Lindars¹ declares that Dodd struck the "death blow" to Harris' theory, and Kilpatrick² considers it improbable that Harris' theory is sound. Kilpatrick avers that though the earliest known testimony books came from Tertullian and Cyprian, collections of this kind may be older than their testimony books, and a traditional apologetic exposition of selected texts of Scripture must be older still. This implies that at an early date there existed a common stock of exegesis of the Old Testament. It need not be implied,

¹Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961), p. 13.

²G. D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 66.

Kilpatrick affirms, that the first century Christians had a testimony book apart from the Greek Bible itself. It can be said that this Greek Bible was their testimony book. Collections of Messianic testimony texts have been found, however, in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹

Stendahl rejects Harris' hypothesis and concludes that:

The methods of the synagogue in dealing with the texts of the O.T., both in liturgical reading and in teaching, account for most of the features Harris wanted to explain by his Book of Testimonies.²

He points out that this is not to say that the primitive Church did not know and use testimonies--oral or even written. He suggests that there was interpretative adaptation and selection.³

Dodd's theory that the New Testament texts pointed to the context rather than an atomistic usage is criticized by Sundberg.⁴ He also discredits Dodd's view that a traditional method of exegesis of Old Testament passages existed. This, he holds, is not borne out in the passages, and, in fact, Dodd's theory is only a variation in form of Harris'

¹Barnabas Lindars, "Second Thoughts: IV. Books of Testimonies," ET (75, 1963-64), pp. 173, 175.

²Stendahl, op. cit., p. 217. ³Ibid., pp. 207-217.

⁴Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., "On Testimonies," NT (3-4, 1959-60), pp. 277-280.

hypothesis of a testimony book. Sundberg and also Dodd¹ question whether such a book, if it had existed, could have been omitted from the canon.

In an examination of the Epistle of Barnabas Prigent concludes that in this work Biblical quotations are not so much testimony books as little "gospels." These are couched in Scriptural terms and are primarily concerned with the death and resurrection of Christ but gradually enlarged to form summaries of the Christian faith.² Lindars observes that Prigent's study serves to throw into relief the complexity of the problem.³

Lindars rejects the theories of Harris, Dodd, and Stendahl, for "they fail to satisfy, because they do not do justice to all the phenomena of the quotations."⁴ Lindars suggests that there are various possibilities which presuppose a complicated picture of the exegetical work of the early Church: Scriptural allusions in oral teaching; liturgical texts, and "little gospels" using Old Testament quotations and allusions; short collections of testimonies for apologetic purposes; and short collections of text-and-

¹Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 26.

²Pierre Prigent, L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses Sources: Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme primitif (Paris, 1961), pp. 217-219. For a continuation of this argument see Pierre Prigent, Justin et l'Ancien Testament (Paris, 1964).

³Lindars, ET. loc. cit., p. 174.

⁴Ibid.

commentary embodying the results of a growing tradition of exegesis.¹

In evaluating Athanasius' use of the Old Testament, though it is not impossible that he used a book of testimonies, it seems more plausible to suggest that his approach to and use of the Old Testament, both in specific passages and method, were those which were currently and previously used in the exposition of Old Testament Scripture in the Church. This seems adequate to explain his use and interpretation of the Old Testament without resorting to the hypothesis of a testimony book. In general both the Scriptural content and method go back to the New Testament itself.²

The Use of the New Testament

The great majority of New Testament references in Athanasius in relation to the Trinitarian doctrine are to the Fourth Gospel. There are some passages that constantly recur in Athanasius' argument: John 1:1-3, 14, 18; 10:30; 14:6, 9, 10 (11), 16, 17, 23, 26; 15:26; 16:13-15; and 17:10.³

In Sanders' opinion the Fourth Gospel appears to have been used first of all by the Gnostics. There seem to be no certain traces of its use in the apostolic fathers.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 175.

²See Parts III and IV.

³See Part III for Athanasius' use of Scripture.

⁴J. N. Sanders, The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church (Cambridge: University Press, 1943), p. 86.

Sanders' conclusion is questioned by Braun¹ who says that it is unlikely, if this is the case, that the leaders of the Church would have placed the Fourth Gospel on a level with the Synoptics. Braun justifiably criticizes Sanders' statements also on the basis that Sanders has not taken all the evidence into account such as the Egyptian papyri (e.g., Papyrus Egerton 2) and the Apocrypha. Sanders' evidence is limited to the Gnostics, apostolic fathers, and apologists. Braun also questions Sanders' strictness in his view of the ancient writers, for it is possible to discern in their writings a fairly extensive use and recognition of the Fourth Gospel which Sanders does not acknowledge.²

It should also be noted that the earliest commentary on John was from the pen of Heracleon, a Valentinian Gnostic. This, Wiles affirms, is no accident, for at first this Gospel seems to have received a wider circulation among the Gnostics than among the orthodox.³

Theophilus (c. 180 A.D.) seems to be the first writer

¹F.-M. Braun, Jean Le Theologien et son Évangile dans l'Église ancienne (Paris, 1959), pp. 73, 74, 290 ff.

²As in The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers by a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).

³Wiles, Spiritual Gospel, p. 96. See also Sanders, Fourth Gospel, pp. 47, 65, 66; and C. K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text (London: SPCK, 1955), p. 106.

whose works are extant to have ascribed the Fourth Gospel to "John." Sanders affirms that the first definite traces not only of the use of this Gospel but also its decisive influence upon the actual theological thought of an orthodox Christian can be found in the writings of Irenaeus. Irenaeus is the first catholic writer to overcome the prejudice which appears to have been felt against the Fourth Gospel, in Rome at least, in the last half of the second century. Though Irenaeus quoted much more frequently from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke than from the Gospel of John, they did not have the crucial importance for him that the quotations from John did. Sanders observes that:

These quotations are not so directly relevant to his central theological themes as are those from the Fourth Gospel. Irenaeus in fact uses the Fourth Gospel as the regula veritatis, and builds his theology upon it. . . .¹

It is probable that through the influence of Irenaeus the Fourth Gospel was eventually accepted as canonical Scripture when he had shown that it was in fact the "cornerstone of orthodoxy." For him this Gospel was of cardinal importance. "The normative influence of the Fourth Gospel continues through the great Alexandrians, Clement, Origen and Athanasius."²

In the struggle between Gnosticism and orthodoxy both

¹Sanders, Fourth Gospel, pp. 35, 66, 72, 73.

²Ibid., pp. 84, 87.

sides accepted the authority of the Fourth Gospel but interpreted it differently. An essential element in the controversy was its right exegesis.¹ The struggle with Gnosticism involved a consideration of correct exegesis on a broad front, Wiles asserts, but subsequent heresies, especially the Arian controversy, involved a similar consideration of the correct exegesis of the Gospel on the narrower front of Christological interpretation.²

The Arian controversy was based on more than the "forced interpretation of a few isolated texts," Wiles observes.³ Its exegetical basis was far broader than any of the earlier heresies, and its use of the Fourth Gospel was extensive.⁴ In the Arian controversy both sides accepted the authority of the Fourth Gospel but interpreted it differently. Finally, it was the Fourth Gospel, Pollard states, that provided Athanasius with his most "effective and devastating weapon" in defending the Biblical faith against the powerful attacks of a highly speculative theology.⁵

Conybeare, on the importance of the Fourth Gospel for Athanasius and orthodoxy, points out that:

It may indeed be said that if Athanasius had

¹Wiles, Spiritual Gospel, p. 96.

²Ibid., p. 112.

³Ibid., p. 121.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Thomas Evan Pollard, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Arian Controversy, an unpublished Ph.D. thesis in the University of St. Andrews, 1956.

not had the Fourth Gospel to draw texts from, Arius would never have been confuted. Had the fathers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries not known this Gospel, or not embraced it as authentic, the Church would have remained semi-Ebionite, and the councils of Nice and Ephesus would never have taken place.¹

The other principal sources for the doctrine of the Trinity in Athanasius, though not as determinative in importance, are Matthew and Hebrews, and, to a lesser extent, I Corinthians, Philippians, and Colossians. The passages from Matthew that most frequently occur are 3:17 (17:5); 11:27 (parallel in Luke 10:22); 16:16; and 28:18-20. The passages from Hebrews are individual verses or groups of verses in 1:1-14. Heb. 13:8 is also frequently used. In I Corinthians the passages that predominate in Athanasius are 1:24 and 8:6. Individual verses or groups of verses from Phil. 2:6-11 frequently occur. There are also frequent references to Col. 1:15-18--either to a part of it or to the entire passage.

The important passages used by Athanasius from the New Testament, and also those from the Old, are those that emphasize the deity and triumph of Christ, the deity of the Holy Spirit, and the unity of the Trinity. These were the points at issue in Athanasius' conflict with Arianism. He turned to those passages which most readily gave support for his doctrine of the Trinity and which lent themselves to his

¹Fred. C. Conybeare, review of Le Quatrième Évangile by Alfred Loisy, in HJ (II, 1903-04), p. 620.

criticism of the Arian use and exegesis of specific passages of Scripture.

SUMMARY

In his concept of Scripture Athanasius stands in the tradition of the Church fathers. His pre-critical attitude toward the production and inspiration of the Scriptures is essentially that of the preceding writers of the early Church including the attitude evidenced in the New Testament. In that the Old Testament was considered a Christian book with an essential unity to the New Testament, it would provide Athanasius with proofs for his Trinitarian doctrine almost as readily as the New. For Athanasius Scripture, comprising the Old and New Testaments, was the final authority for his teaching.

In the history of the Old Testament canon Athanasius followed the Alexandrian practice of enumerating the books of the Palestinian canon, but did not limit his references to the Hebrew canon. With Jeremiah and Daniel he included several additional writings. Athanasius is the first to give the New Testament canon as it stands today without any questions raised about any of the books that had been disputed up to his time. He dismissed the apocryphal books as heretical but listed seven books which were not to be used for doctrine but could be used for reading by catechumens.

In practice, however, Athanasius did not scruple to refer to this Old Testament extra-canonical literature as Scripture and apparently as authoritative.

It seems that Athanasius considered certain Church practices to be sanctioned by tradition of long standing though not by Scripture itself. He appears to refer to tradition, the rule of faith, as a summary of Christian teaching and perhaps as including the development of doctrine. The rule is not a second source of doctrine but is always subject to proof from the Scriptures. Athanasius explicitly affirmed the sufficiency of Scripture for Christian doctrine.

In establishing and defending the Trinitarian doctrine Athanasius turned to the Biblical passages that had already been employed by New Testament writers or to passages that most readily suggested themselves for Athanasius' purposes. These included especially the Christological passages and passages referring to the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel, other Christological passages in the New Testament, passages suggesting a Trinity, and Old Testament passages that could be employed to indicate the activity of the Persons of the Trinity in Old Testament history.

PART III. ATHANASIUS' METHODS OF EXEGESIS

CHAPTER VII

WISDOM-HAND-WORD CHRISTOLOGY

In establishing and defending the doctrine of the Trinity, Athanasius did not hesitate to use the Old Testament as well as the New. In demonstrating the deity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and the unity of the Trinity, Athanasius drew his evidence from the whole of Scripture, for the Old Testament is a Christian book as well as the New Testament.¹ This is especially evident in his doctrine of Christ. G. Henton Davies states that "certainly there is warrant in the Gospels, in the apostles and in various branches of the Christian tradition to look for a pre-existent Christ in the Old Testament."²

Christ as the Wisdom of God

The exegesis of Prov. 8:22

Athanasius explains Prov. 8:22, "The Lord created me a beginning of his ways for his works," at greater length and more thoroughly than any other text that he considers.³

¹See supra, pp. 68 ff.

²G. Henton Davies, "Contemporary Religious Trends," ET (LXVII, 1955-56), p. 6.

³See C. Ar. II.18-32. The three discourses against the Arians are comprised almost entirely of a series of discussions of passages that were interpreted by the Arians as teaching that the Son is a creature and mutable:

No text of the Old Testament was so frequently quoted by the early theologians in the course of their investigation of the doctrine of the Trinity, especially in its relationship to the doctrine of the Son.¹ The Arians found in it a decisive argument in favor of their view, for in the Septuagint version it gave a distinct advantage to the Arian view that the Son is a creature.² Prov. 8:22 was a well established testimony text and was one of the corner stones of the Arian system. Athanasius goes to great lengths to show that the Arians misinterpreted the text and with it the entire passage in which it occurs (8:22-31), but it never occurs to him to question whether the text is truly relevant to the formulation of the doctrine of the Son.³

Athanasius accepts without question the identification of "Wisdom" (Σοφία) in Prov. 8:22-31, as well as in other passages, with Christ. This identification was

Phil. 2:9, 10; Ps. 45:6, 7; Prov. 8:22; etc. Athanasius not only sets out to demonstrate the error of the Arians' interpretation but also sets forth his own interpretation. This is accomplished by an examination of the passage itself in its context and by a comparison with other passages of Scripture.

¹See infra, pp. 161 ff., for the background and history of the conception of Wisdom and the Son as Wisdom.

²Jules Lebreton, History of the Dogma of the Trinity, trans. Algar Thorold from 8th ed. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1939), I, 93.

³M. F. Wiles, "The Old Testament in Controversy with the Jews," SJT (8, 1955), pp. 125, 126.

pursued especially by the Greek fathers in the patristic period.¹ In his history of interpretation Gilbert asserts that "it is highly and variously characteristic of patristic exegesis that its great christological proof-text was taken from Proverbs."² Athanasius assumes that Prov. 8:22 refers to the Son, and therefore it was incumbent upon him to establish its true meaning and to refute the interpretation put on it by the Arians. An examination of this passage will give some indication of the direction that Athanasius' exegesis of specific Scriptural passages takes.

In his consideration of this text Athanasius compares it with Prov. 9:1, "Wisdom made herself a house." Therefore the words, "He created me," indicate that Wisdom's house is his body. The expression, "The Word was made flesh" (John 1:14), is consistent with this interpretation. He notes that Wisdom does not say of himself that he is a creature.³ The passage is to be interpreted as a reference to the incarnation of the Son. Thus Prov. 8:22 does not state that Wisdom

¹R. N. Whybray, Wisdom in Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9 (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1965), pp. 11, 12. See infra, pp. 178 ff., for the identification of the Son as Wisdom in the Church fathers.

²George Holley Gilbert, Interpretation of the Bible: A Short History (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908), p. 123.

³"Wisdom," though feminine in gender, will be considered masculine in that Athanasius identified "Wisdom" as the Son. The only exception will be in direct Biblical quotations.

was created to have being or existence, but it indicates the incarnation of the Word.¹

Subsequently Athanasius uses this whole passage (Prov. 8:22-31) to indicate that the wisdom implanted in man is an image of the Son considered as Wisdom. In this wisdom men receive the creative Wisdom and are enabled to know the Father, for it is stated, "He who has the Son has the Father also" (I John 2:23), and, "He who receives me, receives him who sent me" (Matt. 10:40). Because his "impress" (τύπος) is in men, therefore it is written, "He who receives you receives me" (Matt. 10:40). Thus Athanasius regards this wisdom as the image of the creative Wisdom, and by this image the world can recognize in its own Creator the one who is the Word and through the Word recognize the Father. Proof of this may be found in Rom. 1:19, 20, "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has showed it unto them: for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen." On this basis, Athanasius contends, the Word is not a creature. The wisdom which

¹C. Ar. II.44. Athanasius repeatedly interprets any language attributing createdness or other human qualities to the incarnation, e.g., Ad Episc. Aeg. 17. In Athanasius' interpretation of such passages as Acts 2:36 as well as Prov. 8:22, John 1:1 with John 1:14 are crucial passages, for in his view they point both to the Son's eternity and to his incarnation. Thus they indicate the sense in which human qualities are attributable to the eternal Son. See C. Ar. I.44, 45; II.11-13. In Athanasius' thought the eternity of the Son and his incarnate life are always to be distinguished in interpreting passages referring to the Son.

is man's, he concludes, is referred to in this passage in Proverbs. That this wisdom is in man is evident in the words of Paul, "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God" (I Cor. 1:21). By this wisdom within them, men will recognize the true Wisdom of God.¹ It is true, as Wiles notes, that Athanasius' interpretations of Prov. 8:22 are not entirely consistent.² However, it should be pointed out that they are not completely inconsistent, for the second interpretation is also an extension of Athanasius' thought with a different emphasis. The second interpretation is based on the first which states that Christ is the Wisdom of God whose "creation" refers to his incarnation.

Prov. 3:19, "God in Wisdom established the earth," with Prov. 9:1, "Wisdom made herself a house," Athanasius affirms, indicates that "created" in Prov. 8:22 cannot relate to something which is subsequent to the Word, or that which the Son created would have existed before he did, for the Son is the creator and sustainer of all things (John 1:3; Col. 1:17).³

The statement in Prov. 8:22 is equivalent to saying that the Father prepared a body for the Son (Heb. 10:5). Also John 1:14, "The Word was made flesh," is not to be understood to teach that the whole Word is flesh, but that he

¹C. Ar. II.78, 79. ²Wiles, SJT, loc. cit., p. 126.

³C. Ar. II.50.

put on flesh and became man.¹ Prov. 8:22 does not speak of the creation of the Son, for the Son is not a creature. It is not Christ who is created, but we are created in him, "For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:10). The words, "He created," are therefore written for man's sake. As the Father is eternal, so his Word is eternal. Athanasius substantiates this statement by two Biblical references: one from the context of this passage, "I was daily his delight" (Prov. 8:30); and the other from the Fourth Gospel, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10, 11).²

It is necessary, Athanasius insists, to distinguish between "create" (κρίζω), or "make" (ποιέω), and "beget" (γεννᾶω). Language is used to indicate that the Word was created or made when he became flesh; but when his "generation" (γέννησις) is referred to in an absolute sense, the words, "Before all the hills he begets me" (Prov. 8:25), are immediately added. No reason is given when his "generation" is spoken of, but a reason is given when there is a reference to his creation. Athanasius also refers to John 1:3 as showing that this distinction is true, "All things were made through him."³

¹Ibid., II.47. See also De Dec. 14. ²C. Ar. II.56.

³Ibid. In his interpretation of Heb. 1:4 Athanasius makes this same distinction between "made" (γίνονται) and "beget" (γεννᾶω) (see C. Ar. I.56).

In their interpretation of Prov. 8:22 the Arians also referred to Dt. 32:6, 17 as expressing their concept of the Son, for the passage in Deuteronomy equates "create" and "beget": "Is he not your Father that bought you, did he not make you and create you?" and, "God that begot you, you did desert, and forget God that nourished you." To counter their argument Athanasius points out that "create" precedes "begot" in this passage. To demonstrate the distinction between the two words in question he refers to two passages: John 1:12, 13, "He gave them power to become the sons of God . . . which were born . . ."; and Mal. 2:10, "Has not one God created us? Have we not all one Father?" Thus God creates through the Word, and then he makes sons. The difference in nature between creature and offspring is indicated in Prov. 8:22 and 8:25: "The Lord created me a beginning of his ways," and, "Before all the hills, he begot me." If the Son were a creature, he "begot me" would not be added. The close connection of "begot me" with "created me" shows that "created" refers to the incarnation, for in reality he was begotten before he was created (incarnated), as it is stated that he was begotten "before all the hills." His "begetting" precedes his "creating." Thus the Son is other than and before all things.¹

This difference between "beget" and "create" is also

¹C. Ar. II.58-60.

said to be evident in other passages: Gen. 1:1 speaks of creation, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," as does Ps. 119:73, "Your hands . . . have made me and fashioned me." However, John 1:1, "In the beginning was the Word," speaks of the Word in contrast to Gen. 1:1 which speaks of creatures.¹

Athanasius emphasizes the distinction made in Scripture between Wisdom and creatures. This difference is evident in Heb. 4:12, 13, "The word of God is quick and powerful . . . neither is there any creature hidden before him, . . . him with whom we have to do." The same distinction is also made in Rom. 8:21, 22 where it is stated that the whole creation groans together with man to be set free from bondage, but the Son is not one of the creation but is the one who gives sonship and freedom. This is shown in John 8:35, 36, "The servant does not remain in the house forever, but the Son remains forever; if then the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." This, Athanasius contends, demonstrates that the Son is not a creature but is a true Son and is by nature truly of the Father.²

That the Son is of the Father's own essence is also proved from the context of Prov. 8:22, for in Prov. 8:30 it is stated, "I was always rejoicing before him, and daily his

¹Ibid., II.57. See also De Dec. 13, 17.

²C. Ar. II.72.

delight." These words are to be interpreted literally to indicate that the Son always rejoices in the Father, and therefore the Son was always in him. The Father also rejoices in the Son. Thus he in whom the Father rejoices is eternal. Athanasius then states that the Father sees his own image in his Word, and the Son sees himself in the Father. This is evident in the words of John 14:9, 10, 11, "He who has seen me, has seen the Father," and, "I am in the Father and the Father in me."¹

Athanasius also discusses the phrase, "A beginning of ways" (Prov. 8:22). He brings out what he considers its true meaning by references to other passages in the Scriptures which also speak of Christ as "the way": John 14:6 and 10:7, "I am the way" and "the door"; and Heb. 10:20 which speaks of "a new and living way." Those who enter through him and walk along the way will hear the words, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8). The first way through Adam was lost, and therefore the Word became incarnate to open a new way. Those who enter this new way are a new creation (II Cor. 5:17). If a new creation has come into being, Athanasius reasons, someone must be the first of that creation. It cannot be man the transgressor, and therefore it must be the Son. As the beginning of the new creation he is created as "a beginning

¹Ibid., II.82.

of ways for his works" (Prov. 8:22), and thus men can follow him of whom it is said in Col. 1:18, "He is the head of the body the church, who is the beginning, the First-born from the dead, that in all things he might have pre-eminence."¹

Athanasius also accuses the Arians of misinterpreting Prov. 8:23, "He founded me before the world," which, with Prov. 8:22, seems to indicate that Wisdom was created. Athanasius' refutation of their interpretation consists first in an appeal to Prov. 3:19, "The Lord by Wisdom founded the earth." If the Father founds the earth by Wisdom, how can he who founds be founded? The Scriptures, Athanasius asserts, show also that the Son who is indicated in the passage is truly Son of the Father, for it is stated in Matt. 16:16, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." He is "founded," in Athanasius' view, for the sake of those who are built on him, for this accords with I Cor. 3:10, 11, "Other foundation can no man lay than is laid, which is Jesus Christ; but let every man take heed how he builds thereupon." Therefore by virtue of his incarnation, Athanasius avers, the Son is founded that men may build on him, and thus the words, "He founded me," refer to the incarnation.²

The words in Prov. 8:23-25, "Before the world," "Before the earth was made," and, "Before the mountains were settled," in Athanasius' estimation, are interpreted by Paul.

¹Ibid., II.65, 66.

²Ibid., II.73, 74.

This is said to be evident in two passages: II Tim. 1:9, 10, "According to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began but is now made manifest . . ."; and Eph. 1:3-5, ". . . in Christ Jesus, according as he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world . . ." In his own Word God has prepared life and salvation for man before the world. In his coming in the flesh the Word is laid as a foundation for man, and then God's will and purpose became effective. A further proof of this interpretation is Matt. 25:34, "Come, blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." The kingdom was prepared before the world by virtue of the "founding" of the Lord for the purpose of bringing grace and life to men.¹

True Wisdom, Athanasius concludes, is not a creature, for when it is stated in Prov. 8:27, "When he prepared the heaven, I was present with him," this creation was not done without Wisdom, for "without him was not one thing made" (John 1:3). In that he created all things, he could not be included with created things. He is the true Word of the Father. He is Creator and not creature.²

In this examination of Athanasius' interpretation of Prov. 8:22 (with its context), it is evident that he finds it crucial to interpret it in such a way that it will

¹Ibid., II.75, 76.

²Ibid., II.81.

support the orthodox doctrine of the Son. Wiles concludes that Athanasius, in accepting this text as a legitimate test though it clearly fits the Arian system better than his own, "indulges in the most complex, and at times inconsistent, exegesis to avoid the Arian implications."¹

Christ as Wisdom in Athanasius

In following his exegesis, it has been intimated that Athanasius considered Wisdom to be Creator. Athanasius explicitly declares that he who is the Wisdom of God is Creator of all things, for it is said in Ps. 104:24, "In Wisdom you have made them all"; in Prov. 8:27, "When he prepared the heaven, I was present with him"; and in Prov. 3:19, "The Lord by Wisdom founded the earth, by understanding he has established the heavens." This could not be done, Athanasius avows, without Wisdom, for "without him was not one thing made that was made" (John 1:3).²

It seems apparent then that Athanasius assumes in his interpretation of these Old Testament passages that "Wisdom" is to be identified with Christ. In identifying Wisdom as Creator (Ps. 104:24; Prov. 8:27), he further identifies Wisdom as the Word (John 1:3).³ In De Decretis the Son is declared to be the very Word and Wisdom of the Father on the basis of I Cor. 1:24, "Christ the Power of God and the

¹Wiles, SJT, loc. cit., p. 126. ²C. Ar. I.19. ³Ibid.

Wisdom of God." As the Word is the only-begotten Son, in this Word and Wisdom all things were made, for after John said, "And the Word was made flesh," he immediately added, "And we saw his glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John 1:14).¹

Athanasius also interprets the "Hand" of God to be the Son.² That the "Hand" of God is "Wisdom" and "Word" may be seen in Ps. 104:24, "In Wisdom you have made them all; the earth is full of your creation"; Prov. 3:19, "The Lord by Wisdom founded the earth," and John 1:1-3, "In the beginning was the Word, . . . and without him was not one thing made." Apparently Athanasius makes this identification on the basis of his conception that creation is the work of the Son who is the Hand of God, and to whom are given various titles in Scripture. He refers to several Biblical passages which are purported to identify the "Hand" of God as "Son" and "Image." The "Hand" is the Son, for it is stated in Heb. 1:1, 2, "God, who in many ways and in various manners has spoken in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom he has appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the ages," and in I Cor. 8:6, "There is one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, by whom also he made the ages." These designations, in turn, are identified as the "Image" of the

¹De Dec. 15.

²See infra, pp. 182 ff.

Father on the basis of Col. 1:12-17, "Giving thanks to God and the Father . . . Son . . . who is the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist."¹

It is readily apparent that in his interpretation of Prov. 8:22 and other related passages of Old Testament Scriptures Athanasius "personifies" or "hypostatizes" Wisdom.² Wisdom, in turn, is identified as the Son. In this interpretation various passages both in the Old and New Testaments are associated.

¹De Dec. 17. See also Ad Serap. II.8. In Contra Gentes Athanasius states that the Son who is God and only-begotten Son (John 1:1, 18) derives his true existence from God on the basis of Col. 1:15-18. See C. Gen. 40, 41.

²O. S. Rankin, Israel's Wisdom Literature (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), p. 224, speaks of the difficulty of definition attached to the words "personification" and "hypostasis" when they are applied to the "Word," the "Spirit," or "Wisdom." The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, rev. and ed. C. T. Onions (3rd ed. rev. with addenda; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), defines "personification" as the act of personifying or representing a thing or abstraction as a person (II, 1479), and "hypostatization" as the act of making or treating as a substance, hence to treat as a "person" (I, 946). "Personification" will be used, therefore, to refer to the ascription of human qualities to a thing or abstraction, and "hypostatization" to the treatment of the thing or abstraction as a person.

The background of the conception
of Wisdom

The first glimmer of the personification of Wisdom in the Old Testament is found in Job 28:12-27 (RSV), "But where shall wisdom be found? . . . Man does not know the way of it" In this passage it amounts to little more than a poetic expression referring to the divine quality of Wisdom, but it at least marks the beginning in the Old Testament of the personification of Wisdom.¹ The idea of Wisdom both as a human attribute and as a gift of God appears frequently in the Old Testament but especially in the book of Proverbs. It is represented as a person only in a few passages, all of which occur in Proverbs.²

It is difficult to decide, however, whether Wisdom is personified, or whether it is hypostatized in Prov. 8:22-31. Whybray concludes that in Proverbs Wisdom has assumed a degree of reality as a being distinguishable from, though not independent of, God, and that Wisdom has become a divine agent rather than only a divine attribute.³

The meaning of "personification" in the context of

¹Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1958), p. 156. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: SPCK, 1948), p. 167, holds that in Job 28:12-27 Wisdom is to some extent personified. Samuel Rolles Driver and George Buchanan Gray, The Book of Job, in ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), p. 242, conclude that in this passage Wisdom is clearly hypostatized (perhaps "hypostatize" is in the sense of "personify").

²Whybray, op. cit., p. 12.

³Ibid., p. 13.

the passages in Proverbs is the representation as a person of that which is not a person. In this sense, Whybray affirms, Wisdom is certainly personified (that is, hypostatized) in at least some of the passages in Proverbs.¹ In the opinion of Whiteley Wisdom is virtually, if not explicitly, hypostatized both in the Old Testament passages that speak of Wisdom and also in passages in extra-canonical books. It may be debated whether the idea of Wisdom was hypostatized, or personified, or only used as a poetical metaphor in the Old Testament passages. The language employed to refer to Wisdom, however, seems to be more than metaphorical. It is no doubt legitimate to conclude that Wisdom, in Prov. 8:22-31 at least, was personified but probably not hypostatized.²

¹Ibid., p. 80.

²D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), p. 112. See also Werner Förster, Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times, trans. Gordon E. Harris (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964), p. 24, for the same conclusion. Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958), p. 118, believes that the personification reaches such a degree that Wisdom can be thought of as a kind of hypostasis. Richardson, Introduction, p. 156, states that Wisdom is both personified and hypostatized in Prov. 8:22-31. Helmer Ringgren, Word and Wisdom (Lund, 1947), p. 99, speaks of this passage as the most obvious evidence in Proverbs of the hypostatization of Wisdom. R. S. Franks, The Doctrine of the Trinity (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., n.d.), pp. 20, 23, believes that the Divine Word, the Divine Spirit, the Divine Wisdom are hypostatized in the Old Testament with the hypostatization of Wisdom more developed than the other two. Franks warns, however, that it is unsafe to argue that any of the hypostases imply

In this passage in Proverbs Wisdom is regarded as pre-existent and as the master-workman who is stated to be actively associated with God in creation and who also plays a part in the welfare of mankind. Wisdom is considered to have a special or even a unique relationship to God. The figure of Wisdom never came to be regarded as a deity which was independent of God but did achieve a degree of separateness from God.¹

Prov. 8:22-31 is the principal source for the use and personification of Wisdom in the books of Baruch (3:29 ff.), Wisdom (7-9), and Ecclesiasticus (24).² In these apocryphal books the personification of Wisdom is developed into a hypostatization with the final step in the development reached in Wis. 7:25, 26 (RSV), "For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing defiled gains entrance into her. For she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God and an image of his goodness."³

personality in the modern sense of the word.

¹Whybray, op. cit., p. 82.

²Jacob, op. cit., p. 118; Whybray, op. cit., p. 12.

³Charles T. Fritsch, Proverbs: Introduction and Exegesis, in IB, IV, 774. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: University Press, 1925), p. 127, states that the author of Wisdom borrowed the idea of personifying Wisdom from the older Jewish literature in order to ensure the continuity of his teaching with traditional Jewish ideas.

W. L. Knox holds that the figure of Wisdom appeared quite suddenly in Judaism and that it is obviously interpolated, for it is alien to the whole tradition of Judaism. The figure of Wisdom in Ecclesiasticus, he states, shows a startling affinity to a Syrian Astarte with features of Isis. The personification of Wisdom appears at a significant moment, for its purpose was to offset the attractions of Isis for young Jews under the Ptolemaic dynasty. The answer of orthodox Judaism to this threat, Knox believes, was a personified Wisdom. The source of order in creation and conduct is not Isis but is the Wisdom of God.¹

Knox is confident that not only in Ecclesiasticus but also in Proverbs Wisdom was, in its origin, a deliberate substitute for the Egyptian goddess Isis. In Ecclesiasticus Wisdom is modified by features taken from Astarte. In both Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus Wisdom is a personification of Torah. Wisdom was adopted as an attempt to safeguard monotheism. Torah was semi-personified as an object of reverence and affection but not as an object of worship.² The

¹W. L. Knox, "The Divine Wisdom," JTS (XXXVIII, 1937), pp. 232, 235. See also Robert McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1958), p. 37.

²W. L. Knox, "Phariseeism and Hellenism," Judaism and Christianity, ed. H. Loewe (London: The Sheldon Press, 1937), II, 66, 67. Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959), p. 256, notes that extra-Jewish influences of a mediator figure of pagan mythology must be reckoned with in understanding the figures of both Wisdom and Logos.

effect of the contact of Greek thought on the figure of Wisdom is two-fold:

Wisdom became less obviously the personification of the Torah and became far more the divine power immanent in the cosmos, the rational element in man and the ruling power in the life of the wise man.¹

Ringgren does not find Knox's theory very convincing. The origin of personal Wisdom, in Ringgren's opinion, is to be found in a hypostatization of a divine function. This hypostasis has in time developed into a personal being in that it adopted traits either from Mesopotamian or general Oriental and ancient mythology.²

A strong Egyptian character of the "Book of the Ten Discourses" (Prov. 1-9) is suggested by Whybray. In his opinion the increased knowledge of older Egyptian and Semitic sources which already express certain ideas previously attributed to Greek sources has undermined the arguments of Greek philosophy or speculation which once appeared to be plausible.³ In Wilckens' estimation Prov. 1-9 represents the borrowing of an unknown oriental myth to interpret the

¹Knox, Judaism and Christianity, loc. cit., II, 67.

²Ringgren, op. cit., pp. 146, 149. See also Rankin, op. cit., p. 231, for a discussion of the background of the figure of Wisdom. Rankin, ibid., p. 258, also states that Prov. 1-9 was not late enough to be influenced by the Isis-Sophia speculation. He finds the prototype of the Wisdom figure of Judaism in the Asha of the Gathas which are the earliest documents of Zoroastrianism.

³Whybray, op. cit., pp. 105, 106.

structure of Israel's faith.¹ Wilson points out that Judaism could not admit a second deity. Thus the concept of Wisdom provided an intermediary between Judaism's transcendent God and the world.²

In Jewish thought the Law is connected with Wisdom. In Eccles. 15:1 and 24:1 ff. the figure of Wisdom is identified with the Torah indicating that by the beginning of the second century, B.C., "Wisdom" was interchangeable with "Torah." The Torah was the law which Moses had given.³ From that time it became commonplace in Rabbinic Judaism to regard Wisdom and Torah as one and the same. Therefore Torah was the pre-existent instrument of creation, and without Torah there was nothing made that was made.⁴

In Philo the pre-existent Wisdom of Prov. 8 is sometimes identified with the Logos and is apparently thought of as the mother of the Logos. Wisdom, at least indirectly, is described as an "instrument" and thus, with Logos, is the instrument by which the world was created. It is possibly

¹Ulrich Wilckens, "σοφία," TWNT, VII, 508.

²Wilson, Gnostic Problem, p. 38. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 163, also affirms that Wisdom supplied a real need in the Judaism within which it is found. He points out that whatever the origin of the figure of Wisdom many scholars have claimed it is not necessary to go outside of Judaism itself to account for it.

³Richardson, Introduction, p. 156. See also Cullmann, Christology, p. 257.

⁴Richardson, Introduction, p. 156.

true that Greek influence accounts for the overshadowing of the concept of Wisdom by that of Logos in Philo. This may be indirect, however, as Logos covered a far wider range of relations than Wisdom, and thus Logos was a more adequate term for Philo's purposes. Wolfson affirms that Wisdom is used by Philo in all the senses of the term Logos: (1) both terms mean a property of God, identical with his essence, and so eternal; (2) both mean a real, incorporeal being, created by God before the creation of the world; (3) Logos means also a Logos immanent in the world, and thus Wisdom is also used in this sense; (4) both are used in the sense of the Law of Moses; and (5) Logos is used by Philo in the sense of one of its constituent ideas, such as the idea of the mind, and Wisdom is also so used. Philo also identifies both Wisdom and Logos with the Rock which was with the Israelites in the wilderness.¹ Wilckens states that it is inadequate to attribute simply the development of "Wisdom" in Philo to a process of increasing hypostatization. The Philonic conception of "Wisdom" was a highly syncretistic product.²

Thus, Davies observes, in the Judaism of Palestine of Paul's day and elsewhere the identification of the Torah

¹Leg. All. 1.19, 65; 2.21, 86; De Fug. 20. See Wolfson, Philo, I, 258 ff.; Wilson, Gnostic Problem, p. 36; and H. A. A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), pp. 173, 174.

²Wilckens, TWNT, loc. cit., VII, 501-503.

with Wisdom was common. There are three characteristics which Torah acquired through its identification with Wisdom: (1) Torah, like Wisdom, came to be regarded as older than the world; (2) Torah is brought into connection with creation; and (3) the world is claimed to be created for the sake of Torah.¹ In fact, all that was said of Wisdom was equally applicable to Torah itself.²

It would not be difficult for those brought up under Rabbinic Judaism to think of something as pre-existent. The idea of a pre-existence would emphasize the importance of a thing. Pre-existent Wisdom was taken very seriously, and to identify something with Wisdom was to attribute to it the highest possible divine reality under God himself.³

The New Testament conception
of Christ as Wisdom

The conception of Wisdom was an important factor in the development of the theology of the early Church, and New Testament Christology bears the marks of its influence.⁴ Thus for the New Testament writers, Richardson affirms, to identify Christ with the Wisdom of God was to make the highest possible claim for him, since Rabbinic Judaism knew no higher category than the pre-existent Wisdom. The teachers

¹Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 170, 171.

²Richardson, Introduction, p. 155. ³Ibid.

⁴Whybray, op. cit., p. 11.

of the early Church had a convenient Scriptural and Rabbinic conception already prepared for them when they needed to articulate the doctrine of Christ's pre-existent deity. Rabbinic Judaism had been considerably influenced, however, by its contact with Hellenistic thought.¹ Knox observes that the later Rabbinical writings recognize the existence of a cosmic beginning which is both Wisdom (Prov. 8:22) and Torah which are probably the survivals of an earlier period.² It is stated by Wilckens that the Gnostic wisdom myth and the later Jewish wisdom myth are closely related having the same origin in Jewish teaching. This, he says, is important for an understanding of the New Testament teaching of Wisdom, for the statements of the New Testament concerning Wisdom are to be understood as the result of a fusion of the Jewish elements and the corresponding Gnostic ideas.³ Thus, Fuller suggests, it was on Hellenistic Jewish soil that the concept of Wisdom was first exploited for Christological use.⁴

Kirk believes that in the fully developed theology of Paul, John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, Christ is regarded as being endowed with the full hypostatic

¹Richardson, Introduction, pp. 155-158.

²W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge: University Press, 1939), p. 113.

³Wilckens, TWNT, loc. cit., VII, 514.

⁴R. H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (London: Lutterworth Press, 1965), p. 72.

pre-existence of the divine Wisdom and also the Word.¹ In I Cor. 1:24, 30 (RSV) Paul explicitly asserts that Christ is the "Wisdom of God": "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God," and, ". . . Christ, whom God made our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption." In Paul's thought the Wisdom of God and Power of God are evidently hypostatized. In that only in these two references does Paul actually call Christ "Wisdom," it would appear that Paul does not lay great stress on the title.²

In several passages in Paul, however, the influence of the "Wisdom" concept is apparent. Knox thinks that Paul had in mind the equation between Christ and Wisdom while writing the first epistle to the Corinthians.³ In I Cor. 10:4 Paul states that the Rock which followed Israel was Christ. In current Jewish thinking the Rock from which Israel drank in the wilderness was associated with Wisdom. Wis. 11:1-4 speaks of Wisdom as Israel's helper in the wilderness who supplied them with water from the Rock to quench

¹K. E. Kirk, "The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity," Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1928), p. 202.

²Wainwright, op. cit., p. 144.

³Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 123. L. Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, trans. Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959), p. 273, does not accept this identification in I Corinthians. Athanasius (in Ad Serap. I.19) refers to I Cor. 10:4 in affirming that when men drink of the Spirit (I Cor. 12:13), they drink of Christ (I Cor. 10:4).

their thirst. Philo also identifies the Rock in the wilderness with the Wisdom of God.¹ Thus on this basis, Davies thinks, it is possible to delineate the figure of Wisdom in I Cor. 10:1-4.² Richardson suggests that in Phil. 2:5-11, which speaks of Christ's pre-existence, the influence of the Wisdom literature may be clearly seen.³ The concept of Wisdom is apparent in both of these passages.

It is in Col. 1:15-18 that the clearest indication is found that Paul associated Christ with the Wisdom of God, although the germ of the ideas in this passage may be found in such passages as Rom. 11:36 and I Cor. 8:6. The development discernible in these verses of Colossians is almost wholly in terms of language that is derived from Jewish sources which describe the divine Wisdom.⁴ This passage, Whybray points out, shows the influence of Wis. 7.⁵ In the thought of Col. 1:15-18 the functions of creation and redemption are transferred from Wisdom to Christ. Pre-existence is postulated of Christ as it had been of Wisdom. Just as Wisdom is

¹Leg. All. 2:21, 86.

²Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 152, 153. Whiteley, op. cit., pp. 110, 111, however, thinks that though it is possible that the concept of Wisdom lies behind I Cor. 10:4, it is not probable.

³Richardson, Introduction, p. 158.

⁴Anderson Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul (Cambridge: University Press, 1927), pp. 264, 265.

⁵Whybray, op. cit., p. 11. See Eccclus. 24:3 ff.

the beginning of God's way in Prov. 8:22, so Christ is the beginning par excellence in Col. 1:18.¹

Burney advances the interesting hypothesis that in Col. 1:15-18 Paul is giving an elaborate exposition of the first word in Genesis, Berêshith, and is interpreting rêshith as referring to Christ. This interpretation, he says, depends on an inferred connection between the use of "beginning" in Gen. 1:1 with the same term which is applied to Wisdom in Prov. 8:22. Burney thinks that the passage in Colossians can only be a direct reference to this passage in Proverbs. From the use of "beginning" in Prov. 8:22 as applicable to Christ, Paul passes to the use of the same term in the account of creation in Genesis. Burney notes that the tracing of a connection between this passage in Proverbs and Gen. 1:1 occurs elsewhere in Rabbinic literature. Paul's interpretation is a reflection of Rabbinic exegesis.² Davies finds this interpretation convincingly proved by Burney.³

Davies suggests that the link between Jesus and the divine Wisdom in Paul's thought is to be found in Paul's

¹See Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 153; and F. F. Bruce, "Promise and Fulfilment in Paul's Presentation of Jesus," Promise and Fulfilment, ed. F. F. Bruce (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 148. In Rev. 3:14 (RSV) Christ is called "the beginning of God's creation." On Col. 1:15-18 see also infra, pp. 201 ff.

²C. F. Burney, "Christ as the ARXH of Creation," JTS (XXVII, 1926), pp. 160-177.

³Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 151.

conception of Christ as a new Torah who had replaced the old Torah.¹ Paul, however, never explicitly identifies Torah with Christ. Nevertheless, it appears that Christ takes the place which had been occupied by Torah in Judaism. In replacing Torah with the Person and teaching of Christ, Paul's mind, Davies suggests, would inevitably move forward to transfer to Jesus the attributes with which Judaism honored Torah. In Judaism Torah had been given the qualities of Wisdom including pre-existence and also participation in creation and redemption. In Ecclus. 24:1 ff., and Bar. 4:1 Wisdom is identified with the Law. Thus the way was open for Paul to identify Jesus with the Wisdom of God and ascribe to him the same qualities previously ascribed to Wisdom.² Whiteley affirms that "what Wisdom meant to the Jews was part of what Jesus Christ meant for Paul."³ The immediate occasion that compelled Paul to develop the implications of his early identification of Christ as the Wisdom of God (I Cor. 1:24, 30) was the Colossian heresy.⁴ Knox, in commenting on Col. 1:15 ff., states that the fact that Jesus Christ was nothing

¹Ibid., pp. 162, 163. Vincent Taylor, The Names of Jesus (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1953), p. 151, believes that it cannot be known whether Paul knew of the Rabbinic speculations which identified Wisdom with the Torah.

²See Richardson, Introduction, pp. 155, 168.

³Whiteley, op. cit., p. 112.

⁴Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 172. See also Jacob, op. cit., p. 118.

less than the Divine Wisdom is the reason for the fullness of the redemption which was wrought by Christ. Part of the regular Jewish-Hellenistic tradition was that the divine Wisdom was the "image" of God.¹

Rawlinson believes that Paul had certainly read the book of Wisdom. He suggests that the identification of Christ with the divine image and glory served as the link in Paul's mind with the Old Testament conception of the pre-existent, creating Wisdom. Wisdom, in Wis. 7:25 ff. (RSV), is described both as "a pure emanation" of God's "glory" and also as an "image" of his "goodness." This passage from Wisdom, with the Old Testament passages, became the basis for Paul for the elements in his Christology which ascribe to Christ the role of agent or intermediary in creation.²

In Rawlinson's judgment the author of Hebrews has probably taken over from Paul, rather than from Philo, a "Wisdom" type of Christology (Heb. 1:1-3). The author speaks of the Son whom God has "appointed the heir of all

¹ Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 159.

² A. E. J. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ: Bampton Lectures for 1926 (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926), p. 133. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 128, 129, also asserts that it is impossible to doubt a direct literary relationship between Paul and Wisdom. Whether there is direct borrowing or not, Paul, he concludes was undoubtedly familiar with the methods and conventions of Alexandrian thought that find their expression in Wisdom. Cerfaux, Theology of St. Paul, p. 274, thinks that Paul found in the book of Wisdom the words which enabled him to formulate his doctrine of Christ.

things" as being at the same time the "Son . . . through whom also he created the world," who "reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of his nature . . . upholding the universe by his word of power" (RSV).¹ The author unquestionably thought of Christ in terms of the Wisdom of God.² Moffatt suggests that the writer of Hebrews uses metaphors which had been applied in Alexandrian theology to Wisdom and Logos.³ This suggests that there was possibly a common background of thought for Paul, the author of Hebrews, Philo, and also John.⁴

In John 1:1-18 the "Word" is used by John to express this "Wisdom" Christology.⁵ In Barrett's opinion John's Prologue shows the use of language drawn from Jewish speculations about Wisdom. No other New Testament writer, he says, shows such mastery of the material as does John who "holds

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 187. See also Bruce, Promise and Fulfilment, loc. cit., p. 48. See Wis. 7:25 ff.

²Richardson, Introduction, pp. 160, 161.

³James Moffatt, The Epistle to the Hebrews, in ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), p. 6.

⁴See J. H. Bernard, The Gospel according to St. John, in ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), I, cxxix; F. W. Beare, The Epistle to the Colossians, in IB, XI, 162; and C. Spicq, L'Épître aux Hébreux, (Paris, 1952, 1953), I, 49-53, and II, 5-9. Richardson, Introduction, pp. 159, 160, apparently believes that John (John 1) and Paul (Col. 1) drew from the same background.

⁵See infra, pp. 190 ff., for a discussion of Athanasius' "Word" Christology.

together Jewish, Hellenistic, and primitive Christian strands of thought in a consistent unity."¹ In his interpretation of John's Prologue Dodd concludes that it seems clear that:

Whatever other elements of thought may enter into the background of the Fourth Gospel, it certainly presupposes a range of ideas having a remarkable resemblance to those of Hellenistic Judaism as represented by Philo.²

Bultmann argues that the source of the Prologue is to be found in early Oriental gnosis.³ Rawlinson, however, thinks that it is improbable that John was in any way dependent either on the speculations of Philo or on any alternate Hellenistic religious philosophy.⁴ The Prologue of John, Knox believes, is Gen. 1:1 interpreted in the light of the Wisdom-tradition of Prov. 8:22.⁵ John says that it is Christ and

¹Barrett, Gospel According to St. John, p. 129.

²C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), p. 73.

³Rudolph Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (16th ed.; Göttingen, 1959), pp. 5-26. Fuller, op. cit., criticizes Bultmann's view thus: "To say, as Bultmann does, that the Johannine prologue is derived from 'oriental gnosis' is confusing, quite apart from the question-begging term, gnosis. For in the Johannine prologue it is not a question of direct adaptation to Christology from Hellenistic Judaism of a concept which had long been firmly embedded in Judaism, but which from time to time had received enrichments from extra-Jewish mythology."

⁴Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 210.

⁵W. L. Knox, Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity: The Schweich Lectures (London: University Press, 1944), p. 55.

not Torah who is the πλήρωμα of grace (John 1:14, 17). Dodd points out that for the author of the Fourth Gospel the Torah did not bring grace and truth in the full sense, but Christ does. Thus the Torah is only a shadow of the true Word of God which came in its full reality in Jesus Christ.¹ In that the primitive Church drew its categories from the Old Testament Scriptures and not from Hellenistic religious speculation, it was natural that the early Church should have used the Wisdom-Logos conception as its highest category of interpretation of the person of Christ.²

It has been suggested that the identification of Christ with Wisdom may have been begun by Jesus himself. Scott, attributing the words of Matt. 11:28-30 to Jesus,³ believes that a comparison of this passage with Ecclus. 51:23-27 shows that Jesus was familiar with the passage in Ecclesiasticus and that he consciously put himself in the

¹Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 295.

²Richardson, Introduction, p. 156. Rudolph Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. Kendrick Grobel (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1955), I, 133, however, says that the cosmic figure of Wisdom had crept into the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament and had become an occupation of speculation in Judaism, especially in Hellenistic Judaism. Very early, he believes, this Wisdom speculation (with the Logos speculation) penetrated into Hellenistic Christianity.

³On recent discussion of the identification of the original words of Jesus see, e.g., Martin Dibelius, Gospel Criticism and Christology (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1935); and Rudolph Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963).

place of Wisdom.¹ Cerfaux points out that there is some possibility that Luke may have intended to identify Jesus as "the Wisdom of God" (Luke 11:49; see also Luke 7:35 and John 7:37).² Davies discounts the possibility of postulating that Paul had received such a Christology as a legacy from the Lord, for such a view cannot be substantiated.³

Christ as the Wisdom of God
in the Church fathers

The identification of the Son with Wisdom is widely evidenced in the interpretation of Scripture subsequent to the New Testament period.⁴ Justin Martyr identifies Wisdom with the Word or the Son of God. He uses Prov. 8:22 to prove the pre-existence of the Word and his role in creation.⁵ Irenaeus states that the Word, who is the Son, was always with the Father. Wisdom is identified with the

¹Scott, op. cit., p. 264. See also Bruce, Promise and Fulfilment, loc. cit., p. 49, who also makes this suggestion, for, in his opinion, it would be natural to look for the origin of this idea of "Wisdom" in the Lord's teaching when it finds expression in so many different streams of early Christian thought.

²Cerfaux, Theology of St. Paul, p. 272. Rendel Harris, The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity (Manchester: University Press, 1919), p. 361, apparently assumes that Jesus spoke of himself as the "Wisdom of God."

³Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 158.

⁴Turner, op. cit., p. 275, states that with few exceptions this identification was dominant in the Patristic period.

⁵Dial. 61; see also ibid., 100.

Spirit. He then refers to Prov. 8:19, 20, 22, 25, 27-31. There is one God who by the Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things.¹ Clement of Alexandria speaks of the Son as the Wisdom of God and also of the Word as "the Power and the Wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1:24).² Origen asserts that the Son is called Wisdom as "Solomon said" (Prov. 8:22-25); the Son is also called "First-born" (Col. 1:15). The First-born and Wisdom are one and the same being. Origen also refers to I Cor. 1:24. Wisdom is to be understood as the Word of God. Origen bases his assertion of the eternal generation of the Son on Col. 1:15, Heb. 1:3, and Wis. 7:25, 26.³ Cyprian also identifies Wisdom as the Son and gives as the Scriptural basis for this assertion Prov. 8:22-31; 9:1-6; Eccclus. 24:3-7; Col. 1:15, 18; and I Cor. 1:22-24.⁴

In his interpretation of Prov. 8:22, with its context, Athanasius stands within a common tradition of interpretation which extends back to the New Testament. This interpretation is discernible in such passages as John 1:1-18; Col. 1:15-18; and Heb. 1:1-3 with I Cor. 1:24, 30 explicitly identifying Christ as the Wisdom of God. Athanasius apparently bases this identification on I Cor. 1:24, "Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God," and assumes its relationship to the relevant Old Testament passages and also to other

¹Adv. Haer. 4.34.3, 4.

²Strom. 7.2; 1.26.

³De Prin. 1.2.1-3, 5.

⁴Test. 2.1, 2.

Wisdom literature. He also assumes the connection of the New Testament passages (e.g., Col. 1:15-18) with the Wisdom passages and with I Cor. 1:24.¹ In Richardson's estimation it was "the development of the Wisdom Christology in the OT" which prepared the "categories of thought" by which the apostolic doctrine of the Person of Christ received its fullest expression in the New Testament.² The idea of Wisdom was adopted by the early Christians in order to explain the relationship of Christ to God as well as to indicate the true nature of Christ.³

Rendel Harris asserts that in the early collections of quotations the point of departure is not Messianism but is rather the doctrine that Jesus is the Wisdom of God. The "Testimony Book," he affirms, shows that "Wisdom" has the priority over "Word." In Harris' view the "Word" is an afterthought and an intruder into Christian doctrine where "Wisdom" and "Word" are brought together. All statements which affirm that Christ is the Word of God may be replaced by an earlier series of statements in which he is equated with the divine Wisdom. Harris concludes that whatever is said about Jesus Christ in the Christian creeds is a deduction from Prov. 8:22-31 and from other related passages in the later Wisdom books which are a part of the Old Testament apocrypha.

¹E.g., De Dec. 15. ²Richardson, Introduction, p. 156.

³Wainwright, op. cit., p. 34.

This title of Jesus, "Wisdom of God," explains most of the other titles given to him in the New Testament as well as nearly all the dogmatic statements that were made concerning him in the creeds.¹

Bethune-Baker² makes several valid criticisms of Harris' view. There is no evidence, he points out, that Jesus assumed the title "Wisdom of God" or that he thought of himself as the divine Wisdom. The evidence of the New Testament shows that the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah and as the Son of God was primary and that this recognition carried with it belief in Jesus' deity. It was only in dependence on this primary recognition that the relating of Jesus to the Wisdom of God occurred. Harris adduces no evidence in support of his view that the Lord's own consciousness of his Sonship and Christhood was not the original basis of the doctrine of his deity and therefore should be abandoned. The later conceptions of Jesus as Word and as Wisdom did not confirm belief in the deity of Christ and with it belief in the Trinity, but rather they enlarged this belief. They provided categories by which the early Church could articulate its beliefs.

¹Harris, Doctrine of the Trinity, pp. 27-31, 35, 36. See supra, pp. 135 ff., for evaluations of Harris' "Testimony Book" theory. See also infra, pp. 210 ff.

²J. F. Bethune-Baker, Review of The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity by Rendel Harris, JTS (XXI, 1920), pp. 86-88.

Athanasius, in common with the New Testament writers and later Christian writers, accepted the conception of Christ as Wisdom. He employed this idea with its relevant passages of Scripture to enunciate and defend his doctrine of Christ and the relationship of Christ to the Trinity.

Christ as the Hand of God

Athanasius' conception of Christ as the Hand of God

Involved in the development of Wisdom Christology is the conception of Christ as the "Hand" (Χεῖρ) of God and with it the interpretation of Gen. 1:26. In his contention that the Son precedes in time all created things and is not a part of the created order, Athanasius refers to passages which, he alleges, attribute creation to the Word of God (Ps. 100:3; John 1:3; Heb. 1:3; Col. 1:16; I Cor. 8:6;) and Past. Herm. Mand. 1). He also refers to Is. 66:2, "All these things my Hand has made." The "Hand" of God is identified as God's Word.¹

Athanasius also refers to other passages that speak of the Hand or Hands of God with which God creates: Ps. 143:5, "I do remember the time past, I muse upon all your works, I exercise myself in the works of your Hands"; Is. 48:13, "My Hand also has laid the foundation of the earth,

¹De Dec. 7, 8; De Sent. Dion. 2.

and my right Hand has spanned the heavens"; Is. 51:16, "And I will cover you in the shadow of my Hand, by which I planted the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth"; and Ps. 119:73, "Your Hands have made me and fashioned me." God uses his own Word as a "Hand" in all that he does.¹

Athanasius gives the following passages as Scriptural proof that this "Hand" is "Wisdom" and "Word": Ps. 104:24, "In Wisdom you have made them all; the earth is full of your creation"; Prov. 3:19, "The Lord by Wisdom founded the earth"; and John 1:1-3, "In the beginning was the Word, . . . all things were made by him and without him was not one thing made." The evidence for Athanasius that he who is the "Hand," "Wisdom," and "Word" of God is the Son is found in Heb. 1:1, 2, "God, . . . has in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom he has appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the ages," and I Cor. 8:6, "There is one Lord Jesus, by whom are all things and we through him." Paul, Athanasius avers, knew that the "Word," "Wisdom," the "Son" himself is the "Image" of the Father, for Paul states in Col. 1:12-17, "Giving thanks to God and the Father . . .

¹De Dec. 17; C. Ar. II.71. Rendel Harris, The Origin of the Prologue to St John's Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1917), p. 51, alleges that for Athanasius "Word" and "Wisdom" are the two hands of God. However, for Athanasius Word and Wisdom were not two persons but two designations for the one Person--the Son. Athanasius only identifies one "Hand" of God. See infra, p. 187, for Irenaeus' reference to two "Hands" of God.

Son . . . who is the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist." By his Hand, who is Wisdom, Word, Son, and Image, God created all things.¹ Adam, Athanasius affirms, was fashioned by God alone through his Hand (Gen. 1:26). This Hand also makes and fashions all those who come after Adam.²

Gen. 1:26 (also Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, etc.) is referred to by Athanasius to indicate that in the creation God speaks to someone.³ God does not speak as to an "under-worker" (ὑπουργός) who would then perform his will in creation; this would be proper to creatures but not to God's own Word. God only said, "Let it become," and by his Word all things came into existence. "God said" (Gen. 1:3, etc.) is explained in the Word, for this is indicated in Ps. 104:24, "You have made all things in Wisdom"; Ps. 33:6, "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established"; and I Cor. 8:6, "There is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him." It is not possible, Athanasius asserts, that God would speak to

¹De Dec. 17.

²Ibid., 8, 9.

³For the history of the interpretation of Gen. 1:26 see infra, pp. 185 ff.

that which he was creating. God must have been speaking about the thing being created to someone who was with him in creation. God could only be addressing his Word who must have already existed. Athanasius finds confirmation of this assertion in Ps. 148:5, "He spoke and they were made. He commanded and they were created"; Prov. 8:27, "When he was making the heaven and the earth I (Wisdom) was present with him"; John 5:19, "All things whatsoever I see the Father doing, I also do in like manner"; and Col. 1:16 which teaches that all things were made "through him and unto him."¹

Also in his interpretation of Gen. 1:26 Athanasius declares that the soul of man is made after the image and likeness of God. When God speaks and says, "Let us make man after our Image and likeness," the Image must be the Word. This Word and Wisdom is the unchanging "Image" (Εἰκών) of the Father.² The Son is not only the Image of the Father but is also his Radiance, Expression, and Truth. All that the Father is, the Son must be, for he "who has seen" the Son "has seen the Father" (John 14:9).³

The history of the conception of Christ
as the Hand of God

A greater knowledge of Hebrew idiom would have suggested the interpretation of Gen. 1:26 (and also 1:3, etc.)

¹C. Ar. II.31; C. Gen. 46.

²C. Gen. 34, 41; see C. Ar. II.35. ³C. Ar. I.20, 21.

as simply the plural of majesty. The fathers, and Athanasius, discovered in this passage a glimpse into the counsels of the triune God. The majority of the fathers find here a dialogue between the Father and Son, but others, especially those of the tradition of Antioch, find in this passage a reference to the Trinity. Origen alone of the Church fathers ascribes the reference in Gen. 1:26 to angels.¹ In the New Testament there is no reference to the plural in this passage, nor is the conception of Christ as the Hand of God found in it.

This verse, Skinner observes, has always constituted a problem for exegetes.² Among Jewish interpreters the common opinion was that angels were being addressed in these words, otherwise it was thought that they were addressed to Torah or Wisdom.³

The first interpretation of Gen. 1:26 suggesting

¹See Turner, *op. cit.*, pp. 274, 275; and Robert McL. Wilson, "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26," *Studia Patristica*, ed. Kurt Aland and F. L. Cross (Berlin, 1957), I, 420.

²John Skinner, *Genesis*, in *ICC* (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930), p. 30.

³George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, 407. Philo says that the words in Gen. 1:26 are addressed to subordinate powers in *De Opif. Mund.* 75 but to the Logos in *De Mig. Abrah.* 1. C. H. Dodd, in *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 137, notes that in interpreting Gen. 1:26 to refer to "powers," Philo read into the Biblical narrative the doctrine of the *Timaeus*.

Trinitarianism is found in Barnabas (5:5 and 6:12) where it is said that in this passage God speaks to his Son. Wilson points out that the origins of a Trinitarian interpretation may be traced further back than to these references, for it is a development of the Wisdom-Logos Christology of the New Testament.¹

Justin Martyr interprets the plural of Gen. 1:26 (and also 3:22) as indicating that a certain number of persons, at least two, are associated with each other, for God conversed with someone. In connection with the passage and its interpretation Justin refers to Prov. 8:22 ff. He concludes that the Son must be begotten before the creation of all things.²

In his interpretation of Gen. 1:26 Irenaeus states that man was made according to the likeness of God and molded by his hands. The hands of God are identified as the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Word and Wisdom, to whom are addressed the words, "Let us make man."³ In another place Irenaeus interprets the text to refer to the Son alone. In the latter reference Irenaeus identifies the Hand as the Word on the basis of the declaration of John 1:3 that all things were made by the Word of God. Angels, Irenaeus believes, could

¹Wilson, Studia Patristica, loc. cit., I, 431, 432. In I Clem. 33 there is a reference to the hands of God, but there is no interpretation of the statement.

²Dial. 62, 129. ³Adv. Haer. 4, praef., 3; 4.24.1.

not be responsible for the creation of man, since God had his own Hands.¹

For Clement of Alexandria the Image of God is his Word, and the image of the Word is the mind which is in man, the true man. Therefore the true man is said to have been made "in the image and likeness of God."² For Clement God alone is the Creator, and in Clement's exegesis of Gen. 1:26 there is no hint of Trinitarianism.³ Origen interprets Gen. 1:26 to be a reference to angels. He also applies the text to the Son or to the Logos.⁴

Harris believes that in the early Christian book which contained testimonies against the Jews one of the things which had to be established against the Jews is that Christ is the Hand of God.⁵ In the second book of Cyprian's Testimonies Christ is alluded to as the Hand and Arm of God. This statement is preceded by evidences to show that Christ is the Wisdom and Word of God.⁶

Wilson states that there are two main lines of tradition in the interpretation of Gen. 1:26--the Alexandrian and that represented by Irenaeus. The interpretation of the

¹Ibid., 5.15.4.

²Prot. 10.

³Wilson, Studia Patristica, loc. cit., I, 433.

⁴In Ioh. 13.50; In Gen. Hom. 13.4; C. Cels. 2:9; 5:37.

⁵Harris, Origin of the Prologue, pp. 43, 44.

⁶Test. 2.4.

Gnostics represents a third line of tradition. All three appear to derive their origin from Jewish speculation with the Alexandrians especially indebted to Philo. In the Christian interpretation, Wilson notes, the text as a whole is referred to the regeneration of Christians. The traditions seem to refer especially to the identification of "image" in this passage.¹

Athanasius' main concern in the interpretation of Gen. 1:26 (with the other related passages) is to demonstrate that the Son as Word and Wisdom was present at creation and is, in fact, Creator with God. It is the Son who is addressed when God speaks in these passages. The Son is the Hand of God by which all things are created. Therefore the Son already existed before the creation of all things. Unlike Irenaeus and Origen Athanasius apparently does not differentiate between image and likeness.² He declares that man is made in the image and likeness of God--the "Image" is the Son himself.³ It is difficult to determine Athanasius' place in the stream of tradition, as most of his references

¹Wilson, Studia Patristica, loc. cit., I, 427, 437.

²Ibid., I, 437.

³For Philo the Logos is the image of God (De Conf. 28. 147). Only God is to be described by terms such as archetype and pattern, for God is the Creator and the Logos is created. The Logos is the archetype for further creations, and man is made after this image. (See De Opif. Mund. 51. 146). See Wolfson, Philo, I, 234, 238.

to this text are only concerned with the idea of the Son as the one addressed by God. It would appear, however, that Athanasius is probably independent of the various traditions except that he finds here a reference to the Son and not to the Trinity which indicates at this point an Alexandrian background.

Christ as the Word of God

Athanasius' conception of Christ as the Word of God

It has already been indicated that in Athanasius' thought the Son is variously designated as "Word," "Wisdom," "Hand," and "Image." All that was created through the Word is said to be founded in Wisdom, to be made by the Hand, and to have come into existence through the Son. The proof of this, Athanasius asserts, is to be found in the Scriptures: Is. 48:13 and 51:16 ascribe creation to the Hand of God; Ps. 104:24 and Prov. 3:19 show the Hand to be Wisdom; John 1:1-3 indicates that John knew the Word to be the Hand and Wisdom; and Heb. 1:1, 2 and I Cor. 8:6 show the Hand, Wisdom, and Word to be the Son. Finally, Col. 1:12-17 demonstrates that he who is called by these terms is also the Image of the Father. All of these names are titles of one Person--the Son.¹

Athanasius not only uses New Testament passages that

¹De Dec. 17.

refer to the Son as the Word of God (e.g., John 1:1-3, 14) but also refers to Old Testament passages which, in his view, refer explicitly to the Son as Word.¹ Proof that God's Word is unchanging and has an eternal existence is found in Ps. 119:89, "The Word of God endures forever." God revealed his Word from heaven, for God not only said, "This is my beloved Son" (Matt. 3:17; 17:5), but also, "My heart uttered a good Word" (Ps. 45:1). In Prov. 3:19 creation is attributed to Wisdom, but in Ps. 33:6 it is ascribed to the Son, "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made."²

The incarnation of the Word is not only referred to in the New Testament (e.g., John 1:14) but also in the Old Testament: Ps. 43:3, "Send out your Word and your truth." For Athanasius the latter reference is a proof that God came in the flesh, for it is confirmed by both Old and New Testaments: Matt. 1:23 (Is. 7:14), "Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us"; I Pet. 4:1, "Forasmuch then as Christ suffered for us in the flesh"; and Tit. 2:13, 14, "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of our

¹See Ringgren, op. cit., pp. 157 ff., on the hypostatization of the "Word." He states that the instances of the hypostatization of the divine "Word" are not as clear and unambiguous as those of "Wisdom."

²C. Ar. II.36. See also C. Gen. 40. The last part of Ps. 33:6, "And all their might by the Spirit of his mouth," is interpreted to show the Holy Spirit's part in creation. See infra, pp. 231, 232.

great God and Savior Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, and zealous of good works."¹

Other Scripture passages adduced by Athanasius to prove that the Father revealed his Word are Ps. 36:9, "With you is the well of life, and in your light shall we see light"; Heb. 1:3, "Who being the radiance of the glory"; Phil. 2:6-8, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not a prize to be equal with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being in the likeness of man, and being found in form as man, humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even the death of the cross"; and Col. 1:15, "Who is the Image of the invisible God."²

The Word of God, Athanasius believes, is not that which is involved and inherent in created things which some call a "seminal" (σπερματικὸς) principle which is without a soul and without the power of reason or thought,³ but he is the living and powerful Word of God, the God of the universe, and this Word is God (Heb. 4:12; John 1:1). The Word is a personal being.⁴ This Word of God is not a creature but is

¹ Ad Adelph. 5, 6.

² C. Ar. III.29, 59. See also De Inc. 33, 38, 39.

³ This is a reference to Stoicism. See F. W. Beare, "Stoics," IDB, R-Z, 444.

⁴ C. Gen. 40.

eternal, for, "In the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1), "All things were made by him" (John 1:3), and, "By him all things were created" (Col. 1:16). The Father, Athanasius affirms, could not speak as he does in Ps. 45:1, "My heart uttered a good Word," if the Son were a creature.¹

Athanasius' doctrine of the Word not only includes the eternity of the Word and the relationship of the Word to the Father (e.g., John 1:1-3), but also the incarnation of the Word: John 1:14, "The Word was made flesh." Athanasius finds the purpose of the incarnation of the Word expressed in various passages of Scripture such as: John 6:38-40, "I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me. And this is the will of him who sent me, that of all which he has given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of my Father, that every one who sees the Son and believes on him may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day"; Eph. 2:14, 15, "Having broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, to create in himself of two one new man, so making peace"; I John 3:8, "For this was manifested the Son of God, that he might destroy the works of the devil"; and Rom. 8:3, 4, "For what the law could not do, in that it was

¹De Sent. Dion. 2.

weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."¹

The background of the "Word"
Christology

In Jewish thought, Wainwright affirms, the Law is connected with both Wisdom and the Word. In Ps. 119 "Word" and "Law" are used interchangeably. In Wainwright's opinion the "Word" was personified neither in the Old Testament nor in Rabbinic thought.² However, Jacob asserts that the hypostatization of the "Word," which finds its full development in extra-canonical books, has its roots in the Old Testament. Although it is impossible to speak of a hypostasis of the "Word" in the canonical books of the Old Testament, it should be recognized that many of the affirmations point in that direction. Hypostatization is more obvious in the case of "Wisdom," but, in Jacob's estimation, it is the "Word" which provided a foundation for the theology of "Wisdom."³ Before Philo Jewish theology had developed the concept of the Word of God, and the Alexandrian book, Wisdom, had attributed the same role to the Word and to Wisdom.⁴

¹C. Ar. II.54, 55. See De Inc. 4, 5, 7-9, 13, 14.

²Wainwright, op. cit., pp. 36, 133.

³Jacob, op. cit., p. 134. ⁴Lebreton, op. cit., p. 158.

With reference to Ps. 33:6 (RSV), "By the Word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all their host by the breath of his mouth," Rawlinson observes that:

From the point of view of the Old Testament, the Word was as capable as was the Wisdom of God of being personified as a Divine Principle intermediate between God and the world.¹

It is tempting, Whiteley suggests, to quote the first part of Ps. 33:6 and conclude that the "Word of the Lord" has been hypostatized. The second part of the verse, however, will lead one to suspect that the Psalmist is only reproducing or anticipating in a more vivid and poetical form the thought of Gen. 1:14, 15.²

When God wished to communicate with men, he spoke to them. Moses heard his voice from the burning bush (Ex. 3:2 ff.), and his word was given to the prophets (Is. 2:1; Jer. 1:4; etc.). When the world was created, it came into existence at God's spoken word (Gen. 1:3; etc.). Though the Word in the Old Testament is capable of being personified, Wainwright points out, yet it is, in fact, not personified and does not itself have an existent being. He believes also that in the apocryphal writings the Word is not really personified, but with the closest approach to personification found in Wis. 18:15, 16. Even this reference, he thinks,

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 211.

²Whiteley, op. cit., pp. 111, 112.

could be metaphorical rather than literal.¹

In Wainwright's opinion the only writer previous to and outside of the New Testament who clearly treats the Word as a person is Philo, and he is not consistent in his use of it. Philo speaks of God's word as his action, for when God speaks he acts. His word is his messenger. It is neither Creator as God nor created as man.² In Philo the Logos appears to Hagar when she is driven out by Abraham, wrestles with Jacob, and talks to Moses in the burning bush. He also identifies the Logos (and Wisdom) with the pillar of cloud that guided the Israelites.³ The Logos in Philo, however, is not as clearly personified as Wisdom in the Wisdom literature.⁴

It is Moore's conclusion that neither in the Old Testament nor in the extra-canonical literature of the Jews is the Word of God a personal agent or on the way to becoming such. In Philo's thought, on the other hand, when God appears to men, converses with them, or reveals his will and purpose, all of these activities should be understood of the Logos. The twofold meaning of the Greek word--reason, utterance--made it natural to appropriate for the Logos what was

¹Wainwright, op. cit., p. 35. ²Ibid., p. 133.

³Quis Rer. Div. Her. 42.205, 206; De Cher. 1.3; De Som. 1.39.228; De Mut. Nom. 13.87; Quis Rer. Div. Her. 42.203-205.

⁴Lebreton, op. cit., p. 161.

said of the divine Wisdom and of the Word of God. In Moore's judgment it is erroneous to think that Palestinian Judaism thought of the Word of God as a personal intermediary comparable to Philo's Logos or to connect the Word of God in the Judaism of Palestine with Philo's Logos.¹

Strachan affirms that Word and also Wisdom are personal insofar as they are the activity of a personal God and no further.² Philo's Logos in many places is almost a doublet of Wisdom, Dodd notes, for Logos in Philo certainly has the Wisdom-concept as one of its ancestors.³

The obvious identification of Word and Wisdom had taken place long before New Testament times. It had been made by the Wisdom writers themselves (Ecclus. 24:3; Wis. 7:25; Prov. 2:6; see Ps. 33:6).⁴

¹George Foot Moore, op. cit., I, 415-417.

²R. H. Strachan, The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), p. 92.

³Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 276.

⁴Richardson, Introduction, p. 160. Philo sometimes identifies Logos with Wisdom (Leg. All. 1.65). Aristobulus seems to have been the first to identify Wisdom with the immanent cosmic principle. In Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica, Aristobulus is quoted to confirm a statement of Philo on the Logos. It is said that the title "light" might be transferred to Wisdom from whom all light comes. Solomon has said that Wisdom existed before heaven and earth. Thus Wisdom appears as a pre-cosmic light. See Eusebii Pamphili, Evangelicae Praeparationis, ed. E. H. Gifford (Oxonii, 1903), Vol. II, 13, 12. Knox, in St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, p. 69, suggests that Aristobulus has in mind the equation of Wisdom with Torah. See also Wilson, Gnostic Problem, pp. 38, 39.

Christ as the Word of God
in the New Testament

"Logos" became the predominant designation for Jesus in the classical Christology of the early Church. Cullmann believes that the Logos designation was even considered the essential content of Christology.¹ Only in one group of New Testament writings, however, is "Logos" found as a Christological title--the Johannine literature.

The Logos Christology is above all connected with the creation story (Gen. 1) in which everything takes place as a result of the "word" which God speaks. In the Prologue of John the Word created all things (John 1:3). Cullmann thinks that on reflection the idea emerges that every creative self-revelation of God to the world occurs through his "word" (Ps. 33:6; also Ps. 107:20; 147:15; and Is. 55:10, 11).²

What are the sources for John's doctrine of the Logos? It has been suggested that John's use of Logos in a personal sense is best explained by the influence of Philo or of Philo's unknown predecessors.³ T. W. Manson thinks that John is not dependent on Philo at all but that the Old Testament "Word of God" is the basis of the Logos doctrine in John. The similarities in John and Philo can best be explained by the borrowing on the part of both of them from the same

¹Cullmann, Christology, p. 249. ²Ibid., p. 255.

³Wainwright, op. cit., p. 35.

source--the Old Testament. For John the Word is the creative and revealing Word of God, and Jesus Christ is the supreme revelation of God.¹

Richardson observes that Christ was himself the word or message which the Church preached. Thus it was but a short step from this message to the Johannine identification of Christ with the Word of God as such. The conception of the Word of God, Richardson also believes, was inherited by the New Testament from the teaching of the Old Testament.² It should be noted that the great difference between the Logos doctrine in John and the doctrine of Wisdom in the Wisdom literature (and also the Logos doctrine in Philo) is that in John the "Word was made flesh" (John 1:14).

In his discussion of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel Dodd points out that the doctrine of Torah, as the

¹T. W. Manson, On Paul and John, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 38, ed. Matthew Black (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1963), pp. 148, 149.

²Richardson, Introduction, p. 159. Richardson also notes that it can only be conjectured why John avoided the use of the term "Wisdom" and chose the term "Word." Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 295, avers that "it is impossible to confine the term Logos to the meaning 'word'. It is also the divine Wisdom, the Hebrew analogue at once of the Platonic world of Ideas and of the Stoic Logos: it is that thought of God which is the transcendent design of the universe, and its immanent meaning." A syncretistic background for the concept of the term Logos has also been suggested. The process of a gradual substitution within Hellenistic Judaism of Logos for Sophia, Kleinknecht maintains, may be explained from the popularity of the term in Hellenistic philosophy. See H. Kleinknecht and Gerhard Kittel in "λέγω, λόγος," etc., TWNT, IV, 86-89, 138-140.

pre-existent thought of God revealed in time as it is found in the Talmud and Midrash, is not a late creation. In its main outlines it formed a part of Rabbinic teaching at the period of the Fourth Gospel, and, Dodd concludes, it may be safely inferred that the author of the Fourth Gospel was acquainted with this Rabbinic teaching.¹

Dodd notes that a number of the propositions referring to the Logos in the Prologue of John are the counterparts of Rabbinic statements which refer to the Torah: (1) both are pre-existent with God from the beginning; (2) both are "with God"; (3) both are agents or instruments in creation; and (4) both are regarded as light and life.² Strachan also points out that the contrast of the Law with "the Word made flesh" in John 1:17 may indicate that John has in mind not only the conception of Wisdom but that of the Law as conceived in contemporary Judaism.³ It is Wilson's conclusion that:

The Logos then is Jewish, based on the current philosophy; the Fourth Gospel derives it from the speculation of a circle like that of Philo, although apparently independent of him, and applies the theory to the interpretation of the life and work of Jesus.⁴

¹Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 85.

²Ibid. ³Strachan, op. cit., p. 95.

⁴Wilson, Gnostic Problem, p. 194. Strachan, op. cit., p. 96, also attributes the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel to Jewish thought.

In his investigation of the origin of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, Harris suggests that "Wisdom" may be the ancestress of the "Word" in John. If "Wisdom" is substituted for "Word" in John 1:1-3, one is impressed, he says, by the resulting resemblance to Prov. 8:22-31. He concludes that the stratum on which the Prologue rests is the Old Testament, and, if this is true and if the Word is quoted as being and doing just what Wisdom is and does in the book of Proverbs, then the equation between Word and Wisdom is justified. Therefore one may speak of Christ in the metaphysical sense as the Wisdom of God.¹

Jesus, Harris maintains, is identified successively with the Wisdom of God and the Word of God; first with Wisdom because, he says, the Word doctrine is originally a Wisdom doctrine, and after that Jesus is identified with the Word, because Wisdom became the Word. It is apparent, Harris thinks, that the evolution of John's Prologue from Prov. 8 can be justified. The line of development passed from Proverbs (and other Old Testament passages) through the other Wisdom literature where Wisdom is personified. Jesus as the divine Wisdom underlies the Christology of Hebrews (1:1-3) and Colossians (1:15-18). Both of these passages, with John 1:1-3, are ultimately dependent on Prov. 8.²

¹Harris, Origin of the Prologue, p. 4.

²Ibid., pp. 12-19.

Hegermann also brings together these three passages. He believes that the hymn in Col. 1:15 ff. is a part of older tradition and thus indicates an early Christological conception. In the background of Col. 1:15 ff., as well as in that of the other passages, is the Wisdom-Word speculation and with it the use of a Creation-Mediator Christology. The background of these passages, in Hegermann's opinion, is to be found in the Hellenistic community.¹ So also Fuller believes that the conception of Wisdom was firmly established in Hellenistic Judaism and was readily available as a Christological tool for Hellenistic Jewish Christianity.²

The Logos doctrine, in Harris' opinion, is derived from Wisdom Christology. Wisdom, therefore, has priority over the Word Christology. Harris' views of the origin of John's Prologue and the relationship of Word Christology to that of Wisdom are linked with his opinion that the early "Testimony Book" shows that the doctrine of Christ as the Wisdom of God is the basis of New Testament Christology. The "Word" is an afterthought and an intruder. This is proved, he asserts, by the "Testimony Book."³

It is not necessary to assume, as Harris does, that

¹Harald Hegermann, Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum, TU, 82 (Berlin, 1961), pp. 110-113.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 75.

³Harris, Origin of the Prologue, pp. 27-30.

Wisdom precedes Logos, nor, if it was earlier, to conclude that in John the "Word" usurps the place of "Wisdom." It has already been noted that Wisdom and Word had been identified long before the New Testament period by the Wisdom writers.¹ The concepts of both Wisdom and Word were current in the first century, and therefore the writers of the New Testament found both terms available for their use in expressing their Christological doctrine. Thus the conceptions of Christ as both Wisdom and Word are found in the New Testament. Thus John 1:1-3, Heb. 1:1-3, and Col. 1:15-18 are related in their thought and indicate that the concepts of Wisdom and Word in relation to the doctrine of Christ emerged together. They are best regarded as being complementary in the thought of the early Church and in the articulation of its Christology. In the doctrine of the early Church Christ was both Word and Wisdom at one and the same time.

The conception of Christ as the Word of God
in the Church fathers

After the New Testament period Wisdom became a common designation for the Son. Justin Martyr identifies Wisdom with the Word and the Son and states that the Logos has appeared in perfect fullness in Christ. Prov. 8:22 ff. is used by Justin to prove the pre-existence of the Word. The Word revealed himself in various ways to the patriarchs and

¹Supra, p. 197.

saints but was born of the virgin to fulfill God's purpose.¹ Irenaeus declares on the basis of John 1:3; Ps. 33:9; and Ps. 148:5 that all things were made by the Word. In Ps. 33:6 Irenaeus identifies the Word, whom God commands, as the Son and the Spirit as Wisdom.² Clement of Alexandria frequently refers to the Logos and ascribes creation to him. In his coming from heaven, the Word is the Christian teacher, and his energies fill the universe in creation and salvation. The Word of God is identified as the Son, as Christ, as the true God, as Jesus, as the Arm of the Lord, as the Power of the universe, and as the Will of the Father.³ Wisdom is understood by Origen to be the Word of God. The Word, he says, is God and Creator (Ps. 33:6; John 1:1, 2; and Col. 1:16-18). In Ps. 33:6 Origen sees an intimation that the entire Trinity⁴ was concerned in creation.

For Athanasius "Word" designates the Son even as the terms "Wisdom," "Hand," and "Image." These terms are all identified with the same person--Jesus Christ. Athanasius applies these terms without distinction to the Son. They are used to refer to the Son in his creative and redemptive work and are used to show that the Son is pre-existent and eternal. It is through this Word who is God that God has

¹Dial. 61, 75; I Apol. 1.5; 2.8.

²Adv. Haer. 2.2.4; 1.15; 3.8.3.

³Strom. 1.9; Prot. 11, 12. ⁴De Prin. 2.3; 4.4.

created all things. The Arians, however, drew a rigid distinction between the Word and the Son. The Word was an attribute of God, in their conception, without separate hypostatization. Thus the Word is eternally pre-existent as an attribute of God, but the Son does not have an eternal pre-existence. In Arianism the Son has the title of "Word" by grace, but he is not God's "proper" (ἴδιος) Word. In name only he is the Son and Wisdom.¹

Athanasius, Wand points out, did not deny the Logos doctrine but thought of the Logos after the pattern of the Fourth Gospel as a divine person--the Son of God. Though the Logos was the agent in creation, he was separate from it.² Athanasius' conception of the Logos was religious rather than philosophical in that his emphasis was on "the Word made flesh" (John 1:14). The incarnation of the Word was for the salvation of mankind. The chief function of the Word was to become man in order to restore a fallen humanity.

¹C. Ar. I.5, 9; De Dec. 16. See Pollard, Studia Patristica, loc. cit., II, 284, 286.

²Wand, op. cit., p. 46.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRIST AS LORD AND AS ANGEL OF THE LORD

Christ as Lord

The background of the title "Lord"

Athanasius frequently used the name "Lord" (Κύριος) as an appellation for the Son not only in the New Testament passages where the Son is addressed or referred to as Lord, but also in Old Testament passages. Some of the Old Testament passages are applied to the Son in the New Testament, but Athanasius also employed other passages as references to the Son though they are not used in this way in the New Testament.

The origin of the application of the name "Lord" to the Son goes back to the early years of the Church. Though the early Christians were reluctant to call Jesus "God," they applied the name "Lord" to him in many passages of the New Testament including early passages. Cullmann states that the very earliest Christian communities called Jesus "the Lord."¹

"Lord" is adjectival in form, and its earliest appearance was in the fifth century, B.C.² It came to be used as a divine title in the Hellenistic world. In the wider

¹Cullmann, Christology, p. 208.

²Whiteley, op. cit., p. 103.

religious and historical context the title came to be used of the deified emperors and also divinities. It was oriental in origin and was characteristic of a number of Hellenized cults, especially in Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt. Rawlinson suggests that the choice of this word "Lord" by the translators of the Septuagint to serve in rendering the divine name Yahweh in the Old Testament belongs to the same general context of ideas. The use of the title "Lord" for Jesus, Rawlinson believes, was likely to suggest to Greek minds the conception of the Christian Church as a kind of community of devotees who were associated together for the worship of a divine "Lord" whose name was "Jesus."¹ Cerfaux argues that the custom of addressing a ruler as "Lord" was an oriental one. In the East, and especially among Arameans, kings were called "Lord." The title was used in the East for kings without any connotation of religious reverence, as it was simply a title that belonged to rulers. There was no indication of emperor worship in the title. Cerfaux suggests that the Christians began to use this royal title in its application to the risen Christ.²

The use of "Lord" in the Septuagint to render the Hebrew Adonai as well as "Yahweh" implies that, with or

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 76, 77. See also Cullmann, Christology, pp. 195 ff.

²L. Cerfaux, Études d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse (Gembloux, 1954), I, 3 ff.

without the definite article, it denotes the power of God over the world as Creator, Ruler, and the Giver of life and death.¹ This title expressed the conception of Yahweh as the solitary and unique "Lord" to whom Israel might lawfully render their allegiance. In religious usage this name seems to have been especially a title used by the worshipers themselves of the deity who was the object of their worship. The worshipers invoked God as the "Lord" whom they honored and whose servants they acknowledged themselves to be.²

Bultmann thinks that it is improbable that Kyrios is derived from the Septuagint. He believes that it is better to conclude that it comes from the religious terminology of Hellenism and specifically that of Oriental Hellenism. He states that this is clearly the view in I Cor. 8:5.³ Bultmann accepts the theory of Bousset who claimed that the religious title, Kyrios, being oriental in origin, was used especially to designate the gods who occupied important places in "mystic" circles. Thus the little communities of Christians of Greek culture would then have treated Jesus as one of these gods before Paul appeared on the scene. Hence Paul would have received, either from Antioch, Tarsus, or Damascus, both the title of Kyrios and the mystic ideas as the

¹Taylor, Names of Jesus, p. 39.

²Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 77.

³Bultmann, Theology, I, 124, 125.

basis of all his theology.¹

Whiteley thinks that though Bultmann's (and Bousset's) view cannot be formally refuted, it is unconvincing.² It is most probable that Jesus was called "Lord" in the earliest Christian communities which would preclude the view that it was later, through Paul, that the worship of Jesus as "Lord" took place.³ One point which calls for attention in this context is the early Aramaic invocation, "Maranatha." On the basis of I Cor. 16:22 Kuhn concludes that the use of "Maranatha" could only have arisen in Palestine because of the Aramaic background of the word.⁴ However, as Whiteley points out, this argument is inconclusive, for the Aramaic language was not confined to Palestine.⁵ Bruce asserts that the use of the invocation, "Maranatha," sufficiently proves that Jesus was addressed as "Lord" in the Aramaic-speaking Church. This invocation was so primitive that it was taken over by the Greek-speaking Christians (see I Cor. 16:22;

¹Ibid., I, 24, 25; Wilhelm Bousset, Kyrios Christos (Göttingen, 1913), pp. 94-125; Cerfaux, Theology of St. Paul, pp. 461, 462.

²Whiteley, op. cit., p. 105.

³See Cullmann, Christology, pp. 203, 208.

⁴K. G. Kuhn, "μαραναθά," TWNT, IV, 473, 474.

⁵Whiteley, op. cit., p. 105. Wainwright, op. cit., p. 87, also states that Bousset fails to prove that the application of the title "Lord" to Jesus originates in Antioch.

Did. 10:6).¹ Foerster finds the origin of "Lord" in the use, though infrequent, of the word Mari which was applied to Jesus during his ministry.² The background of the use of "Lord" to apply to Jesus in Paul is not to be traced to the pagan mystery cults, Stewart concludes, but to the Septuagint version of the Old Testament.³

Christ as Lord in the New Testament

Jesus' argument in Matt. 22:41-45 (and Parallels) from Ps. 110:1 is based on the idea that David calls the Messiah "Lord." The majority of Jewish scribes would have agreed that "my Lord" was the expected Messiah but would have dismissed as blasphemy the suggestion that the Messiah was entitled to be put on a par with Yahweh. They would certainly have regarded as blasphemous the ascription of Yahweh's name to the Messiah.⁴

The title "Lord" as applied to Jesus received its full meaning only after his death and resurrection. The decisive event is the resurrection after which Jesus becomes

¹Bruce, Promise and Fulfilment, loc. cit., p. 49. See Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 231, who also states that the use of "Lord" by the Greek-speaking Christian communities must traced back to the original Aramaic-speaking Church. See also Cerfaux, Theology of St. Paul, p. 464.

²Werner Foerster, "x6p1oc," TWNT, III, 1092-1094.

³James S. Stewart, A Man in Christ (London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1935), p. 301.

⁴Bruce, Promise and Fulfilment, loc. cit., pp. 39, 40.

the Lord for his disciples.¹ Jesus' use of Ps. 110:1 (Matt. 22:41-45, and parallels) was no doubt influential in the ascription of the title "Lord" to Jesus. This passage from the Psalms regularly received a Messianic interpretation in New Testament times, and, applied to Jesus, the designation quickly became "the Lord Jesus" or simply "the Lord." The title gave expression to the Christian conviction of the absolute Lordship of Jesus, his exaltation in majesty, and his unqualified claim to allegiance. Its use tended to promote a definite belief, though not thought out, in the deity of Jesus. This was based on the fact that the same divine title was applied to Jesus which in Greek was the name of God in the Old Testament.²

One of the consequences of the application of the title "Lord" to Jesus, Cullmann avows, is that in principle all the Old Testament passages which speak of God may be applied to Jesus. When Jesus quoted the Old Testament, the word "Lord" referred to God. The New Testament writers, however, quite commonly applied such Old Testament passages to Jesus.³ One of the most striking examples of this procedure is found in Heb. 1:10-12 which applies to Jesus a text

¹See Cullmann, Christology, p. 203; and Cerfaux, op. cit., p. 464.

²Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 78. See also Bruce, Promise and Fulfilment, loc. cit., p. 39.

³Cullmann, Christology, p. 234.

(Ps. 102:25-27) which obviously speaks of God the Father as Creator. The author of Hebrews did not hesitate to address Jesus with the words of the Psalm and thus designate him as Creator of heaven and earth. Heb. 1:8, 9 expressly states that the passage refers to the Son, and the passage itself apparently designates the Son as God in applying Ps. 45:6, 7 to the Son. The author of Hebrews at least implies that the Son may be addressed as "God."¹ This same procedure of applying to Jesus passages which, in the Old Testament, refer to God may be seen also in such passages as Is. 45:23 in Phil. 2:9-11, and Joel 2:32 in Rom. 10:13 and Acts 2:21. Cerfaux observes that Paul is very moderate in this form of exegesis.²

Believers in Christ are described by Paul as those who "call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 1:2)--that is, they are those who invoke Jesus Christ by the title of "Lord." In I Cor. 12:3 Paul says that the confession, "Jesus is Lord," can only be made "by the Holy Spirit." Cullmann concludes that, on the basis of the designation "Lord," early Christianity did not hesitate to transfer to Jesus everything the Old Testament says about God. As a consequence of the application of this title to Jesus all of the titles of honor for God himself with the exception of

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 187, 188.

²Cerfaux, op. cit., p. 472.

"Father" may be transferred to Jesus.¹ Once given the name which is above every name there could be no limitations at all for the transfer of divine attributes to him. All the functions of God were attributed to Jesus including that of creation.²

In Taylor's estimation the conception of Christ as "Lord" is the dominating idea in the theology of Paul. This, he suggests, is especially evident in four passages: I Cor. 8:5, 6; I Cor. 12:3; Rom. 10:9; and Phil. 2:6-11.³ In Paul's use of "Lord" for Christ the name always retains a special shade of meaning applicable only to Christ, though "Lord" is used as a name for God. Paul is consistent, Cerfaux affirms, in his use of the antithesis between God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (e.g., I Thess. 1:3; Rom. 1:8). This does not imply a distinction, however, between one person who is God and another who is not, for both "God" and "Lord" are divine names. Cerfaux believes that Paul's letters echo the original faith that "Jesus is Lord" and that Paul inherited the title "our Lord Jesus Christ" from

¹Athanasius asserts that all that is affirmed in Scripture of the Father may also be said of the Son except that the Son is not called "Father." He states that the Son can only be called "Father" with the meaning it has in Is. 9:6, ". . . Father of the coming age." See De Syn. 49, 50; In Illud, Omnia, etc. 5. See also infra, pp. 242 ff.

²Cullmann, Christology, pp. 235-237, 307.

³Vincent Taylor, The Person of Christ in the New Testament (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd, 1958), p. 42.

the first community. For Paul Theos meant God the Father. Both "God" and "the Father" signify one and the same divine person who is the God of the Old Testament--the one true God. Then "the Lord" comes who is another divine person, a Kyrios who, as it were, takes his place by the side of Theos.¹

The question of the deity of Christ in the New Testament, Cullmann believes, should be asked in terms of the Kyrios title with its implications for the absolute Lordship of Christ, for only in this way can the problem of Christ's deity be considered within a genuinely New Testament framework.²

Though the title "Lord" was applied to Jesus in many New Testament passages the early Christians were reluctant to call Jesus "God." He is called God, Whiteley holds, only in the Johannine writings and the Pastoral Epistles with the possible exception of Rom. 9:5.³ He suggests that the apparent reason for the paucity of these references is that for a Jew the word "God" could mean one Person only. Its use

¹Cerfaux, Theology of St. Paul, pp. 461, 467, 468, 510, 511.

²Cullmann, Christology, p. 235.

³See Isaac Newton, in The Correspondence of Isaac Newton, ed. H. W. Turnbull (Cambridge: University Press, 1961), III, 141, 142, for an interesting discussion of the interpretation of Rom. 9:5. He concludes that the text does not refer to Christ as God. See Nigel Turner, Grammatical Insights into the New Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965), pp. 13 ff., for a discussion of Rom. 9:5 and other disputed texts. He interprets Rom. 9:5 as a reference to Jesus as God.

would have seemed an infringement of monotheism, whereas by calling Jesus "Lord" the early Christians confessed that he was associated with the Father in the exercise of authority.¹ It is indisputable that Jesus is designated "God" in John 1:1 and 20:28. Other passages that so designate Jesus, though they have been disputed, are John 1:18; I John 5:20; Heb. 1:8, 9; and Rom. 9:5. Additional passages that can possibly be interpreted to entitle Jesus with the name "God" are Col. 2:2; II Thess. 1:12; Tit. 2:13; and II Pet. 1:1. In Rev. 19:12 the name no one knows may be an allusion to the divine name.²

In Bultmann's judgment Christ is described as "God" by any possible exegesis only in II Thess. 1:12; Tit. 2:13; and II Pet. 1:1 with the exception of John 1:1 where the pre-existent Logos is called God and John 20:28 where Thomas addresses Jesus as, "My Lord and my God."³

In his discussion of the title "Lord" as a designation of Jesus and the application of Old Testament passages to him, Bruce makes the following observation:

¹Whiteley, op. cit., pp. 105, 106.

²Cullmann, Christology, pp. 307-313. See also Whiteley, op. cit., pp. 106, 107; and Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, trans. from 5th ed. John Marsh (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1955), p. 114.

³Bultmann, Theology, I, 29. In Essays Philosophical and Theological, trans. James C. G. Greig (London: SCM Ltd, 1955), p. 276, Bultmann avers that the only passage in which Jesus is undoubtedly addressed as God is John 20:28.

But it was not primarily this linguistic accident that made those early Christian writers apply to Jesus Old Testament passages which plainly referred to Israel's God. What moved them to do so was the impact so unparalleled that it made men who had been brought up as faithful monotheistic Jews give Jesus, inevitably and spontaneously, the glory which belonged to the one God.¹

Athanasius' application of the title "Lord" to the Son

Athanasius applies to Christ Old Testament passages which are so used in the New Testament, but he also uses other Old Testament passages to refer to the Son that are not used in this way in the New Testament.² He asserts that the Son is true God, for it is stated in Ps. 45:6 (Heb. 1:8), "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of equity is the scepter of your kingdom." He argues that Phil. 2:5-11 makes it clear that the Son who existed as God took the form of a servant and that he was always worshiped by this name--Lord. While he was worshiped by the patriarchs, it is written about the angels, "Let the angels of God worship him" (Ps. 97:7; Heb. 1:6). He also refers to Ps. 45:6, 7 (Heb. 1:8, 9) as a passage that indicates that the Son is praised as the eternal God.³

The difference between the Son and creatures is

¹Bruce, Promise and Fulfilment, loc. cit., pp. 49, 50.

²See infra, pp. 217 ff., for the latter passages.

³Ad Serap. II.3, 4; C. Ar. I.40, 41, 46.

indicated in Heb. 1:10 (Ps. 102:25) where it is said that the Son "laid the foundation of all things." The creative activity of the Son and his eternal existence is shown in Heb. 1:8, 10, 11 (Ps. 45:6; 102:25, 26). "You remain" in Heb. 1:11 indicates that the Son is eternal and does not have the capacity of perishing as creatures have. In Athanasius' view the words of Ps. 110:1, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit on my right hand," and Ps. 45:6, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of your kingdom," demonstrate that the Son is worshiped, for in these references "Lord" and "God" are identified as the Son before his incarnation.¹

Athanasius also applies to the Son Old Testament passages that are not so used in the New Testament. The Son was worshiped by Abraham (Gen. 18:2)² and by Moses (Ex. 3:6). Daniel is said to have seen the hosts ministering to him (Dan. 7:10). The Son appeared to Abraham on the plain of Mamre (Gen. 18:1) and spoke to Moses in the burning bush (Ex. 3:4).³ The "Ancient of days" in Daniel (Dan. 7:9, 10)⁴ is the Son. The activity of the Son before his incarnation is

¹C. Ar. I.57, 58.

²So also Justin Martyr (Dial. 56); and Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 3.6.1; 4.14).

³So also Justin Martyr (Dial. 59-61); and Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 4.20.1). See also infra, pp. 221 ff.

⁴So also Justin Martyr (I Apol. 51; Dial. 81).

signified in Ps. 18:9, 13, for he "bowed the heaven and came down," and, "The Highest gave his thunder."¹

In contrast to men the Son is true God, for it is stated in Is. 45:14, 15, "Egypt was overwhelmed and the commerce of the Ethiopians; and the Sabaeans, men of stature, shall come over to you, and they shall follow behind you bound with fetters, and they shall worship you, because God is in you. For you are the God of Israel, and we did not know you." In Athanasius' opinion the God of whom this verse speaks can only be the Son who said, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10).²

That the Son was always worshiped by the name "Lord" is evident in Ps. 54:1, "Save me, O God, for your name's sake," and in Ps. 20:7, "Some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God." The worship of the Son is also evidenced in Ps. 72:5, 17, "His name remains before the sun, and before the moon from one generation to another."³ Ps. 24 refers to the Son when it speaks of the King of glory and his entrance through the gates. It indicates both his deity, "Lord" and "King of glory," and his incarnation, "Lift up your gates" and "shall come in." For Athanasius the phrases that speak of the incarnation are spoken as if a man were entering--and

¹C. Ar. I.38; II.13.

²Ad Serap. II.4.

³So also Justin Martyr interprets Ps. 72:17 (Dial. 121).

thus it is a reference to the flesh he bore. Athanasius also believes that man's exaltation through the Son is seen in the words, "And in your righteousness shall they be exalted, for you are the glory of their strength" (Ps. 89: 16, 17).¹

Athanasius asserts that Abraham worshiped the Son as Lord (Gen. 18:1, 2), for it is said, "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven" (Gen. 19:24). The words of Ps. 145:13 show that the Son is worshiped: "Your kingdom is an everlasting kingdom." The Son is worshiped with the Father and confessed as God in Dan. 3:57, "O all you works of the Lord, bless the Lord." This is corroborated in Ps. 33:4, "The Word of the Lord is true, and all his works are faithful," and in Ps. 104:24, "O Lord, how manifold are your works! in Wisdom you have made them all."²

As the words of Dt. 6:4, "The Lord your God is one Lord," and Ps. 50:1, "The God of gods, the Lord has spoken, and has called the earth," are written of the Father, in the same way it is written of the Son, "The Lord God has shined

¹C. Ar. I.40, 41. In C. Ar. II.23 Athanasius says that Ps. 24:10, "The Lord of hosts, the Lord of Sabaoth," shows that the Son is the God who is both true and almighty. Ps. 24 is also interpreted as a reference to the Son by Justin Martyr (I Apol. 51; Dial. 36), Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 4. 44.4), and Origen (C. Cels 8.1).

²C. Ar. II.13, 71. Ps. 104:24 is also interpreted in this way by Origen (De Prin. 1.2.10).

upon us" (Ps. 118:27), and, "The God of gods shall be seen in Zion" (Ps. 84:7). The kingdom of the Son is referred to in Dan. 4:3 and 7:14, "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his kingdom shall not be destroyed."¹

In his argument that ignorance cannot be attributed to Jesus as the Word, though Jesus himself stated that he did not know the time of his coming (Mk. 13:32), Athanasius points out that the Lord knew exactly the time of the coming of the impending flood in Noah's day. This is evident, he believes, because the Lord himself instructed Noah to enter the ark (Gen. 7:1, 5).²

Athanasius asserts that the Son could not fear death as the Arians alleged, for the Son had said to Abraham, "Fear not, I am with you" (Gen. 26:24); he had encouraged Moses against Pharaoh (Ex. 4:12); and he had also spoken thus to Joshua, "Be strong and of good courage" (Josh. 1:6).³ That the Son had strengthened others against fear is also evident in Ps. 118:6, "The Lord is on my side, I will not fear what man shall do unto me."⁴

That the essence of the Son does not change and

¹De Syn. 49. Dan. 7:9 ff. is also interpreted in this way by Justin Martyr (I Apol. 51; Dial. 81) and Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 4.34.10).

²C. Ar. III.45. See also infra, pp. 271 ff.

³Justin Martyr also ascribes the words of Josh. 1:6 to the Son (Dial. 61).

⁴C. Ar. III.54.

develop can be ascertained, Athanasius believes, from the Son's own words, "Behold, behold, it is I, and I do not change" (Dt. 32:39; Mal. 3:6). Athanasius also applies these words to God, or else he applies them to God but maintains that they suit the Son also.¹

It is clearly evident that Athanasius followed the precedent set by the New Testament writers in attributing to the Son passages which, in the Old Testament, were obviously references to God the Father. Athanasius greatly extends the number of Old Testament passages which, in his opinion, can be affirmed of the Son though ascribed in the Old Testament to God. Often his method of attributing the acts and words of God in the Old Testament to the Son seem quite arbitrary and indiscriminate. It is evident that these passages are employed to demonstrate the deity of the Son, for he is pre-existent, he created, and he is also unchanging.²

Christ as Angel of the Lord

Christ as Angel of the Lord in Athanasius

In Athanasius' thought the pre-existence of the Son is also to be seen in the Christophanies in the Old Testament. In Gen. 18 and 19 one of the three visitors is

¹Ad Epict. 5; C. Ar. I.36; II.10.

²See Part IV for a discussion of the relationship of the Son to the Old Testament in Athanasius.

identified by Athanasius as the Son, for Abraham is said to worship him. It is also affirmed that the gifts of God come through the Son, for this is demonstrated in Gen. 48:15, 16 where Jacob blesses his children with the words, "God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which delivered me from all evil, bless the lads." That the Angel was the Word of God indicated in that he was united to the Father in Jacob's prayer. Athanasius refers to Is. 9:6 to substantiate this identification where, he says, the Word is called the "Angel of great counsel."¹

The Angel in Jacob's experience is also identified as the Son in Gen. 32:26 where Jacob prays, "I will not let you go except you bless me." The one Jacob addressed was God, for he said, "I have seen God face to face" (Gen. 32:30). The difference between angels and the Son is also evident in their functions. Angels are sent to minister, Athanasius asserts, but he whom Jacob addressed (Gen. 32:26) was God. This is evident in that the Lord said to Jacob, "And behold I am with you, to guard you in all the way wherever you go" (Gen. 28:15). Also it is stated that it was God who kept Laban from treachery and ordered him not to speak evil words to Jacob (Gen. 31:24). Jacob is said to have asked God, "Rescue me from the hand of my brother Esau, for I fear him" (Gen. 32:11). Jacob had earlier said to his wives, "God has

¹C. Ar. I.38; III.12.

not allowed Laban to injure me" (Gen. 31:7).¹

It is affirmed by Athanasius that Jacob saw the Word of God himself and received a blessing from him, for it is stated in Gen. 32:31, "And as he passed by the Form of God, the sun rose upon him." This person in the experience of Jacob is identified by Athanasius as the one who said, "He who has seen me has seen the Father," "I am in the Father and the Father in me," and, "I and the Father are one" (John 14:9, 10, 11; 10:30). Therefore, Athanasius concludes, the Angel in these episodes in Jacob's life is the Word of God who is associated with God himself in his activities. This is said to show the difference between the Word, or Angel, in his relationship to God in distinction to created beings.²

Athanasius also refers to Moses' experience, for the Word of God, he declares, appeared to Moses. In Ex. 3:2-6 Moses is said to have seen an angel but to have heard the voice of God. God spoke in the angel. Athanasius differentiates between seeing an angel and seeing God and in this connection states that Zechariah saw an angel, but Isaiah saw God; Manoah, the father of Samson, saw an angel, but Moses saw God; an angel appeared to Gideon, but God appeared to Abraham; and an angel spoke to Joshua.³ Athanasius

¹Ibid., III.12. In Ad Serap. I.14 Athanasius seems to suggest that the Son is distinct from the angel mentioned in Gen. 48:15, 16.

²C. Ar. III. 16.

³Ibid., III.14.

apparently holds that the angel Moses saw was not God, although God was the speaker. It must be in this sense that he asserts that Moses saw God, or else his statements are contradictory. Thus Athanasius accepts the statement in Ex. 3:2-6 and asserts that Moses saw God, and yet he distinguishes between the angel and God. The angel Moses saw was not the God of Abraham in Athanasius' opinion.¹ Thus the angel must be the Son, or, as Robertson apparently suggests, the Son was the unseen speaker.²

In Athanasius' interpretation of these appearances, the Angel of the Lord is usually identified specifically as the Son. For Athanasius the Son was pre-existent and active in the Old Testament, and thus the appearances of the Angel of the Lord can be termed "Christophanies."

The background and history of the conception of Christ as Angel of the Lord

References to theophanies are scattered throughout the Old Testament literature.³ Knight states that the significance of these theophanies is that throughout the Old Testament period and into the New Testament they were

¹Ibid. ²Robertson, op. cit., IV, 400, n. 2.

³See George A. F. Knight, A Christian Theology of the Old Testament (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959), pp. 75-78, for a list and discussion of the various Old Testament theophanies.

accepted as indications of God's self-revelation to men.¹ In some of the Old Testament passages the Angel identified himself with God and claimed to exercise the prerogatives of God (e.g., Gen. 18, 19). Those to whom the Angel appeared also identified him with God as in Gen. 32:30 (RSV), "I have seen God face to face." Therefore these appearances of the Angel of the Lord constitute theophanies in that they are self-manifestations of God.² It should also be noted that the Angel that was singled out was conceived as containing within him the essence of God himself and yet was separate from God. "He was really God in the act of performing a mission from God."³ Daniélou suggests that the background of the usage of the conception lies in later Judaism as well as in the Old Testament.⁴

Johnson emphasizes that in the Israelite conception of God there is an oscillation between the "One and the Many." This idea, he believes, is reinforced by the conception of the Angel or Messenger of Yahweh. Along this line

¹George A. F. Knight, A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 1 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1953), p. 27.

²A. B. Davidson, "Angel," HDB, I, 194.

³Knight, Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 27.

⁴Jean Daniélou, Historie des Doctrines Chrétiennes avant Nicée: I. Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme, in Bibliothèque de Théologie (Tournai, Belgium, 1958), p. 168.

of oscillation of extension of personality a new line of approach may be gained to the New Testament extension of Jewish Monotheism in the direction of the later Trinitarianism. Thus the possibility can be seen of a Jewish Christian being able to relate his Messiah so closely with the divine Being that a basis was afforded for the later metaphysical formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity.¹ Hengstenberg suggests that in Mal. 3:1 the doctrine of the Angel of the Lord is expressly brought into connection with that of Christ: "Behold, I send my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple; the messenger of the covenant in whom you delight, behold, he is coming, says the Lord of hosts"² (RSV). There is no indication in the New Testament of an identification of the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament with the Son. It should be noted, however, that in Stephen's speech there is a reference to the appearance of an angel of the Lord in the burning bush from which Moses heard the voice of the Lord (Acts 7:30-34).³

¹Aubrey R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961), pp. 28, 37.

²F. W. Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions, trans. Theod. Meyer (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1854), I, 102.

³Martin Werner, in The Formation of Christian Dogma: An Historical Study of Its Problem (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), pp. 121, 122, 130 (n. 1), 133, etc., holds that the Son of Man is represented in the Synoptics as the Prince of angels and that Paul's Christology was an "Angel-Christology."

The oscillation between the singular and plural in Abraham's and Lot's words to the three strangers (Gen. 18 and 19) is interpreted by Philo to be a triple manifestation of the one God. In his view it is like an object which casts two shadows at once. Philo also associates the Logos with the appearances of the Angel of the Lord.¹

Some of the Church fathers considered these appearances of the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament to be important.² Justin Martyr identifies the "Angel of great Counsel" with Christ. He identifies the three men who appeared to Abraham as Christ and two angels. The Son is said to be the Angel who appeared to Moses and spoke to him, and it was the Son who wrestled with Jacob.³ Irenaeus affirms that the Son gave Noah the dimensions of the ark, visited Abraham, brought down judgment on the Sodomites, directed Jacob on his journey, and spoke to Moses from the bush.⁴ Origen also appears to identify one of the angels who visited Abraham as the Son.⁵ Cyprian interprets the appearances of the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament as Christophanies.⁶

Daniélou believes that the practice of identifying the

¹De Abr. 22, 24; De Conf. 38.146.

²Wainwright, op. cit., p. 28.

³Dial. 56, 61, 126, 127; I Apol. 63.

⁴Adv. Haer. 4.14; 4.20.1. ⁵In Gen. Hom. 4.

⁶Test. 2.5.

Angel of the Lord with Christ tended to disappear because of the ambiguity of the expression and because of its use by the Arians. The problem of the use of the term for Christ was that it presented the danger of subordinationism.¹

It is evident that Athanasius, in common with other Church fathers, interprets these appearances of the Angel of the Lord to be appearances of the pre-incarnate Son. The Son, as the Angel of the Lord, is distinguished from angels, for they are sent as servants, but the Son exercises divine prerogatives. For Athanasius the activities of the Angel of the Lord, that is, the Son, demonstrate that the relationship of the Son to God is one of unity, and thus the deity of the Son is signified. The Son is not a created being. The Son who appeared as the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament events is to be distinguished from creatures, for he is eternal and unchanging.²

It is evident that Athanasius' practice of applying the name "Lord" in the Old Testament to the Son was common to both New Testament writers and the Church fathers. His interpretation of the appearances of the Angel of the Lord to be that of the pre-incarnate Son was also the interpretation of earlier writers, though no evidence of this method

¹Daniélou, Historie des Doctrines Chrétiennes, pp. 167, 198.

²C. Ar. II.12-14.

is discernible in the New Testament. Thus for Athanasius the ascription of the name "Lord" to the Son and the pre-incarnate Son's appearance as the Angel of the Lord are evidences for the deity of the Son.

CHAPTER IX

THE COMMON ACTIVITIES AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE PERSONS OF THE TRINITY

One of the principles in Athanasius' conception and defense of the doctrine of the Trinity is the unity of the Divine operation of the Persons of the Godhead. He seeks to demonstrate from Scripture the relationship of the activities of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. That which God has spoken is said through the Holy Spirit. The activity of one Person of the Trinity involves the other two Persons as well. Wherever one acts the others are present. This argument establishes not only the deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit but demonstrates the unity of the Trinity as well. McIntyre refers to this method as the logical or deductive principle which the Greek fathers employed in their treatment of the Holy Spirit.¹ This is of course true of the doctrine of the Son also. Athanasius turns to various passages of Scripture to establish the validity of his argument. Because of the conception that all of the Persons of the Godhead are involved in the operation of each, whatever is said of one of the Persons of the Trinity can be said of the other two Persons as well. At each point of his

¹John McIntyre, "The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought," SJT (7, 1954), p. 355.

argument Athanasius cites Scripture passages to support his statements.

Creation

The Son, Athanasius affirms, is not a creature but is Creator like the Father, for it is said in John 5:19, "What things I see the Father doing, these things I do also," and in John 1:3, "All things were made by him and without him was not one thing made that was made."¹

The function of creating is also attributed to the Spirit, and it therefore follows that the Spirit is not a creature. The evidence that Athanasius adduces for this contention is Ps. 104:29, 30, "You shall take away their spirit, and they shall die and return to their dust. You shall put forth your Spirit, and they shall be created, and you shall renew the face of the earth." The fact that the Spirit takes part in creation precludes the assertion that the Spirit is a creature. The Father, Athanasius affirms, creates all things through his Word and in the Spirit, for where the Word is, there the Spirit is also.² The things

¹Ad Serap. III.4. See supra, pp. 147 ff., for Athanasius' conception of the Son as Creator.

²The formula that God works "through the Word in the Spirit" (διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι), based on I Cor. 8:6; 12:3; etc., occurs many times in Athanasius. Shapland, op. cit., pp. 36, 37, observes that for Athanasius this means that the action of the Godhead "derives from the Father and is accomplished through the agency of the Son in the Spirit."

which are created through the Word have their "strength" (λογος) out of the Spirit from the Word, for so it is declared in Ps. 33:6, "By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the Spirit of his mouth is all their power"; and also in Ps. 147:18, "He shall send out his Word and shall melt them, he shall breathe his Spirit and the waters shall flow." Creation is a prerogative of God. To the Son and the Spirit is also ascribed the function of creating. Therefore the Son and the Spirit cannot be creatures, for they are thus united with God.¹

The Inspiration of Prophets and Apostles

Athanasius asserts that when the Word was in the prophets, they prophesied in the Holy Spirit. When the Scripture says that "the word of the Lord came" (Jer. 2:1; Mic. 1:1; etc.) to a particular prophet, it also shows that he prophesied in the Holy Spirit. Thus it is written in Zech. 1:6, "But receive my words and my commandments which I charge by my Spirit to my servants the prophets." Later the prophet rebuked the people, "They made their hearts disobedient, lest they should hear my law and the words which the Lord of hosts has sent by the hands of the prophets of old" (Zech. 7:12).²

Athanasius sees this same relationship of the Word

¹Ad Serap. I.24, 31; II.5.

²Ibid., I.31; III.5.

and the Spirit in the inspiration and guidance of the apostles in the New Testament. The Scriptural evidence suggested for this assertion is Acts 1:16, "Brethren, it was needful that the Scripture should be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spoke before"; and Acts 4:24, 25, "O Lord, you who did make the heaven and the earth and the sea and all that is in them, who by the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of our father David your servant, did say" Additional support for this idea may be seen in Acts 28:25, "Well did the Holy Spirit speak by Isaiah the prophet unto your fathers"; and in I Tim. 4:1, "The Spirit says expressly that in later times some will fall away from the sound faith, giving heed to spirits of seduction."¹

This line of thought is continued by Athanasius in demonstrating that when the Scriptures speak of the Spirit being in someone, it also means that the Word is in him and bestows the Spirit. The evidence advanced for this contention is found in Joel 2:28, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." This outpouring of the Spirit enabled Paul to say, "According to the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ to me" (Phil. 1:19). II Cor. 13:3 is to be compared with these references, for Paul also said, "If you seek a proof of Christ that speaks in me" On this basis Athanasius can assert that if he who spoke in Paul was Christ,

¹Ibid., I.31.

then the Spirit who spoke in him was the Spirit of Christ. This same association is also purported to be seen in Acts 20:22, 23 where Paul says that Christ was speaking in him, "Now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there, except that the Spirit testifies to me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions await me." When Scripture declares, "Thus says the Lord" (e.g., Amos 1:3), it also means that the prophets spoke in the Holy Spirit; and if they spoke in the Spirit, they spoke in the Spirit of Christ. In the words, "Thus says the Holy Spirit" (Acts 21:11), Agabus indicates that the Spirit in him enables him to speak and testify as he does.¹

The Work of Sanctification

In Contra Arianos Athanasius affirms that the Spirit descended upon the Son for the sanctification of Christians and that they might share in the Son's anointing. When the Son received the Spirit, Christians were made the recipients of the Spirit. Thus it is said in I Cor. 3:16, "Do you not know that you are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you?" The Son is said to be anointed and sanctified for man's sake and not for his own sake. The Lord himself said, "The Spirit shall take of mine," and, "I will

¹Ibid., I.31; III.5.

send him" (John 16:14, 7). He said to his disciples, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22). From the Son Christians receive the unction and the seal, "And you have an unction from the Holy One" (I John 2:20), and, "And you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:13). Athanasius declares that these passages are intended for the benefit of Christians.¹

Athanasius asserts that the Son is "proper" (ἴδιος) to the essence of the Father, for he participates wholly in the Father, and he is God's Son by nature. Men, however, participate in the Father by participation in the Son. All things, Athanasius believes, so partake according to the grace of the Spirit who comes from the Son. That men by partaking of the Son partake of the Father is evident in II Pet. 1:4, "That you may be partakers in a divine nature"; I Cor. 3:16, "Do you not know, that you are a temple of God?" and also II Cor. 6:16, "We are the temple of a living God." The Father is contemplated and known in the Son (John 14:9), for the Son and the Father are one (John 10:30).²

In Ad Serapion Athanasius makes these same predications of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit, Paul writes, is the Spirit of holiness and renewal: "Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the

¹C. Ar. I.47. See also infra, pp. 237, 238.

²C. Ar. I.16.

resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 1:4); "But you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (I Cor. 6:11); and, "But when the kindness of God our Savior and his love toward men appeared, not by works done in righteousness which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior, that being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life" (Tit. 3:4-7). The Spirit is distinct from creatures, for they are sanctified and renewed. This is evident in Ps. 104:30, "You shall send forth your Spirit, and they shall be created, and you shall renew the face of the earth," and Heb. 6:4, "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit . . ."¹

The Holy Spirit is not sanctified by another, nor is he a partaker of sanctification. Men partake of the Spirit, and all creatures are sanctified in him. Therefore the Spirit cannot be a creature. Those who say this of the Spirit must also make the same declaration of the Son who created all things. The Spirit, Athanasius affirms, is called a life giving Spirit, for the Scriptures state, "He

¹Ad Serap. I.22.

that raised up Christ from the dead shall also make alive your mortal bodies through his Spirit who dwells in you" (Rom. 8:11). The Lord is life itself and also the "Author of life" (Acts 3:15). The Lord himself declared, "The water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up into eternal life. . . . this he spoke concerning the Spirit which they that believed in him were to receive" (John 4:14; 7:39).¹

Athanasius points out that the Spirit is called unction and seal: "As for you, the unction which you received of him abides in you, and you do not need that anyone teach you, but his unction"--his Spirit--"teaches you concerning all things" (I John 2:27); "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me" (Is. 61:1); and, "In whom having also believed, you were sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 1:13). The Spirit is the unction and seal with which the Word anoints and seals all things, therefore the unction and seal could not be like or proper to the things that are anointed and sealed. By this consideration also it must be concluded that the Spirit cannot belong to the creatures which are sealed and anointed in him. He who is the seal and the unction is proper to the Word who anoints and seals. The Spirit as the unction has the fragrance and odor of him who anoints, and those who are

¹Ibid., I.23.

anointed say when they receive the anointing, "We are the fragrance of Christ" (II Cor. 2:15). The Spirit as the seal has the form of Christ who seals, and those who are sealed partake of and are conformed to the seal. Thus Paul said, "My little children, for whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you" (Gal. 4:19). Those who are thus sealed are "sharers in the divine nature" (II Pet. 1:4); so all creation partakes of the Word in the Spirit.¹

Irenaeus also makes use of the symbol of unction. He relates it from Is. 61:1 to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Christ. He affirms that it is by the Spirit who is the unction that the Father anoints the Son. As the Son receives, so he transmits the gift to those who partake of himself.² For Origen the unction of the Spirit expresses the permeation of the soul by the Word and Wisdom of God. Its fragrance extends to those who partake of the Son.³

Athanasius states that men are "deified" (θεοποιέω)

¹Ibid. G. W. H. Lampe, in The Seal of the Spirit (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1951), p. 251, states that in his description of the Holy Spirit as the seal whereby Christ stamps men with the divine image, Athanasius clearly connects the gift of the Spirit with the renewal of God's image in man. Clement of Alexandria refers to the Spirit as the seal stamped upon the believer's soul. This seal is the mark of Christ's ownership. Christ who is himself the image of God's glory, stamps this spiritual seal upon the soul. Clement equates the seal with baptism. (See Strom. 4.18; 7.3; 5.11). See Lampe, op. cit., pp. 153 ff.

²Adv. Haer. 3.18.3; 3.19.3. ³De Prin. 2.6.6.

through the Son.¹ If the Son were a creature, men could not be deified by being united to him. Men can only be made partakers of God if the Son is very God. The Son is very God, but other beings, to whom it is said, "I said you are gods" (Ps. 82:6), are made partakers of God only by participation in the Word through the Spirit.²

It was the Arians' contention that the oneness of the Son with the Father (John 17:11) is not different than that of men with God. Athanasius refutes their statement on the basis of John 10:30 and 14:10, 11, "I and the Father are one," and, "I am in the Father, and the Father in me." Men are made sons, however, by adoption and grace in partaking of the Spirit, "As many as received him to them gave he power to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name" (John 1:12). The Son became incarnate to redeem mankind.³

In his first letter to Serapion Athanasius reiterates his conception of the deification of men by participation in the Word but extends it to include participation in the Holy Spirit. Participation in the Word is through the Spirit, he asserts, and so men are said to be partakers of God. This may be concluded on the basis of I Cor. 3:16, 17, "Do you

¹E.g., De Inc. 54; and many other places.

²C. Ar. I.9; II.70. In De Syn. 51 Athanasius declares that in partaking of the Son men partake of the Father, because the Son is the Father's own Word.

³C. Ar. III.10, 19; see also Ad Adolph. 4.

not know that you are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? If any man destroys the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple you are."¹

As in his statements of participation in God through the Son, Athanasius argues that man could not participate in God if the Spirit were a creature. The fact that Christians are called partakers of Christ and partakers of God shows that the unction and seal that is in them does not belong to that which is created but to the nature of the Son who, through the Spirit who is in the believer, unites the Christian to the Father. This is said to be taught in I John 4:13, "Hereby know we that we abide in God and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit." If men are made "partakers in the divine nature" (II Pet. 1:4) by participation in the Spirit, in Athanasius' judgment it is folly to say that the Spirit has a created nature and not the nature of God. If the Spirit makes men divine, it cannot be doubted that the Spirit's nature is of God.²

Athanasius proposes two additional passages which are purported to show that there can be no likeness between the Creator and creatures: Ps. 104:29, 30, "You shall take away your Spirit, and they shall die and return to their dust. You shall put forth your Spirit, and they shall be created,

¹Ad Serap. I.23, 24.

²Ibid., I.24.

and you shall renew the face of the earth"; and Tit. 3:5, "Through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ . . ." Therefore as the Father, through the Word and in the Holy Spirit, creates and renews all things, there can be no likeness and kinship between Creator and creatures.¹

Athanasius also associates the Father and the Son in their indwelling the Christian. The Father comes in the Son as the Son promised when he said, "I and the Father will come and make our abode with him" (John 14:23). Also when the Scriptures state that the Father gives grace and peace, the Son also gives it, for Paul expressed it thus, "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1:7; I Cor. 1:3; etc.). This is an indication that by their common activity the Father and Son are unique in their relationship in the oneness of their essence.²

Later this association of the Father and Son in the indwelling of the Christian is extended to include the Holy Spirit. To Serapion Athanasius writes that when the Spirit is given to men, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22), God is in them. That this is true is indicated by John, "If we love one another, God abides in us; hereby know we that we abide in him and he in us, . . . because he has given us of

¹Ibid. ²C. Ar. III.11; also Ad Serap. I.19.

HAVING OBSERVED MISSING PAGES.
M.R. DANES 39. GRANGE ST. PORT TARBOR.
242

JUNE 1973.

his Spirit" (I John 4:12, 13).¹

The Spirit cannot be divided from the Word, and therefore when Christ said, "We will come, I and the Father" (John 14:23), the Spirit comes with the Son. This is expressed in Eph. 3:16, 17, "That he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, that you may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man, that Christ may dwell" If the Son indwells a person, the Father is also in him for the Son said, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10). The indwelling of the Son in the Christian includes that of the Father and the Spirit.²

The Declarations Made of the Father,
of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit

The Father, Athanasius points out, is called Fountain and Light: "They have forsaken me, the Fountain of living water" (Jer. 2:13); "Why, O Israel, are you in the land of your enemies? You have forsaken the Fountain of Wisdom" (Bar. 3:12); and, "Our God is Light" (I John 1:5). In contrast to the Fountain the Son is said to be called River, "The River of God is full of water" (Ps. 65:9). In distinction to the Light, the Son is called Radiance, "Who being the Radiance of his glory and the Image of his Person" (Heb. 1:3).³ In Contra Arianos Athanasius also refers to Jer. 2:13

¹Ad Serap. I.19.

²Ibid., I.31.

³Ibid., I.19.

and Bar. 3:12. On the basis of these references he states that Life and Wisdom, which are eternal, are proper to the essence of the Fountain. The Fountain refers to the Father, but the Son is both Life and Wisdom, for the Scriptures say, "I am the Life" (John 14:6) and, "I Wisdom dwell with prudence" (Prov. 8:12). If the Fountain is eternal, then the Son who is Life and Wisdom must also be acknowledged to be eternal. To say that once the Son was not would be tantamount to saying that the Fountain--God--was once dry, that is, destitute of Life and Wisdom.¹

As the Father is Light and the Son is his Radiance, so the Spirit who enlightens may be seen in the Son.² That the Spirit enlightens is evident in the words of Eph. 1:17, 18, "The Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, having the eyes of your heart enlightened." In being enlightened by the Spirit, it can be said that Christ enlightens men, "There was the true light which lights every man coming into the world" (John 1:9). As the Father is Fountain and the Son is called River, men drink of the Spirit, for it is stated in I Cor. 12:13, "We are all made to drink of one Spirit." In drinking of one Spirit, Christians

¹C. Ar. I.19.

²Shapland, op. cit., p. 108, n. 3, states that this illustration of light and radiance is the most important of all such illustrations used by the fathers. Prestige, in God in Patristic Thought, p. 214, calls it the "traditional way of expressing the divine unity."

drink of Christ, "They drank of a spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ" (I Cor. 10:4). As Christ is the true Son, so when he is received those who receive him are made sons, "For you have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but you have received the Spirit of adoption" (Rom. 8:15). Therefore if men are made sons by the Spirit, it is clear that it is in Christ that they are called God's children, for it is written in John 1:12, "As many as received him, to them gave he the power to become children of God." Paul calls the Father the "only wise" (Rom. 16:27), and the Son is the Father's Wisdom: "Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1:24). Then, as the Son is Wisdom, those who receive the Spirit of Wisdom¹ have the Son and are made wise in him. This is indicated in Ps. 146:7, 8, "The Lord looses the prisoners, the Lord makes wise the blind."²

Also as the Son is Life, "I am the Life" (John 14:6), so Christians are said to be made alive by the Spirit: "He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also make alive your mortal bodies, through his Spirit who dwells in

¹Shapland, *op. cit.*, p. 112, n. 22, points out that Athanasius does not identify the Spirit with the Wisdom of God in Prov. 8:22-31 as some writers did such as Irenaeus in *Adv. Haer.*, 4.20.3, 4. Athanasius stresses the genitive, Shapland states. The Spirit does not merely bear the name, but belongs to the Word who is Wisdom.

²Ad Serap. I.19.

you" (Rom. 8:11). When men are made alive by the Spirit, it is said that Christ himself lives in them: "I have been crucified with Christ, I live, but no longer I, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:20).¹

Athanasius also attributes the same "works" to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Father is said to work the works that Christ did, for Christ said, "The Father abiding in me does his works. Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for his works' sake" (John 14: 10, 11). Paul declares that the works he worked by the Spirit's power were the works of Christ: "For I will not dare to speak of any things except those which Christ wrought through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 15:18, 19).²

Athanasius also asserts that as the Son is sent forth from the Father, "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son" (John 3:16), so the Son sends the Spirit, "If I go away, I will send the Paraclete" (John 16:7). The Son glorifies the Father: "Father, I have glorified you" (John 17:4); and the Spirit glorifies the Son: "He shall glorify me" (John 16:14). The Son asserted that "the things I heard from the Father I speak to the world" (John 8:26); and the Spirit takes of the Son: "He shall take of mine and

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

shall declare it unto you" (John 16:14). The Son came in the name of the Father, and the Son said, "The Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name" (John 14:26).¹

The Worship of Father, Son, and Spirit

The worship of the Son is seen by Athanasius as an indication that the Son is true God, for he is worshiped as God, and is confessed as God.² Creature does not worship creature, but the servant worships the Lord, and the creature worships God. Thus Peter prevented Cornelius from worshipping him (Acts 10:26), and the angel prevented John from worshipping him (Rev. 22:9). Worship is to be directed toward God alone. The Son, for he is not a creature, is worshiped even by angels: "Let all the angels of God worship him" (Ps. 97:7; Heb. 1:6). The Gentiles worship the Son also, for it is stated in Is. 45:14, "The labor of Egypt and merchandise of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans . . . they shall fall down unto you, and shall make supplication unto you,

¹Ibid., I.20.

²Wainwright, op. cit., pp. 10, 11, states that the New Testament evidences for a belief in the deity of Christ can be divided into three groups: (1) Jesus Christ was worshiped; (2) Jesus Christ performed the functions of judgment, salvation, and creation which were all considered in Hebrew thought to be uniquely divine; and (3) the titles given to Jesus. All of these are used by Athanasius: see C. Ar. II.6 on Eccl. 12:14 for Christ as judge; supra, pp. 234 ff., for Christ as Savior; supra, pp. 147 ff., for Christ as Creator; and supra, pp. 204 ff., for the titles given him.

for God is in you, and there is no God except you."¹

Athanasius also cites as indications of the worship of the Son, and that he is confessed as God, Dan. 3:57, "O all you works of the Lord, bless the Lord"; Ps. 33:4, "The Word of the Lord is true, and all his works are faithful"; and Ps. 104:24, "O Lord, how manifold are your works! in Wisdom you have made them all." John 13:13 also signifies the worship and confession of the Son as God: "Do you not call me Lord and Master? and you say well, for so I am." The Son himself accepted the worship of Thomas: "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28). It is said that the healed leper recognized and worshiped the Creator as dwelling in a created temple (Matt. 8:2).²

Whoever worships and honors the Son, Athanasius affirms, worships and honors the Father in the Son. There is one Godhead, and the honor and worship which are offered to the Father through the Son are one. He who worships the Father in and through the Son, worships one God, for there is only one God and not another (Mk. 12:29; John 17:3). This God states, "I am" (Ex. 3:14), "Beside me there is no God" (Dt. 32:39), and, "I am the first and I am the last" (Is. 44:6). To affirm that there is one God is not to deny the Son, for the Son is in the one God, and he is God's fullness.

¹C. Ar. II.23; see *infra*, pp. 301, 302.

²C. Ar. II.23; see also *Ad Adelph.* 3, 4.

The Son is wholly and fully God.¹

John 4:21, 23, 24 is used by Athanasius to demonstrate that true worshipers worship the Father, Son, and Spirit: "Believe me, woman . . . the hour comes and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth; for such does the Father seek to be his worshipers. God is a Spirit, and they who worship him must worship in Spirit and Truth." The "Truth" in this passage is identified as the Son himself, for the Son said, "I am the Truth" (John 14:6). David also indicated this: "Send out your light and your Truth" (Ps. 43:3). In this worship of Father, Son, and Spirit, the worshipers confess the Son and in him confess the Spirit, for the Spirit is "inseparable" (ἀχώριστος) from the Son as the Son is "inseparable" from the Father. To this inseparability the Son himself bore witness: "I will send you the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth which proceeds from the Father, whom the world cannot receive" (John 15:16; 14:17).²

The Divine Attributes

Athanasius avers that the Son is "image" (εἰκών) and "exact representation" (χαράκτις) of God (Col. 1:15; Heb. 1:3). Because the Son is the Father's true image, the attributes of the Father must be the attributes of the Son in order for

¹C. Ar. III.6.

²Ad Serap. I.33.

the statement in John 14:9 to be true: "He who has seen the Son has seen the Father." The image of the Son is evident in creation: "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them: . . . for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made . . ." (Rom. 1:19, 20). That the Father is seen in his image, his Son, is shown in I John 2:23, "He who acknowledges the Son, has also the Father."¹

The very concept of "image" presupposes that the likeness of that represented is seen in the image. This is to be understood in Phil. 2:6, "Who being in the form of God," and John 14:10, 11, "The Father in me." The image of God in the Son is not merely partial, but the fullness of the Godhead of the Father dwells in the Son (Col. 1:19; 2:9), and therefore the Son must be completely God. As God's image the Son is also equal with God. This is stated in Scripture, for the Son "thought it not a prize to be equal with God" (Phil. 2:6). Because the Godhead and image of the Son is that of the Father, the Son could say, "I am in the Father" (John 14:10, 11); and therefore it could also be said that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" (II Cor. 5:19). The works of the Son are therefore the Father's works. He who sees the Son sees the Father also (John 14:9).²

The "identity" (ταύτότης) of the Godhead and the unity

¹C. Ar. I.9, 21; II.80, 81.

²Ibid., III.6.

of the "essence" (*οὐσία*) of the Father and Son are shown in the words, "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30), and, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10, 11). The Son and the Father are one. The Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son, for the Godhead of the Son is the Father's Godhead. Therefore "he who has seen the Son has seen the Father" (John 14:9).¹ The words of Heb. 1:3 signify that the Son is of the essence and eternity of the Father: "Who being the brightness of his glory and express image of his Person."²

In that the Father and the Son are one, and the Son is the true image of the Father, the Scriptures affirm the same things of the Son as they affirm of the Father. The attributes that are ascribed to the Father must also be assigned to the Son. Athanasius shows from Scripture that the same attributes are ascribed to the Father and to the Son except that the Son is not called "Father."³ The Son is called "God": "And the Word was God" (John 1:1); "He that is over all, God blessed forever. Amen" (Rom. 9:5); and, "We are in him that is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life" (I John 5:20); he is "Almighty": "This says he which was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1:8). The Son is "Light": "I am the

¹Ibid., III.5.

²Ad Episc. Aeg. 13.

³In Illud, Omnia, etc. 4.

Light" (John 8:12); and he forgives sins: "That you may know that the Son of Man has power upon earth to forgive sins" (Luke 5:24).¹

The Son is also said to be Creator: "All things were made by him" (John 1:3); and, "Whatsoever I see the Father do, I do also" (John 5:19). The Son is eternal: "His eternal power and Godhead" (Rom. 1:20); "In the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1); and, "He was the true light which lights every man who comes into the world" (John 1:9). The Son is called "Lord": "The Lord rained fire and brimstone from the Lord" (Gen. 19:24); the Father said, "I am the Lord" (Is. 45:5), and, "Thus says the Lord, the almighty God" (Amos 5:16); and Paul said of the Son: "One Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things" (I Cor. 8:6). It is written of the Father, "The Lord your God is one Lord" (Dt. 6:4), and, "The God of gods, the Lord, has spoken, and has called the earth" (Ps. 50:1); so it is also written of the Son, "The Lord God has shined upon us" (Ps. 118:27), and, "The God of gods shall be seen in Zion" (Ps. 84:7).²

It is declared of God, "Who is a god like unto you; taking away iniquities and passing over unrighteousness" (Mic. 7:18); so the Son himself said, "Your sins are forgiven you" (Mk. 2:5). The authority of the Son was manifested when he said, "Rise, take up your bed, and go to your

¹C. Ar. III.4; Ad Serap. II.4.

²De Syn. 49.

house" (Mk. 2:11). Paul said of God, "To the King eternal" (I Tim. 1:17); David said of the Son, "Lift up your gates, O rulers, and be lift up, everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in" (Ps. 24:7); so Daniel spoke of the kingdom of the Son: "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his kingdom shall not be destroyed" (Dan. 4:3; 7:14).¹

As the image and offspring of the Father, the Son must be unchangeable. This is evidently true, Athanasius believes, on the basis of Matt. 12:33, "For by the fruit the tree is also known," and John 14:9, "He who has seen the Son has seen the Father." The Scriptures explicitly teach that the Son is unchangeable: Heb. 13:8, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever"; Ps. 102:25-27 (Heb. 1:10-12), "You, Lord, in the beginning have laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands. They shall perish, but you remain; and they shall wax old as does a garment. And as a vesture you shall fold them up, and they shall be changed, but you are the same, and your years shall not fail"; Dt. 32:39, "See me, see that I am he"; Mal. 3:6, "I change not"; and also Is. 40:8 speaks of the Son as unchanging: "The Word of God abides forever." In the latter references, Athanasius affirms, it is justifiable to say that they suit the Son, though they are related of the Father. That which alters or changes cannot be true, but the

¹Ibid.

Son himself said, "I am the Truth" (John 14:6). The Son is also faithful even as the Father is faithful. The Scriptural passages adduced to support the Son's faithfulness are:

I Thess. 5:24, "Faithful is he who called you, who also will do it"; and II Tim. 2:13, "If we believe not, yet he abides faithful; he cannot deny himself." Even in his incarnation the Son is declared to be faithful: "Apostle and faithful to him that made him" (Heb. 3:1, 2).¹

As the Father's attributes are those of the Son, the Son can consistently say, "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30); "That you may know that I am in the Father, and the Father in me" (John 10:38); and, "He who has seen me, has seen the Father" (John 14:9). These three passages, Athanasius asserts, have the same meaning. Whoever grasps this meaning understands that the Son and Father are one and that the Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son, for the Godhead of the Son is the Father's Godhead. He is convinced that in seeing the Son the Father is seen.² Because the Son has the Father's attributes, it follows that the Son is not a creature but is the Father's own Son and is proper to him. God himself, Athanasius asserts, indicates that a

¹C. Ar. I.35, 36, 48; II.8-10.

²Ibid., III.5. These three texts, John 10:30; 10:38; and 14:9, frequently occur together in Athanasius. See Robertson, *op. cit.*, IV, 396, n. 3. These three passages also occur together in Origen in De Prin. 1.2.8.

creature could not have his attributes, for God has declared, "My glory will I not give to another" (Is. 42:8).¹

Athanasius not only shows that the Son is the image of God, but also points out that the Spirit is the image of the Son. This, he avers, is evident in Rom. 8:29, "Whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son." If, as the Tropici admitted, the Son is not a creature, neither can the image of the Son, the Spirit, be a creature.²

The attributes of the Spirit are those that are proper to the Godhead. The Holy Spirit is incapable of change and alteration. This can be seen in Wis. 12:1, "Your incorruptible Spirit is in all things." Also if "no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God which is in him" (I Cor. 2:11), and if in God "there is no variation or shadow that is cast by turning" (James 1:17), then it must follow that the Spirit, being in God, cannot change or vary. This quality of unchangeableness is in contrast to the capacity for change in created things which are not of God's essence. The Spirit, like the Son, is unchangeable.³ The Scriptures also teach that the Spirit fills the universe: "Whither shall I go from your Spirit?" (Ps. 139:7); and, "Your incorruptible Spirit is in all things" (Wis. 12:1).⁴

¹De Syn. 50. ²Ad Serap. I.24; also ibid., I.16, 20.

³Ibid., I.26.

⁴Ibid.

The Unity of Father, Son, and Spirit Expressed
in Baptism, Benediction, and Gifts

Athanasius declares that the Church's faith holds that there is a Triad which is confessed to be God in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This is seen, he avows, in the words of the Lord when he sent forth the apostles, "Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19).¹ The emphasis of this passage makes it clear, Shapland observes, that for Athanasius the formula in Matt. 28:19 is fundamental for the tradition and teaching of the Church.²

The unity of the Son with the Father is indicated in the baptismal formula, for the Son is named with the Father. This also signifies that the Son is of the Father's essence. That what the Father works he works through the Son is demonstrated in John 5:19, "What I see the Father do, that I do also." In the rite of baptism, therefore, the Son baptizes the one whom the Father baptizes, and such a one is also consecrated in the Holy Spirit.³

¹Ibid., I.28; III.6.

²Shapland, op. cit., p. 136, n. 13. Georg Kretschmar, Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie (Tübingen, 1956), pp. 125-127, gives the background of the use of the baptismal formula in Matt. 28:19 in the Eastern Church and points out that Arius also baptized with this formula. Athanasius used the formula against both the Arians and the Tropici.

³C. Ar. II.41.

Also if the Holy Spirit is a creature, then there is no longer one faith and one baptism (Eph. 4:5) but two--one in the Father and the Son, and another in a creature. If the Spirit is a creature, then when the rite of baptism is performed it is not entirely in the Godhead, for a creature is part of the Godhead. That the Church's faith is grounded and rooted in the Triad is proved by the words of the Lord himself (Matt. 28:19). Athanasius suggests that Paul also taught the oneness of this grace which is given in the Triad: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:5).¹ Also Origen states that baptism was not complete except by the authority of the Trinity--that is, by the naming of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19). Thus, for Origen, the Holy Spirit is united with the Father and Son, and the great majesty of the Holy Spirit is also shown.²

Another important passage of Scripture used by Athanasius for the proof of the doctrine of the Trinity is II Cor. 13:14, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all." This grace and gift is said to be given in the Holy Spirit. As this grace is from the Father through the Son so one can have no communion in the gift except in the Holy Spirit. It is when the Spirit is partaken of that men have the love of the Father, the grace of the Son, and the communion of the

¹Ad Serap. I.28-30; III.6.

²De Prin. 1.3.2.

Holy Spirit himself. Fellowship with the Father and the Son is possible only in the Holy Spirit. This demonstrates, in Athanasius' judgment, that the activity of the Triad is one. The things which are given are not given differently and separately, however, but all these things are bestowed in the Triad. All are from the one God. Therefore the Spirit is not a creature but one with the Son, as the Son is one with the Father. He is glorified with the Father and Son and is confessed as God with the Word.¹

Athanasius declares that Paul taught the unity of the Triad when, in writing to the Corinthians, Paul said that the source of all things is to be attributed to the one God who is the Father: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God who works all things in all" (I Cor. 12:4-6). The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed, therefore, from the Father through the Word. All things that are of the Father are of the Son also. Therefore those things which are given from the Son in the Spirit are gifts of the Father.²

¹Ad Serap. I.30, 31; II.6. Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 159, 160, believes that in this passage of Scripture (II Cor. 13:14) Paul has given classical expression to precisely the elements in the Christian experience of God which would in time make a Trinitarian theology inevitable.

²Ad Serap. I.30.

In a reference to I Cor. 12:4-6 Origen alleges that this passage demonstrates that each Person of the Trinity has a special ministry but also states that the power of the Trinity is one and the same. That which is called the gift of the Spirit is made known through the Son and is operated by God the Father. This shows the unity of the Father, Son, and Spirit and also signifies that none of the Persons of the Godhead is greater or lesser.¹

In establishing these postulations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Athanasius resorts to many Biblical passages. He attempts to demonstrate each point he propounds by a variety of passages which speak directly of the issue involved whether of the creation, the work of the Trinity in the Christian, or in direct assertions of the Persons of the Trinity as Father, Son, and Spirit. These passages which are employed by Athanasius are linked together by a word or concept which occurs in the various passages asserting the same fact or activity of the Persons of the Trinity. In showing the unity of the Trinity, the proof of the deity of the Son and of the Spirit is necessarily involved. There could be no unity if a creature were included in the Godhead.

McIntyre observes that as the self-manifestation of God has as its end the self-manifestation to actual believing persons, it is not surprising that the Divine operation

¹De Prin. 1.3.7, 8.

of sanctification should also appear in Athanasius' argument. The Spirit is associated not only with the Son but is given a place within the total economy of grace. In Athanasius' thought wherever God acts--in creation or in sanctification--the Spirit is present with the Father and the Son. The theology of the Trinity in Athanasius, as in the other Greek fathers, is rooted and grounded in grace. The knowledge of any one of the Persons of the Trinity is at the same time knowledge of the other two.¹

Shapland² and Prestige³ assert that Athanasius argues from the unity of ἐνέργεια to the unity of οὐσία. McIntyre takes issue with this contention maintaining that Athanasius argues from the prior unity of the Divine nature.⁴ Athanasius states that the Triad is indivisible and a unity in itself.⁵ This appears to be the highest premise of Athanasius. Thus, McIntyre contends, the argument is not from unity of ἐνέργεια to the unity of οὐσία but to identity of οὐσία of the Persons of the Godhead. "The progression is unity of

¹ McIntyre, SJT, loc. cit., pp. 355, 356, 361-363.

² Shapland, op. cit., pp. 110, 111, n. 11.

³ Prestige, God in Patristic Thought, pp. 257-260.

⁴ McIntyre, SJT, loc. cit., p. 357. See also T. E. Pollard, "The Exegesis of John X. 30 in the Early Trinitarian Controversies," NTS (3, 1956-57), p. 344.

⁵ Ad Serap. I.14.

ousia--unity of energeia--identity of ousia."¹

¹McIntyre, SJT, loc. cit., p. 357. Maurice Wiles, in "Some Reflections on the Origins of the Doctrine of the Trinity," JTS (N.S., 7-8), pp. 101, 102, states that the ante-Nicene fathers accepted a Trinitarian form of doctrine, because it was already the accepted pattern of expression. It was expressed in this way, though they found it difficult to interpret their experience of God in this particular threefold way. By the fourth century, he says, the issues at stake had changed, and "the threefold pattern was fully and firmly established." Thus the fourth century fathers repeatedly argued for the identity of substance between the three Persons of the Trinity basing their case on the identity of their activities.

CHAPTER X

OTHER SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCES OF THE TRINITY

Christ as God's Son

One of the basic tenets of Athanasius' doctrine of the Trinity in the relationship of the Word to God is that the Word is the true Son of the Father. Athanasius characteristically refers to God as Father. The name "Father" has its significance in reference to the Son, for it indicates that God has a Son. The Scriptural proof for the use of "Father" and "Son" in Athanasius is direct and literal.¹

The Son himself speaks of God as his Father in such passages as: "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10, 11); "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14:9); and, "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30). It is observed also that when the disciples were taught to pray, they were to address God as Father, "Our Father, which art in heaven" (Matt. 6:9; Luke 11:2). The importance of this Father-Son relationship is evident in the words of John 5:23, "He who honors the Son honors the Father, and he who dishonors the Son dishonors the Father." Athanasius avers that God is always Father, and therefore the relationship of Father and Son is eternal.²

¹E.g., C. Gen. 6, 9; C. Ar. I.30-33; De Dec. 28-32.

²C. Ar. I.28, 33, 34.

Matt. 3:17 (Matt. 17:5) is frequently referred to by Athanasius as an expression of the Sonship of Christ: "This is my beloved Son." Only Christ is only-begotten, is in the bosom of the Father, and is acknowledged by the Father to be from him. Not to angels but to the Son the Father said, "You are my Son, this day have I begotten you" (Ps. 2:7; Heb. 1:5). Athanasius states that adoption of the Christian is impossible apart from the true Son, for it is stated in Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22), "No one knows the Father, except the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Peter also is said to have recognized that the Word is God's true Son in his confession: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16). The Word is spoken of as the "only-begotten Son," and therefore he is not a creature but is the Father's own Word and Wisdom: "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten Son" (John 1:14); "God sent his only-begotten Son" (I John 4:9); and, "The only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father" (John 1:18). That Christ is the Son of God is also indicated in the opposition of the Jews to his claim to be the Son of God (John 5:18).¹ For Athanasius these passages show without equivocation that the Son is not a creature but is of the Father's own essence.

The fact that God himself has spoken of Christ as his Son determines that he who believes in God cannot attribute

¹De Dec. 11; C. Ar. I.39; II.18, 62, 73.

creatureliness to the Son but must ascribe Sonship to him. As Son the Word does not partake of that which is external to God but is of the Father's "essence" (οὐσία). Therefore he is, in a true sense and entirely, the Son. The Father "begets" (γεννάω), and the fact that he begets indicates that he has a Son. Because the Son is the Father's own "offspring" (γέννημα) and from his essence, he who beholds the Son sees also the Father. In comprehending the Son, the Father can also be known. It is stated that he and the Father are one (John 10:30), and therefore he who sees the Son sees also the Father. All that the Father is and has must be true of the Son, for he is God's own offspring. The knowledge of God as Father would be impossible apart from the true Son. All others are adopted and deified through the Son.¹

The Godhead of the Father, Athanasius asserts, is the Godhead of the Son. As a Son who always was and is, he is Sovereign and Lord of all. In all things he is like the Father and has all that is the Father's, even as the Son himself has said. This is clearly evident in John 16:15, "All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he shall take of mine, and shall declare it to you." It is the Son who gives sonship and freedom to men: "The servant does not remain in the house forever, but the Son remains forever; if the Son shall make you free, you shall be free

¹C. Ar. I.9, 16, 39.

indeed" (John 8:35, 36). This is possible only in that the Son is not a creature but is true Son and by nature proper to the Father.¹

Athanasius discusses the relative merits of calling God "Uncreated" ('Αγέννητος)² or calling him "Father." Apparently the former term was utilized by the Arians as a characteristic appellation for God. This term, in Athanasius' judgment, is acceptable only in denoting that God is different from created things. The word "Father," however, is indicative of the Son, but "Uncreated" has reference to that which he creates and indicates that he is distinct and separate from creatures. The word "Uncreated" is unscriptural and suspicious, because it has various meanings. The word "Father," however, is simple, Scriptural, more accurate, and only implies the Son. The Son never refers to the Father as "Uncreated," Athanasius observes, but the Son has acknowledged and approved the name "Father."³

¹ Ibid., II.18, 72.

² In A Patristic Greek Lexicon, Fascicle 1, pp. 15, 16, it is stated that 'αγέννητος (unbegotten, ungenerated) and 'αγέννητος (uncreated, unoriginated) were used in the same sense by early writers, and that the two words were frequently confused in manuscripts and editions. The usage of 'αγέννητος became unorthodox by later doctrinal standards. The Arians exploited the use of the word and accused the orthodox of having two who were unbegotten. In the orthodox view the word did not denote essence of divinity but the relationship of the First to the Second Person of the Trinity. Robertson, op. cit., IV, 169, n. 1, comments that Newman unfortunately confused the two words.

³ C. Ar. I.30-34; De Dec. 28-32; and De Syn. 24-28.

Wainwright states that the Christian belief in the Fatherhood of God was not derived from the Greek tradition but rather was indebted to Hebrew thought. The title "Father" is only infrequently employed in the Old Testament (as in Is. 64:8 and Jer. 31:9), but occurs in many different writers outside of the Old Testament and is found at many stages of Hebrew history. The idea of God as Father is found in many ancient religions. In the New Testament the use of the title emphasizes that God is the Father of Jesus Christ. This use of the title is especially frequent in the sayings of Jesus and in the writings of Paul and John.¹

For Athanasius the titles "Father" and "Son" are significant in that they convey the idea that the Son is of the essence of the Father. Therefore the Son is not a creature, and all that is postulated of the Father must also be true of the Son. The Scripture passages that Athanasius employs to establish this contention are used as literal, direct proofs that God is Father and that Jesus is his true Son.

The Eternity of the Son

Athanasius believes that the eternal being of the Son is clearly indicated in Col. 1:17, "Who exists before the ages," and in Heb. 1:2, "By whom he made the ages." So it is also stated in Is. 40:28, "The everlasting God, the

¹Wainwright, op. cit., pp. 42, 43, 49.

Creator of the ends of the earth"; Dan. 3:42 (Susanna), "O everlasting God"; and Bar. 4:20, 22, "I will cry unto the Everlasting in my days," and, "For I hoped in the Everlasting for your salvation, and joy is come to me from the Holy One." The eternity of the Son cannot be doubted, for man could not see light without the brightness of its radiance, and thus it is expressed in Heb. 1:3, "Who being the radiance of his glory and the express image of his Person"; in Ps. 90:17, "And let the brightness of the Lord be upon us"; and in Ps. 36:9, "In your light shall we see light." In that the Son is the radiance, glory, and expression of God himself who is everlasting, therefore the Son must be eternally existent.¹

The words of the Lord himself are cited to demonstrate that the Son is eternal and without beginning: "I am the Truth" (John 14:6); "I am the Shepherd" (John 10:14); "I am the Light" (John 8:12); and, "Do you not call me Lord and Master? and you say well, for so I am" (John 13:13). The Son also said, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58). The Lord's use of the phrase, "I am," is interpreted to be clear evidence of his eternity. The Son created all things, but he himself is before all things.²

Rawlinson points out that the analogy for the phrase "I am" in John is to be found in the Old Testament. The

¹C. Ar. I.12.

²C. Ar. I.12, 13; II.53.

self-affirmations in John are intended to suggest the Son's deity and eternity. Especially the statement, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58) is meant definitely to recall the mysterious "I am" of the Old Testament (Ex. 3:14). It suggests that the Lord shares, as the pre-temporal Word, the uncreated eternity of God.¹ It is apparent that Athanasius interpreted these self-affirmations as proof of the Son's eternity.

The Eternity of the Holy Spirit

Athanasius seeks to demonstrate that Moses knew that angels were creatures but that the Holy Spirit is united with the Father and the Son. This he attempts to do by bringing together a variety of Old Testament passages which he uses in their literal sense. In Exodus God is represented as saying to Moses, "Depart, go up hence, you and your people which you have led up out of the land of Egypt, to the land of which I swore unto Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob, saying, To your seed will I give it. And I will send my angel before your face, and he will drive out the Canaanites" (Ex. 33:1, 2). Moses is said to have refused this promise of the angel's presence: "If you do not go with us yourself, do not carry me up hence" (Ex. 33:15). He refused because he did not desire a creature to lead the people lest they would

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 208.

learn to worship the creature more than the Creator. In response to Moses' refusal God promised Moses that the people would be led by God himself: "I will do this thing also that you have spoken; for you have found grace in my sight, and I know you beyond all men" (Ex. 33:17).¹

Athanasius turns to two passages in Isaiah to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit was present in the exodus of Israel: Is. 63:11, 12, "He who raised up from the earth the shepherd of the sheep, where is he who put the Holy Spirit in the midst of you, that led up Moses by his right hand?" and Is. 63:14, "The Spirit came down from the Lord and led them. So you led your people to make yourself a glorious name." Therefore when God promised to lead his people, he did not send an angel but sent the Spirit who is above angels. This shows, Athanasius concludes, that the Spirit is neither an angel nor a creature but is above creation and is united to the Godhead of the Father. God himself through the Word and in the Spirit led the people.² Shapland suggests that Athanasius apparently sees a reference to all three Persons of the Trinity in Is. 63:14.³

The Unity of the Father, Son, and Spirit

In writing to Serapion on the Holy Spirit, Athanasius

¹Ad Serap. I.12.

²Ibid.

³Shapland, op. cit., p. 90, n. 7.

asserts that the activity of the Triad is one. This is shown, he maintains, in the consideration that the gifts of the Spirit are also the gifts of the Father and the Word (e.g., II Cor. 13:14). That which is given is not given differently and separately, but all gifts are from the one God. The Spirit, therefore, is not a creature but is one with the Son, as the Son is one with the Father. Thus he is glorified with the Father and the Son and is confessed as God with the Word. He is active in the works which God performs through the Son. All things, in fact, are originated and energized through the Word in the Spirit.¹

In proof of these declarations Athanasius adduces a florilegium of proof texts to establish the operation of the Holy Spirit in all the works of God. The Spirit is active in creation and nature: Ps. 33:6, "By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all their might by the Spirit of his mouth"; and Ps. 147:18, "He shall send out his Word and shall melt them; he shall breathe his Spirit and the waters shall flow." He is also active in grace: men are justified "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (I Cor. 6:11); when Christ said, "We will come, I and the Father" (John 14:23), the Spirit comes with the Son, for it is written, "That he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, that you may be

¹Ad Serap. I.31.

strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man, that Christ may dwell . . ." (Eph. 3:16, 17). The Father must be included also, for the Son said, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10, 11). Athanasius then refers to the work of the prophets and apostles and the origin of their message. He refers to passages which speak of the word of the Lord coming to prophets and apostles and shows that they were then prophesying in the Holy Spirit: Jer. 1:1; Mic. 1:1; Zech. 1:6 and 7:12; Acts 1:16; 4:24, 25; 28:25; I Tim. 4:1; Joel 2:28; Phil. 1:19; II Cor. 13:3; Acts 20:22; Amos 1:3; and Acts 21:11.¹

These texts are presented by Athanasius almost without comment. The bringing together of these references is on the basis of their literal meaning with the use determined by the ideas that Athanasius is seeking to demonstrate--that is, that the Holy Spirit is not a creature but is proper to the Godhead.

The Double Account of the Son

A similar use of Scripture to that above is evident in the proof that Athanasius propounds for his assertion that there is a double account of the Son in the Scriptures--of his humanity and of his deity. This idea is used to interpret Prov. 8:22, "He created me . . .," and similar

¹Ibid. See supra, pp. 232-234, for the use of these passages.

passages in this sense that the creating of the Word must refer to his incarnation. This explanation is also employed to interpret passages that speak of the Son as ignorant, such as Mk. 13:32, "But of that day and that hour no man knows, neither the angels of God, nor the Son"; that speak of the Son as "advancing," as in Luke 2:52, "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man"; or that attribute human emotions, such as fear, to Christ, as in John 12:27, "Now is my soul troubled." Jesus was God incarnate, and therefore it must be determined whether a passage speaks of the Son as man or as the Word of God. If the Scriptures speak of the fear or ignorance of Jesus, it must be ascribed to his humanity, but as the Word he did not know fear, nor was he ignorant.¹

In interpreting Mk. 13:32 which speaks of the Son's ignorance, it must be noted that it refers to the time after the Word was made flesh. That the Son knew the hour of the end is evident in his words, "Father, the hour is come, glorify your Son" (John 17:1). Therefore the words, "Nor the Son," in Mk. 13:32 refer to his humanity. Another evidence that this lack of knowledge must be attributed to the Son's humanity is Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22), "No one knows the Father except the Son." In his second letter to Serapion Athanasius refers to John 16:30 as well as Matt. 11:27 as

¹C. Ar. I.62, 64; III.51-53; Ad Serap. II.9.

evidence of the Son's knowledge, as God's Word, of all things: "Now we know that you know all things." It follows, Athanasius affirms, that he who thus knows the Father knows the whole creation including its end. Further evidence advanced to demonstrate that this interpretation is correct is John 16:15 which states that all that is the Father's is the Son's also, John 1:3 which ascribes creation to the Son, and Col. 1:17 which declares that in him the whole universe consists. Though Mk. 13:32 speaks of the humanity of the Son, yet in his divinity the Son knew all things. The context of the passage also shows that the Son in his humanity is referred to, or the passage would have referred to the Spirit as well as the angels. If the Spirit, therefore, knows the time of the end, certainly the Son must know.¹

It should also be noted, Athanasius asserts, that in Matt. 24:42, 44 the Son attributes the ignorance of the day of the end to the disciples but does not include himself. Also Matt. 24:39 affirms that men in Noah's day did not know until the flood came; but the Lord knew, for it was the Son who stated that in seven days a flood would come. The Son himself summoned Noah to enter the ark (Gen. 7:1, 5). Therefore the Son who knew the time of the coming of the flood must also know the time of his own coming.²

¹C. Ar. III.43, 44.

²Ibid., III.42-45; Ad Serap. II.9.

Passages of Scripture which speak of the human emotions of the Son (e.g., John 11:35, "He wept") are interpreted by Athanasius as indicating the humanity of the Son. Such emotions are not proper to the Word considered as Word. The Son, to whom human emotions are attributed, performed miracles and also said, "I and my Father are one" (John 10:30). Though he became man the Son showed himself to be the Word of God by his works. Those who listened to the Son in his ministry on earth, though they did not believe him when they saw him in a human body, were exhorted by the Son to believe the works (John 10:37, 38) that they might know the truth of his statement: "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10, 11).¹

The incarnate Son was thus shown to be God by his works. Athanasius not only adduces John 10:37, 38 as proof but also Eph. 3:17-19, "That you being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length, and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passes knowledge that you may be filled with all the fullness of God." Even the demons confessed that the Son is God, "We know you who you are, the Holy One of God" (Luke 4:34). The events that occurred at his death also testify that Christ is God. The miracles show that the Son is God. Though miracles had previously

¹C. Ar. III.54, 55.

occurred, only at the coming of the Word did the lame walk and the blind see: "Since the world began, it was never heard that anyone opened the eyes of a man born blind. If this man were not from God, he could do nothing" (John 9:32, 33). The human qualities of Christ must be ascribed to his incarnation, but his works testify that he is God.¹

Athanasius charges the Arians with misinterpretation of John 10:30 and with distorting the passage's meaning and so separating the unity of the Father and the Son. The Arians do not attribute the human emotions of the Son to the body but rank the Son with creatures, though he is, in truth, the Creator. As the Word, Athanasius declares, the Son spoke the words found in John 10:18, "I have power to lay down my life, and power to take it again." In contrast to the Word, who is immortal but has a human body, man dies by necessity--not by his own power but against his will. The Word had the power, as God, to lay down his life and take it again. This is also expressed in Ps. 16:10, "You shall not leave my soul in hades, neither shall you permit your Holy One to see corruption."²

In his defense of Dionysius Athanasius avows that the Son is spoken of in human terms for the purpose of leading

¹De Inc. 16-19, 32, 38; see also De Episc. Aeg. 13 and Ad Serap. IV.14-17.

²C. Ar. III.55-57.

men to faith in the Son's Godhead. This is evident when, in referring to Christ's sufferings, Peter immediately added, "He is the Prince of Life" (Acts 3:15). Peter also said, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16), and called him a bishop of souls and Lord of himself (Peter) and of angels and of powers (I Pet. 2:25; 1:3; and 3:22). When, in Hebrews, Christ is called a man of David's seed, it is also said, "Who being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his Person" (Heb. 1:3). So it is also expressed in Phil. 2:6, "Who being in the form of God did not count it a prize to be equal with God." Therefore it must be concluded that Christ was the Word of God in a body, the Creator of all and inseparable from the Father.¹

Pollard points out that Origen also makes this distinction between the humanity of the Son and the Son as Word. There is a double account of the Son in Scripture and therefore some sayings refer to the manhood of Christ and others to his deity. This distinction, Pollard affirms, became a standard exegetical practice.² This "two-nature exegesis was thus an essential feature in the whole case of Athanasius against Arius."³

¹De Sent. Dion. 8. ²Pollard, NTS, loc. cit., p. 237.

³Wiles, Spiritual Gospel, pp. 116, 117.

Comparing Scripture with Scripture

It has been evident that Athanasius often interprets a Scripture passage by comparing it or contrasting it with other passages of Scripture.¹ Thus in his interpretation of Prov. 8:23, "He founded me before the world," Athanasius compares it with a verse from the wider context of the passage: "The Lord in Wisdom founded the earth" (Prov. 3:19). He who "founds," Athanasius argues, could not be that which is founded. Not only so, but Scripture itself must be permitted to show whether this Wisdom is the Son. This Peter did in his confession, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16). The meaning of the words, "He founded me," can also be ascertained by a comparison with I Cor. 3:10, 11, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ; but let every man take heed how he builds thereupon." Thus the words, "He founded me," are not for the Son's own sake but for the sake of those built on him. Therefore Prov. 8:23 must be interpreted to refer to the fact that the Son became incarnate, and so founded that men may be built on him. The words of the passage itself state, "He founded me," and not that he was made a foundation.²

¹See, e.g., supra, pp. 147 ff., for Athanasius' interpretation of Prov. 3:22 by means of comparing or contrasting the passage with other Scriptural references.

²C. Ar. II.73, 74.

This method of comparing passages of Scripture for the purpose of demonstrating the meaning of the passage under consideration is also seen in Athanasius' interpretation of three phrases in Prov. 8:23-25, "Before the world," "Before he made the earth," and, "Before the mountains were settled." Athanasius avers that it is evident that Paul interprets these passages in II Tim. 1:9, 10, "According to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began but is now made manifest . . ."; and in Eph. 1:3, 4, "In Christ Jesus, according as he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world . . ." In the Son God has prepared beforehand the ministry of salvation. This interpretation is corroborated in Matt. 25:34, "Come, blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Salvation was prepared for man before the world. In his incarnation the Word is laid as a foundation for man; and in that the Son was made flesh, God's will and purpose took effect.¹

A rather unusual comparison of Scriptures is found in the interpretation of Mk. 13:32. The Arians alleged that this text proved that by his own admission the Son was ignorant. Athanasius refutes their allegation not only by reference to Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22) but also by use of II Cor. 12:2, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago,

¹Ibid., II.75, 76.

whether out of the body I do not know; but God knows." In Athanasius' estimation Paul did know, and he says that the Arians also recognized this. Therefore it must be concluded that if Paul knew, how much more the Lord knew though he said that he did not know the hour or day of the end. That this is the right interpretation is confirmed in II Kings 2:12, 15-18 which states that Elisha was silent regarding Elijah. This silence, Athanasius maintains, is not to be construed as ignorance on the part of Elisha.¹

In their interpretation of Heb. 1:4, "Being made so much better than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they," the Arians applied "made" to the Son as an indication that he is created. In his refutation of the Arians' interpretation and in setting forth his own interpretation, Athanasius gives a different meaning than did the Arians to "made" by a comparison of this passage with other passages in Scripture. This is done on the basis that there is a distinction between "made" (*γενόμεναι*) (which occurs in Heb. 1:4) and "born" (*γεννώω*). He shows that this distinction is made in Scripture, for it is said in John 1:3, "All things were made by him, and without him was not one thing made," and in Ps. 104:24, "In Wisdom you have made them all." In contrast to these passages it is said of the children of Job, Abraham, and Moses (Job 1:2;

¹Ibid., III.46, 47.

Gen. 21:5; Dt. 21:15) that they were born when they came into existence. Therefore the Son is not a creature but the true offspring of the Father.¹

Later, with reference to Prov. 8:22, Athanasius refers to the difference between "make" and "beget." On the basis of Gen. 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," and Ps. 119:73, "Your Hands . . . have made me and fashioned me," which speak of creatures as being made, and Ps. 2:7, "I begot," and Ps. 110:3, "He begets me," which speak of the Son as begotten, Athanasius points out the distinction between these two words. In contrast to Gen. 1:1 is the statement in John 1:1 which refers to the Son: "In the beginning was the Word."²

Athanasius also avers that "better" ($\chi\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\tau\omega\nu$) in Heb. 1:4, "Being made so much better than angels," is used to differentiate between the Son's nature and originated things. This is proved by Scripture, for it is stated in Ps. 84:10, "One day in your courts is better than a thousand." The word "better" is used to contrast, and not to compare, that which is different in nature.³

In a subsequent passage, however, Athanasius interprets "become" ($\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$) in Heb. 7:22, "He is become surety," to refer to the incarnation of the Son. This, he says, is

¹Ibid., I.53-56. ²Ibid., II.57; also De Dec. 13, 20.

³C. Ar. I.54, 55.

parallel to the use of this same word in John 1:14, "The Word was made flesh." Heb. 1:4 must be interpreted to have reference to the superiority of the Son's ministry to that of angels. This indicates that grace is better than law. This idea is supported by Rom. 8:3, "What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh"; in Rom. 8:9, "But we are not in the flesh but in the Spirit"; and in John 3:17, "For the Son of God came into the world, not to judge the world, but to redeem all men, and that the world might be saved through him." The Word has taken on himself this judgment in his suffering for all men, and thus he has brought salvation to them. John therefore affirmed, "The Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John 1:17). Thus grace is better than law.¹

Athanasius also points out that the word "become" in Heb. 1:4 cannot denote a coming into existence, for the same word is used of the Father: Ps. 31:2, "Become my strong rock and house of defense that you may save me"; and Ps. 9:9, "The Lord became a defense for the oppressed." These references can also be applied to the Son and then would refer to the Son's incarnation. If "become" indicates to come into existence, then it must also be concluded that God originated.²

¹Ibid., I.60.

²Ibid., I.62.

Another illustration of the comparison of Scriptures to interpret a disputed passage is seen in Athanasius' exegesis of Heb. 3:2, "Who was faithful to him who made him." Here the dispute is also centered in the use of the word "made" ($\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$). Athanasius bases his interpretation on the Biblical usage of various terms which express the relationship of the Word with the Father. The Word, Athanasius maintains, attracts terms to himself such as "Offspring" and "Son" but changes their significance. The evidence for this use of terms is seen in I Pet. 3:6 where Sarah calls Abraham "lord"; in Philem. 16 where Philemon and Onesimus are termed brothers though they are master and servant; and in II Kings 20:18 Hezekiah uses the word "made" ($\kappa\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\omega$) for the word "beget" ($\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega$) of his son. So Eve also spoke of Cain, "I have gotten a man," instead of saying "brought forth" (Gen. 4:1). This same use of terms is also to be observed in Gen. 48:5, 6 where Jacob speaks of Joseph's sons as "becoming" ($\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$) his sons. Job (Job 1:2) and Moses (Dt. 21:15) also used this same expression. The terms are to be interpreted by the use which is made of them. The use of terms in relation to the Son indicates that they are to be considered as parallel terms and so expressing true and genuine Sonship. A work, Athanasius asseverates, could never be Son and Word, and therefore the Scriptures never speak of the Son as a

work which has been made or has come into existence.¹

The Exegesis of Various Scripture Passages

Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22)

One of Athanasius' writings² is entirely an exposition of Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22), "All things were delivered to me by my Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father; and who the Father is, except the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son wills to reveal him." The Arians evidently interpreted this passage to mean that there was once a time when the Son was not, for "all things were delivered" to him by the Father. By "all," Athanasius points out, the Arians included the Lordship of creation and also his divine Sonship. Athanasius' answer to this interpretation is that if the Son did not have "all things," he is not of the Father, for if he were of the Father, he would always have had them. Thus he would not have needed to receive them. The passage, however, does not refer to the Lordship over creation but is meant to reveal in part the intention of the incarnation. If, when the Son was speaking, they "were delivered" to him, then creation was void of the Word before he received them. As the Creator of all things (John 1:3) it would be superfluous to speak of all things being delivered to him if this delivery was at the beginning of creation. If

¹Ibid., II.3-5.

²In Illud, Omnia, etc.

he is the Creator, there is no need for the deliverance of all things to him, for it is through the Word that all things were made.¹

The time of the delivery of all things to the Son, Athanasius explains, was the incarnation of the Son which was for the purpose of redeeming man. Matt. 11:28, "Come unto me, all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," gives the sense in which "all things were delivered," for all men were given to the Son that he might renew them. In his incarnation the Son became that which he was not, that is, a man, and in this sense "all things were delivered to him." "All things" refer to the mediatorial work of the Son and not to his essential nature.²

The passage that Athanasius uses to show that the Son is distinct from the Father, but that at the same time the attributes of the Father are also the Son's, is John 16:15, "All things whatsoever the Father has are mine." The Son, therefore, is always with the Father, and the Father and Son are inseparably united. The Son is united by nature to the Father. If it could be said that the Father once was not, then this could also be said of the Son. If this assertion cannot be made of the Father, neither can it be made of the Son, for what belongs to the Father belongs to the Son. The Father is not a creature; therefore the Son is not a

¹Ibid., 1.

²Ibid., 2, 3.

creature. The attributes of the Father, including eternity, must also be ascribed to the Son. Therefore he who honors the Son, honors the Father who sent him; and he who receives the Son, receives the Father with him, because he who has seen the Son has seen the Father.¹

In his interpretation of Matt. 11:27 Athanasius meets the Arian argument from this text by completely denying the minor premise: "all things" refers to Christ's redemptive work and not to his essential nature. In a later writing Athanasius does not maintain this interpretation of Matt. 11:27.² In Contra Arianos Athanasius states that with John 3:35, "The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into his hand," and John 5:30, "I can do nothing of myself, but as I hear, I judge," Matt. 11:27 is not to be interpreted as showing that once the Son did not have these prerogatives, but that the Son has these divine attributes from the Father, for he has eternally what the Father has (John 16:15). The intention of Athanasius' interpretation in this later reference is to safeguard the Son's separate personality against the Sabellian error. The phrases, "Was given unto me," "I received," and, "Were delivered to me" (Matt. 28:18; John 10:18; Matt. 11:27), show that the Son is not the Father, but that he is the Word of the Father and his eternal Son. The Son, because of his likeness to the Father,

¹Ibid., 4. ²See Robertson, op. cit., IV., 87, n. 2.

must always have had the Father's attributes. The Godhead of the Son is not impaired by the words of Matt. 11:27, but the reference shows him to be the true Son. The Son is other than all things, for these things are delivered to him. In that he is heir of all, he alone is the Son and proper to the Father's essence. If he is included in all things, then he is not "heir of all things" (Heb. 1:2).¹

Robertson observes that in this interpretation Athanasius' denial is transferred from the minor premise of Matt. 11:27 to the major premise. In In Illud, Omnia, etc. Athanasius argues that "all things" refers to the Son's redemptive mission and not to his nature, but in Contra Arianos he interprets the passage to maintain the distinction of the Son from the Father without denying their essential nature.²

John 10:30; 17:11, 20-23

Of crucial importance in the Arian controversy was the correct interpretation of various passages that speak of the unity of the Father and the Son. The most important of

¹C. Ar. III.35, 36.

²See Robertson, op. cit., IV, 86. Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22) is frequently referred to by other writers before Athanasius. Justin Martyr, Dial. 100, refers to it as showing that by revealing the Father the Son is known to be the First-begotten of God who is before all creatures. Origen, De Prin. 1.3.4, refers to Matt. 11:27 as declaring that the Son reveals the Father. So the Holy Spirit also reveals the Son (I Cor. 2:10).

these passages is John 10:30, "I and the Father are one."¹ John 17:11, 20-23 also express this unity: "Holy Father, keep them through your own name, whom you have given me, that they may be one even as we are. . . . Neither do I pray for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through your word; that they all may be one, as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that you have sent me. And the glory which you gave me I have given them, that they may be one; I in them, and you in me that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that you sent me." The Arians contended that the oneness of the Father and the Son consists in their oneness of wills, their oneness in judgment and thought, and that their words and teaching are in accord. The Arians preserved the distinction between Father and Son but denied their essential unity.²

Athanasius' answer to the Arians' interpretation is that, if their interpretation is true, the same can also be said of angels, powers, and other beings, and even of the sun and moon, and all of these would also then be the Word and Image of God. But only the Son, Athanasius observes, is called only-begotten Son, Word, and Wisdom. All who have

¹See Pollard, NTS, loc. cit., who discusses the history and the importance of the interpretation of John 10:30.

²C. Ar. III.7-25. See Pollard, NTS, loc. cit., p. 339.

obeyed Christ would be one with the Father in the view of the Arians. None of them, however, has said, "I and the Father are one," or, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 10:30; 14:10, 11). It is said of men, "Who is like unto you among the gods, O Lord?" and, "Who shall be likened to the Lord among the sons of God?" (Ps. 86:8; Ps. 89:6). The "likeness" (ὁμοιωσις) and "oneness" (ἐνότης) of the Son with the Father must refer to the very "essence" (οὐσία) of the Son, or he is not essentially different from creatures.¹

Athanasius contends that the relationship of the Son with the Father is to be understood as radiance in relation to the sun. As he is the Son, so when he works the Father works. When the Son comes to his followers, the Father comes in the Son as the Son promised when he said, "I and the Father will come and make our abode with him" (John 14:23). Also when it is said that the Father gives grace and peace, the Son also gives grace and peace, for Paul wrote, "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1:7; I Cor. 1:3; etc.). The same grace is from Father and Son. If the Son were divided in nature from the Father, it would be sufficient for the Father alone to give, for that which is created cannot be in partnership with the Creator in his giving.²

Athanasius believes that the experience of Jacob with

¹C. Ar. III.10.

²Ibid., III.11, 12.

the Angel (Gen. 28; etc.) also demonstrates that God gives through the Son.¹ In that the Angel is identified as the Word, the association of Father and Son in their activity is considered proved.²

The Arians also alleged that John 17:11, 20-23 indicate that the unity of the Father and Son are the same as the believer's oneness with the Father. Therefore, they said, it cannot be asserted on the basis of John 10:30, "I and the Father are one," and John 14:10, 11, "I am in the Father, and the Father in me," that the Son is proper to and like the Father's essence. Athanasius answers that the Scriptures use illustrations for the purpose of instruction. Thus when the Scriptures exhort men to be unlike the horse and mule (Ps. 32:9) or like serpents and doves (Matt. 10:16), they intend to teach men to put away an animal's irrationalities or to assume the wisdom of serpents and meekness of doves. So the pattern for man is taken from God himself, "Be merciful, as your Father who is in heaven is merciful" (Luke 6:36).³

Man does not become such as the Father is, for this is impossible for creatures, but that which man does, he does for the Father's sake and not man's. There is one Son by nature, but men may become sons also. Man's sonship is

¹See supra, pp. 222 ff.

²C. Ar. III.12.

³Ibid., II.17-19.

not like the Son's in nature, for man's sonship accrues to him by grace. By "nature" (φύσις) and by "essence" (οὐσία) the Son is the Word and true God, as John said, "We know that the Son of God is come, and he has given us an understanding that we might know the true God, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son, Jesus Christ: this is the true God and eternal life" (I John 5:20). That men are made sons by grace and adoption is shown in John 1:12, "As many as received him, to them he gave the power to become the children of God, even to those who believe on his name." Men become sons "by imitation" (κατὰ μίμησιν). Athanasius states that the passages in John 17 are not to be interpreted to indicate that men are to become like the Son in his unity with the Father, but that, taking him as their example, they might become united with one another in harmony and in spirit.¹

The orthodox interpretation of the passages in John 17 may also be supported in noting the exact words that are used. The passage states that they may be one "in us" (John 17:21) and not one "in you" as if it were possible to become as the Son is in the Father. By saying "in us" the Son expresses the distance and difference between his Sonship and man's. The Son alone is in the Father as his Word and Wisdom, but men are in the Son and through him are in the

¹Ibid., II.19.

Father. A comparison with Paul's words in I Cor. 4:6, "These things I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos, that you may learn in us not to be puffed up above what is written," confirms this interpretation of "in us." Athanasius concludes that this phrase cannot denote that man is in the Father as the Son is in him but implies example and image by the unity of the Father and the Son.¹

This difference between the unity of man and God and that between the Father and the Son is seen in I John 4:13, "Hereby we know that we dwell in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit." By the grace of the Spirit given to them, men come to be in the Spirit and he in them. As this Spirit is the Spirit of God, men are considered to be in God and God in them. This is not as the Son is in the Father, for the Son does not partake of the Spirit nor receive him, but he supplies the Spirit to all. Men are united to the Godhead by participation, but the Son is by nature of the essence of the Father.²

In his interpretation of John 10:30 and 17:11, 20-23 Athanasius argues from the oneness of activity and operation that the Son must belong to the Godhead as proper to the Father's essence. This external unity of action can only proceed from an internal and genuine unity of essence. Though Athanasius' emphasis falls on the unity of the Father and

¹Ibid., III.21.

²Ibid., II.24.

the Son, he does not lose sight of the distinction between them. The unity of the Father and Son is essentially different from the unity of believers. The latter unity is only patterned after the oneness of Father and Son.¹

Amos 4:13

The Tropici referred to two passages in support of their view that the Holy Spirit is a creature: Amos 4:13 and I Tim. 5:21.² Amos 4:13 states, "I am he who establishes thunder and creates spirit and declares unto men his Christ, who makes dawn and mist, who ascends unto the high places of the earth. The Lord God omnipotent is his name." "Spirit" was identified by the Tropici as the Holy Spirit and therefore, on the basis of this passage, must be a created being.³

Turner observes that the orthodox were in a dilemma in their interpretation of the passage, for they were reluctant to lose a proof text for the Son in the Old Testament. They were well aware that the word πνεῦμα could mean "wind" as well as "spirit." The whole context, "thunder . . . dawn and mist," Turner points out, cries aloud for interpreting

¹See Pollard, NTS, loc. cit., pp. 342, 348. Appeals for the modern Ecumenical Movement are frequently based on these passages from John 17 but often with an interpretation that is at variance with that of Athanasius.

²On I Tim. 5:21 see infra, pp. 296 ff.

³Ad Serap. I.3; I.10.

πνεῦμα as a reference to wind.¹ Athanasius accepts this passage as a reference to "spirit," and goes to great lengths to show that the reference in the passage is to the "spirit" of man and not to the Holy Spirit.

In his interpretation of Amos 4:13 Athanasius first points out that there is no qualifying word or article with "spirit" in the passage, and therefore it cannot refer to the Holy Spirit, it is always with a qualifying word such as "holy" or "of God," or the definite article is used with it. In his support of the latter contention Athanasius refers to such passages as Gal. 3:2, "This only would I learn from you: Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law or by hearing of faith?" and I Thess. 5:19, "Quench not the Spirit." There is no exception to this rule, he says, and cites a long list of additional proof texts found in both Old and New Testaments. The passage in Amos does not have the definite article, nor is it qualified in any way--therefore it cannot refer to the Holy Spirit.²

Athanasius does not consistently maintain this rule, for he finds a reference to the Holy Spirit in John 4:23, 24, ". . . true worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and Truth: for the Father seeks such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they who worship him must worship him in

¹Turner, op. cit., p. 275.

²Ad Serap. I.3-7.

Spirit and in Truth."¹

The references to the Holy Spirit are contrasted with passages of Scripture which refer to man's spirit such as Ps. 77:6, "I communed with my heart and was troubled in my spirit"; and Rom. 8:16, 17, "The Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs." The word "spirit" is also used to indicate the meaning of words: II Cor. 3:6, "Who also made us sufficient ministers of a new covenant, not of letter but of spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life."²

Origen notes that some of his predecessors had observed that wherever in the New Testament "spirit" is mentioned, and there is no qualifying adjective, man's spirit is indicated. A reference to the Holy Spirit is qualified. Origen extends this idea to the Old Testament as well as the New.³

The Tropici also argued that there is a reference to Christ in Amos 4:13, and therefore to be consistent the mention of "spirit" in the passage must be construed to refer to the Holy Spirit. Athanasius concedes that it is absurd to name together things which are not alike in nature as there would be no likeness between creature and Creator. Thus the words, "declares unto men his Christ," refer to the incarnation of the Son. This is equivalent to saying, "Behold a

¹Ibid., I.33.

²Ibid., I.7, 8.

³De Prin. 1.3.4.

virgin shall conceive and bear a Son" (Is. 7:14; Matt. 1:23). If, then, the incarnate presence of the Word is indicated, the spirit to which reference is made is the spirit of man which is renewed or recreated. The renewal of man's spirit was, indeed, promised, "I will also give you a new heart, and I will give you a new spirit, and I will take away the stony heart of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh, and I will put my Spirit in you" (Ezek. 36:26). This was fulfilled in the coming of the Son who renewed all things by grace. In the passage in Ezekiel there is a distinction between man's spirit which is renewed and the Holy Spirit which is God's Spirit by which man's spirit is made new. The same distinction may be observed in Ps. 104:29, 30, "You shall take away their spirit, and they shall die and return to their dust. You shall put forth your Spirit, and they shall be created, and you shall renew the face of the earth."¹

Athanasius finds further confirmation of this interpretation of Amos 4:13 in Ps. 51:10, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." It is affirmed in this passage that God creates this spirit. So Zechariah also spoke of God as forming man's spirit, "Stretching forth the heavens and laying the foundations of the earth, and forming the spirit of man within him" (Zech. 12:1). God himself came, for "the Word was made flesh" (John 1:14), so

¹De Serap. I.9.

that "he might create in himself of the two one new man, who after God had been created in righteousness and holiness of truth" (Eph. 2:15; 4:24). That men were to receive the mind renewed in Christ is made clear in Ezek. 18:31, 32, "Make yourselves a new heart and a new spirit. For why will you die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him who dies, says the Lord God." It must be concluded that Amos 4:13 refers to the coming of Christ for the purpose of creating and renewing man's spirit. The passage does not refer to the Holy Spirit but to man's spirit.¹

The conclusion of Athanasius' exegesis of Amos 4:13 appears very curious, and his association of ideas is difficult to follow.² The thunder, he says, is "the faithful word and unshakeable law of the Spirit" (ὁ πιστὸς λόγος, καὶ ἀσάλευτος τοῦ Πνεύματος ὁ νόμος). The Lord wanted James and John to be ministers of this word when he called them "Boanerges," which means "Sons of Thunder." Therefore John said, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John 1:1). Formerly the law was "a shadow of good things to come" (Heb. 10:1), but when Christ was declared to men and came saying, "I who speak to you am he" (John 4:26), then it is said, "His voice shook the earth, as he promised of old, Yet once more will I make to tremble not only the earth, but also the heaven. And this word, Yet

¹Ibid.

²Shapland, op. cit., p. 84, n. 10.

once more, signifies the removing of the things that are shaken, that the things which are not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken, we have grace whereby we offer service well pleasing to God" (Heb. 12:26-28). In Athanasius' opinion David declared that this kingdom is established, for he said, "He has also established the world that it shall not be shaken" (Ps. 93:1).¹

In Athanasius' treatment of some of the problems involved in the interpretation of Amos 4:13, Smythe concludes that they are by no means treated inadequately. Smythe believes that Athanasius' careful and detailed handling of the problems involved in the passage's interpretation is a contribution of permanent value for a solution of the difficulties presented by Amos 4:13. Smythe concludes that:

Despite an exegesis at times unnecessarily elaborate through lack of knowledge of the Hebrew original, the treatment of this controverted text by St. Athanasius . . . is pre-eminently sane. There is no forced interpretation of single words, and, whilst particular points are examined with some care, the doctrinal issue is never made to depend on mere literalness. Lastly, and most important perhaps, the positive exposition of the prophetic oracle pays careful attention to context²

I Tim. 5:21.

The Tropici also employed I Tim. 5:21 as proof that

¹Ibid., I.10.

²H. R. Smythe, "The Interpretation of Amos 4¹³ in St. Athanasius and Didymus," JTS (N.S., I-II, 1950-51), pp. 161, 168.

the Holy Spirit is a creature: "I charge you in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels that you observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality." The Tropicci alleged that this passage associates angels with God and the Son but that there is no mention of the Holy Spirit, or, if the Spirit is included, he must be included with the angels. In his answer to this interpretation Athanasius points out that the Scriptures, in fact, never refer to the Holy Spirit as an angel. The Spirit, however, is ministered to with the Son, and this is indicated in Luke 1:35, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow you."¹

The Tropicci believed that Zechariah (1:9; 4:5; etc.) referred to the Spirit as an angel: "These things said the angel who spoke within me." This contention is countered by Athanasius with a reference to Zech. 4:5, 6, "And the angel who spoke within me answered and said, Do you not know what these things are? and I said, No, my Lord. Then he answered and spoke unto me, saying, This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, Not by great might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, says the Lord almighty." This makes it clear to Athanasius that the angel who spoke to Zechariah was not the Holy Spirit but an angel, but the Holy Spirit is the

¹Ad Serap. I.10, 11. See *infra*, pp. 300, 301, for Athanasius' interpretation of Luke 1:35.

Spirit of the Almighty to whom an angel ministers, and who is inseparable from the Godhead.¹

It is asserted by Athanasius on the basis of various Scripture passages that the Holy Spirit and angels are to be distinguished. The Holy Spirit, not an angel, descended like a dove on the Son (Matt. 3:16). The Lord said to the disciples, "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels" (Matt. 13:49); but in giving the Spirit he said, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22), and in sending them out, "Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19). The Son did not promise to send an angel but to send "the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father" (John 15:26).² Moses also, in Athanasius' opinion, recognized that angels are creatures but that the Holy Spirit is united with the Son and the Father (e.g., Ex. 33:1, 2, 15, 17, 18; Is. 63:11, 12, 14).³

Athanasius' answer to the Tropici's argument from silence, in that I Tim. 5:21 mentions the Father and the Son but not the Spirit, is that in other passages of Scripture the Son and Spirit are mentioned, but there is no mention of the Father. This is seen in such passages as Is. 48:16,

¹ Ad Serap. I.11.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., I.12. See supra, pp. 267, 268, for his use of these passages.

"Come near to me, and hear these things. From the beginning I have not spoken in secret; where it was, there was I. And now the Lord has sent me, and his Spirit"; and in Hag. 2:4, 5, "Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, says the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua, son of Josedech, the high priest. And be strong all you people of the land, says the Lord, and work; for I am with you, says the Lord of hosts, and my Spirit abode among you." Athanasius points out that whether "Lord" refers to the Father or the Son in these passages, the other Person is passed over in silence. On the basis of the Tropici's argument this would mean that the one omitted does not exist, or, if he does exist, he is a creature.¹

Athanasius' conclusion in his exegesis of I Tim. 5:21 is that when the Father is mentioned the Word is also included as well as the Spirit who is in the Son. There is one grace from the Father which is fulfilled through the Son in the Holy Spirit. There is one divine nature and one God "who is over all and through all and in all" (Eph. 4:6).²

Some unusual interpretations

Athanasius sometimes discovers the clue for the interpretation of a passage of Scripture in a single word which he relates to another passage which includes the same word.³

¹ Ad Serap. I.13.

² Ibid., I.14.

³ This has previously been seen in his interpretation of such passages as Prov. 8:22. See supra, pp. 147 ff.

This method was facilitated in that his Old Testament was the Septuagint, and thus for Athanasius both Testaments were in the Greek language. Athanasius finds the explication of the one passage under consideration in the use of the word in the related passage. This may be seen in the connection of several passages through the one word, "power." Paul is said to confute the Greeks in Rom. 1:20, "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead." The Arians apparently contended that the Father himself is "his eternal Power." This cannot be, Athanasius avers, for the text itself does not state that God himself is the "Power." The "Power" is God's, however, which may be deduced from a comparison with I Cor. 1:24, "Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God." Having spoken of creation, Paul would naturally speak of the Power of the Creator as seen in it. This Power is the Word of God who made all things as Paul explicitly states.¹

Athanasius makes the same identification in his explanation of Acts 1:7, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father has put in his own Power." "His own Power" is identified as the Son on the basis of I Cor. 1:24.²

Athanasius finds a reference to both the Holy Spirit

¹ C. Ar. I.11.

² Ibid., III.48.

and the Son, and probably also the Father, in Luke 1:35, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow you." In earlier interpretations both "Holy Spirit" and "Power of the Highest" were applied to the Word.¹ Athanasius identifies "Power of the Highest" as the Son on the basis of Paul's declaration in I Cor. 1:24.²

In writing to Serapion Athanasius contrasts creatures who are subject to change with the Son who is unalterable. The Son, like the Father, is true God. God is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father. So it is written in Is. 45: 14, 15, "Egypt was overwhelmed and the commerce of the Ethiopians; and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over to you, and they shall follow behind you bound with fetters, and they shall worship you, because God is in you. For you are the God of Israel, and we knew you not." Athanasius asks, "Who is this God in whom God is?" He answers that it can only be the Son, for the Son himself said, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10, 11).³ The phrase, "God is in you," in this passage in Isaiah suggests to Athanasius the correct interpretation of the text. This simple

¹As Justin Martyr in I Apol. 33 and Theophilus in Ad Aut. 2.10.

²Ad Serap. I.11, 31; II.6. In Adv. Prax. 27 Tertullian interprets the "Power of the Highest" to be the Word of God or the Spirit of God. He equates the Word and the Spirit in his interpretation of Luke 1:35.

³Ad Serap. II.4.

association provides Athanasius with a Christological text from the Old Testament. On this interpretation Telfer makes this comment: "By this combination of texts, Athanasius thinks to establish the consubstantiality of the Son!"¹

Athanasius notes that the cherubim and seraphim in their Trisagion (in Is. 6:3 and Rev. 4:8) praise and glorify God. Athanasius points out that it is not reported by the writers of Scripture that the first "holy" is raised aloud while the second is lower in volume and the third quite low with the consequence that the first "holy" denotes Lordship, the second subordination, and the third an even lower degree. The living creatures offered their praises three times, "Holy, Holy, Holy." This proves, in Athanasius' opinion, that the three "Hypostases" (ὑποστάσεις) are perfect, just as in saying, "Lord," the living creatures declare the one "Essence" (οὐσία). So the Triad is praised and revered and is one and indivisible.² In his reference to Athanasius' interpretation of Is. 6:3 Gilbert observes that: "Thus out of a simple poetical acknowledgment of the holiness of Jehovah there is spun the most abstruse of theological doctrine."³

¹Telfer, HTR, loc. cit., p. 96.

²In Illud, Omnia, etc. 6. Origen, in De Prin. 1.2.8, interprets the two seraphim in Is. 6:3 to be the only-begotten Son of God and the Holy Spirit. See Kretschmar, op. cit., pp. 62-71, for the history of the interpretation of Is. 6:1-3 as a Trinitarian text.

³Gilbert, op. cit., p. 123.

An unusual interpretation is also found in Athanasius' reference to Is. 6:8. God, not willing that man who was made in his own image should perish, asked, "Whom shall I send, and who will go?" All remained silent, Athanasius avows, except the Son who said, "Here am I, send me." In response to God's command to go, the Word became flesh in order to restore man from his fallen condition.¹ This interpretation of Is. 6:8, Robertson points out, stands alone in the writing of Athanasius, and, if pressed, lends itself to a conception of the Son's relation to the Father which is at least similar to Arianism. It is contrary, Robertson believes, to the more explicit and mature conception of Athanasius.² This mature conception is evident in Contra Arianos where Athanasius asserts that in speaking to the Word in creation, God does not speak as to a servant but speaks as to his own Word who is proper to him.³

In Daniel 9:24, 25 Athanasius discovers a reference to the incarnation, for Daniel marks both the actual date and the coming in flesh of the Son: "Seventy weeks are cut short upon your people, and upon the holy city, for a full end to be made of sin, and for sins to be sealed up, and to blot out iniquities, and to bring everlasting righteousness, and to seal vision and prophet, and to anoint a Holy of

¹In Illud, Omnia, etc. 2.

²Robertson, op. cit., IV, 87, n. 2. ³C. Ar. II.31.

holies; and you will know and understand from the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Christ the prince." For Athanasius the title, "Holy of Holies," signifies that Christ is not simply a man but that he is pre-existent and God.¹

SUMMARY

In his use of the Scriptures for formulating and defending the doctrine of the Trinity Athanasius employed established methods of exegesis. The Son was identified as the Wisdom, Word, and Hand of God and also as the Angel of the Lord. Athanasius also ascribed the title "Lord" to the Son in Old Testament passages--not only those so used by New Testament writers but other passages as well, apparently almost without discrimination. All of these methods are discernible in the New Testament writings with the exception of the identification of the Son as the Hand of God (and the interpretation of Gen. 1:26) and as the Angel of the Lord. The early Christian writers subsequent to the New Testament era also employed all of these methods of interpretation.

Athanasius sought to establish the deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, as well as the unity of the Trinity, by demonstrating that the activities and attributes ascribed to

¹De Inc. 39. Clement of Alexandria (in Strom. 1.21. 126) also interprets "Holy of Holies" in Dan. 9:24, 25 to be a reference to the Son.

the Father in the Scriptures are also attributed to the Son and the Spirit. For Athanasius the deity of the Son and the Spirit is indicated in that the same declarations are made of all three Persons of the Trinity in Scripture, and the Son and the Spirit are worshiped with the Father. The baptismal formula of Matt. 28:19, the benediction of II Cor. 13:14, and the bestowal of gifts referred to in I Cor. 12:4-6 were all adduced to prove the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.

The Scriptures were also used by Athanasius to demonstrate that Christ is God's Son, the Son and the Spirit are eternal, and that the Trinity is at the same time a unity. Passages referring to the Son are to be interpreted by the principle that there is a double account of the Son in Scripture. Athanasius supported all of these declarations by direct references to Scripture passages and often with many texts put forward, sometimes with little or no comment, to substantiate a single doctrinal statement. He also extensively used related passages from any part of Scripture as evidence for the doctrine that he was defending. These texts were associated simply by verbal and idea resemblances. This resulted in some unusual interpretations of individual passages of Scripture. Proof texts used as evidence and comparison of Scripture texts are readily evident in an examination of Athanasius' interpretation of various passages of Scripture.

PART IV. ATHANASIUS' PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER XI

BASES OF INTERPRETATION

The Relationship of Christ to the Old Testament

A. T. Hanson¹ suggests that there are four levels on which the Old Testament is interpreted by New Testament writers, each level a degree further removed from history: (1) the real presence of Christ in Old Testament history; (2) prophecy; (3) typology; and (4) allegory.² By "real presence" Hanson means the method of interpretation by which Jesus is regarded as actually present in Old Testament events.

Athanasius employed all four of these methods in his interpretation of Scripture. The allegorical method is present in his writings, but it is not frequently used and does not assume any significant importance in his use of Scripture. In Contra Gentes Athanasius treats the account of Eden and the Fall as figurative, but there is nothing like this in his later writings.³ In De Incarnatione he allegorizes Dt. 28:66, "You shall see your life hanging before

¹Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, Jesus Christ in the Old Testament (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 176. See infra, pp. 310 ff. for a discussion of the interpretation of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers.

²See infra, pp. 317 and 321, for definitions of typology and allegory.

³C. Gen. 2, 3.

your eyes and shall not believe." This, with Jer. 11:19 and Ps. 22:16, 18, is said to indicate Christ's death on the cross.¹ The Alexandrian tradition of allegorical exegesis had little influence on Athanasius and was inconsequential for his doctrine of the Trinity; but, as Pollard states, Athanasius had not completely broken away from allegorical exegesis, at least in his early writings.² In the Arian controversy the conflict between literal exegesis on the one hand, and allegorization on the other, did not play a significant part. Pollard believes that Athanasius inherited from Alexander and Peter of Alexandria an aversion to the allegorical method at least in providing arguments for doctrinal formulations.³ As Shapland observes, Athanasius did not question the legitimacy of allegory, though he seldom used it.⁴ Allegorical interpretation did not lend itself for Athanasius' use in his controversy with the Arians and the Tropici.

Athanasius only infrequently uses typological exegesis. He apparently speaks of Solomon's temple as a "type" (τύπος) of Christ who came in the flesh as in a temple. In Contra Arianos the robe that Aaron put on is said to

¹De Inc. 35. See also C. Ar. II.16.

²Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 419.

³Pollard, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 560, 561.

⁴Shapland, op. cit., p. 76, n. 2.

prefigure the incarnation of the Son.¹ The happenings of old are said to be a shadow of Christ's coming. Athanasius refers to the "old things" as "types" of that which is new, but when the reality came, the type then ceased to exist.² He does not rely on this method in his formulation and defense of the Trinitarian doctrine.

Reference is also made by Athanasius to Old Testament prophecy concerning Christ. In De Incarnatione he maintains that the Jews can be refuted from the Scriptures, for the Scriptures speak of Christ's birth (Is. 7:14), his incarnation (Num. 24:17, 5-7; Is. 8:3, 4), and his death, dishonor, and the difference of his nature from man's (Is. 53:3-10). They also state that he is Lord of all (Is. 19:1), and that he is called from Egypt (Hos. 11:1).³ Athanasius also speaks of both Christ and the Holy Spirit as speaking through Old Testament writers.⁴ However, though Athanasius refers to Old Testament prophecies of Christ, and also to Christ and the Spirit as speaking through Old Testament

¹In Philo the High Priest symbolizes the Logos (De Fig. 20.109), and his vestments and its parts are said to have a varied beauty which is derived from "powers belonging some to the realm of pure intellect, some to that of sense-perception" (De Mig. Abrah. 18.102; De Mos. 2.24.117-126; and De Spec. Leg. 1.16.85-87).

²Ad Adelph. 7; C. Ar. II.7, 8; and Ep. Heort. 45.

³De Inc. 33, 34.

⁴E.g., C. Ar. II.52, 57, 60. See also supra, pp. 232 ff.

writers more extensively than he uses allegorical and typological methods of exegesis, the prophetic method of exegesis is not significantly used in Athanasius' expression of the Trinitarian doctrine.

In Athanasius' interpretation, however, the pre-existent Christ was actually in Old Testament history and was, in fact, present at the creation. This has been shown in his conception of Christ as Wisdom, as the Hand of God, as the Word, as the Lord, and as the Angel of the Lord.¹ This conception of the pre-existent Christ, and also of the Holy Spirit, as active in the events of the Old Testament is the key to Athanasius' interpretation of such passages as Gen. 1:26; Is. 6:3; 6:8; 45:14; 48:16; 63:11, 12, 14; and Prov. 8:22.² For Athanasius the Persons of the Trinity are active from the beginning, and the Old Testament, as well as the New Testament, has reference to each of them and to the activity of each.

It has been noted that there are four suggested levels on which the Old Testament is interpreted in the New.³ John Marsh suggests that the central reality or concept within the Biblical revelation which provides the major hermeneutical key for the interpretation of the Old Testament is Jesus

¹Supra, pp. 158 ff.

²Supra, pp. 147 ff.

³Supra, p. 307.

Christ himself.¹ The Scriptures themselves indicate that Christ is the means to an understanding of the Old Testament: John 5:39 (RSV), "You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness to me"; Luke 24:27, 44-46 (RSV), "And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. . . . Then he said to them, 'These are my words which I spoke to you, while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled.' Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures, and said to them, 'Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead'; and I Cor. 15:3, 4 (RSV), "For I delivered unto you . . . he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures." Also in the speeches in Acts there are indications of this conception of the relationship of Christ to the Old Testament, such as Acts 2:29-31 (RSV), "David . . . foresaw and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ." In I Pet. 1:10, 11 (RSV), the prophets are said to prophecy by the "Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glory."

The writers of the New Testament regarded the Old

¹John Marsh, "History and Interpretation," Biblical Authority for Today, ed. by Alan Richardson and W. Schweitzer (London: SCM Press Ltd. 1951), p. 181.

Testament as their book.¹ For Paul and the other New Testament writers everything in the Old Testament points to Christ, and therefore "exegetical ingenuity has to find him in every Old Testament page."² The writers of the New Testament are concerned to establish that Jesus Christ is the real meaning of the Old Testament. The interpretation that the understanding of the Old Testament means Jesus Christ rests on a theological unity of the Old Testament with the new revelation in Christ.³ Jesus believed himself to be the fulfillment and embodiment of all the messianic hopes of his people. The New Testament bears witness that the early Church accepted this claim. This is especially evident in their appeal to the Old Testament as evidence that Jesus is the Christ. Higgins suggests that more important than individual passages is the correspondence of ideas in the Old Testament and the New. He suggests that "in Christian retrospect it may even be permissible to speak of Old Testament 'Christology.'"⁴ The beginning of Christology may be found

¹Ibid., p. 184. See supra, pp. 68 ff.

²James N. S. Alexander, "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Ante-Nicene Period: A Brief Conspectus," Interpretation (July, 1958), p. 272.

³H. Cunliffe-Jones, The Authority of the Biblical Revelation (London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1945), pp. 47, 48, 51.

⁴A. J. B. Higgins, "The Old Testament and Some Aspects of New Testament Christology," Promise and Fulfilment, p. 128.

ultimately in Jesus' own thought about himself and about his mission. In answering the question of whose was the original mind who "set in motion the rudiments of an original, coherent, and flexible method of biblical exegesis," which is evident in the New Testament, Dodd suggests that it is safe in saying that it was the early Church, but that the New Testament affirms that it was Jesus himself. "To account for the beginning of this most original and fruitful process of rethinking the Old Testament we found need to postulate a creative mind. The Gospels offer us one. Are we compelled to reject the offer?"¹ Briggs believes also that in his own method of interpretation, Jesus enunciated the distinctive principles of Scriptural interpretation which enabled his followers to understand the Old Testament and delivered them from the allegorical and legal methods of his times.²

Each of the interpretative methods mentioned above is Christological in that each is an approach to the Old Testament that is intended to make it a Christian book which in some manner pointed to Christ. Wolff makes the point that:

We need to be reminded that no New Testament writer felt he was in a position to witness to Jesus Christ without constantly opening and quoting the Old Testament. Both the proclamation of

¹Dodd, According to the Scriptures, pp. 108-110.

²Charles Augustus Briggs, General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899), p. 441.

Jesus and the preaching of the early Christians are unthinkable without the Old Testament.¹

How, then, does the New Testament relate Christ to the Old Testament? The most obvious indication that Christ was considered by New Testament writers to be pre-existent and active in Old Testament history is I Cor. 10:4 (RSV), "For they drank from the supernatural Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ." As R. P. C. Hanson observes, Paul believed that the Messiah was in some form present with the people of Israel in the wilderness. Thus in their ultimate significance, Israel was the Messiah's people in the period of wandering in the wilderness. It seems likely that Paul here means that "the Rock really was Christ: the word was (ἦν) is expressed in the Greek." It is thus not an example of allegory, Hanson avers, but an example of Paul's tendency to read back the Messiah into the Old Testament.² In A. T. Hanson's estimation the "Rock" is not to be interpreted typologically or allegorically, for in Paul's view

¹Hans Walter Wolff, "The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, ed. Claus Westermann (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1963), p. 188. R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit (London: SPCK, 1957), p. 47, states that a thoroughgoing reinterpretation of the Old Testament along Christian lines is not met until in the letters of Paul.

²Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 79. Oscar Cullmann, in "πέτρα," TWNT, VI, 96, believes that Paul did not intend to identify absolutely the Rock in the wilderness with Christ as if he assumed the appearance of the Rock. The Messiah, Cullmann believes, remains a spiritual reality.

the Rock was Christ himself. Christ would not be a type of himself.¹ Stauffer affirms that Paul discusses Christ's activity in salvation-history only in I Cor. 10:4 ff., but then with unmistakable clarity he indicates that Christ himself was active in the history of the old Covenant.² It seems best then to interpret I Cor. 10:4 neither as a type nor an allegory. Paul meant that Christ himself accompanied Israel in the wilderness.

A. T. Hanson also suggests that in Rom. 10 Paul is not saying that the references to the Old Testament in this chapter have been fulfilled centuries later but is saying that Christ himself actually made these statements in the old Covenant. Other passages that may possibly be interpreted as references to the pre-existent Christ and his activity in Old Testament events, in Hanson's opinion, are passages such as John 12:37-41, II Cor. 3:7-18, and Heb. 3:1-6.³ In Hanson's estimation the key to an understanding of Paul's use of the Old Testament is that for Paul Christ himself was present in the Old Testament. He concludes that:

Once grant Paul his one great assumption, that Christ spoke and acted in OT times,

¹Hanson, op. cit., p. 8.

²Stauffer, op. cit., p. 101. G. W. H. Lampe, "Typological Exegesis," Theology (56, 1953), p. 201, refers to I Cor. 10:4 as an example of genuine typology.

³Hanson, op. cit., pp. 6 ff.

and his interpretation becomes homogeneous and comprehensible.¹

There are various evidences in the New Testament of the use of the fulfillment of prophecy as a method of interpreting the Old Testament. This is evident in Matthew, for its author frequently relates to the Old Testament the events which he narrates. These events are presented as being fulfillments of Old Testament prophecies. Thus in the account of the birth of Jesus it is affirmed that all these events took place to fulfill "what the Lord had spoken by the prophet" (Matt. 1:22, RSV), and then Is. 7:14 is quoted. The author of Matthew also refers to Old Testament passages with the words, "It is written," such as in Matt. 2:5. He then proceeds to quote Mic. 5:2 (Matt. 2:6) as a prediction of the birthplace of Christ.

Also in Luke 4:16-21 there is an account of Jesus' visit to the synagogue and his reading of Is. 61:1, 2 with the words, "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (RSV). In Luke 24:25-27, 44-47 Jesus is said to have interpreted the Old Testament Scriptures as written of his own sufferings and resurrection. Fulfillment of prophecy is also evident in Acts 2:14-21 where the events of Pentecost are said to be the fulfillment of the words in Joel 2:28-32. In this same chapter in Acts the resurrection of

¹A. T. Hanson, op. cit., p. 47.

Christ is said to have been foreseen by David in Ps. 16:8-11 (Acts 2:24-31). Paul speaks of the gospel as being promised beforehand through the prophets in the Scriptures (Rom. 1:2). In Heb. 8:7-13 the new covenant is said to have been referred to be Jeremiah (Jer. 31:31-34).

R. P. C. Hanson refers to fulfillment of prophecy as a method of interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures current in the early Church by which proof texts were found in the Old Testament to demonstrate that the prophecies of the Old Testament had been fulfilled in Christ.¹

A third method of interpreting the Old Testament by the writers of the New Testament is typology. Woolcombe² observes that allegorism, typology, and the fulfillment of prophecy are to be differentiated, but that to a certain extent typological writing and the fulfillment of prophecy overlap. Woolcombe defines typology as follows:

Typology, considered as a method of exegesis, may be defined as the establishment of historical connexions between certain events, persons or things in the Old Testament and similar events, persons or things in the New Testament.³

Typology is based on a historical foundation. It is the

¹Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 73.

²K. J. Woolcombe, Essays on Typology, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22 (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956), p. 42.

³Ibid., p. 39. See also R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 7.

search for "linkages," Woollcombe avers, between events, persons, or things within the framework of revelation.¹ Thus typology is a method of interpreting the events of history.² It is oriented toward the future with the types as anticipations or prefigurations of later events or persons. Typology is a historical method rather than a philological one and presupposes and implies the reality of history. It links together the past, present, and future "in a unity of divine purpose, and the purpose was Christ. Therefore typology has emphatically a Christological meaning . . ."³ This method of interpretation presupposes that there are parallels and correspondences between the two Testaments and that Christ is prefigured in the Old Testament.⁴

Markus affirms that this typology of anticipation and

¹Woollcombe, op. cit., p. 40.

²E. C. Blackman, Biblical Interpretation (London: Independent Press Ltd., 1957), p. 102.

³Georges Florovsky, "Revelation and Interpretation," Biblical Authority for Today, p. 176.

⁴Jean Daniélou, Origen, trans. Walter Mitchell (London: Sheed and Ward, 1955), pp. 160, 161. See also T. E. Pollard, "The Origins of Christian Exegesis," JRH (1, 1961), p. 144; Walther Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, p. 227; and E. von Dobschütz, "Interpretation," ERE, VII, 391. Daniélou, in From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers, trans. Wulstan Hibberd (London: Burns & Oates, 1960), pp. 11-22, believes that there are two types of typology in the New Testament: eschatological typology and Adamic.

its fulfillment are firmly planted in the Scriptures.¹ In R. P. C. Hanson's estimation it is evident from almost every page of the New Testament that its writers used typology in their interpretation of the Old Testament. This method was not invented by Christ or the early Christians, for there was a mass of typological material already existing before the use of typology by the New Testament writers. The literature of the Qumran community and also the remains of early Jewish liturgy, Hanson notes, show that typology, and also allegory, were well established in the first century B.C. The existence and use of this method in the early Church, and subsequently in the New Testament, was part of her literary inheritance from Judaism. Both the methods of typology and allegory inherited from Judaism were of the Palestinian and not a Philonic type. In the early Church a body of types taken from the Old Testament and more or less limited was used for the proclamation of the Gospel and for teaching. The peculiar character of the Church's typology would be in the conception that it was fulfilled typology.² It was a typology that had an emphatically Christological

¹R. A. Markus, "Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture," CQR (158, 1957), p. 444.

²Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 65-67; and Hanson, SJT, loc. cit., pp. 29, 30. See also F. C. Grant, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960), pp. 158, 159; and F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), pp. 75-88.

meaning.¹

In Matt. 12:39, 40 the prophet Jonah's three days and three nights in the belly of the whale prefigure the death and burial of Christ. The raising of the serpent in the wilderness by Moses is interpreted to be a type of the crucifixion of Christ (John 3:14). In Rom. 5:14 Paul refers to Adam as a "type" (τύπος) of the one who was to come. Paul also uses τύποι and τυπικῶς in I Cor. 10:6 and 11 where he speaks of events in the wilderness as "warnings" not to desire evil as the Israelites did. In this latter context the word is therefore not used in the sense in which it is employed in genuinely typological contexts.²

Schoeps believes that Paul's typological patterns are central to his whole picture of history, and therefore show that Paul read the Old Testament with "prophetic eyes" in order to extract from it its hidden typological content and its "suggestions of saving history." Thus, Schoeps affirms, the great figures and moments in the Old Testament become for Paul "types" which foreshadow the events of the last age.³

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, in R. P. C. Hanson's

¹Florovsky, Biblical Authority for Today, loc. cit., p. 176.

²Woolcombe, op. cit., p. 62, says that Paul invariably uses τύπος in the sense of "pattern" or "model" which is the usual meaning in the New Testament.

³H. J. Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 233.

judgment, there is virtually no allegory of any sort, and no Alexandrian allegory at all. The author of Hebrews, however, gives much attention to typological interpretation.¹ Melchizedek is presented as a type of Christ (Heb. 6:20-7:17), and also the Old Testament high priest typifies Christ (Heb. 4:14 ff.). The law is a shadow of the good things to come (Heb. 10:1).

Allegory is almost absent from the New Testament, and the allegorical interpretation which does appear in it is peripheral.² The allegorical method of interpretation to some extent resembles the typological. Often typology is confused with allegory and passes over into it.³ R. P. C. Hanson defines allegory thus:

Allegory is the interpretation of an object or person or a number of objects or persons as in reality meaning some object or person of a later time, with no attempt made to trace a relationship of "similar

¹Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 83, 86. Eichrodt, Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, loc. cit., p. 229, states that the Epistle to the Hebrews is the first case of something approaching a constant typological method in the Scriptures. R. M. Grant, in Interpretation of the Bible, pp. 35, 36, points out that the Epistle to the Hebrews represents the most thorough analysis of the Old Testament in typological terms in the New Testament. Hebrews, he says, played an important role in the history of exegesis.

²A. T. Hanson, op. cit., p. 5; also Gerhard von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, p. 177; and R. M. Grant, IB, loc. cit., p. 107.

³See R. M. Grant, IB, loc. cit., I, 111; and Lampe, Theology, loc. cit., p. 205.

situation" between them.¹

Whereas genuine typology rests on a historical foundation, "allegory is founded upon a disregard of history."² Lampe affirms that in allegorical interpretation the whole range of Scripture becomes one great field of symbolism in which the interpreter is free to wander as he wishes. He is not restricted by the considerations of historical accuracy nor by the apparent intent of the Biblical writers. In that typology rests on the perception of actual historical fulfillment, allegory therefore differs radically from it.³ In contrast to typology, allegory is the "search for a secondary and hidden meaning of a narrative."⁴ Thus Philo makes Adam and Eve symbolic of mind and sense perception respectively.⁵ According to the laws of allegory, in Philo's interpretation, Abraham's migrations are made by a "virtue-loving soul in its search for the true God" and indicates the soul's journey from "godless astronomy" first to "self-knowledge" (heaven), then to the "knowledge of God."⁶ Thus allegorical

¹Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 7. See also Friedrich Büchsel, "ἀλληγορία," TWNT, I, 260-264.

²Lampe, Theology, loc. cit., p. 205.

³Lampe, Essays on Typology, p. 31.

⁴Woollicombe, op. cit., p. 40. Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality, p. 61, contends that allegory is not a sense of Scripture at all.

⁵De Cherub. 17.57 ff.

⁶De Abrah. 15.68 ff.

interpretation is symbolic, without regard to the historical value of the persons and the narrative. In typology, however, the persons and narrative have a recognized validity in their own right. Thus the author of Hebrews interprets the high priesthood of the Old Testament as a type of Christ's priesthood (Heb. 4:14 ff.). The high priesthood of the Old Testament is a shadow of things to come, but it does not lose its historical validity. Blackman understands typological and allegorical interpretation to be different in kind and not alternative methods of interpreting Scripture. Allegory is a literary method applied to the text of Scripture, but typology is a method of interpreting the events of history.¹

There is no evidence, R. P. C. Hanson points out, that Jesus interpreted the Old Testament Scriptures allegorically with the possible exception of the statement in Mk. 12:10 (RSV) which comes at the conclusion of the parable of the Wicked Husbandman: "The very stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner." The existence of allegorical interpretation of some of the parables shows that allegory was in the minds of the earliest Christians.²

¹Blackman, Biblical Interpretation, p. 102. See also R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 22; Eichrodt, Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, loc. cit., p. 227; Turner, op. cit., p. 270; and Pollard, JRH, loc. cit., 1, 142, 143, 164.

²Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 76, 77. C. H. Dodd,

There are a number of passages in Paul's writings which appear to be allegory though there are different opinions in reference to such passages whether the interpretation is typological or allegorical. Grant calls Paul the earliest allegorist who is known in the Christian Church.¹ In Gal. 4:24 Paul uses the word ἀλληγορούμενα in his interpretation of the story of Hagar and Sarah. It cannot be assumed that this interpretation is strictly allegorical, however, for the incidents to which Paul refers do not lose their historical basis. R. M. Grant evidently considers this passage as not strictly an example of allegorization.² Florovsky regards Paul's interpretation to be typological though it occurs under the name of allegory.³ R. P. C. Hanson considers it to be allegory but not of the Alexandrian variety.⁴

in The Parables of the Kingdom (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1936), pp. 13, 14, also affirms that it must be confessed that the Gospels themselves give "encouragement to this allegorical method of interpretation."

¹R. M. Grant, "The Bible in the Ancient Church," JR (XXVI, 1946), p. 194.

²Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, pp. 19, 20.

³Florovsky, Biblical Authority For Today, loc. cit., p. 175; also Alexander, Interpretation, loc. cit., p. 273.

⁴Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 80-83. Gal. 4:21-31 is considered allegory by Gilbert, op. cit., p. 82; Bonsirven, op. cit., p. 309; H. P. Smith, Essays in Biblical Interpretation (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1921), p. 45; and Schoeps, op. cit., p. 234. See Woollcombe, op. cit., pp. 52, 53, for a comparison of the story of Hagar and Sarah in Paul with that in Philo.

There seems to be a clear case of allegory in I Cor. 9:8-10 where Paul uses the statement in Dt. 25:4 (RSV), "You shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain," not as a proof that God is concerned for oxen, but that a Christian worker is to share in the material benefits of those who are taught. Grant also considers Rom. 10:5-10 to be allegorization.¹ In Blackman's opinion there are only two allegorical passages: Gal. 4:21-31 and I Cor. 10:1-4.²

R. P. C. Hanson believes that when Paul employed allegory, he used it in a Palestinian rather than an Alexandrian tradition.³ Paul's allegorism is not comparable to the allegory of Philo, Woollcombe states, for allegory in Paul is firmly anchored in history.⁴ In his method and results Paul, Grant observes, combined Rabbinic and Hellenistic Jewish exegesis to find his Gospel in the Old Testament.⁵ The tendency of writers of the New Testament Epistles, and especially Paul and the author of Revelation, to see in

¹R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, p. 51.

²Blackman, Biblical Interpretation, p. 88. Bonsirven, op. cit., pp. 309, 310, considers as allegory only Gal. 4:21-31; I Cor. 9:8-10; and II Cor. 3:13-4:6. Büchsel, TWNT, loc. cit., I, 263, 264, regards I Cor. 5:6-8; 9:8-10; 10:1-11; and Gal. 4:21-31 as allegorical interpretations.

³Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 83. So also Woollcombe, op. cit., p. 53, with reference to Gal. 4:21-31.

⁴Woollcombe, op. cit., pp. 55, 56.

⁵R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, p. 54.

almost every Old Testament passage a reference to Christ would encourage the growth of allegory. Hanson points out that the habit of envisaging Christ as being present and active in Old Testament events would inevitably eventuate in the appearance of allegory though allegory seldom became explicit in the text of the New Testament itself.¹

Methods of Interpretation in the
Post-New Testament Period

The methods of interpreting the Scriptures that have been discussed were all continued in the post-New Testament period. Dobschütz declares that the early writers adopted a method of interpretation which is reminiscent of the exegesis of Palestinian Rabbinism and early Christianity which, he thinks, took mainly the form of prophecy.² Apart from the Epistle of Barnabas there was little allegory or typology. With the exception of this author's single writing there are

¹Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 77. See Cunliffe-Jones, op. cit., p. 44, who suggests that I Cor. 9:9, 10 "opens the door to all the allegorizing teaching of later centuries . . ." On the history of allegorical interpretation see Louis Ginzberg, "Allegorical Interpretation," The Jewish Encyclopedia (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1901), I, 403-411; R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 11-64; R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, pp. 1-40; Wolfson, Philo, pp. 112-163; L. Mowry, "Allegory," IDB, A-D, 82-84; Joh. Geffcken, "Allegory, Allegorical Interpretation," ERE, 327-331; and J. Tate, "Plato and Allegorical Interpretation" and "On the History of Allegorism," CQ (XXIII-XXIV, 1929-30; and XXVII-XXVIII, 1933-34), pp. 142-154 and 105-114, respectively.

²Dobschütz, "Bible in the Church," ERE, II, 597.

no signs that the writers of the sub-apostolic period were influenced at all by Alexandrian allegory and certainly not of the Philonic type.¹ Alexander points out that the writers of this period were much more fanciful than the New Testament writers. They usually followed the New Testament exegetical pattern, however, and remained, like Paul, Christocentric and close to the historical sense of the Old Testament.² Franks suggests that the importance of Ignatius in this period lies in the fact that he prefigured the soteriology which would ultimately determine the patristic Trinitarianism. In Franks's opinion the beginnings not only of the theology of Irenaeus but also that of Athanasius are to be found in the epistles of Ignatius.³

In Justin Martyr there is a marked development of the allegorical tradition. R. P. C. Hanson attributes this increase partly to the fact that the Dialogue with Trypho was written to show that the Old Testament pointed to Christ. Justin regarded the whole Old Testament as prophecy of the

¹ See R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 100-103, for evaluations of the interpretative methods of the sub-apostolic period.

² Alexander, Interpretation, loc. cit., p. 273.

³ Franks, Doctrine of the Trinity, pp. 66-68. In De Syn. 47 Athanasius quotes a statement from Ignatius (Ad Eph. 18, 20) which speaks of Christ as both human and divine, as both God and man, and as being from both Mary and God.

coming of Jesus as the Messiah.¹ Only rarely did he interpret the Old Testament to mean exactly and only what it said but related the Old Testament to Christianity in terms of types, mysteries, and even allegory. He pointed to the prophetic passage and then pointed to the historical event which fulfilled it, or he cited a historical event and then stated that it had been prophesied in a particular passage.²

Justin speaks of Noah as being saved by wood and water which are types of the cross and baptism in their relationship to the Christian.³ He allegorizes the twelve bells on the High Priest's garment as a symbol of the twelve apostles.⁴ Hanson observes that Justin was "much more unrestrained" than New Testament writers about reading the presence of the pre-incarnate Son back into the Old Testament.⁵ For Justin the one true key to the understanding of the Old Testament was Christ.⁶ His interpretation of the Old Testament, Grant suggests, was at once Christocentric and

¹Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 103. See R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, pp. 76, 77. Woolcombe, op. cit., p. 70, asserts that the Dialogue is exclusively concerned with historical typology.

²Shotwell, op. cit., pp. 29, 55.

³Dial. 138; see also I Apol. 32.1-13 and Dial. 3.1-4.

⁴Dial. 42.1-3.

⁵Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 104.

⁶Shotwell, op. cit., p. 7.

historical, for he did not deny the historical reality of God's relationship to Israel but insisted that the old covenant itself looked forward to being superseded.¹ Shotwell avers that Justin "uses the Old Testament as one great mass of proof texts"² Justin's use of proof texts can be seen in I Apology where a long series of texts is cited to demonstrate the prediction of Jesus' coming by the prophets.³

In Shotwell's opinion Justin was a direct descendant of Paul in matters of exegesis, for both were Christocentric, both believed that it was God who gave true understanding of the Scriptures, and both related the Old Testament to Christianity in terms of types, mysteries, and even allegory. The methods of Scriptural interpretation of both Justin and Paul were thoroughly Rabbinic.⁴ There is no sign in Justin of the influence of Alexandrian tradition of allegory, Hanson concludes, but the sources of his methods of interpretation were Rabbinic allegorism, the example of the New Testament writers, and a traditional typology.⁵

¹R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, p. 48.

²Shotwell, op. cit., p. 29.

³I Apol. 32.1-13.

⁴Shotwell, op. cit., p. 55.

⁵R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 108. Hanson, ibid., p. 105, points out that Justin not only employs typology, but there are also interpretations in Justin where "typology seems to be trembling on the verge of allegory" (see pp. 105-107 for examples). Hanson also turns from these examples of "near-allegory" to several instances of "full-blooded, well-developed allegory" (pp. 107, 108). See also

Theophilus of Antioch employed allegory which, R. P. C. Hanson notes, has the flavor of Alexandrian allegory.¹ Theophilus, for example, interprets the acts of each day of creation in the first chapter of Genesis as signifying spiritual things.² He was not prepared to use allegory exclusively in his interpretation of the Old Testament which is evident in that he does not allegorize the garden of Eden.³ R. M. Grant points out that Theophilus could not find Christ in the Old Testament as freely as Justin could.⁴

In his interpretation of the Old Testament Irenaeus employed allegory basically along the same lines as Justin.⁵ For Irenaeus both Testaments are substantially historical records of God's dealings with men.⁶ Though subordinating the Old Testament to the New, Irenaeus maintains the organic unity and continuity of the Scriptures and believes that the key to understanding the Old Testament is the New.⁷ The

R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, pp. 47-50, on Justin's use of typology. Bultmann, Theology, I, 113, declares that Justin's method of dealing with the Old Testament became the typical view of the Church.

¹Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 109. ²Ad Aut. 2.11-17.

³Ibid., 2.19. ⁴Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, p. 80.

⁵See R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 111-113, for a discussion of Irenaeus' methods of interpretation.

⁶See Markus, CQR, loc. cit., p. 444; and R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 111, 112.

⁷Adv. Haer. 4.40.1. See F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, Irenaeus of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching (Cambridge: University Press, 1914), pp. 200-205.

greater part of the Demonstration consists in adducing proof texts to demonstrate that every part of the new dispensation was predicted in the Old Testament.¹ Irenaeus uses allegory in his interpretation of the Old Testament² and also typology,³ and he was the first writer to allegorize the New Testament.⁴ For Irenaeus the pre-existent Christ was present and active in the history of the Old Testament.⁵ Hanson observes that in the Demonstration Irenaeus was "content in his handling of the Old Testament to follow the line laid down already by Justin."⁶ For Irenaeus there was one standard of correct interpretation and that was the rule of faith.⁷

¹As Demon. 57 ff.

²In Demon. 57 "robe" and "blood of the grape" in Gen. 49:11 are allegorized to mean believers and the blood of Christ.

³In Adv. Haer. 4.24.12 the spies that Rahab received are said to be types of the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit. Also in Adv. Haer. 4.40.1 the hidden treasure in Matt. 13.44 is said to be Christ hidden in the Scriptures and made known through types and parables.

⁴Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 112. See Adv. Haer. 3.18.2 for Irenaeus' allegory in his reference to the parable of the Good Samaritan. This interpretation of the parable was continued by Origen (Hom. on Luke 34) and fully elaborated in Augustine (Quaes. Ev. 2.19). The "wine and oil" is identified with chrism in the Gospel of Philip (111).

⁵See Hitchcock, op. cit., pp. 114, 115.

⁶R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 110, 111.

⁷See R. M. Grant, Interpretation the Bible, pp. 54, 55. Grant, JR, loc. cit., p. 198, also states that in Adversus Haereses Irenaeus enunciated the lines which Scriptural interpretation was generally to follow in orthodox Christianity until the end of the nineteenth century. Kelly, in Doctrines, pp. 38, 39, believes that Irenaeus did not

In his summary of the period from Clement of Rome to Irenaeus Gilbert declares that no tendencies are evident which are not seen in the New Testament writers at least in germ. The feature of the second century that departed most from New Testament interpretation is the arbitrary spiritualizing of the Old Testament in both the use of typology and allegory.¹ Grant concludes that at the end of the second century:

The Church had firmly rejected the unhistorical literary criticism, allegorization, and "prophetization" of Marcion, Valentinus, and Montanus. The Bible was the Church's book and the Church had come to general agreement that the book was the inspired record of an historical revelation. While there was still room for exegetical freedom, this freedom was severely limited by the insistence on history and, to² a considerable extent, on literal interpretation.

In Clement of Alexandria allegory is prominent not only as Alexandrian allegory, but it is openly Philonic.³ He allegorized the New Testament as well as the Old and

subordinate Scripture to tradition and that his real defense of orthodoxy was founded on Scripture.

¹Gilbert, op. cit., pp. 106, 107.

²R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, p. 85. In Interpretation of the Bible, p. 59, Grant refers to the Gnostics as the "most militant allegorizers in the second century," in that they took New Testament passages "with the severest literalism," and then proceeded to claim that their meaning could be understood only in the light of Gnostic myths about the spiritual world, man's fallen state, and the redemption of the "divine spark." R. P. C. Hanson, in Allegory and Event, pp. 134-161, includes the Gnostics with those opposed to allegorism. See infra, p. 337.

³R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 117.

handled miracles as if they were parables. It was as a philosopher, Gilbert suggests, that Clement read and interpreted the Scriptures. As an interpreter of Scriptures he stood on essentially the same ground as Philo, though he showed better judgment than Philo and did not go to Philo's excesses in his interpretation.¹ Grant concludes that in Clement's interpretation of the Scriptures his practice is based on that of Philo.² He has, indeed, borrowed it from Philo and is the first Christian scholar to formulate a doctrine of allegory.³ Clement looked on the Scriptures as a book of enigmas and held that allegory is the one key to the understanding of Scripture.⁴ By his use of Philo's principles of interpretation Clement could demonstrate that from Genesis to Malachi the Scriptures refer to that which was to come.⁵ In his method every word and syllable of Scripture has a meaning--but usually not the obvious one, for Scripture is written symbolically.⁶ Clement's aim in allegorical interpretation, as was Philo's, was apologetic in the face of pagan

¹Gilbert, op. cit., p. 111. See also Blackman, Biblical Interpretation, p. 94.

²R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, p. 61.

³R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 117.

⁴Strom. 6.1. See Gilbert, op. cit., p. 110.

⁵Kennedy, op. cit., p. 47.

⁶R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, p. 61.

philosophic polemics in Alexandria.¹ Clement regarded allegorism as a part of a secret tradition handed down from Christ and a few chosen apostles through a succession of teachers.² Clement also used a Christocentric interpretation of Old Testament Scripture.³

Gilbert refers to Origen as a greater interpreter than Clement. Origen illustrated the Alexandrian type of exegesis most systematically and extensively and thus, Gilbert avers, represents the culmination of a fatal method.⁴ With Origen the allegorization of the New Testament may be seen in its full and methodical expression.⁵ Dobschütz points out that of the Christian theologians Origen was the first to formulate a theory of interpretation by a hypothesis of the manifold sense of Scripture: somatic (or verbal), psychic (or moral), and pneumatic (or mystic).⁶ At times,

¹Alexander, Interpretation, loc. cit., p. 278.

²Strom. 1.1.11, 12. See R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, p. 86; Grant, JR, loc. cit., pp. 198, 199; and Charles Bigg, The Christian Platonists of Alexandria: Bampton Lectures of 1886 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 85, 86.

³Supra, p. 71; see R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, p. 62.

⁴Gilbert, op. cit., p. 113. Geffcken, ERE, loc. cit., p. 330, avows that Origen "gave the allegorical method a kind of scientific basis."

⁵R. P. C. Hanson, Tradition, p. 209; W. den Boer, "Hermeneutic Problems in Early Christian Literature," VC (1-2, 1947-48), pp. 151, 152.

⁶Dobschütz, "Interpretation," ERE, VII, 391.

however, it appears that for Origen there were only two senses of Scripture--literal and spiritual. Origen tended to associate the literal sense with Judaistic tendencies and with unintelligent literalists and simpler folk. He admits that the literal sense is useful in a humble and subordinate capacity.¹ Hanson points out that occasionally Origen refused to desert the literal sense for allegory and sometimes insisted that the literal sense must be retained with the allegorical. In other places Origen declared that the literal sense is not true and that the passage must be understood wholly in the spiritual sense.²

It is in imitation of Philo, Hanson declares, that Origen turned traditional Christian typology into non-historical allegory.³ Bate notes that it has been suggested that the inheritance of Origen was divided into two parts: one part passed to Alexandria--his Platonism in thought and his allegorical interpretation of the Bible; the other passed to Antioch--his critical activity and his devotion to the actual text of Scripture.⁴

Origen sets forth a systematic statement of his

¹R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 236, 237; and R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, p. 64.

²R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 237, 238.

³Ibid., p. 365. See also Bigg, op. cit., p. 185.

⁴Bate, JTS, loc. cit., p. 59. See also K. Grobel, "Interpretation, History and Principles of," IDB, E-J, 719.

hermeneutical principles in the fourth book of De Principiis.¹ Origen refers to the Old Testament prophecy as fulfilled in Christ. He also uses proof texts.² Origen also emphasized the unity of Scripture which could better be called its uniformity.³ In applying this principle Origen habitually read the pre-incarnate Logos into the Old Testament.⁴

In an evaluation of Origen's interpretation of Jer. 13:12⁵ which may be said to be typical of Origen's exegetical style, Hanson points out that Origen weighed every phrase and nearly every word of each verse separately and minutely, explained its meaning by frequent and often fallacious references to other parts of Scripture, and then replied to difficulties and objections suggested by the verse. He related the text to its context in the whole of Scripture but not to the context in Jeremiah itself.⁶ In his interpretation of John 8:23 Origen ranged almost indiscriminately through Scripture to find texts that would interpret the passage under consideration.⁷ Origen emphasized that Scripture

¹De Prin. 4.2.1-9.

²C. Cels. 1.51, 53; Peri Archon 4.1.1-5.

³R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 198.

⁴See supra, pp. 70, 71. ⁵Hom. on Jer. 12.1, 2.

⁶R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 179.

⁷In Ioh. 19.20-22.

must be interpreted by Scripture.¹ Grant concludes that Origen's exegesis was "fundamentally spiritual and unhistorical."²

There existed in Origen's day opinion of considerable proportions both within the Church and outside of it that was hostile to allegory. Included in those opposed to allegorism were such groups as Gnostics, Marcionites, Jews, pagan philosophers, and the Literalists. The latter group asserted that the Bible must be taken literally and not allegorically. They were people who distrusted allegory and preferred a literal interpretation of the text. They formed a recognizable body of opinion, as R. P. C. Hanson notes, and gave Origen a certain amount of trouble.³

¹R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 180.

²R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, p. 96.

³Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 134-161. See Grobel, IDE, E-J, 720, who points out that there arose only one noteworthy protest against allegorical exegesis--that of the school of Antioch. The Antiochenes emphasized the literal meaning and historical exegesis of the text. Typology was prominent in their interpretation of the Old Testament as well as prediction and fulfillment. Woolcombe, op. cit., p. 60, states that it is generally true to say that the Alexandrians were more dependent on Philo and the Antiochenes on Paul. Almost all Antiochene interpreters were post-Nicene. On the school of Antioch see R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, pp. 72-79; Bate, JTS, loc. cit., pp. 59-64; R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit, p. 105; Den Boer, VC, loc. cit., p. 150; Pollard, JRH, loc. cit., 1, 143; and W. O. E. Oesterley, "The Exegesis of the Old Testament," Record and Revelation, ed. H. Wheeler Robinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 415, 416.

The theology of Alexandria, Robertson notes, remained Origenist with its character purest and most marked in Plerius, Theognostus, and in the non-episcopal heads of the Alexandrian school.¹ Pollard observes that by the end of the third century Origen's influence apparently had waned in Alexandria. The theology of the school of Alexandria was not representative of the theology of the Alexandrian Christians as a whole. As Origen's influence waned, the Biblical faith of the Church asserted itself with greater strength until at the end of the third century it found literary expression in the writings of Peter the Bishop and Martyr.² Pollard concludes that it is legitimate to assume that at last Origen's opponents, the simpliciores who opposed the intellectualism of the school, gained control and found in Peter one who could give literary expression to the Church's faith as expressed in the rule of faith and in the Scriptures.³ The majority of literalists were ordinary believers, as Grant points out, without a taste for theology, and with whom both Clement and Origen had experienced trouble.⁴ In Alexander, the theological sponsor of Athanasius, the "combination of a fundamentally Origenist theology with ideas traceable to the

¹Robertson, op. cit., IV, lxviii.

²Pollard, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 205, 206.

³Ibid., p. 217. ⁴R. M. Grant, JR, loc. cit., p. 191.

Asiatic tradition is conspicuous."¹

In his use of Scripture Athanasius, as did the simple believers in the Alexandrian Church, followed an interpretation that was basically literal and historical. Such a use of the Scriptures lent itself more readily for Athanasius' purposes in refuting both the theology and exegesis of the Arians. In many of his writings a polemic purpose is clearly apparent in his use of Scripture, as Athanasius himself explicitly avowed.² Athanasius resorted to Scripture itself in his formulation of the Trinitarian doctrine and a literal use of Scripture adapted itself best for his use in the defense of Trinitarianism and the orthodox interpretation of the Scriptures.

The Literal Use of the Scriptures

Pollard points out that all of the antagonists in the Arian controversy were "primarily interested in the literal interpretation of Scripture, and it was on this ground that the battles were fought."³ That the Arians were extreme literalists is evident in Athanasius' criticism of them. He criticized them not because they interpreted the Scriptures literally, but because they isolated carefully selected texts from their context and interpreted them literally with

¹Robertson, op. cit., IV, lxviii. ²Supra, p. 56.

³Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 415.

a complete disregard for the context and for the general teaching of Scripture.¹ The exegetical method of the Tropici was evidently the same as that of the Arians, and Athanasius complained vigorously of their exegesis.²

Athanasius usually adhered to the literal sense of Scripture.³ As Robertson notes, there is an observable tendency, especially in his later writings, toward a more literal exegesis than was usual in the Alexandrian school.⁴ In most of his writings Athanasius regarded and used the Scriptures as strictly and literally true, though occasionally he referred to passages as having a deeper meaning than their literal and obvious one.⁵ The influence of allegory in Athanasius' writings is insignificant, and in the refutation of Arianism his attention was concentrated on the literal meaning of Scripture.⁶ The exigencies of the historical situation would tend to require a literal use of Scripture. This method, rather than a spiritualizing method, would lend itself for use in a doctrinal controversy such as that in which he was engaged.

¹Ad Episc. Aeg. 3, 4; C. Ar. I.8, 52; II.1, 18. See Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 416.

²See Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 417; and Shapland, op. cit., pp. 29-32.

³See Part III. ⁴Robertson, op. cit., IV, lxxii.

⁵See infra, pp. 356 ff.

⁶See Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., pp. 418, 419.

Athanasius' defense of Trinitarianism also involved the use of passages of Scripture as proof texts.¹ Turner points out that the Arians on their part assiduously collected and used proof texts.² Athanasius' view and use of Scripture was oracular, for he understood Scripture to be inspired throughout and infallible.³ Thus in his controversy with the Arians the Scriptures tended to become an armory from which he could draw forth texts to use as weapons in his warfare against heterodoxy. Athanasius writes that he cites passages from Scripture as proof of his own position.⁴ Therefore Athanasius sometimes used a plethora of texts to prove his point. Shapland notes that parts of the letters to Serapion are little more than a series of Scriptural quotations.⁵ Athanasius' use of proof texts often exhibits a great deal of skill, and he could readily turn to a variety of passages throughout Scripture as it suited his purpose. In this sense Athanasius may be termed a Biblical theologian, for he supported the tenets of his belief by a continual recourse to Scripture. As Pollard observes, Athanasius looked to the Bible for proof of the falsity of Arian teaching though he was not a professional exegete.⁶

¹ See Part III, especially Chs. IX and X.

² Turner, op. cit., p. 194. ³ See Ch. III.

⁴ E.g., Ad Serap. I.33. ⁵ Shapland, op. cit., p. 14.

⁶ Pollard, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 564.

Also as a concomitant of his oracular view of Scripture and his belief that there was one divine purpose overruling the whole content of the Bible, Athanasius could combine the words of one part of Scripture with another in order to convey the truth he needed in his argument. Thus an idea could be set forth as proved which could not be deduced from one or from either passage by itself. The consequence of this method for Athanasius' exegesis is evident in many places.¹ By a single word, phrase, or idea, he could bring into combination a variety of passages--often with great ingenuity--and so refute an erroneous interpretation on the part of his adversaries or establish and prove his own point. Thus, for example, Athanasius interpreted "power" in Rom. 1:20, Acts 1:7, and Luke 1:35 by the simple expedient of a reference to I Cor. 1:24 which declares that Christ is the power of God. On this basis "power" in these three passages is designated as Christ himself.² In Athanasius' view any passage of Scripture could be interpreted by another or by other passages by their similarities of words or concepts. The context of the passages in question and the possibility of an alternative meaning of a word or phrase were often not considered at all.

Athanasius' interpretation of a Biblical passage

¹See Telfer, JR, loc. cit., p. 96. See also Part III.

²Supra, pp. 300, 301.

could also depend on a single word in the reference--either the word's presence or absence. His conception of the Scriptures as divinely inspired made it possible for him to interpret Scripture in this way and with an expressed assurance in the validity and orthodoxy of his exegesis. This is clearly seen in his interpretation of Amos 4:13 as a reference to man's spirit, for a reference to the Spirit of God, he believed, always includes the article or some qualifying word.¹

In their interpretation of the Old Testament the New Testament writers usually stood close to Judaism in interpreting the Old Testament literally, though there are some traces of allegory.² R. M. Grant suggests that literalism was a natural method for those who came out of Judaism into Christianity. It had been the method of Jesus himself and, for the most part, of Paul.³ This method, Moore maintains, was also generally the method of Rabbinic interpreters in the age of the Tannaim.⁴ Fitzmyer observes that both the Qumran and the New Testament use of the Old Testament is in general to be characterized as a literal exegesis when this is defined in opposition to the allegorical exegesis of

¹Supra, pp. 292, 293.

²R. M. Grant, IB, loc. cit., p. 107.

³Grant, JR, loc. cit., p. 190.

⁴George Foot Moore, op. cit., I, 248, 319.

Philo and the Alexandrian school of later times. Thus it is not always a strictly literal exegesis which respects the original meaning and the context of the words quoted from the Old Testament. It is, Fitzmyer avers, normally an exegesis based on the words quoted, even though the relevance of the words to their historical setting often meant little to the Qumran or to the New Testament writers.¹

An illustration of the literal use of the Old Testament in the New is in the account of Jesus' temptation. Jesus is said to counter Satan's temptations by quotations from the Old Testament (Matt. 4:1-11 and Luke 4:1-12).²

R. M. Grant suggests that perhaps the most instructive example of Christocentric interpretation, combined with verbal exegesis, is to be found in Rom. 10:5-10. Here, Grant notes, Paul analyzes a passage of the Old Testament (Dt. 30:12-14) in which salvation by works is set forth to support the concept of salvation by faith.³ In Rom. 3:10-18 Paul uses a series of Old Testament passages as proof texts (Ps. 14:1, 2; 53:1, 2; etc.) to demonstrate that both Jews and Greeks are under the power of sin. Paul's literalism is evident in Gal. 3:16 and the stress on the singular "seed."

¹Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," NTS (7, 1960-61), pp. 330, 331.

²See Briggs, op. cit., p. 437.

³Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, pp. 26, 27.

Bonsirven observes that the strangest thing is that these uses of the Old Testament in the New Testament take the form of a demonstration.¹ The most striking features of Paul's exegesis of the Old Testament, in Grant's estimation, are its verbalism and its emphasis on single words at the expense of the contexts, but once the Christocentric reference to the Old Testament is admitted, Paul's exegesis can be sympathetically understood.²

It is pointed out by Vriezen that the New Testament writers are not necessarily giving an exegesis when they used certain Bible texts in their preaching. They did not merely interpret the text; they employed it in a given situation.³ This statement admirably describes much of Athanasius' use of Scripture. He often interpreted the Scriptures

¹Bonsirven, op. cit., pp. 306-308. See also R. P. C. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 73.

²R. M. Grant, Interpretation of the Bible, p. 27. See also Gilbert, op. cit., p. 81, who says that the interpretation of the Old Testament by the writers of the New is marked by a tendency to depart from the primary meaning of the text and find its chief significance in a hidden sense. However, he avers that compared to Philo the New Testament writers adhered remarkably to the literal sense of the text. See also Ellis, op. cit., especially pp. 10 ff. and 54 ff., for a discussion of Paul's quotations from the Old Testament and his exegesis of the Old Testament.

³Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), p. 104; so also Fitzmyer, NTS, loc. cit., p. 333, who says of the Qumran and New Testament writers that "generally their use of the Old Testament was a free, sometimes figurative, extension or accommodation of the words to support a position already taken."

thoroughly, validly, and adequately, but there is frequently, perhaps usually, discernible in his interpretation a use of the passages and their interpretation to support a position already taken on other grounds. Athanasius' avowed purpose was to refute the doctrine of the Arians and their interpretation of Scripture and to defend the orthodox conception of the doctrine of the Trinity and with it the orthodox interpretation of Scripture--especially the disputed passages.¹

The Doctrine of the Trinity in Scripture

It has already been noted that in Athanasius' thought the activities of the Persons of the Trinity are discernible in the Old Testament as well as in the New. For him the pre-existent Son was active in Old Testament events, and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit finds its basis in the Old Testament as well as the New, for in the Old Testament the Spirit has a role in creation, in the inspiration of the prophets, and in the guidance and salvation of Israel.²

To what extent do the Scriptures contain a Trinitarian doctrine? The Spirit of God, Barrett points out, has a secure place in the Old Testament simply because the Spirit stood between God and man.³ In Gen. 1:2 the Spirit is

¹See supra, pp. 55, 56; and Part III. ²See Ch. IX.

³C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, n.d.), p. 141.

linked with creation, but this idea is not expressed again until Ps. 33:6. The plural is used of God in such passages as Gen. 1:26 and 3:22, and the concepts of Wisdom and Word are associated with God in his creative activity (e.g., Ps. 33:6 and 104:24). Wainwright observes that in no passage of the Old Testament is the Spirit explicitly identified as God. In two Old Testament passages the Spirit is linked with the Messiah (Is. 11:1, 2 and 61:1). The idea of the Spirit, Wainwright suggests, provided a climate in which plurality within the Godhead was conceivable. It did not lead directly to doctrines about the Person of Christ, for the concepts of Wisdom and Word were preferred in Christology, and the Spirit was regarded as a Person distinct from Christ.¹

In the New Testament are found the ideas which in later Christian thought were developed and formulated into a Trinitarian doctrine. Paul, A. T. Hanson believes, held at least a Binitarian theology and a Trinitarian theology in the making.² Though Paul's language is not always explicitly Trinitarian, and one could not expect to find in his writings a technical statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, nevertheless his theology is Trinitarian in tendency. When Paul writes of the "grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit" (II Cor. 13:14,

¹Wainwright, op. cit., pp. 30-33.

²Hanson, op. cit., p. 172.

RSV), he has given "classical expression to precisely those elements in the Christian experience of God which were in the long run to render a Trinitarian theology inevitable."¹

It is in the Johannine literature especially that the raw materials for the formulation of a Trinitarian doctrine are evident. Barrett affirms that more than any other New Testament writer John laid the foundation for a doctrine of a coequal Trinity.² The Fourth Gospel emphasizes the deity of Jesus Christ which is the central fact of the Christian faith. This emphasis presented the Church with the problem of fitting this fact into the framework of belief in "one God" which was the "basic presupposition of the Church's faith."³ As Wainwright points out, John maintains that both the Father and Son are God, that they are one, and that the Father has priority over the Son, but John does not explain the relationship between the Father and the Son.⁴ It should be pointed out also that, with his statements concerning the Father and the Son, the writer of the Fourth Gospel also speaks of the Holy Spirit as one not yet given (John 7:39), as another Counselor (John 14:16) whom the Father will send in the Son's name (John 14:26), as one sent by the Son from

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 159, 160.

²Barrett, Holy Spirit, p. 78.

³Pollard, NTS, loc. cit., p. 348.

⁴Wainwright, op. cit., pp. 265, 266.

the Father and proceeding from the Father (John 15:26), and as the Spirit of truth whom the Son sends and who will guide the disciples into all truth and glorify the Son (John 16:7, 13, 14).

The words attributed to Jesus in Matt. 28:19 (RSV), "Go therefore . . . baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," are also important, for they are indications of Trinitarianism in New Testament thought. In later doctrinal formulations and in controversy these words, with other Scriptural references, would contribute to the formal expression of the Trinitarian doctrine and would also be used in its defense.¹

It is evident that the New Testament has all the elements of the doctrine of the Trinity but has no explicit statement of Trinitarianism, because, as Burrows suggests, the problems that led to its formulation were not yet felt. Burrows affirms that the fact that the doctrine of the Trinity is nowhere clearly stated made possible and probably inevitable the later Trinitarian controversies.²

In Harris' estimation the Old Testament is historically the real court of appeal for the Trinitarian doctrine.

¹See Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God, in Church Dogmatics, trans. G. T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), I, 1, 359 ff.

²Millar Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 80.

Christ as "The Wisdom of God" at once explains most other titles given to Jesus in the New Testament and also the dogmatic statements made concerning him in the creeds. In this single assumption, Harris believes, is to be found the basis of the doctrine of the Trinity, and from it there flows a whole series of proof texts from the Old Testament. Many of these texts are incorporated in the New Testament itself and are the backbone of its theology. Harris also maintains that the doctrine of the Trinity is proved only incidentally from the New Testament, but the appeal is usually to the Old Testament. To prove the Trinity, or to establish the deity of Christ, from Col. 1, Heb. 1, or John 1 would be to prove it from passages which had already drawn their proof from the Old Testament.¹

Though Athanasius made extensive use of the Old Testament in defense of the Trinitarian doctrine, for the pre-existent Son and the Holy Spirit are present and active in Old Testament events, it is the New Testament especially that provides the evidence for his case. In that Athanasius regarded the Old and New Testaments as a unity and as inspired,² he could use any part of them equally well for

¹Harris, Doctrine of the Trinity, pp. 35, 36. See also George Foot Moore, op. cit., I, 250, who states that from the beginning Christians found the distinctive doctrines of Christianity expressed or implied in all parts of the Old Testament.

²See Ch. III.

formulating and proving Christian doctrine.¹ For Athanasius the doctrine of the Trinity could be found in the Old Testament, for all the Persons of the Trinity are active in its history. The most important and most frequently cited passages that Athanasius uses to refute Arian doctrine and to defend Trinitarianism are taken from the Fourth Gospel, the Christological passages of Hebrews and Colossians, and such passages as Matt. 28:19 and II Cor. 13:14. Not only John 1:1-18 finds an important place in Athanasius' conception of the Trinity, but such passages as John 10:30, 38; 14:9, 10, 11; and 16:15 constantly recur in his writings and are, in fact, crucial in his defense of orthodoxy. It cannot justifiably be said that the basis of the Trinitarian doctrine in Athanasius is the Old Testament. Both the Old and New Testaments as an organic whole provided the basis for Athanasius' expression of the Trinitarian doctrine with the emphasis falling on the New Testament and especially on the Fourth Gospel.

¹See Gilbert, *op. cit.*, p. 121, who states that for Athanasius "all parts of the Bible were equally good, in his judgment, as sources of proof-texts."

CHAPTER XII

RULES OF INTERPRETATION

Athanasius accuses the Arians of fixing on the Scriptures their own private and distorted meaning. Therefore, Athanasius asserts, it is necessary for him to vindicate the passages that are questioned by proving that they have an orthodox meaning and thus demonstrating that his opponents are in error.¹ He alleges that Arius, like the devil, pretends to quote the simple words of Scripture even as they had been written in order to conceal his heretical ideas. The Arians use Scriptural language, he contends, but they distort its meaning.² The Arians are challenged to interpret correctly the words of Scripture.³ In his own endeavor to explain the Scriptures, Athanasius used certain rules in his interpretation which Pollard denotes as "clearly formulated principles."⁴ These rules are both explicit and implicit in Athanasius' writings.

The Scope of Scripture

In Contra Arianos Athanasius declares that it is readily apparent from the "scope" (σχοπέα) of the faith that Christians hold that the Arians' interpretation of Scripture

¹C. Ar. I.4, 37.

²Ad Episc. Aeg. 3, 18.

³C. Ar. I.53.

⁴Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 429.

is unsound. This "scope" of faith is applied as a "rule" ($\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$) in the reading of Scripture. Ignorance of this "scope," Athanasius affirms, has caused the Arians to err from the way of truth. On this basis Athanasius proceeds to show that the Scriptures contain a double account of Christ: that he is God and Son of the Father but became flesh, for this is the "scope" and "character" ($\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$) of Scripture. This is said to be evident throughout Scripture, for the Lord himself said, "Search the Scriptures, for they are they that testify of me" (John 5:39).¹

To transliterate $\sigma\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma$ as "scope" does not convey the meaning that this word has in Athanasius' use of it. Neither can its meaning be adequately conveyed by such translations as "aim," "end," "object," or "purpose."² In his appeal to the "scope of Scripture," which in Athanasius is identical with the "scope of faith,"³ Athanasius employed "scope" with the meaning of "the general bearing or drift"

¹C. Ar. III.28, 29. See also Ad Serap. II.7 where Athanasius purports to show from Prov. 8:22 that the Arians greatly err, for they do not realize the scope of Scripture.

²As in A Greek-English Lexicon, ed. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott (rev. and aug.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 1614.

³See C. Ar. III.28, 29. In C. Ar. III.58 Athanasius refers to "ecclesiastical scope" and evidently identifies it with the "scope of Scripture" and "scope of faith."

of Scripture.¹ Turner points out that Athanasius' appeal to the general sense of Scripture is not to be construed as a "tacit abandonment of the appeal to Scripture, but rather as the recognition of the need to take the Biblical evidence as a whole."²

One of Athanasius' criticisms of the exegesis of the Arians and Tropici was that they took isolated texts from Scripture and on them erected their false views of the Son and the Spirit. The consequence of their practice was a misinterpretation of Scripture. In contrast to this selective method of exegesis Athanasius insisted that any passage of Scripture must be interpreted in the light of the Scriptures' general teaching or drift. The part, therefore, must be interpreted in the light of the whole and not in isolation. Thus Athanasius prefaced his explanation of Scripture with an appeal to the general bearing of the teaching of Scripture³ which, Shapland affirms, was his general practice.⁴

It is evident, then, that one rule for interpretation is the consideration of the "scope of Scripture." Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture. The appeal to the scope

¹Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 423. See also Shapland, op. cit., p. 162, n. 2; and R. P. C. Hanson, Tradition, p. 180.

²Turner, op. cit., p. 300.

³See De Dec. 13; C. Ar. II.18; etc.

⁴Shapland, op. cit., p. 162, n. 2.

of Scripture is an appeal to Scripture as a whole. Implicit in this rule of interpretation is Athanasius' conception of Scripture as a unity and as divinely inspired.¹ Thus it is to be viewed as an organic whole with all of its parts consonant and noncontradictory. Any passage of Scripture must fit into the whole teaching of Scripture. On the basis of Biblical passages that attribute human qualities to the Son, the Arians contended that the Son is a creature. This cannot be supported, Athanasius asserts, for the general drift of Scriptural teaching shows that there is a double account of the Son.² No doctrine can be based on the exegesis of an isolated passage but must be in harmony with the "scope of Scripture."

The Determination of the Meaning
of a Passage of Scripture

Athanasius also appeals to the "sense" or "meaning" (διάνοια, νόος) of Scripture. In defending the Nicene statement and the criticism that certain of its expressions were not Scriptural, Athanasius contends that these expressions contain the "sense" of Scripture.³ He concludes his exegesis of Phil. 2:9, 10 with the comment that he considers the meaning which he gives it to be very "ecclesiastical" (ἐκκλησιαστικός). So also the words of Ps. 45:7, 8 are said to exhibit

¹See Ch. III.

²C. Ar. III.28, 29.

³De Dec. 33 ff.

an orthodox sense.¹ In his comments on II Cor. 3:6, "Who also made us sufficient ministers of a new covenant, not of letter but of spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life," Athanasius avers that that which is expressed is designated as "letter," but the meaning which is in the expression is called "spirit."²

In his discussion of Prov. 8:22 Athanasius calls this passage a "proverb" (καροιμία), and therefore it is expressed in the manner of proverbs. Thus it must not be explained "simply" (ἀπλῶς) with the "obvious" (κρόχειρος) sense. The true meaning is to be determined, he observes, by inquiring into the "person" (κρόσωπον) of the passage. What is said in proverbs is not said "plainly, openly" (φανερῶς), but is set forth "latently, concealed" (κρυπτῶς). Athanasius bases this contention on John 16:25, "These things have I spoken to you in proverbs, but the time comes when I shall no longer speak to you in proverbs, but openly." Therefore the meaning of Prov. 8:22, and such passages, must be discovered, not as an evident, open meaning, but as a concealed meaning. In the case of Prov. 8:22, Athanasius concludes, therefore, that "he created" does not have a meaning that is contrary to "he begot." It cannot, therefore, be used as a proof that the

¹De Dec. 21. In C. Ar. I.52 Athanasius avows that the Arians use Scriptural passages but do not discern their meaning.

²Ad Serap. I.8.

Son is a creature.¹

Athanasius appears to be saying that when the writers of Scripture use proverbs or figures, these must be recognized and interpreted as such. Thus proverbs cannot be interpreted in a strictly literal way. The meaning of the words, or the meaning behind the words, must be discovered. This does not mean, however, that Athanasius indiscriminately spiritualized the words of Scripture. It has already been noticed that Athanasius' method of interpreting Scripture was usually literal. Though he approached Scripture as literally true, it is also evident that Athanasius was not always restricted to the literal sense, but he sought to recognize the varying literary styles of the writers of Scripture. Thus he was not bound to accept the obvious meaning of any passage under consideration, for sometimes the writers of Scripture used "proverbs."

Athanasius does not indicate how to determine whether a passage is a proverb, but it would appear that if the obvious meaning is not in harmony with the scope of Scripture, the meaning of the passage must not be sought in its strictly literal sense. It would also appear that the pressure of circumstances cannot be overlooked as a possible factor in Athanasius' search for another meaning rather than the literal and obvious one. This appears evident in the

¹C. Ar. II.44; see also *ibid.*, II.13, 73, 77.

exegesis of a passage such as Prov. 8:22 which in its strictly literal sense provided the Arians with a useful and formidable proof text for their doctrine of the Son.¹ Athanasius was not willing to concede this text to the Arians, nor did he find it irrelevant to the controversy. Therefore he endeavored to give what he considered an "orthodox" interpretation of Prov. 8:22.

Athanasius does not interpret a passage to have two meanings if the obvious meaning is not accepted, for the obvious meaning is, in his judgment, not actually the meaning of the passage at all. The interpretation of a literary text is not necessarily the obvious and literal one. The meaning that the writer of the text had in mind may lie hidden beneath the letter of the text. Athanasius was not restricted to the strictly literal sense of a passage, but this does not of necessity mean that he was looking for a spiritual or mystical interpretation of the text. Athanasius' obligation, as he considered it, was to discover the true meaning of the disputed passage--a meaning which was orthodox and which was consistent with the general teaching of Scripture, and, ostensibly, one that could be used as a weapon in defense of the orthodox faith.

In contrast to the interpretation of Scripture by finding the meaning beneath the obvious one, Athanasius

¹See supra, pp. 147 ff.

speaks of the use of a word in an absolute sense--that is, its literal meaning and without a qualification attached to it. In Contra Arianos he asserts that when Scripture speaks of the Godhead of the Son, "all is said in simple diction" (πάντα ἀπλῆ τῆ λέξει) and "in an absolute sense" (ἀπολελυμένη τε τῆ διανοίᾳ). It is necessary to determine when the Scriptures speak in proverbs and when they speak absolutely.¹ Similar to these expressions is that used in Athanasius' interpretation of Luke 2:52 for the writer of Luke is said to speak "with cautious exactness" (μετὰ ἀκριβοῦς τῆς παρατηρήσεως).²

Athanasius also appeals to the "custom" (ἔθος) of Scripture. This idea is related to the "sense" of Scripture.³ In Contra Arianos Athanasius distinguishes between the Son as eternal and man as a creature in his explanation of the meaning of John 10:30, 17:11, 20-23, for there is a difference between the unity of the Father and Son and the unity of believers. In his argument Athanasius contends that it is the custom with Scripture to use natural "images" (εἰκόν) and "illustrations," "examples" (παράδειγμα)⁴ to

¹C. Ar. II.53. See also ibid., I.56; etc.

²Ibid., III.52. See also ibid., II.71; etc.

³Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 427, says that the "sense" of Scripture is another name for the "custom" of Scripture.

⁴Shapland, op. cit., p. 108, n. 3, points out that παράδειγμα is a philosophical term used by Plato of the ideas regarded as exemplars of material things. Athanasius uses

explain man's moral impulses whether they are good or bad. Thus Christ enjoined his disciples to be wise as serpents and as harmless as doves (Matt. 10:16). Athanasius concludes that man is not summoned to be one with the Father and Son by nature, for this is impossible, but is exhorted to imitate the unity of the Father and Son.¹

In a later passage in Contra Arianos Athanasius refers to the custom of Scripture to call man by the name of "flesh," as in Joel 2:28, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Thus when Scripture says that the Word became flesh, it means that the Word became man.²

In his appeal to the custom of Scripture Athanasius applied to its language the rule that Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture.³ The language or illustration that is employed in one part of Scripture is to be compared and interpreted in the light of the usage of Scripture generally. This rule also reflects Athanasius' view that Scripture is not necessarily to be interpreted in a strictly literal way, and that no passage is to be explained in isolation from the whole of Scripture.

Another variation of the principle of the appeal to the sense and custom of Scripture is the appeal to the

it to denote the material analogies, sanctioned by Scripture, which express the truth concerning the divine nature.

¹C. Ar. III.18, 19.

²Ibid., III.30.

³Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 425.

"style" (ἰδίωμα)¹ of Scripture. This expression is used by Athanasius in asserting that the word "made" in Heb. 3:2 is not to be interpreted as an indication that the Son is a creature. The Scriptures speak of children as being made, created, or begotten. These terms are used indiscriminately, and the meaning is indicated by the use of each in its context. This is the "style" of Scripture. If the Arians were aware of this, Athanasius believes, they would not err in their interpretation.² The underlying principle of this rule of interpretation is also that Scripture passages must not be explained in isolation but are to be compared with the whole of the teaching of Scripture. The part must be interpreted by the whole and the lesser known passage by the better known.³

The Context of Scripture

In contrast to the Arians' practice of selecting isolated passages of Scripture and erecting their system of doctrine on them, Athanasius insists on the necessity of considering the Scriptural context to interpret correctly any passage. In his interpretation of Rom. 1:20 Athanasius affirms that if the Arians would "study the context" (τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ῥημάτων ἀνάγνωτε) they would discern that this passage

¹In A Greek-English Lexicon, p. 819, ἰδίωμα is given meanings such as: style, peculiarity of style, idiom.

²C. Ar. II.3, 4.

³Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 427.

refers to the Son as the "eternal Power." It seems that the context referred to is the first part of Rom. 1:20, for the creation is said to speak of the invisible things of God which could only be the Creator's "Power" who is the Word of God. The Word is seen through the creation.¹

In his interpretation of Mk. 13:32 Athanasius declares that the very "context" (εἰρηδός) of this passage shows that the Son is not ignorant of the hour and day of his coming. The context to which reference is made is the verses which follow. In these Christ indicates the signs that will precede his coming. Therefore the Son must know the day, for he knows the preceding events as the context shows.² In his defense of Dionysius Athanasius avers that the expressions that are used of the Son's Godhead and those used of his incarnation must be interpreted according to their contexts. The interpreter will then be able to recognize whether reference is made to the Son's humanity or to his Godhead in each particular passage.³

In his interpretation of various passages it has been evident that Athanasius turns to the context of the passage under consideration to determine its interpretation. This is evident, for example, in the exegesis of Prov. 8:22 where Athanasius refers to the immediate context (Prov. 9:1; the other verses in Prov. 8:22-31; and Prov. 3:19) and also to

¹C. Ar. I.11. ²C. Ar. III.42. ³De Sent. Dion. 9.

the wider context which extends throughout Scripture (Gen. 1:1; Ps. 104:24; John 1:1-3; 14:10; etc.).¹ This rule of observing the context of the passage being interpreted involves the comparison of passages and relating the passage to the whole of Scripture. Athanasius' rule of considering the context of Scripture in interpretation is closely related to his other rules of interpretation.

In De Decretis Athanasius purports to give the correct interpretation of Prov. 8:22. Anyone, in his view, may discover this meaning by investigating the "time" (καιρός), "characters" (πρόσωπα),² and "purpose" (χρεία). In applying these rules to find the true interpretation, Athanasius affirms that the "time" to which reference is made is the Son's incarnation though the Son is eternal. Though he is Son of God, he became Son of man also. The "purpose" involved in the meaning of the passage is that the Son became incarnate that he might deliver man from death. The "character" is the Savior's, but it is said, "The Lord created me a beginning of his ways for his works" (Prov. 8:22). The Son is eternal, and "created" may be applied to him in that he became man.³

¹ See supra, pp. 147 ff.

² Robertson, op. cit., IV, 159, n. 2, avers that πρόσωπα is to be translated "characters" and not "persons."

³ De Dec. 14.

In his interpretation of Heb. 1:4 Athanasius refers to the necessity of ascertaining the time, purpose, and character in order to reach the correct meaning of the passage. He declares that this must be the procedure in the explanation of all Scripture. These rules are then applied to the account of the conversation of the Ethiopian and Philip (Acts 8), for the Ethiopian asked of whom the prophet spoke-- that is, he inquired of the "person" so that he would not misunderstand the passage. The "time" element in interpretation is to be seen in the inquiry of the disciples: "Tell us when shall these things be? and what is the sign of your coming?" (Matt. 24:3). Athanasius affirms that Hymenaeus and Alexander and those with them (II Tim. 2:17, 18; I Tim. 1:20) were "beside the time" (καρὰ καιρόν) and that the Galatians were behind the time in emphasizing circumcision. The Jews, he declares, missed the "person," for they do not recognize that Old Testament prophecy, such as Is. 7:14, Dt. 18:15, and Is. 53:7, refers to the Son rather than a prophet or one of themselves. Therefore, Athanasius concludes, if the Arians had known the "character," "subject" (πράγμα), and "time," they would not have ascribed to the deity of Christ that which belongs to his humanity.¹

In his application of these rules to the exegesis of Heb. 1:4, Athanasius points out that Heb. 1:1, 2, "God . . .

¹C. Ar. I. 54.

has in these last days spoken to us by his Son," and Heb. 1:3, 4, "When by himself he made purification for our sins . . .," indicate the time, the character, and the purpose, for these verses refer to the incarnation of the Son for the purpose of bringing redemption for mankind.¹

The Spiritual Qualifications of the Interpreter

Athanasius believes that anyone may arrive at the orthodox meaning of the Scriptures if, instead of relegating their study to a secondary place, he studies and ponders what he reads as he investigates the occasion, character, and purpose of the Scripture passage under consideration.²

In Athanasius' opinion the diligent student of Scripture must also meet certain spiritual qualifications if he is to arrive at a true knowledge of the Scriptures. The Biblical student, he avows, needs an honorable life, a pure soul, and the virtue which is in accordance with Christ. If he has these qualities, the intellect will be guided by them so that it attains its desires and comprehends Scripture to the extent that it is possible for human nature to do so. Without a pure mind, Athanasius believes, and patterning one's life after the saints, a man cannot possibly understand

¹Ibid., I.55. See also ibid., II.7, where, in his interpretation of Heb. 3:2, Athanasius holds that the consideration of the time and purpose involved in the passage leads to an orthodox explanation of it.

²De Dec. 14.

the words of the saints. So also if a man wishes to see the sight of the sun, he "cleanses" his eye so that he may see the sun's light. If a man wishes to see a city or country, he goes to that place. He who would comprehend the mind of those who speak of God must begin by cleansing his own soul, by his manner of living, and by imitating the saints' works. Thus, associated with them in a common life, the interpreter may understand what has been revealed to them by God.¹

In writing to Serapion Athanasius affirms that tradition does not declare the Godhead to us by demonstration in words, but it is declared "by faith and reverent reasoning with discretion" (ἐν πίστει καὶ εὐσεβεῖ λογισμῷ μετ' εὐλαβείας). In the context of this statement Athanasius asserts that the Persons of the Trinity cannot be separated, for they are united in their activities. The difficulty of understanding and declaring the Trinity is primarily met by faith and by using the illustrations that are provided by Scripture such as that of image and radiance.² In Shapland's estimation the import of Athanasius' words regarding reason is:

It lies within the sphere of exposition, the co-ordination of the various testimonies of Scripture and the discovery of the ecclesiastical sense; which, in this context, means the delicate comparison and cross-interpretation of the symbols and titles Scripture uses of the Son.³

¹De Inc. 57.

²Ad Serap. I.20.

³Shapland, op. cit., p. 114, n. 6.

The idea of the necessity of the spiritual qualifications of the interpreter goes back to Paul himself: "But, as it is written, 'What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him,' God has revealed to us through the Spirit. . . . And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual truths to those who possess the Spirit. The unspiritual man does not receive the gifts of the Spirit of God for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned. The spiritual man judges all things, but is himself to be judged by no one. 'For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?' But we have the mind of Christ" (I Cor. 2:9-16, RSV).

Early writers of the Church subsequent to the New Testament period also emphasized the spiritual qualifications of the interpreter of Scripture. Justin Martyr states that if a man cannot explain the argument of the words and deeds of the prophets, these words and deeds will be of no value to him though he appears to repeat them. To understand what the prophets said and did a man must receive power by God's grace.¹ Irenaeus contends that the man who believes will find every word consistent, but he must diligently read the Scriptures in company with those who are presbyters in the

¹Dial. 92.

Church, among whom is the apostolic doctrine. The spiritual disciple, receiving the Spirit of God, judges all men (Jews, Marcion, etc.) but is himself judged of no man. Irenaeus speaks of a firm belief in the Spirit of God who furnishes believers with a knowledge of the truth.¹

Clement of Alexandria believes that those who possess the Holy Spirit search the deep things of God--that is, they grasp the secret that is in the prophecies. Clement apparently believed that all Scripture was in parables, but is understood by the spiritual man and gnostic, as he is the disciple of the Holy Spirit given by God and so has the mind of Christ (I Cor. 2:9, 10, 12, 16).²

Origen gave instructions on how the Scriptures are to be read. With his instructions he maintains that an accurate interpretation of the Gospels, since it is an interpretation of the mind of Christ, demands that grace which was given to Paul who assures Christians that they have the Spirit and are taught by him (I Cor. 2:9-16). What is said in Scripture, Origen avers, is not to be judged in accordance with the meanness of the language but with the divine power of the Holy Spirit who inspired their composition.³

The starting point for Athanasius in his arguments against the Arians is the word of Scripture itself which,

¹ Adv. Haer. 4.49.1, 2; 4.50; 4.53.1, 2.

² Strom. 2.2; 5.4.

³ De Prin. 4.2.3; 4.3.15.

Pollard asserts, is interpreted by Athanasius according to exegetical principles which are clearly defined.¹ Though it is true that Athanasius interprets according to certain principles, instances can be readily adduced of interpretations where these rules were not applied. Thus in the interpretation of Is. 45:14, 15 as a reference to the Son,² a consideration of the immediate context of the chapter would have indicated that the reference is to Israel. In his exegesis of passages such as Prov. 8:22 and Rom. 1:20³ a consideration of the "sense" of Scripture and its "style" and "custom" might have suggested that a word does not necessarily have the same meaning in every occurrence in which it is found in Scripture. In his explication of Amos 4:13 the examination of both the "meaning" of words and the context of the passage would have suggested other conclusions than those to which he came in his exegesis of the text.⁴

SUMMARY

The method of interpreting the Old Testament that predominates in Athanasius is that of tracing the activities of the pre-existent Christ in Old Testament history, though the methods of prophecy, allegory, and typology are also evident.

¹Pollard, BJRL, loc. cit., p. 419.

²Supra, pp. 301, 302.

³Supra, pp. 147 ff., 300.

⁴Supra, pp. 291 ff.

Athanasius' conception of Christ as Wisdom, Hand, Word and Angel of the Lord, and his frequent ascription of the title "Lord" in the Old Testament to the Son all indicate that for him Christ was pre-existent and active in the events of the Old Testament. With the exception of the identification of Christ as the Hand of God and as the Angel of the Lord these methods of interpretation are present in the New Testament itself. All of these interpretive methods were continued in the patristic period. He also traced the activities of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament, and thus all of the Persons of the Trinity were active in the history of the Old Testament. Athanasius' oracular view of Scripture, his conception of the unity of the Testaments, and his view that all of the Scriptures were equally valid for the formulation of Christian doctrine enabled him to turn to the Old Testament as well as the New for support for his statements of doctrine. However, the Fourth Gospel, the Christological passages of Philippians, Colossians, and Hebrews, and passages that include references to the three Persons of the Trinity--Matt. 28:19, II Cor. 13:14, and I Cor. 12:4-6--provided Athanasius with the principal sources for the formulation and defense of Trinitarianism. It is evident that for Athanasius the Scriptures--both Old and New Testaments--teach the doctrine of the Trinity.

Athanasius' use and interpretation of the Scriptures

was based on the assumption that they are literally and historically true. He did not spiritualize in his interpretation except in the sense that the meaning of a Biblical passage may not be the obvious one but may lie hidden beneath the surface. For Athanasius this only indicated that the true interpretation of the passage must be discovered, whether it is clearly evident or whether it is to be discovered beneath the words themselves. The allegorical method of the Alexandrian school which had reached its culmination in Origen had waned by the fourth century and thus did not assume any significant importance in Athanasius' interpretation. The literal use of Scripture was more readily adaptable for the purposes for which Athanasius used the Scriptures. The literal interpretation of Scripture combined with his conception of Scripture as inspired enabled Athanasius to bring together passages from any part of either Testament on the basis of verbal and idea similarities. His view of Scripture also made it possible for him to emphasize single words, or the lack of them, and to make an extensive use of proof texts. All of Athanasius' methods are traceable to the New Testament itself and are evident in the writings of the Church fathers. Thus Athanasius does not contribute anything original in his use and interpretation of the Scriptures. He does not stand in the tradition of the allegorical interpretation of Alexandria. This may indicate that

Athanasius adopted the exegetical practice of the simple believers of Alexandria or that he was following exegetical practice that had become prevalent there.

Athanasius employed certain rules in his interpretation of Scripture which are explicitly stated and are also implicitly evident in his interpretation of Biblical passages. Though he was not always consistent in applying them, it is evident that his intention was to discover the meaning of Scripture by the application of these clearly enunciated and valid rules to the Biblical text.

It is apparent that the conflict in which Athanasius was engaged conditioned his use and interpretation of Scripture. Much of Athanasius' interpretation is thorough and valid, but much of it also indicates that he was using Scripture for polemic purposes rather than simply interpreting it. Sometimes it is evident that the exigencies of his situation dictated the direction which the interpretation of the passage under consideration would take. Passages employed by the Arians must be interpreted by Athanasius to demonstrate that their meaning was orthodox and that they therefore supported the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Athanasius did not examine Scripture to discover what it teaches about the Trinitarian doctrine so much as to defend a doctrine of the Trinity to which he already subscribed and which he regarded as the orthodox doctrine of the Church based on the teaching

of the Scriptures.

Athanasius was not a professional exegete in that he did not examine a Biblical passage so much to elicit the meaning from the text but rather examined it simply to demonstrate that its meaning was orthodox. Thus it provided a useful weapon against the Arians' exegesis and doctrine and, on the other hand, was evidence for the validity of his own doctrinal statements. In his use and interpretation of Scripture Athanasius' writings reveal his remarkably extensive and accurate knowledge of both Old and New Testaments. He was able to summon a great variety of Scripture passages for the purpose of defeating Arianism and defending the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. In this he was eminently successful.

EPILOGUE

The Doctrine of the Trinity

The principal issues that have emerged in the study of Athanasius' use of Scripture with reference to the doctrine of the Trinity are also important issues in recent thought. The problem of Christology and that of the relationship of Christ, and the New Testament, to the Old Testament is a current one, and various answers are proposed. In Athanasius' thought Christ is the eternal Son, of one essence with the Father, and the second Person of the Trinity who became incarnate for man's salvation. His conception of the relationship of Christ to the Old Testament is that the pre-existent Christ was active in Old Testament history. This view is closely approximated by Vischer¹ who sees a double witness to Christ in the Old Testament and in the New. The Old Testament, he believes, indicates what Christ is, and the New who he is. Both Testaments manifest the same spirit and point to each other, for every word in the New looks back to the Old in which it is foretold. "All the words of the Old Testament look beyond themselves to the One in the New in whom alone they are true."² The distinctive doctrine

¹Wilhelm Vischer, The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, trans. A. B. Crabtree (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), I.

²Ibid., I, 7, 13.

of apostolic preaching is that Jesus is the Christ of the Old Testament.¹ Brunner describes Vischer's book as a "valuable gift" but also a book "with a dangerous tendency to arbitrary exposition." Its value, Brunner believes, is that Vischer fully accepts the fundamental truth that the Old Testament as a whole witnesses to Christ. In that the "evolutionary" point of view retained little of this fundamental truth, it was unable to show the connection between the precursory and the final revelation. Brunner contends that Vischer's reaction was necessary but that it has gone too far in another direction, for Vischer confuses exposition and significance and in so doing opens the door to arbitrary methods of exegesis.²

More recently A. T. Hanson has argued for this same conception of the relationship of Christ to the Old Testament.³ He maintains that the New Testament writers themselves held this view and that typology is not to be accepted as the normative method by which New Testament writers interpreted the Old Testament. Thus the clue to understanding the interpretation of the Old Testament by the writers of the New Testament is the recognition of the real

¹Ibid., p. 27.

²Emil Brunner, Dogmatics: The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), II, 211, 212.

³Hanson, op. cit.

presence of the pre-existent Jesus in Old Testament history. The basic question, in Hanson's estimation, is not the tracing of types in the Old Testament for New Testament events, but tracing the activity of Jesus in both the old and the new dispensations.¹ G. Henton Davies also suggests that it is better to look for Christ himself in the Old Testament rather than for types of Christ. He recognizes that this is a dangerous statement to make in view of the lengths that Vischer has carried this idea. Davies sees the Christological key to the Old Testament to be in the "adumbration of a theme." This theme is the "presence-theme" which is seen in the act of the incarnation in the New Testament. In this theme is to be seen the key to an understanding of the ultimate unity of the Bible.² Cunliffe-Jones alleges that though it is not necessary to be tied to the details of the interpretation of the Old Testament in the New which may be strained or misplaced, yet a blow has been struck at the heart of the Christian Gospel if in principle the New Testament writers are mistaken in their conception of Jesus as the real meaning of the Old Testament.³

¹Ibid., pp. 6-8, 167-177.

²Davies, ET, loc. cit., pp. 6, 7. Davies, ibid., avers that the policy of typology is a policy of despair, for it is the quest for Christ in the Old Testament at the expense of Israel, and for the divinity of Christ at the expense of Israel's humanity.

³Cunliffe-Jones, op. cit., pp. 47, 48.

Brunner believes that the whole of the Old Testament bears witness to Christ. In his view there is a fundamental difference between the Old and New Testaments, but at the same time they are closely united. The interpretation of this dualism is by the all-inclusive conception of promise and fulfillment, and in accepting this fundamental Christian principle of promise and fulfillment it must be admitted, Brunner affirms, that there is a certain justification for typology. Christ is the one who fulfills the Old Testament revelation.¹

For Barth the historical knowledge of Christ has its boundaries which are the texts of the New Testament. Therefore he does not search for the historical facts behind the texts for which objective reality is then claimed. It is within the limits of the New Testament itself that the past of Jesus is to be discovered, for the New Testament witnesses really saw him and attest to his life. Within the bounds of the New Testament texts the reality of the man Jesus is to be grasped.²

In Cullmann's estimation the New Testament emphasis is neither exclusively nor primarily on the nature of Christ

¹Brunner, op. cit., II, 201-210.

²Barth, op. cit., IV, 2, 149 ff. See Hugh Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins: A Commentary on Modern Viewpoints (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 22-24, for an evaluation of Barth's view.

but is on his function. Thus, he contends, it is characteristic of New Testament Christology that "Christ is connected with the total history of revelation and salvation, beginning with creation." Therefore, in his view, there can be "no Heilsgeschichte without Christology; no Christology without a Heilsgeschichte which unfolds in time." In the thought of the early Church there emerges "one total picture of the Christ-event from the pre-existence to eschatology."¹ The answer to the question "Who is Jesus?" is found, Cullmann thinks, in the consideration of the titles given to him. These titles find their roots in Jewish thought. The answer to the question about Jesus was answered by early Christianity in terms of a series of facts--facts which happened in the first century of this era. The answer to the question did not emerge for the first time with the early community's experience of Easter but with the life of Jesus in Jesus' own self-consciousness and in the "presentiment his person and work evoked among the disciples and the people."²

Taylor thinks that the Christology that is most in accord with the New Testament teaching is the doctrine that, in becoming man, the Son of God willed to renounce the exercise of divine powers and prerogatives, so that in his earthly limitations he might live within the necessary

¹Cullmann, Christology, pp. 3, 4, 9.

²Ibid., pp. 315-317.

limitations which belong to human finitude. Taylor suggests that the merits of his hypothesis are that: (1) without equivocation it accepts the divinity of Christ in its Trinitarian foundations and the possession of two natures; (2) it preserves the unity of his divine-human Person by presupposing that he surrendered before time the exercise of divine powers so that he could truly participate in humanity; and (3) it sets the incarnation within the context of eternal love and sacrifice.¹

The historical approach in Christology is vigorously pursued by Stauffer. He attempts to dismiss all interpretations in order to arrive at a picture of "Jesus as he really was." Stauffer is convinced that historical criticism can recover the facts of Jesus, and seeks in the New Testament world testimony that bears on the story of Jesus. These are used to check and clarify the narratives of the Gospel.²

A radically different approach to Christology is espoused by Bultmann. Bultmann gives an existential answer to

¹Taylor, Person of Christ, pp. 287, 304. John Macquarrie, in "The Pre-existence of Jesus Christ," ET (April, 1966), pp. 199-202, affirms that the idea of the Son renouncing certain divine prerogatives cannot be retained in its traditional form. He suggests that the idea of pre-existence, "purged of its mythological associations, is an ancient and perhaps indispensable symbol for helping us understand the deeper significance of Jesus Christ."

²Ethelbert Stauffer, Jesus and His Story, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1960), pp. xx, 7-18, etc.

the question of historical and creedal elements included in the Biblical witness to the revelation of Christ. He combines a radical historical skepticism with a program of demythologizing. The origin and significance of Jesus' person as well as his fate are not within earthly occurrence. For Bultmann the theology of the New Testament begins with the kerygma of the earliest Church and not before. He discounts the common opinion that the belief of the early Church in Jesus as the Messiah rests upon Jesus' self-consciousness. Belief in the messiahship of Jesus arose with and out of belief in the resurrection of Jesus.¹

In the post-Bultmannian school of thought there has been a reaction to and a criticism of Bultmann's view. Bornkamm approaches the life and person of Jesus primarily as teaching. Though he believes that something can be known historically about Jesus, his viewpoint is also primarily existential and kerygmatic.² Fuchs finds the true context of Jesus' preaching in his conduct--thus his message and action

¹Bultmann, Essays Philosophical and Theological, pp. 185, 187, 207; and Bultmann, Theology, I, 26, 27, 304, 305. See N. H. G. Robinson, "The Future of Christology: I and II," ET (LXXVII, February, March, 1966), pp. 136-140 and 167-170, who suggests that a middle way in Christology must be followed--that is, avoiding both extreme conservatism and existentialism.

²Günther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960), pp. 53 ff., 155 ff., 180 ff.

go together.¹ Käsemann emphasizes the need to retain the unity between the message of Jesus of Nazareth and the Church's proclamation of Christ. Criteria should be established for deciding the features in the tradition which belong to the historical figure of Jesus.²

Athanasius also regarded the Holy Spirit to be present and active in the events of the Old Testament. In the New Testament there is no indication that there was a problem of the Spirit or any difficulty about the relationship between the Spirit and the Father or between the Spirit and the Son.³ Thus in Athanasius' conception all of the Persons of the Trinity were present in Old Testament history though the New Testament provided Athanasius with his principle source of evidence for the Trinitarian doctrine.

It has been suggested that the background of the doctrine of the Trinity is to be found in the Old Testament. Knight endeavors to bring together what he considers are the concepts in the Old Testament that lie behind the Trinitarian

¹Ernst Fuchs, "Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus," ZTK (LIII, 1956), pp. 210-229; and Fuchs, Studies of the Historical Jesus, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 42, trans. Andrew Scoble (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964).

²E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," ZTK (LI, 1954), pp. 125-153. See Anderson, op. cit., Introduction and Ch. IV, on the controversy about the problem of the historical Jesus; see also James M. Robinson, A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 25 (London, SCM Press Ltd, 1959); and Fuller, op. cit., pp. 243-259.

³Wainwright, op. cit., p. 249.

doctrine. Among these concepts is included God's self-revelation in the Old Testament in such ways as in the "Angel" of God, the "Word" of God, and the "Spirit" of God. He attempts to show that from Biblical evidence the revealed nature of God is a priori possibly that of a Trinity and not that of a Monad. There are indications of a plurality in God in the Old Testament. God is not "one" in the mathematical sense of the word but is a "unity-in-diversity."¹ A similar view is expressed by Johnson in that he regards such expressions as "name" and "Word" of God in the Old Testament as indications of extension in God's personality and states that in this Israelite conception there is an oscillation between the "one and the many." Along this line of his argument, he suggests, there is gained "a new approach to the New Testament extension of Jewish Monotheism in the direction of the later Trinitarianism."² Also in Wainwright's opinion there are three important Hebrew ideas that were used by Christians to express their beliefs about the unique relationship of the Son to the Father: Spirit, Wisdom, and

¹Knight, Biblical Approach, pp. 6 ff.; and Knight, Christian Theology, p. 58.

²Johnson, op. cit., p. 37. Wainwright, op. cit., pp. 18, 19, observes that Knight and Johnson find not only the seed but the unfolding bud of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Old Testament. Neither Knight nor Johnson, Wainwright declares, has shown that Old Testament religion was Trinitarian, or that there is a direct connection between the theology of the New Testament and the veiled signs purported to be found in the Old Testament.

Word. The importance of these ideas, he believes, is not that they offer evidence for "twoness" in the Godhead, but because they support the idea of plurality. All of these ideas were sufficiently flexible to enable the New Testament writers to formulate a lofty conception of Christ without committing themselves to polytheism.¹

Taylor affirms that there is no satisfactory explanation of the Christology of the New Testament except in a Trinitarian context. There are three different views, he points out, of how Christ is related to the doctrine of the Trinity (this would be true of the Holy Spirit as well):

(1) the view that the three Persons are not persons in the modern sense of the term; (2) the view that there are "modes of being" in relation to the Trinity; (3) and the view that the Persons of the Trinity are "Persons" in the modern sense of the term and yet in a unity which is organic and not arithmetical.²

Barth speaks of a "threefold mode of being" in the

¹Wainwright, op. cit., p. 29. J. Daniélou, in Christ and Us, trans. Walter Roberts (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1961), p. 93, thinks that Word, Wisdom, and Spirit of God in the Old Testament do not appear as having any personal reality but are powers of God. From the moment when the New Testament reveals the existence of three Persons, it is clear, Daniélou affirms, that the three Persons are already at work in the creation of the world and in the Old Testament.

²Taylor, Person of Christ, pp. 249, 250.

Trinity as being a better term than that of "Person."¹ Baillie,² Welch,³ and Franks⁴ also prefer this term. Barth asserts that these "modes" are not merely phases of manifestation, but are necessary distinctions in the Divine Essence and are eternal as God is eternal.⁵ Hodgson believes that the three Persons of the Trinity are "Persons" in the modern sense of the term in an organic unity.⁶ This conception of the Trinity, Taylor avers, is the nearest to New Testament teaching. "With the richest meaning that can be poured into the word 'person' the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are Persons in the full sense of that term."⁷ This statement not only expresses a contemporary conception of the Trinity but corresponds to that of Athanasius.

¹Barth, op. cit., I, 1, 344.

²D. M. Baillie, God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1948), pp. 133-147.

³Claude Welch, The Trinity in Contemporary Theology (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1953), pp. 276-281.

⁴Franks, Doctrine of the Trinity, pp. 181, 182, 199.

⁵Barth, op. cit., I, 1, 344 ff. Perhaps Barth clarifies his use of "modes" to attempt to protect himself against the charge of Sabellianism. Barth, ibid., I, 1, 383 affirms that the doctrine of the Trinity is rooted in Biblical revelation.

⁶Leonard Hodgson, The Doctrine of the Trinity: Croall Lectures, 1942-1943 (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1943), p. 140.

⁷Taylor, Person of Christ, p. 258.

The Interpretation of Scripture

In his interpretation of the Scriptures Athanasius' emphasis was on the explication of the text of Scripture itself. He approached the Scriptures with certain rules which he applied to its text in order to ascertain its true meaning which, in this study, was used by him to defend the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. This procedure of seeking to discover the meaning of the Scriptural text is still valid as James Muilenburg indicates: "The task of all exegesis is to understand the meaning of the transmitted text."¹

Lampe observes that there has been a renewed emphasis recently on the unity and continuity of Scripture as a whole. He suggests that, combined with the supposition of a common pattern to which every book of the Bible contributes its share, typology has again come into its own. He regards

¹James Muilenburg, "The Interpretation of the Bible," Biblical Authority for Today, p. 207. Bultmann, Essays, p. 256, also states that the old hermeneutical rules of grammatical interpretation, formal analysis, and explanation on the basis of the historical period are indisputably valid, though the presupposition for comprehension is the connection of text and interpreter and also a prior understanding of the subject. See also James M. Robinson, "Hermeneutic since Barth," The New Hermeneutic, ed. James M. Robinson and John B. Cobb (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964), p. 15. The older emphasis on the interpretation of the Biblical text is perhaps best represented by Milton S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics: A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1883). A recent study in hermeneutics which emphasizes the explanation of the Biblical text but also takes into consideration the problem of "understanding" is that by A. Berkeley Mickelsen, Interpreting the Bible (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963).

typology as an expression of the view of history held by the writers of Scripture, for in this expression the type is a genuine foreshadowing. The New Testament writers were especially concerned about finding Scriptural fulfillments and antitypes in the events of which they wrote.¹ Typology, Lampe affirms, is a "legitimate method of exegesis."² This does not necessarily mean, however, that all kinds of modern typology are legitimate.

Markus Barth points out that at present there are three alternative approaches to the problem of hermeneutics which are receiving specific attention. Those who propose them are primarily interested in refining a clear-cut method of Biblical interpretation.³ Bultmann and others who share his outlook regard man's understanding of himself and a certain definition of historicity as the presupposition of exegesis. In this view the problem of interpretation is that

¹Lampe, Essays on Typology, pp. 18-20, 29, 30. R. P. C. Hanson, in Allegory and Event, and Daniélou, in From Shadows to Reality, and in Origen, consider typology to be the principal method of the interpretation of the Old Testament in the New. Pollard, JRH, loc. cit., 1, 144, declares that typological interpretation is not only legitimate and necessary but inescapable. Daniélou, in Christ and Us, p. 98, considers typology to be a part of the apostolic tradition.

²G. W. H. Lampe, "Allegorical Interpretation," LQHR (1958), p. 116.

³Markus Barth, "The Old Testament in Hebrews," Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, ed. William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962), p. 53.

of understanding.¹ The Scriptures are to be interpreted in terms of faith.² A group of Belgian and French Roman Catholics promote a doctrine of a sensus plenior of Scripture. There is a deeper meaning of a text which God the author of Scripture had in mind when he inspired the human author to write. This meaning may have been hidden to the consciousness and intention of the writer. In the light of subsequent revelation this meaning may be discerned and spelled out by readers and interpreters of a given text.³ A group of Old Testament scholars call for a sort of typological interpretation which does justice both to the historical and literary character of the Old Testament and to the mystery of Heilsgeschichte which culminates in Jesus Christ.⁴

¹See Bultmann, Essays, pp. 234-261. Robinson, New Hermeneutic, loc. cit., p. 19, notes that one may see during the first third of this century the gradual shift in hermeneutical discussion from explanation to understanding. Robinson, ibid., pp. 1-17, discusses the recent history of "hermeneutics" and the emphasis in the new "hermeneutic." See also Gerhard Ebeling, "Word of God and Hermeneutic," New Hermeneutic, pp. 78 ff., for a discussion of such terms as "hermeneutic," "exegesis," and "Word of God."

²Bultmann, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, pp. 50-75; Fuchs, "The New Testament and the Hermeneutical Problem," New Hermeneutic, pp. 111-145; and Fuchs, Hermeneutik (Bad Cannstatt, 1963).

³E.g., Henri de Lubac, Historie et Esprit: L'Intelligence de L'Écriture d'après Origène (Paris, 1950).

⁴See von Rad, Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, loc. cit., pp. 17-39. The ideas in this essay are expanded by von Rad in Theologie des Alten Testaments, Band II: Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels (München, 1960), pp. 329-424. See also Wolff, Essays on Old Testament

It should be noted that the conception of promise and fulfillment is also proposed for the interpretation of Scripture. Promise in the Old Testament is distinguished from New Testament promise, and also promise and prediction are not identical in meaning. The Old Testament does not speak of Jesus Christ in the sense of Christology, but Jesus Christ becomes the fulfillment of Old Testament promise.¹

These issues, then, of Trinitarianism and the interpretation of the Scriptures were of paramount importance in the fourth century. The history of the fourth century bears witness to Athanasius' success in his Scriptural defense of the Church's doctrine of the Trinity. These problems are of current and crucial importance. The Church today must also formulate its answers to the problems of the Trinitarian doctrine and the interpretation of the Scriptures.

Interpretation, loc. cit., pp. 166-199; and Eichrodt, Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, loc. cit., pp. 224-245.

¹Friedrich Baumgärtel, "The Hermeneutical Problem of the Old Testament," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, pp. 134-159; Baumgärtel, Verheissung: Zur Frage des evangelischen Verständnisses des Alten Testaments (Gütersloh, 1952); and Franz Hesse, "The Evaluation and the Authority of O.T. Texts," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, pp. 285-313.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Original Texts

Athanasius:

- Bright, William (ed.). The Orations of St. Athanasius against the Arians according to the Benedictine Text with an Account of His Life. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1873.
- Cross, Frank Leslie (ed.). Athanasius de Incarnatione: An Edition of the Greek Text. London: SPCK, 1939.
- Migne, J. P. (ed.). S. P. N. Athanasii: Opera omnia quae extant, in Patrologiae cursus completus Ser. Graeca. Vols. XXV and XXVI. Parisiis, 1857.
- Opitz, Hans-Georg (ed.). Athanasius Werke: Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vol. II. Berlin, 1935-1941.
- _____. (ed.) Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites. Dritter Band. Berlin, 1935-1941.

Apostolic Fathers:

- Page, T. E., and Rouse, W. H. D. (eds.) English translation by Kirsopp Lake. The Apostolic Fathers, in The Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 1. London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Augustine:

- Sancti Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi opera omnia. Tomus Tertius, Pars altera. Parisiis, 1837.

Clement of Alexandria:

- Stählin, Otto (ed.). Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte: Clemens Alexandrinus. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1905-1906.

Cyprian:

Hartel, Guilelmus (ed.). S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani opera omnia, in Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. I. Vindobonae, 1868.

Eusebius of Caesarea:

Capps, E., et al. (eds.) English Translation by Kirsopp Lake, et al. Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History, in The Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1926, 1932.

Irenaeus:

Harvey, W. Wigan (ed.). Sancti Irenaei: Libros Quinque Ad-versus Haereses. 2 vols. Cantabrigiae, 1857.

Mékérttschian, Karapet ter, and Wilson, S. G. (eds. and translators) S. Irenaeus: ΕΙΣ ΕΠΙΔΕΙΞΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΥ ΚΗΡΥΓΜΑΤΟΣ, in Patrologia Orientalis. Vol. XII, Fascicule 5. Paris, 1919.

Robinson, J. Armitage. St Irenaeus: The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching: Translated from the Armenian with Introduction and Notes. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921.

Josephus:

Capps, E., et al. (eds.) English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray. Josephus, in The Loeb Classical Library. Vol. I. London: William Heinemann, 1926.

Justin Martyr:

Goodspeed, Edgar J. (ed.) Die Ältesten Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen. Göttingen, 1914.

Origen:

Jenkins, Claude (ed.). "Documents: Origen on I Corinthians," JTS, X (1908-09), 29-51.

Koetschau, Paul, et al. (eds.) Origenes Werke, in Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Drei Jahrhunderte. 12 vols. Leipzig, 1899-1959.

Migne, J. P. (ed.) Origenis opera omnia, in Patrologiae cursus completus Ser. Graeca. Vol. XI. Montrouge, 1857.

Philo:

Page, T. E., et al. (eds.) English translation by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Philo, in The Loeb Classical Library. Vols. I-X. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1929-1962.

Tertullian:

Evans, Ernest (ed.). Tertulliani: Adversus Praxean Liber: The Text Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. London: SPCK, 1948.

Refoulé, R. F. (ed.) Tertullian: Traité de la Prescription contre les Hérétiques, in Sources Chrétiennes. Paris, 1957.

Tertulliani Opera, in Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina. 2 vols. Turnhout, 1954.

Theophilus of Antioch:

Bardy, G. (ed.) Théophile d'Antioch: Trois Livres à Autolycus, in Sources Chrétiennes. Paris, 1948.

Secondary Sources

(1) Books

Abba, Raymond. The Nature and Authority of the Bible. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1958.

Allen, Alexander V. G. The Continuity of Christian Thought: A Study of Modern Theology in the Light of Its History. New ed. London: Ward, Lock & Bowden, Limited, 1895.

Altaner, Berthold. Patrology. Translated by Hilda C. Graef from 5th German ed. Freiburg, 1960.

- Amsler, Samuel. L'Ancien Testament dans L'Eglise: Essai d'Herméneutique Chrétienne. Neuchâtel, 1960.
- Anderson, Hugh. Jesus and Christian Origins: A Commentary on Modern Viewpoints. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. The Making of the New Testament. London: Williams & Norgate, n.d.
- Baillie, D. M. God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1948.
- Bardenhewer, Otto. Patrology: The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church. Translated from 2nd ed. by Thomas J. Shahan. Freiburg, 1908.
- Eardy, Gustave. Saint Athanase. Paris, 1914.
- Barnes, W. E. Canonical and Uncanonical Gospels. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1893.
- Barr, James. Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1966.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text. London: SPCK, 1955.
- _____. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, n.d.
- Barry, George Duncan. The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture: A Study in the Literature of the First Five Centuries. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919.
- Barth, Karl. Church Dogmatics. Vol. I: The Doctrine of the Word of God. Translated by G. T. Thomson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.
- Bastgen, Matthias J. Athanasius: Wirtschaftsgeschichtliches aus seinem Schriftem, Giessen Diss. Darmstadt, 1928.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 4th revised and augmented ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

- Baumgärtel, Friedrich. Verheissung: Zur Frage des evangelischen Verständnisses des Alten Testaments. Gütersloh, 1952.
- Beare, Francis W. The Epistle to the Colossians, in IB.
- Benoit, Pierre. Exégèse et Théologie. 2 vols. Paris, 1961.
- Bentzen, Aage. Introduction to the Old Testament. Vol. I. Copenhagen, 1948.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, in ICC. Vol. I.
- Bethune-Baker, J. P. An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine: To the Time of the Council of Chalcedon. London: Methuen & Co., 1903.
- Bettenson, Henry (ed.). Documents of the Christian Church. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- The Bible Today: Historical, Social, and Literary Aspects of the Old and New Testaments. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955.
- Bigg, Charles. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria: Bampton Lectures of 1886. Reprinted with some additions and corrections. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- _____. The Origins of Christianity. Edited by T. B. Strong. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.
- Black, Matthew, and Rowley, H. H. (eds.) Peake's Commentary on the Bible. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962.
- Blackman, E. C. Biblical Interpretation: The Old Difficulties and the New Opportunity. London: Independent Press Ltd., 1957.
- _____. Marcion and His Influence. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Blair, H. A. A Creed before the Creeds. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1955.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. Christology. Translated by John Bowden. London: Collins, 1966.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. Exégèse Rabinique et Exégèse Paulinienne. Paris, 1939.

- _____. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by S. F. L. Tye. London: Burns & Oates, 1963.
- Bornkamm, Günther. Jesus of Nazareth. Translated by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus. Göttingen, 1913.
- Braun, F.-M. Jean Le Theologien et son Évangile dans l'Église ancienne. Paris, 1959.
- Briggs, Charles Augustus. General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899.
- Bright, William. The Age of the Fathers: Being Chapters in the History of the Church during the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903.
- _____. Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1890.
- Bruce, F. F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. London: The Tyndale Press, 1960.
- _____. (ed.) Promise and Fulfilment. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Brunner, Emil. Dogmatics. Vol. II: The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- _____. The Mediator: A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: The Lutterworth Press, 1934.
- Buhl, Frants. Canon and Text of the Old Testament. Translated by John Macpherson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. Essays Philosophical and Theological. Translated by James C. G. Greig. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1955.
- _____. Das Evangelium des Johannes. 16th ed., Göttingen, 1959.

- _____. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.
- _____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1955.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. The Gospel History and Its Transmission. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- Burrows, Millar. An Outline of Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.
- Campbell, James Marshall. The Greek Fathers. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1963.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. The Fathers of the Greek Church. English translation, revised, by L. A. Garrard. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1963.
- Cerfaux, L. Christ in the Theology of St. Paul. Translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.
- _____. Études d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse. Tome I. Gembloux, 1954.
- Charles, R. H. (ed.) The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I: Apocrypha. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Congar, Y. La Tradition et les Traditions: Essai historique. Paris, 1960.
- Conybeare, F. C. History of New Testament Criticism. London: Walls & Co., 1910.
- Cross, F. L. (ed.) The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1955.
- _____. (ed.) The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Reprinted with corrections. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- _____. The Study of St. Athanasius: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered before the University of Oxford on 1 December 1944. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945.

- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959.
- _____. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- _____. The Early Church. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Translated by A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956.
- Cunliffe-Jones, H. The Authority of the Biblical Revelation. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1945.
- Daniélou Jean. Christ and Us. Translated by Walter Roberts. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1961.
- _____. From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers. Translated by Wulstan Hibberd. London: Burns & Oates, 1960.
- _____. Historie des Doctrines Chrétiennes avant Nicée: I. Théologie du Judeo-Christianisme, in Bibliothèque de Théologie. Tournai, Belgium, 1958.
- _____. Message Évangélique et Culture Hellénistique. Paris, 1960.
- _____. Origen. Translated by Walter Mitchell. London: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism: Jordan Lectures, 1952. University of London: The Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.
- Davies, J. G. The Early Christian Church. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965.
- Davies, W. D. Christian Origins and Judaism. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962.
- _____. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Den Eynde, Damien van. Les Normes de l'Enseignement Chrétien dans la Littérature patristique des trois premiers Siècles. Gembloux, 1933.

- Dibelius, Martin. Gospel Criticism and Christology. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson Limited, 1935.
- Diestel, Ludwig. Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der Christlichen Kirche. Jena, 1869.
- Dillistone, F. W. (ed.) Scripture and Tradition. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952.
- _____. The Authority of the Bible: A Contribution to the Philosophy of Revelation. London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1928.
- _____. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- _____. The Bible Today. Cambridge: University Press, 1952.
- _____. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- _____. The Parables of the Kingdom. London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1936.
- Dods, Marcus. The Bible: Its Origin and Nature. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905.
- Dorner, J. A. History of the Development of the Doctrine of Christ. Division I; Vol. II. Translated by D. W. Simon. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882.
- Driver, Samuel Rolles, and Gray, George Buchanan. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, in ICC.
- Du Bose, William P. The Ecumenical Councils, in Eras of the Christian Church. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.
- Duchesne, Louis. Early History of the Christian Church: from Its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century. Vol. II. Translated from the 4th ed. London: John Murray, 1912.

- Dugmore, C. W. (ed.) The Interpretation of the Bible: Edward Alvey Lectures, 1943. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1944.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 3., neu bearbeitete auflage. Tübingen, 1964.
- Ellis, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Farrar, Frederic W. The Bible: Its Meaning and Supremacy. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.
- _____. History of Interpretation: Bampton Lectures of 1885. London: Macmillan and Co., 1886.
- _____. Lives of the Fathers: Sketches of Church History in Biography. Vol. I. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1889.
- Farrer, Austin. The Glass of Vision: Bampton Lectures for 1948. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1948.
- Filson, Floyd V. Which Books Belong in the Bible? A Study of the Canon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956/.
- Fisher, George Park. History of Christian Doctrine. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.
- Flesseman-van Leer, Ellen. Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church. Assen, 1953.
- Förster, Werner. Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times. Translated by Gordon E. Harris. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964.
- Franks, Robert S. The Doctrine of the Trinity. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., n.d.
- _____. A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ in its Ecclesiastical Development. Vol. I. London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.
- Frend, W. H. C. The Early Church. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965.
- Fritsch, Charles T. Proverbs: Introduction and Exegesis, in IB. Vol. 4.

- Fuchs, Ernst. Hermeneutik. Bad Cannstatt, 1963.
- _____. Studies of the Historical Jesus, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 42. Translated by Andrew Scobie. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964.
- Fuller, R. H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. London: Lutterworth Press, 1965.
- Gelin, A. (ed.) Son and Savior: The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures. Translated by Anthony Wheaton. Revised. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1962.
- Georgi, Dieter. Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964.
- Gerhardsson Birger. Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic and Early Christianity. Uppsala, 1961.
- Ghellinck, J. de. Patristique et Moyen Age: Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale. Tomes II-III. Paris, 1947.
- Gifford, E. G. (ed.) Eusebii Pamphili: Evangelicae Praeparationis. Tomus II. Oxonii, 1903.
- Gilbert, George Holley. Interpretation of the Bible: A Short History. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Formation of the New Testament. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- Gore, Charles, et al. (eds.) A New Commentary on Holy Scripture including the Apocrypha. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1928.
- Grant, Frederick C. Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.
- _____. Roman Hellenism and the New Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Grant, Robert M. The Earliest Lives of Jesus. London: SPCK, 1961.

- _____. The Letter and the Spirit. London: SPCK, 1957.
- _____. A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1965.
- Greenslade, S. L. Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1954.
- Gregory, Caspar René. Canon and Text of the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907.
- Grosheide, F. W. Some Early Lists of the Books of the New Testament. Leiden, 1948.
- Gwatkin, Henry Melvill. The Arian Controversy. 2nd ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.
- _____. Studies of Arianism: Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction Which Followed the Council of Nicaea. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. Jesus Christ in the Old Testament. London: SPCK, 1965.
- Hanson, R. P. C. Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959.
- _____. The Bible as a Norm of Faith: Inaugural Lecture of the Lightfoot Professor of Divinity delivered in the Applebey Lecture Theatre on 12 March, 1963. University of Durham, 1963.
- _____. Origen's Doctrine of Tradition. London: SPCK, 1954.
- _____. Tradition in the Early Church. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962.
- Hardy, Edward Rochie. Christian Egypt: Church and People: Christianity and Nationalism in the Patriarchate of Alexandria. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- _____. (ed.) The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. III: Christology of the Later Fathers. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1954.

- Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. Translated from the 3rd German ed. by Neil Buchanan, et al. Vols. I-IV. London: Williams & Norgate, 1894-1898.
- Harris, Rendel. The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity: A Popular Exposition. Manchester: University Press, 1919.
- _____. The Origin of the Prologue to St John's Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1917.
- Harris, Rendel, with the assistance of Burch, Vacher. Testimonies. Part I and II. Cambridge: University Press, 1916 and 1920.
- Hebert, A. G. The Authority of the Old Testament. London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1947.
- _____. Fundamentalism and the Church of God. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1957.
- _____. The Throne of David: A Study of the Fulfilment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ and His Church. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1941.
- Hegermann, Harald. Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum, in TU. Band 82. Berlin, 1961.
- Hengstenberg, F. W. Christology of the Old Testament and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. 4 vols. Translated by Theod. Meyer. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1854.
- Hennecke, E. (ed.) New Testament Apocrypha. Vol. I. English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson. London: Lutterworth Press, 1963.
- Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery. Irenaeus of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching. Cambridge: University Press, 1914.
- Hodgson, Leonard. The Doctrine of the Trinity: Croall Lectures, 1942-1943. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1943.
- Hoss, K. Studien über das Schriftum und die Theologie des Athanasius. Freiburg, 1899.
- Hunt, B. P. W. Stather. Primitive Gospel Sources. London: James Clarke & Co., Limited, 1951.

- Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by Arthur W. Heathcote & Philip J. Allcock. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958.
- Jenkins, Daniel. Tradition and the Spirit. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1951.
- Jeremias, Joachim. The Unknown Sayings of Jesus. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. 2nd English ed. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Johnson, Aubrey R. The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961.
- Jonas, Hans. The Gnostic Problem: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.
- _____. Gnosis und spätantiker Geist. Teil 1: Die mythologische Gnosis. Göttingen, 1954.
- Jülicher, Adolph, and Fascher, Erich. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 7th ed. Tübingen, 1931.
- Kahle, Paul E. The Cairo Geniza. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.
- Kaye, John. Some Account of the Council of Nicaea in Connection with the Life of Athanasius. London: Francis & John Rivington, 1853.
- Kelly, J. N. D. Early Christian Creeds. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1950.
- _____. Early Christian Doctrines. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. Philo's Contribution to Religion. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.
- Kidd, B. J. A History of the Church to A.D. 461. Vol. II. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Klassen, William, and Snyder, Graydon F. (eds.) Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962.

- Klostermann, Erich. Jesu Stellung zum Alten Testament: Ein Versuch. Kiel, 1904.
- Knight, G. A. F. A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 1. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1953.
- _____. A Christian Theology of the Old Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959.
- Knox, Wilfred L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.
- _____. Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1942. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Kretschmar, Georg. Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie, in Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, No. 21. Edited by Gerhard Ebeling. Tübingen, 1956.
- Lagrange, M. Histoire ancienne du Canon du Nouveau Testament. Paris, 1933.
- Lampe, G. W. H. (ed.) A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Fascicles 1-4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961-1965.
- _____. The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1951.
- Lampe, G. W. H., and Woolcombe, K. J. Essays on Typology, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. A History of Christianity. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Limited, n.d.
- Lauchert, Friederich. Die Lehre des Heiligen Athanasius des Grossen. Leipzig, 1895.
- Lebreton, Jules. History of the Dogma of the Trinity. Vol. I. Translated by Algar Thorold from the 8th ed. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1939.

- Leitzmann, Hans. The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Vol. II: The Founding of the Church Universal. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1938.
- _____. A History of the Early Church. Vol. III: From Constantine to Julian; Vol. IV: The Era of the Church Fathers. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. 2nd ed., revised. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert (eds.). A Greek-English Lexicon. A new ed. revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones, et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961.
- Lowe, H. (ed.) Judaism and Christianity. Vol. II. London: The Sheldon Press, 1937.
- Lubac, Henri de. Historie et Esprit: L'Intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène. Paris, 1950.
- McGiffert, Arthur Cushman. A History of Christian Thought. Vol. I: Early and Eastern: From Jesus to John of Damascus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- McIntyre, John. The Shape of Christology. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1966.
- McKenzie, John L. The Power and the Wisdom: An Interpretation of the New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1965.
- McNeile, A. H. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.
- _____. The Old Testament in the Christian Church. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1913.
- Manson, T. W. (original ed.) A Companion to the Bible. New ed. by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- _____. On Paul and John: Some Selected Theological Themes, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 38. Edited by Matthew Black. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1963.

- Matthews, W. R. (ed.) The Christian Faith: Essays in Explanation and Defence. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1936.
- Metzger, Bruce M. An Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Mickelsen, A. Berkeley. Interpreting the Bible. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.
- Milburn, R. L. P. Early Christian Interpretations of History: Bampton Lectures of 1952. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954.
- Moffatt, James. The Approach to the New Testament: The Hibbert Lectures. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1922.
- _____. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in ICC.
- _____. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. 3rd and revised ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918.
- Molland Einer. The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology, in Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps--Adademi i Oslo. Oslo, 1939.
- Moore, Edward Caldwell. The New Testament in the Christian Church. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30.
- Moule, C. F. D. The Birth of the New Testament. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962.
- Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.
- Müller, Guido. Lexicon Athanasianum. Berlin, 1952.
- Newman, John Henry. The Arians of the Fourth Century: Their Doctrine, Temper, and Conduct Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the Church between A.D. 325, & A.D. 381. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1833.
- _____. Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians: Freely Translated. Vols. I & II. 2nd ed. London: Pickering and Co., 1881.

- The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers, by a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Nineham, D. E. (ed.) The Church's Use of the Bible: Past and Present. London: SPCK, 1963.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1935.
- Oesterley, W. O. E., and Robinson, Theodore H. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1934.
- Onions, C. T. (rev. and ed.) The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary. 2 vols. 3rd ed. rev. with addenda. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. Grundzüge der Christologie. Gütersloh, 1964.
- Paterson, W. P. The Rule of Faith. New and enlarged ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton Limited, 1932.
- Peake, Arthur S. (ed.) The People and the Book. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941.
- Pittenger, W. Norman. The Word Incarnate: A Study of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. London: James Nisbet & Co. Ltd, 1959.
- Pollard, Thomas Evan. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Arian Controversy. An unpublished Ph.D. thesis in the University of St. Andrews, 1956.
- Prestige, G. L. Fathers and Heretics: Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue: The Bampton Lectures for 1940. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1940.
- _____. God in Patristic Thought. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1936.
- Prigent, Pierre. L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses Sources: Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme primitif. Paris, 1961.

- _____. Justin et l'Ancien Testament. Paris, 1964.
- Quasten, Johannes. Patrology. Vol. III: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon. Utrecht/Antwerp, 1960.
- Rad, Gerhard von. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band II: Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels. München, 1960.
- Rankin, O. S. Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.
- Raven, Charles E. Apollinarianism: An Essay on the Christology of the Early Church. Cambridge: University Press, 1923.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. (ed.) Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1928.
- _____. The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ: The Bampton Lectures for 1926. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926.
- Reid, J. K. S. The Authority of Scripture: A Study of the Reformation and Post-Reformation Understanding of the Bible. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1957.
- Reuss Eduard. History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. Translated by Edward L. Houghton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884.
- The Revised Standard Version: Containing the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd, 1959.
- Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1958.
- _____. Preface to Bible-Study. London: Student Christian Movement Press Ltd, 1943.
- Richardson, Alan, and Schweitzer, W. (eds.) Biblical Authority for Today. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1951.
- Ringgren, Helmer. Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East. Lund, 1947.

- Robertson, Archibald. St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters, in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Vol. IV. Oxford: Parker and Company, 1892.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler (ed.). Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- _____. Redemption and Revelation in the Actuality of History. London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd, 1942.
- Robinson, James M. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 25. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959.
- Robinson, James, M., and Cobb, John B., Jr. (eds.) The New Hermeneutic. Vol. II, in New Frontiers in Theology: Discussions among Continental and American Theologians. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.
- Rowley, H. H. The Relevance of the Bible. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1941.
- _____. The Unity of the Bible. London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Limited, 1953.
- Ruler, Arnold A. van. Die Christliche Kirche und das Alte Testament. München, 1955.
- Ryle, Herbert Edward. The Canon of the Old Testament: An Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture. London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.
- _____. Philo and Holy Scripture. London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.
- Sanday, W. Inspiration: Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration: Bampton Lectures for 1893. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1894.
- Sanday, W., et al. Criticism of the New Testament: St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902. London: John Murray, 1902.
- Sanders, J. N. The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin & Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus. Cambridge: University Press, 1943.

- Schaff, Philip. The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes. Vol. I: The History of the Creeds. 4th ed., revised and enlarged. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877.
- _____. History of the Christian Church. Division II: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity: From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great. New ed., revised and enlarged. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884.
- Schoeps, H. J. Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Schwartz, Eduard. Zur Geschichte des Athanasius in Gesammelte Schriften. Dritter Band. Berlin, 1959.
- Scott, Anderson. Christianity according to St. Paul. Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- Sellers, R. V. Two Ancient Christologies: A Study in the Christological Thought of the Schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the Early History of Christian Doctrine. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1940.
- Shapland, C. R. B. The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit: Translated with Introduction and Notes. London: The Epworth Press, 1951.
- Sherrard, Philip. The Greek East and the Latin West: A Study in the Christian Tradition. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Shotwell, Willis A. The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr. London: SPCK, 1965.
- Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, in ICC.
- Smalley, Beryl. The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Smart, James D. The Interpretation of Scripture. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961.
- Smith, Harold. Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels. 6 vols. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925.
- Smith, Henry Preserved. Essays in Biblical Interpretation. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1921.

- Smith, W. Robertson. The Old Testament in the Jewish Church: A Course of Lectures on Biblical Criticism. 2nd ed. revised and much enlarged. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1882.
- Souter, Alexander. The Text and Canon of the New Testament. Revised by C. S. C. Williams. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1954.
- Spicq, C. L'Épître aux Hébreux. 2 vols. Paris, 1952, 1953.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. Jesus and His Story. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1960.
- _____. New Testament Theology. Translated from the 5th ed. by John Marsh. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1955.
- Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament. Uppsala, 1954.
- Stewart, James S. A Man in Christ: The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1935.
- Strachan, R. H. The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941.
- Sträter, Hermann. Die Erlösungslehre des hl. Athanasius. Freiburg, 1894.
- Studia Evangelica, in TU. Edited by F. L. Cross. Vol. I, 1959; Vol. III, 1964. Berlin.
- Studia Patristica, in TU. Edited by Kurt Aland and F. L. Cross. Vol. I, 1957; Vol. II, 1957; Vol. III, 1961; Vol. IV, 1961; Vol. VI, 1962. Berlin.
- Stülcken, Alfred. Athanasiana: Litterar-und Dogmenschichtliche Untersuchungen, in TU. Neue Folge. Vierter Band. Leipzig, 1899.
- _____. Beiträge zur Athanasius-Frage: Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig, 1899.
- Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. The Old Testament of the Early Church, in Harvard Theological Studies, XX. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

- Swete, Henry Barclay. The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1912.
- _____. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1900.
- _____. Patristic Study. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902.
- Tasker, R. V. G. The Old Testament in the New Testament. London: S. C. M. Press Ltd., 1946.
- Tavard, George H. Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation. London: Burns & Oates, 1959.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1953.
- _____. The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching. London: Macmillan & Co Ltd, 1958.
- Terry, Milton S. Biblical Hermeneutics: A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1883.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1900.
- Torrance, T. F. Theology in Reconstruction. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1965.
- Turnbull, H. W. (ed.) The Correspondence of Isaac Newton. Vol. III. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.
- Turner, H. E. W. The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church: Bampton Lectures, 1954. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1954.
- Turner, Nigel. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.
- Vischer, Wilhelm. The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ. Vol. I. Translated by A. B. Crabtree. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.

- Vriezen, Th. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- Wainwright, Arthur W. The Trinity in the New Testament. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922.
- Wand, J. W. C. The Four Great Heresies. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1955.
- Weiss, Johannes. The History of Primitive Christianity. 2 vols. Edited by F. C. Grant. Translated by F. C. Grant, et al. London: Macmillan and Co. Limited, 1937.
- Welch, Claude. The Trinity in Contemporary Theology. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1953.
- Werner, Martin. The Formation of Christian Dogma: An Historical Study of Its Problem. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Bible in the Church. London: Macmillan and Co., 1864.
- _____. A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament. 5th ed. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1881.
- _____. An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. 6th ed. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1881.
- Westermann, Claus (ed.). Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. English translation edited by James Luther Mays. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1963.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.
- Whybray, R. N. Wisdom in Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1965.
- Wildeboer, G. The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament. Translation of 2nd ed. by Benjamin Wisner Bacon. London: Luza & Co., 1895.
- Wiles, Maurice F. The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church. Cambridge: University Press, 1960.

Wilson, R. McL. The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1958.

_____. The Gospel of Philip: Translated from the Coptic Text, with an Introduction and Commentary. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1962.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. 2 vols. 2nd printing revised. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.

_____. The Philosophy of the Church Fathers. Vol. I: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Wood, James D. The Interpretation of the Bible: A Historical Introduction. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1958.

Woolcombe, K. J. (and Lampe, G. W. H.) Essays on Typology, in Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956.

Zahn, Theodor. Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Erster Band. Erlangen, 1888.

_____. Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Eine Ergänzung zu der Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Leipzig, 1901.

(2) Encyclopedia Articles

Bainvel, Jean. "Tradition and the Living Magisterium," CE. XV, 6-13.

Bardy, G. "Interprétation (Histoire de L^o): II. Exégèse Patristique," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement. Edited by Louis Pirot, et al. Paris, 1928-. IV, 570-591

Barnes, W. Emery. "Athanasius," ERE. II, 168-173.

Beare, F. W. "Canon of the NT," IDB. A-D, 520-532.

_____. "Stoics," IDB. R-Z, 443-445.

- Becelaere, E. L. van. "Inspiration (Roman Catholic Doctrine)," HDB. VII, 350-352.
- Beyer, Hermann Wolfgang. "κανών," TWNT. III, 600-606.
- Bright, William. "Athanasius," DCB. I, 179-203.
- Büchsel, Friedrich. "ἀλληγορέω," TWNT. I, 260-264.
- _____. "παραδίδωμι" and "παράδοσις," TWNT. II, 171-175.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "πέτρα," TWNT. VI, 94-99.
- Davidson, A. B. "Angel," HDB. I, 93-97.
- Denio, F. B. "Quotations," DCG. II, 464-467.
- Dobschütz, E. von. "Bible in the Church," ERE. II, 579-615.
- _____. "Interpretation," ERE. VII, 390-395.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J. "Arianism," ERE. I, 775-786.
- Foerster, Werner. "χρῖστος," TWNT. III, 1038-1094.
- Geffcken, Joh. "Allegory, Allegorical Interpretation," ERE. I, 327-331.
- Ginzberg, Louis. "Allegorical Interpretation," The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer, et al. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, Company, 1901-1906. I, 403-411.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. "The Canon of the New Testament," IB. I, 63-71.
- Gordon, A. R. "Quotations," DAC. II, 293-297.
- Grant, Robert M. "History of the Interpretation of the Bible: I. Ancient Period," IB. I, 106-114.
- Grobel, K. "Interpretation, History and Principles of," IDB. E-J, 718-724.
- Jeffrey, Arthur. "The Canon of the Old Testament," IB. I, 32-45.
- Kleinknecht, H. and Kittel, Gerhard. "λέγω, λόγος, etc.," TWNT. IV, 76-89, 100-147.

- Kuhn, K. G. "μαρναναθδ," TWNT. IV, 470-475.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "Inspiration and Revelation," IDB. E-J, 713-718.
- Loofs, F. "Arianismus," RE. II, 6-45.
- Mowry, L. "Allegory," IDB. A-D, 82-84.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. "Canon of the OT," IDB. A-D, 498-520.
- Reid, George J. "Canon of the Holy Scriptures," CE. III, 267-279.
- Richardson, Alan. "Scripture, Authority of," IDB. R-Z, 248-251.
- Sanday, W. "Bible," ERE. II, 562-579.
- Schaff, Philip. "Arianism," DCB. I, 155-159.
- _____. "Arius," DCB. I, 162-163.
- Stanton, V. H. "Canon," HDB. I, 348-350.
- _____. "New Testament Canon," HDB. III, 529-542.
- Stewart, A. "Bible," HDB. I, 286-299.
- Strack, H. L. "Kanon des Alten Testaments," RE. IX, 741-768.
- Strahan, J. "Inspiration (Protestant Doctrine)," HDB. VII, 346-350.
- Weaver, J. W. "Septuagint," IDB. R-Z, 273-278.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. "σοφια," TWNT. VII, 497-529.
- Woods, F. H. "Old Testament Canon," HDB. III, 604-616.
- _____. "Quotations," HDB. IV, 184-188.
- Zahn, T. "Canon of Scripture," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1908-1912. I, 278-282.
- _____. "Kanon des Neuen Testaments," RE. IX, 768-796.

(3) Periodical and Other Articles

- Abba, Raymond. "Recent Trends in Biblical Studies," SJT, 4 (1951), 225-240.
- Aland, Kurt. "Das Problem des Neutestamentlichen Kanons," NZST, 4 (1962), 220-242.
- Alexander, James N. S. "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Ante-Nicene Period: A Brief Conspectus," Interpretation, July (1958), 272-280.
- Amundsen, Valdemar. "The Rule of Truth in Irenaeus," JTS, XIII (1912), 574-580.
- Bacht, Heinrich. "Die Rolle der Tradition in der Kanonbildung," Catholic, 12 (1958-59), 16-37.
- Barnes, W. Emery. "The Heretics of the Church and Recurring Heresies: Arius and Arianism," ET, XLVI (1934-1935), 18-24.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Bible in the New Testament Period," The Church's Use of the Bible: Past and Present. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Pp. 1-24.
- Barth, Markus. "The Old Testament in Hebrews," Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. Pp. 53-78.
- Bate, H. N. "Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis," JTS, XXIV (1923), 59-66.
- Baumgärtel, Friedrich. "The Hermeneutical Problem of the Old Testament," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Edited by Claus Westermann. Pp. 134-159.
- Benoit, André. "Écriture et Tradition chez Saint Irénée," RHPR, 40 (1960), 32-43.
- Bertram, Georg. "Preparatio Evangelica in der Septuaginta," VT, 7 (1957), 225-249.
- Bethune-Baker, J. F. Review of The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity by Rendel Harris, JTS, XXI (1920), 85-88.
- Bonnard, Pierre. "La Tradition dans le Nouveau Testament," RHPR, 40 (1960), 20-30.

- Bouyer, Louis. "Holy Scripture and Tradition as seen by the Fathers," ECQ (Suppl. Num., 1947), pp. 2-16.
- Box, G. H. "The Value and Significance of the Old Testament in Relation to the New," The People and the Book. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. Pp. 433-467.
- Bruce, F. F. "Promise and Fulfilment in Paul's Presentation of Jesus," Promise and Fulfilment. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Pp. 36-50.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. "Prophecy and Fulfillment," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Edited by Claus Westermann. Pp. 50-75.
- _____. "Das Problem der Hermeneutik," ZTK, 47 (1950), 47-69.
- Burghardt, Walter J. "On Early Christian Exegesis," TS, XI (March, 1950), 78-116.
- Burney, C. F. "Christ as the APXH of Creation," JTS, XXVII (1926), 160-177.
- Casey, R. P. "The Earliest Christologies," JTS, N.S., 9-10 (1958-59), 253-277.
- Chadwick, Henry. "The Bible and the Greek Fathers," The Church's Use of the Bible: Past and Present. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Pp. 25-39.
- Cheek, John L. "The Apocrypha in Christian Scripture," JBR, 26 (1958), 207-212.
- Childs, Brevard S. "Prophecy and Fulfillment: A Study of Contemporary Hermeneutics," Interpretation (July, 1958), pp. 259-271.
- Christie, W. M. "The Jamnia Period in Jewish History," JTS, XXVI (1925), 347-364.
- Clavier, H. "Les Sens multiples dans le Nouveau Testament," NT, 2 (1958), 185-198.
- Conybeare, Fred. C. Review of Le Quatrième Évangile by Alfred Loisy, HJ, II (1903-04), 618-620.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "'KYRIOS' as Designation for the Oral Tradition concerning Jesus: (Paradosis and Kyrios)," SJT, 3 (1950), 180-197.

- _____. "Scripture and Tradition," SJT, 6 (1953), 113-135.
- Davies, G. Henton. "Contemporary Religious Trends," ET, LXVII (1955-56), 3-7.
- Den Boer, W. "Hermeneutic Problems in Early Christian Literature," VC, 1-2 (1947-48), 150-167.
- Den Brink, J. N. Bakhuizen van. "La Tradition dans l'Eglise primitive et au XVI^e Siècle," RHPR, 36 (1956), 271-281.
- _____. "Traditio im Theologischen Sinne," VC, 13-14 (1959-60), 65-86.
- Dobschütz, Ernest von. "The Abandonment of the Canonical Idea," AJT, XIX (1915), 416-429.
- Ebeling, Gerhard. "Word of God and Hermeneutic," The New Hermeneutic. Edited by James M. Robinson and John B. Cobb, Jr. Pp. 78-110.
- Eichrodt, Walter. "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Edited by Claus Westermann. Pp. 224-245.
- Evans, C. F. "Bible and Tradition," Theology, 60 (1957), 487-494.
- Filson, Floyd V. "Theological Exegesis," JBR, XVI (1948), 212-215.
- _____. "The Unity of the Old and the New Testaments: A Bibliographical Survey," Interpretation, 5 (1951), 134-152.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," NTS, 7 (1960-61), 297-333.
- Flesseman-van Leer, Ellen. "Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons," ZTK, 61 (1964), 404-420.
- Florovsky, Georges. "The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius," Studia Patristica, VI (1962), 36-57.
- _____. "Revelation and Interpretation," Biblical Authority for Today. Edited by Alan Richardson and W. Schweitzer. Pp. 163-180.

- Fuchs, Ernest. "Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus," ZTK (LIII, 1956), pp. 210-229.
- _____. "The New Testament and the Hermeneutical Problem," The New Hermeneutic. Edited by James M. Robinson and John B. Cobb, Jr. Pp. 111-145.
- Gore, Charles. "The Bible in the Church," A New Commentary on Holy Scripture including Apocrypha. Edited by Charles Gore, et al. Part I, 1-18.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Appeal to the Early Fathers," JTS, N.S., 11-12 (1960-61), 13-24.
- _____. "The Bible in the Ancient Church," JR, XXVI (1946), 190-202.
- _____. "The Place of the Old Testament in Early Christianity," Interpretation, 5 (1951), 186-202.
- _____. "The Study of the Early Fathers Today," ATR, XLIV (1962), 280-294.
- Häggglund, Bengt. "Die Bedeutung der 'regula fidei' als Grundlage theologischer Aussagen," ST, 11-12 (1957-58), 1-44.
- Hanson, R. P. C. "The Church and Tradition in the Pre-Nicene Fathers," SJT, 12 (1959), 21-31.
- _____. "The Inspiration of Holy Scripture," ATR, (April, 1961), pp. 145-152.
- Hardy, Edward Rochie. "General Introduction: Faith in Christ, Theology and Creeds," The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. III: Christology of the Later Fathers. Edited by Edward Rochie Hardy. Pp. 15-58.
- _____. "Introduction to Athanasius: Background and Ideas," The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. III: Christology of the Later Fathers. Pp. 243-251.
- Heard, Richard. "(a) The ἀπομνημονεύματα in Papias, Justin, and Irenaeus, (b) Papias' Quotations from the New Testament," NTS, 1 (1954-55), 122-134.
- Hesse, Franz. "Das Alte Testament als Kanon," NZST, 3 (1961), 315-327.

- _____. "Das Alte Testament in der gegenwärtigen Dogmatik," NZST, 2 (1960), 1-44.
- _____. "The Evaluation and the Authority of Old Testament Texts," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Edited by Claus Westermann. Pp. 285-313.
- Higgins, A. G. B. "The Old Testament and Some Aspects of New Testament Christology," Promise and Fulfilment. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Pp. 128-141.
- Irwin, William A. "The Interpretation of the Old Testament," ZATW, 61-62 (1949-1950), 1-10.
- Jaeger, H. "The Patristic Conception of Wisdom in the Light of Biblical and Rabbinical Research," Studia Patristica, IV (1961), 90-106.
- Jellicoe, S. "The Septuagint To-day," ET, (December, 1965), pp. 68-74.
- Jepsen, Alfred. "Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments," TL, 74 (1949), 65-74.
- _____. "Zur Kanongeschichte des Alten Testaments," ZATW, 71-72 (1959-60), 114-136.
- Jonas, H. "Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation," Studia Patristica, VI (1962), 96-111.
- Käsemann E. "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," ZTK, LI (1954), 125-153.
- Katz, Peter. "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria," ZNTW, XLVII-XLVIII (1956), 191-217.
- Kelly, J. N. D. "The Bible and the Latin Fathers," The Church's Use of the Bible: Past and Present. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Pp. 41-56.
- Kirk, K. E. "The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity," Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation. Edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson. Pp. 157-237.
- Knox, Wilfred L. "The Divine Wisdom," JTS, XXXVIII (1937), 230-237.
- _____. "Phariseeism and Hellenism," Judaism and Christianity. Edited by H. Lowe. II, 61-111.

- Laeuchli, Samuel. "The Case of Athanasius against Arius," CTM, 30 (1959), 403-420.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "Allegorical Interpretation," LQHR, (1958), pp. 109-116.
- _____. "The Early Church," Scripture and Tradition. Edited by F. W. Dillistone. Pp. 23-52.
- _____. "Typological Exegesis," Theology, 56 (1953), 201-208.
- L'Huillier, Peter. "The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and Magisterium," Sobornost, Ser. 4; no. 1 (Autumn, 1959), 19-33.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Second Thoughts: IV. Books of Testimonies," ET, 75 (1963-64), 173-175.
- Lofthouse, W. F. "The Old Testament and Christianity," Record and Revelation. Edited by H. Wheeler Robinson. Pp. 458-480.
- McCown, C. C. "Symbolic Interpretation," JBL, 63 (1944), 329-338.
- McIntyre, John. "The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought," SJT, 7 (1954), 353-375.
- MacQuarrie, John. "A Dilemma in Christology," ET, 76 (1964-65), 207-210.
- _____. "The Pre-existence of Jesus Christ," ET, (April, 1966), pp. 199-202.
- Markus, R. A. "Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture," CQR, 158 (1957), 442-451.
- Marsh, John. "History and Interpretation," Biblical Authority for Today. Edited by Alan Richardson and W. Schweitzer. Pp. 181-197.
- Meecham, H. G. "The Apocrypha: Its Value and Historical Importance," The Bible Today: Historical, Social, and Literary Aspects of the Old and New Testaments. Pp. 52-57.
- Menoud, Philippe H. "Revelation and Tradition," Interpretation, 7 (1953), 131-141.
- Merk, A. "Origines und der Kanon des Alten Testamentes," Biblica, 6 (1925), 200-205.

- Miller, Randolph Crump. "Authority, Scripture and Tradition," RL, XXXI (1952), 551-562.
- Moore, A. C. "Tradition and the N.T. Canon," RTR, 16 (1957), 1-11.
- Mozley, J. K. "The Bible: Its Unity, Inspiration, and Authority," The Christian Faith. Edited by W. R. Matthews. Pp. 41-64.
- Mullenburg, James. "The Interpretation of the Bible," Biblical Authority for Today. Edited by Alan Richardson and W. Schweitzer. Pp. 198-218.
- _____. "Preface to Hermeneutics," JBL, 77 (1958), 18-26.
- Musurillo, Herbert. "Shadow and Reality. Thoughts on the Problem of Typology," TS, 22 (1961), 455-460.
- "The Mystical Interpretation of Holy Scripture," CQR, XXII (1886), 22-64.
- Nash, Henry S. "The Exegesis of the School of Antioch," JBL, XI (1892), 22-37.
- Nineham, D. E. "The Lessons of the Past for the Present," The Church's Use of the Bible: Past and Present. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Pp. 145-169.
- Nordberg, Henric. "On the Bible Text of St. Athanasius," AAPF, N.S., III (1962), 119-141.
- _____. "A Reconsideration of the Date of St. Athanasius' Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione," Studia Patristica, III (1961), pp. 262-266.
- Oberman, Heiko. "Quo Vadis? Tradition from Irenaeus to Human Generis," SJT, 16 (1963), 225-255.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Exegesis of the Old Testament," Record and Revelation. Edited by H. Wheeler Robinson. Pp. 403-426.
- Opitz, Hans-Georg. "Die Zeitfolge des arianischen Streites von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 328," ZNTW, XXXII-XXXIII (1933-1934), 131-159.
- Oppel, Herbert. "KANON. Zur Bedeutungs-geschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula-norma)," Philologus, Supplementband, XXX (1937), 1-108.

- Pollard, T. E. "The Exegesis of John X. 30 in the Early Trinitarian Controversies," NTS, 3 (1956-57), 334-349.
- _____. "The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy," BJRL, 41 (1958-59), 414-429.
- _____. "Logos and Son in Origen, Arius and Athanasius," Studia Patristica, II (1957), 282-287.
- _____. "The Origins of Arianism," JTS, N.S., 9-10 (1958-59), 103-111.
- _____. "The Origins of Christian Exegesis," JRH, 1 (1961), 138-147.
- Prestige, Leonard. "Tradition," Theology, XIII (1926), 8-14.
- Quispel, Gilles. "The Jung Codex and Its Significance," The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus. Edited by F. L. Cross. Pp. 35-78.
- Rad, Gerhard von. "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Edited by Claus Westermann. Pp. 17-39.
- Ramsey, A. M. "The Authority of the Bible," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. Pp. 1-7.
- Rankin, O. S. "Old Testament Interpretation: Its History and Development," HJ, XLIX (1950-51), pp. 146-153.
- Riesenfeld, Harold. "The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings," Studia Evangelica. Edited by F. L. Cross. I (1959), 43-65.
- Roberts, B. J. "Canon and Text of the Old Testament," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. Pp. 73-80.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. "Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems: II. Canonicity and Inspiration," ET, XLVII, (1935-36), 119-123.
- Robinson, James M. "Hermeneutic since Barth," The New Hermeneutic. Edited by James M. Robinson and John B. Cobb, Jr. Pp. 1-7.
- Robinson, N. H. G. "The Future of Christology: I and II," ET (February, March, 1966), pp. 136-140; 167-170.

- Rotenstreich, Nathan. "On the Notion of Tradition in Judaism," JR, XXVIII (1948), 28-36.
- Ruwet, Jean. "Le Canon Alexandrin des Écritures. Saint Athanase," Biblica, 33 (1952), 1-29.
- Sagnard, F. M. M. "Holy Scripture in the Early Fathers of the Church," Studia Evangelica. Edited by F. L. Cross. I (1959), 706-713.
- Sanders, J. N. "The Literature and Canon of the New Testament," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. Pp. 676-682.
- Schneemelcher, W. "General Introduction," New Testament Apocrypha. Edited by E. Hennecke. I, 19-84.
- Skydsgaard, Kristen Ejner. "Scripture and Tradition," SJT, 9 (1956), 337-358.
- Smythe, H. R. "The Interpretation of Amos 4¹³ in St. Athanasius and Didymus," JTS, N.S., I-II (1950-51), 158-168.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation," JBL, 77 (1958), 33-38.
- Stone, Darwell. "The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament," A New Commentary on Holy Scripture including the Apocrypha. Edited by Charles Gore. Part I, 688-696.
- Sundberg, A. C., Jr. "Dependent Canonicity in Irenaeus and Tertullian," Studia Evangelica. Edited by F. L. Cross. III (1964), 403-409.
- _____. "The Old Testament of the Early Church (A Study in Canon)," HTR, 51 (1958), 205-226.
- _____. "On Testimonies," NT, 3-4 (1959-60), 268-281.
- Symonds, H. Edward. "The Patristic Doctrine of the Relation of Scripture and Tradition," ECQ (Suppl. Num., 1947), pp. 59-70.
- Tate, J. "On the History of Allegorism," CQ, XXVII-XXVIII (1933-34), 105-114.
- _____. "Plato and Allegorical Interpretation," CQ, XXIII-XXIV (1929-30), 142-154.

- Telfer, W. "The Fourth Century Greek Fathers as Exegetes," HTR, 50 (1957), 91-105.
- Thomson, J. G. S. S. "Christ and the Old Testament," ET, LXVII (1955-56), 18-20.
- Towers, T. J. "The Value of the Fathers," CHO, 166 (1965), 291-302.
- Unnik, W. C. van. "De la Règle *Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελείν* dans l' Histoire du Canon," VC, 3-4 (1949-50), 1-36.
- _____. "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament," The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus. Edited by F. L. Cross. Pp. 79-129.
- Wainwright, W. W. "The Confession 'Jesus is God' in the New Testament," SJT, 10 (1957), 274-299.
- Wilder, Amos. "New Testament Hermeneutics Today," Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. Pp. 38-52.
- Wiles, Maurice F. "In Defence of Arius," JTS, N.S., 13-14 (1962-63), 339-347.
- _____. "The Old Testament in Controversy with the Jews," SJT, 8 (1955), 113-126.
- _____. "Some Reflections on the Origins of the Doctrine of the Trinity," JTS, N.S., 7-8 (1956-57), 92-106.
- Wilken, Robert L. "Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies," CH (June, 1965), pp. 123-145.
- Williams, George Huntston. "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," CH, 20 (1951), No. 3, 3-33; No. 4, 3-26.
- Wilson, R. McL. "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26," Studia Patristica, I (1957), 420-437.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. "The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament," Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Edited by Claus Westermann. Pp. 160-199.