

Arius and athanasius essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Contents

- IV. Decision

SYPNOSIS

Arius and Athanasius were archrivals of the Arian contention. Arius was the taking male parent in Arianism whilst Athanasius was the guardian of the Nicene Theology for Orthodox Christianity against Arianism. As Arianism rejects the deity of Christ, redemption to mankind was at interest.

Athanasius advocates the consubstantiality of the three individuals of the three which was important statement to support the deity of Christ.

Consequently Athanasius had built the land of the Trinitarian and Christological philosophy which together with the humanity of Christ represents the complete Trinitarian divinity.

I. Introduction

The 4th century church experienced a major crisis in understanding God ' s godly nature, features and relationship with members of the Godhead. This Arian contention centred upon two archrival theologians, Arius and Athanasius. 1 The contention represented a new stage of doctrinal development of the Godhead and led to the Council of Nicaea in 325 and the Church ' s first oecumenic statement of the Trinity. 2 Athanasius was the title-holder of Nicene Theology, who greatly defended the traditional Christianity against the Arian heresy. 3 Section II of this essay will briefly discourse the background of Arius, and sum up his basic divinity. Section III will supply an overview about Athanasius ' s life, Athanasius ' divinity in concurrence with his defense mechanism against the Arians ' heretic claims. Finally, the decision will be drawn in Section IV.

II. THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY

The ' Arian contention ' ignited in 318, when Arius openly taught his heretic instructions that denied the full deity of the Son. Consequently, Arius challenged his bishop (Alexander of Alexandria) and instructors of Alexandria to an Christological conflict. 4 The contention lasted for about half a century and became the confrontation between the two archrivals, the ' Nicene party ' and Origenists. 5 Athanasius coined the names ' Arian ' and ' Arians ' as dyslogistic political and theological slurs against Arius and his oppositions, who disagreed with him on the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and those meant the Son as a animal or held fast to Arius ' basic place. Cf. Thomas G. Weinandy, *Athanasius: a Theological Introduction* (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2007) , 51-52. Donald K. McKim, *Theological Turning Points: Major Issues in Christian Thought* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988) , 14.

Justo L. Gonzalez, *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Dawn of The Reformation* (3 vols. ,

New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1984, Vol. 1) , 173. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology: The Golden Age of*

Grecian Patristic Literature. From the Council of Nicaea to the council of Chalcedon (Utrecht, Netherlands:

Spectrum Publishers, 1963, Vol. III) , 66.

Bruce L. Shelly, *Church History in Plain Language* (2nd Ed. , Dallas, Texas: Word Publishing, 1995) , 100.

Everett Ferguson (ed.) , Encyclopaedia of Early Christianity (New York: Garland Publishing Inc. , 1990) , 8485, 92.

The contention roots lay deep in “ the differences of the ante-Nicene philosophy of the

Logos, ” particularly in the two contradictory half truths of Origen ‘ s Christology, which was

claimed by both archrivals ? the full deity of Christ and his ageless sharpness from

the Father. 6 Conclusively, the Arians were the accelerators, instead than the chief participants. 7

II. 1. ARIUS AND HIS DOCTRINE

Trained in the Lucian School, Arius was called one of the dissident male parents of Arianism. 8 Arianism was a dissident philosophy of theological rationalism, based on the instructions of Lucian of Antioch, Paul of Samosata, and Neoplatonic theory of subordinationism. 9 Arius wrote really small and merely a few fragments survived. Thalia was his lone ain authorship which Athanasius recited. 10 Most information about Arius ‘ life and his philosophy came from Athanasius ‘ writings. 11

Influenced by Origen, Arius rejected the term ?????????? (consubstantial) and insisted the concrete and distinguishable three individuals (??????????) of the Godhead, a separate kernel and the subordination of the Son to Father.

12 Nicene split the church into two major groups: 1) The ‘ Nicene party’? consisted of the West, the school of Antioch and other in the East like

Athanasius. They affirmed the full divinity of Jesus Christ, but were less clear on the ageless threeness of the Godhead. They did not deny the differentiation between Father, Son and Holy Spirit (i. e. they were non Monarchians) , but they did not prove it every bit forcefully as the Origenists wanted and so appeared to them to be Monarchian. (2) The Origenists ? were strong on the threeness of the Godhead, but less clear on the divinity of Jesus Christ. They were non Arians (i. e. they did not see Jesus Christ as a animal made out of nil) , but they held him to be inferior to the Father and so appeared Arian to the Nicene party. Cf. Tony Lane, A Concise History of Christian Thought (Rev. ed. , London: T & A ; T Clark, 2006) , 30. Philip Schaff, ' Arianism ' in A Religious Encyclopaedia or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology (3rd ed. , Toronto, New York & A ; London: Funk & A ; Wagnalls Company, 1894, Vol. 1) 134-137. Cf. [hypertext transfer protocol: //www.earlychurch.org.uk/arianism-schaff.html](http://www.earlychurch.org.uk/arianism-schaff.html) (29 April 2010) .

Tony Lane, A Concise History of Christian Thought, 30-31. Philip Schaff, ' Arianism ' in A Religious

Encyclopaedia or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology, 134-137. Cf.

[hypertext transfer protocol: //www.earlychurch.org.uk/arianism-schaff.html](http://www.earlychurch.org.uk/arianism-schaff.html) (29 April 2010) .

Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 7.

Ephiphanius, Panarion 69, 4. Theodoret, Historia ecclesiastica, 1, 4. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 15.

Note: Scholars still debate over the ideological precursor of Arius ' philosophy, whether it was derived from the

theories of Origen, or of Paul of Samosata, or of Lucian of Antioch. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 2, 6-8.

Athanasius, Orationes contra Arianos, I. 5, 6 ; Athanasius, De Synodis, 15. R. P. C. Hanson, The Search for

Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381 (Edinburgh: T & A ; T Clark Ltd. , 1988) , 11.

And a few beginnings from the church historiographers of the 4th and 5th centuries, and from the letters of St.

Basil and of Epiphanius of Salamis. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 10-13.

Philip Schaff, ' Arianism ' in A Religious Encyclopaedia or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal,

and Practical Theology, 134-137. John Behr, The Way to Nicaea: The Formation of Christian Theology (3

vols. ; Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir ' s Seminary Press, 2001, Vol. 1) , 200-201.

Arius denied all internal Godhead dealings bing between the Father and the Son ? the

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

ageless divinity of Christ and his equality with the Father (?????????) . 13

II. 2. A SUMMARY OF ARIUS ' Theology

Arius ' basic doctrine: 14 (1) Godhead is uncreated, unbegotten (?????????) , without get downing ; 15 (2) The Son of God can non be genuinely God. The Son is the first of God ' s animals, a secondary God, " god by participation." Like the other creative activities, " the Son is non unbegotten (?????????) , " " he is one of the things fashioned and made, " 16 brought out ex nihilo (? ?? ?????) . " There was a clip when the Son of God was non (? ?? ?? ?) . " 17 " Neither does the Son so cognize his ain substance as it is, " " he was created for our interest, instead than we for his." " He is the Son of God non in the metaphysical, but in the moral sense of the word." 18 By the will of God, the Son has " his legislative act and character (??????? ??? ???) ." " The Son is by his nature ; mutable, changeable, every bit with other rational beings." The Father is ' ineffable to the Son ; for neither does the Word (Logos)

absolutely and accurately cognize the Father, neither can he absolutely see Him (the Father) ." 19

(3) " The rubric of God is improper for the Son of God, since the lone true God adopted him

as Son in prevision of his merits." This sonship by acceptance insists " no existent engagement

in the deity and no true similitude to it ; " Thus, the absolute and ageless deity of Jesus

13

Epiphanius, Panarion 69. 6. 1ff. Theodoret of Cyrus, Haereticarum fabularum collection (History of

Unorthodoxies) I. 5. Cf. Philip Schaff, ' Arius ' in A Religious Encyclopaedia or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical,

Doctrinal, and Practical Theology, 139. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 7-8.

14

Epiphanius, Panarion 69, 6. Theodoret, Historia ecclesiastica, 1, 5, 1-4.

Athanasius, De Synodis 15.

Socrates, Historia ecclesiastica, 1, 6. Gelasius of Cyzicus, Historia conc. Nic.

2, 3. Cf. Johannes Quasten,

Pathology, 8, 14, 15-16. Cf. Athanasius, Epistula encyclical ad episcopos

Aegypti et Libyae, 12. Athanasius,

NPNG2-04. Athanasius: Choice Work and Letters (Philip Schaff erectile dysfunction. ; Grand Rapids, Mi: Christian Classicss

Ethereal Library, 1892) , 229. hypertext transfer protocol: //www. ccel. org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_229. html (25 April 2011) .

15

Theodoret, Historia ecclesiastica, 1. 4. 1. See besides the decision in Arius ' first Letter to Eusebius of

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

Nicomedia. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 10.

16

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 16.

17

See the Arius ' decision in his first Letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, II. 26. Cf.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 10. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian*

Controversy 318-381, 8.

18

Athanasius, *Ad Episcopos Aegypti* 12. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 16.

Maurice F. Wiles, *Archetypal*

unorthodoxy: Arianism through the centuries, 8.

19

Italic words are mine. Athanasius, *De Synodis* 15. Cf. Maurice F. Wiles, *Archetypal unorthodoxy: Arianism*

through the centuries, 7. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy*

318-381, 15.

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

3

is to be denied. 20 (4) The Logos is created by God as the instrument of creative activity. The Logos

holds a in-between topographic point between God and the universe is made flesh by the will of the Father and

fulfilled in Jesus Christ the map of a psyche, “ though Godhead, was less than to the full divine.” 21

(5) The Holy Spirit is the first animal of the Logos, and is still less God than the Word.

III. ATHANASIUS AND HIS THEOLOGY

Though Athanasius was non a systematic theologian, his greatest dedication in life was the ferocious defense mechanism of Orthodox Christianity against the Arian unorthodoxy. 22 He was “ so identified with the cause that the consecutive history of the Arian contention is best told by following Athanasius ‘ life.” 23 The three discourses of Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos*, were his chief dogmatic Hagiographas targeted against Arianism. 24 The first discourse contained the definition of the Nicene Council ? there is a integrity of godly kernel between the Father and the Son, and the Son is ageless, increated (???????) and unchangeable. 25

III. 1. ATHANASIUS

Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 15. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 8. Cf. the undermentioned commendation: “ The leaders in the Arian motion (Arius himself, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris and Theognis) received their

preparation under Lucian and ever venerated him as their maestro and the laminitis of their system. Later critics of Lucian, including Alexander of Alexandria, during the Council of Nicaea in 325, associated his school with Arius ' s rejection of the absolute deity of Christ. No 1 before Lucian of Antioch and Arius had taught that the Logos is flatly different from God." of ' Lucian of Antioch ' in New World Encyclopedia. hypertext transfer protocol: //www. newworldencyclopedia. org/entry/Lucian_of_Antioch (10 April 2011) .

Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, 100-101.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 67-68.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 66.

Justo L. Gonzalez, *The Story of Christianity*, 166.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 26.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 26.

The systematic and dependable ancient history of Athanasius could be found in the

model, such as *Historia acephala* and *Festal Index*. 26

Ordained as deacon to his bishop Alexander in Alexandria, Athanasius accompanied

Black loyage to the Council at Nicaea (325) . Subsequently he succeeded Alexander and became the

bishop of Alexandria (328-373) . 27 Athanasius, as a taking Christian author of NeoAlexandrine School, adopted the historic-grammatical reading of Scripture (which

the School of Antioch advocated) in all polemical and theological contention with the

Arians. 28

The Arians enlisted the support of secular power and corrupt church authorization to hush and destruct Athanasius. When Athanasius refused Constantine ' s order to readmit Arius to Communion, his oppositions launched all sort of allegations, doing defamations further to increase. 29 For case, under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, the bishops of the Tyrian Synod condemned Athanasius with charges which he could non get away. They exiled Athanasius to Trier and restored Arius to church Communion and reinstate him into the rank of the clergy. 30

The history about Athanasius ' life is besides found in his ain Hagiographas and the Syriac debut to his Festal Letters, besides in Historia acephala or called Historia Athanasii, Gregory Nazianzen ' s Oration 21, and some fragments of a Coptic eulogium. Cf. Timothy D. Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politicss in the Constantinian Empire (2nd Printing 1994 ; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993) , 5. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 20.

' Athanasius ' in Oxford Reference Online. Oxford University Press. hypertext transfer protocol: [//www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t100.e116](http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t100.e116) (18 March 2011) . Cf. David Hugh Farmer, ' Athanasius ' in The Oxford Dictionary of Saints (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2003) . Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 2, 20. Timothy D. Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire, 1.

Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 2, 20.

Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 20-21.

Athanasius was foremost charged with slaying (black magic and slaying of Arsenius, a Meletian bishop in the Thebaid) . His 2nd charge was a political sort (he had threatened to halt the Alexandrian corn-ships) . His 3rd charge was his order to assail the presbyter Ischyras. Cf. ' St. Athanasius - (ca. 297 - 373) , Patriarch of Alexandria ' in Christian Classic Ethereal Library.

hypertext transfer protocol: [//www.ccel.org/ccel/athanasius](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/athanasius) (18 March 2011) . Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 9. Archibald Robertson, Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria: Edited, with Prolegomena, Indices, and Titles (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Cushing-Malloy Inc. , 1978) , eighty-six. John Behr, The Nicene Faith Part1, 165-166. For the missive, see H. I. Bell, Jesus and Christians in Egypt (London: 1924) , 53-71.

Because of Arian contention, Athanasius spent 17 of his 45 old ages as bishop in five different exiles. 31 This state of affairs happened, likely " because his Defense mechanism against the Arians gave so full an account." 32 Athanasius was likened to " a modern mobster, " " an unscrupulous

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

politician, " 33 because of " his oppressive and violent important nature." 34 However he had ne'er been officially charged with heresy, 35 and some mentioned that he was the " pillar of the church ; " 36 And the Roman Church hailed him among the four great

Fathers of the East. 37

III. 2. ATHANASIUS ' Theology

Black lovalge and his replacement Athanasius laid accent on Origen ' s insisting on the Son ' s ageless deity related to the being of God as Father instead than Godhead, which had led to the Nicene philosophy of the individuality of substance (?????????) . Athanasius prioritized religion over ground, contrary to Arians ' rationalistic tendency. 38 Athanasius ' theological attack was centred on Soteriology. 39 He was committed to monotheism. 40 But Arius ' history of God was incoherent since on one reading it was similar to the extremist Judaic monotheism, and the other reading of it (one that emphasized " the Son is god in some secondary sense") was tantamount to a sort of polytheism ? two Gods, viz. one God who is ingenerate and 31 Tony Lane, A Concise History of Christian Thought, . Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 20. ' St. Athanasius - (ca. 297 - 373) , Patriarch of Alexandria ' in Christian Classic Ethereal Library. hypertext transfer protocol: //www. ccel. org/ccel/athanasius (18 March, 2011) . See besides, Timothy D. Barnes, Athanasius and

Constantius: Theology and Politicss in the Constantinian Empire, 20. R. P. C. Hanson, The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381, 239-273, 422. Cf. David M. Gwynn, The Eusebians: The Polemic of

Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the ' Arian Controversy ' (Oxford Theological Monographs ; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) ,
 2. Maurice F. Wiles, Archetypal unorthodoxy: Arianism through the centuries,
 6. John Behr, The Nicene Faith Part 1, 167. Cf. Adolf Harnack, History of Dogma, (6 vols ; trans. Neil Buchanan ; New York: Dover Publications, 1961, Vol. 4) , 62. [hypertext transfer protocol: //www. ccel. org/ccel/harnack/dogma4. ii. ii. i. i. iii. html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/harnack/dogma4.ii.ii.i.i.iii.html) (25 April 2011) .

Gregory of Nazianzus, The Orations 21, 26. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 20. The four great Fathers of the Eastern Church ? John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Athanasius of Alexandria ? were recognized in 1568 by Pope St. Pius V. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 20. ' Church Fathers ' in Wikipedia [hypertext transfer protocol: //en. wikipedia. org/wiki/Doctor_of_the_Church](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doctor_of_the_Church) (6 April 2011) .

Athanasius, In Illud ' Omnia mihi tradita sunt ' , 6. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 66. R. P. C. Hanson, The Search for Christian Doctrine of God, 423. R. P. C. Hanson, The Search for Christian Doctrine of God, 425. 1 who is generated. This resulted in two incongruous accusals against the Arians that they were no better than Hebrews and that they were indistinguishable with heathens. 41

Unlike the Arians, who needed the Son as a lower God to accommodate an uncomparable and

unpassable God with the Scriptural message that God suffered for world ' s redemption,

Athanasius dealt with the self-revelation of God who had come into the closest contact

with His creative activity (Jn 14: 9) . 42

Athanasius endeavoured to confirm “ the really tradition, instruction, and religion of the

Catholic Church from the beginning, which the Lord gave, the Apostles preached, and the

Fathers kept.” Athanasius maintained, “ I have delivered the tradition, without contriving

anything immaterial to it.” The tradition was that the one God is a Triad. 43

Three

At the bosom of Athanasius ‘ s divinity of Incarnation lay his philosophy of Trinity, 44 summed up as follows: There is a Three, sanctum and complete, consistent, ageless and indivisible in nature, non composed of one that creates and one that originated, but all originative, called to be God in Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Father does all things “ through the Word (the Son) in the Holy Spirit” . Their activity is one, and their integrity is preserved. The Three is Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos* III. 67, I. 17, 18, III. 16. Maurice F. Wiles, *Archetypal unorthodoxy: Arianism through the centuries*, 8. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, 424-425.

R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God*, 426.

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

Athanasius, Epistulae IV ad Serapionem episcopum Thmuitanum, I, 28-33. Cf. Johannes Quasten,

Pathology, 66. Brian LePort, An Introduction to the Letters of Serapion on the Holy Spirit by Athanasius of

Alexandria, 18.

hypertext transfer protocol: //westernseminary. academia.

edu/BrianLePort/Papers/172851/An_Introduction_to_the_Letters_of_Serapi

on_on_the_Holy_Spirit_by_Athanasius_of_Alexandria. (21 April 2011) .

Athanasius, Orationes contra Arianos III. 15 ; Athanasius, NPNG2-04.

Athanasius: Choice Work and Letters, 402. hypertext transfer protocol:

//www. ccel. org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_402. html (20 April 2011) . R. P.

C. Hanson, The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy

318-381, 424-425. “ not merely in name and signifier of address but in truth

and actuality.” Thus one God, “ who is overall (Eph. 4: 6) , and through all

and in all.” 45 Athanasius invariably defended the ontological integrity of the

Father and the Son through his Biblical statement. He proved the deity of

Christ and of Holy Spirit, 46 because “ if we participate in Christ, we must so

take part in God, if our salvation is to be assured.” 47 Athanasius refuted

Arius ‘ claims that the Son was a animal and had come into being from ‘ non-

existence ‘ , and that “ there was a clip when He was not.” Athanasius

argued that there can be merely one Son ? the ageless Word and Wisdom of

the substance of God the Father, and that the Word is ever coexisting with

the Father, who is the Godhead and Lord of all, to whom all things owed their

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

existence. 48 Athanasius rejected the Arian place that the really name ' Son ' presumes His being generated, and that the Son (the Word) is a work of the will of God for the creative activity of the universe. Athanasius argued that to be begotten implies to be " an progeny of the Father ' s kernel, non of His will, " since " begetting in God differs from human begetting" because of God ' s indivisibility.

Because the Son is in the Father and proper to Him, as the glow in the visible radiation and watercourse from fountain, Athanasius asserted that the Son ' s ageless relation to the Father is indispensable *Italic words are mine.*

Athanasius, *Epistulae IV ad Serapionem episcopum Thmuitanum*, I, 2, 12, 14, 16, 19-20, 25, 27, 31 ; III, 15. Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos II*. 24, 25.

Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 66-67. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, 427. Athanasius, *De embodiment et contra Arianos*, 13-19. Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, 422. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 29. Kurt Aland, *A History of Christianity: From the Beginnings to the Threshold of the Reformation* (Trans. James L. Schaaf, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980, Vol. 1) , 191. Athanasius, *Vita antonii*, 69.

Athanasius, *Depositio Aarii*, 2, 3. Athanasius, *Epistula de decretis Nicaenae synodi*, 11. Athanasius, " On Luke X. 22 (Matt. XI. 27) " in *In Illud ' Omnia mihi tradita sunt ' , 4*. Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos*, III. 4 ; Cf.

Athanasius, NPNG2-04. Athanasius: Choice Work and Letters, 214. hypertext transfer protocol: [//www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_214.html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_214.html) (15 April 2011) . Athanasius, NPNG2-04. Athanasius: Choice Work and Letters, 70. hypertext transfer protocol: [//www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).

org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_70. html (15 April 2011) . Athanasius, NPN2-04. Athanasius: Choice Work and Letters, 89. hypertext transfer protocol: //www. ccel. org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_89. html (18 April 2011) .

Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 69. and non simply moral as Arius viewed. 49 Besides, Athanasius refuted the Docetic positions of the

Arians and Apollonarians on the relationship of the historical Jesus to the ageless Son. 50 Arius maintained, based on Proverbs 8: 22ff, that the Son ' s mediatory ontological position between God and creative activity was necessary, because " the Father was excessively high and mighty, or excessively proud to transport out the work of creative activity himself, " and " therefore begot the Son" as " the curate of the purposes of the Father." 51 However, Athanasius argued that the footings applied to the Incarnate and non the preexistent Christ ; Thus, Athanasius implied that the mediating activity of the Son is non in his place within the Godhead, but in his going Incarnate.

So, Athanasius placed the Son (Logos) on the side of God, opposite Arius ' arrangement of the Son on the side of the creatures. 52 Athanasius insisted that " the Son has in common with the Father the comprehensiveness of the Father ' s Godhead" and " the Son is wholly God." 53 Against Arius ' subordination of the Son, Athanasius argued that if the Son says, " The Father is greater than I, " He means that, " The Father is the beginning, the Son the derivation." 54 " Eternally begotten, the Son is the Father ' s substance, He is consubstantial to the Father, He is ??????????" 55 Athanasius besides rejected the term ?????? as unacceptable. So, Athanasius defended the term ?????????? against the Arians and Semi-Arians. 56

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

Consequently, Athanasius disapproved what the Arians ' claim ? a ' proceeding beginning ' for the Father and the Son. 57 Athanasius, *Epistula ad Afros episcopos*, 3-6. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 56, 67-68. Athanasius, *Epistula ad Epictetum episcopum Corinthi*, 9. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 59. Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos II*. 24-25. Cf. Maurice F. Wiles, *Archetypal unorthodoxy: Arianism through the centuries*, 8. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, 101.

Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos*, II. 25 ; I. 16 ; III. 3, 6 ; II. 41 ; III. 3, 4. Athanasius, *Epistula ad Afros episcopos*, 3-6. Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, 424. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 67. Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos I*. 16 ; III. 6. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 68. Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos III*, 3 ; Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 69. Athanasius, *De Synodis* 41. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 69. Athanasius, *De Synodis* 41. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 69-70. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for Christian Doctrine of God*, 434.

Logos and Redemption

Athanasius ' divinity of the Logos centred upon the construct of redemption. 58 For Athanasius, the redeeming will of God necessitated the embodiment of Christ and his decease. If God Himself had non become adult male, and if Christ were non God, there would non hold been salvation for mankind. 59 This can merely necessitate that Christ was God by nature, non by engagement, because the latter could ne'er hold formed the similitude of

God in anyone. Therefore, Athanasius refuted the Arian construct of the Son as “ God by engagement ” . 60

Christology

Athanasius ' divinity upheld the existent differentiation between the deity and humanity after the Incarnation, yet emphasized the personal integrity of Christ. Consequently, whatever the Lord did as God and as human being belongs to the same person. 61 Athanasius refuted the Arian charge of creature-worship directed against the Nicene Christology with the statement, that Catholics do not idolize the humanity of Christ, but the Lord of creative activity, the Word Incarnate. 62

Holy Spirit

By keeping that the Spirit “ is no animal, but is one with the Son as the Son is one with the Father, [the Spirit] is glorified with the Father and the Son, and confessed as God with the Word, ” Athanasius rejected the thought of the Holy Spirit being one of the Athanasius, *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, 9, 54. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 70-71. Athanasius, *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, 8. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 71. Athanasius, *De Synodis* 51. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 71-72. Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii* 9. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 72. Athanasius, *Epistula ad Adelphium et confessorem*, 3. Athanasius, “ Letter LX. ? To Adelphius, Bishop and Confessor: against the Arians” in *NPNG2-04. Athanasius: Choice Work and Letters*, 575. [hypertext transfer protocol: //www. ccel. org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_575. html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_575.html) (20 April 2011) . Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, ministering religious animals, and insisted the <https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

Godhead of the Holy Spirit harmonizing to the Nicene Creed. 63 Athanasius defended the non-scriptural Nicene term ?????????? (consubstantial) and ? ?? ????? (of the kernel) . He claimed that these footings were to be found in the Scripture, and they had already been used by the Church Fathers, including Tertullian, Origen, Dionysius of Rome, Dionysius of Alexandria and Theognostus. 64 Against the claims of the heretic Arians and Tropicists, Athanasius gave the grounds for following the word ?????????? (consubstantial) for both the Son and the Spirit in relation to the Father, and proved that the Nicaea ' s Trinitarian expression was in conformity with Scripture. 65 Athanasius accused the Arians of learning that God was non ever a Three since the Son has non ever existed, and besides of splitting the Three because they attributed different natures to the Father and the Son. 66

Arianism attacks the really nature of Christianity because it denotes “ a God who was non a true God at all” , who was “ in no place to pass on salvation” to worlds, and hence “ incapable for delivering mankind”. 67 The Arian philosophy, which formed a canon Athanasius, *Epistulae IV ad Serapionem episcopum Thmuitanum*, I, 1, 15-21, 27, 31 ; III. 1. Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos II*, 25, 26, 73, 74. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 56, 67. For a treatment of Athanasius ' s usage of homoousios of the Spirit, see Kilian McDonald, *The other manus of God: the Holy Spirit as the Universal Touch and Goal* (Collegeville, Minnesota, USA: Liturgical Press, 2003) , 18, 74, 126. Athanasius, *Epistula de decretis Nicaenae synodi*, 18. Athanasius, NPNG2-04. Athanasius: *Choice Work and Letters*, 163. hypertext transfer protocol:

[//www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_163.html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf204/Page_163.html) (20 April 2011) . Cf.

Johannes

Quasten, Pathology, 61.

Epistula de decretis Nicaenae synodi (Letter Referring the Decrees of the Council of Nicaea) was written about 350/351 and addressed by Athanasius to one of his friends, to whom the Arian claim had caused confusion.

Whereas and Epistulae IV ad Serapionem episcopum Thmuitanum (the four letters referring the Holy Spirit) was written by Athanasius around 359/360 and addressed to Serapion to rebut the heretic tropicists, who opposed the deity of the Holy Spirit. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 57, 61. Kilian McDonald, The other manus of God: the Holy Spirit as the Universal Touch and Goal, 18. R. P. C. Hanson, The Search for Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381, 424. Athanasius, De synodis 51. Cf. Johannes Quasten, Pathology, 8. Maurice F. Wiles, Archetypal unorthodoxy: Arianism through the centuries, 7. of biblical misunderstanding, was a slander against the Fathers. 68 The worship which the Arians offered to God was a profane devotion. 69 Athanasius defended the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, successfully explained the nature and coevals of the Logos, built the land of the Trinitarian and Christological philosophy of the Church, and therefore established the theological foundation for centuries to come. 70

Athanasius ' Christological failing

In his Christology, Athanasius did non delegate any of import function to the human psyche of Christ. In fact, When the Arians objected the deity of Christ by mentioning to the Scriptural transitions which mention the inner agony,

<https://assignbuster.com/arius-and-athanasius-essay/>

fright and affliction of the Logos, Athanasius ne'er made use the chance and ne'er attacked the Arians in this mistake, because it dealt with the human psyche of Christ. 71 Christ ' s decease is to Athanasius is a separation of Logos and body. 72 Athanasius ' divinity was based on Logos-Sarx divinity. In relation to *Orationes Contra Arianos* (III. 35-37) its failing was revealed when Athanasius could non notice to the Arians in: (1) the linking nexus between the Logos and his flesh ; (2) the being of a human psyche in Christ. 73

Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii* 1. Cf. Maurice F. Wiles, *Archetypal unorthodoxy: Arianism through the centuries*, 8.

Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos* I. 8, II. 43, III. 16. Athanasius, *Ad Episcopos Aegypti* 13. Cf. Maurice

F. Wiles, *Archetypal unorthodoxy: Arianism through the centuries*, 8.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 66.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 73.

Athanasius, *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, 22. Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 74.

Johannes Quasten, *Pathology*, 73.

IV. Decision

The brief overviews of two archrivals (Arius and Athanasius) involved in the fourth-century Arian Controversy have been presented, in footings of their life, and particularly of the significance of their contrasting divinities. The important issues at interest for Athanasius in the Arian contention have been made obvious, as important elements of Athanasius ' divinity being discussed in contrast with its opposite numbers in Arianism. A failing of Athanasius ' Theology has been indicated. The centrality of Arianism was the denial of the deity of Christ, which insists the rejection of the term ?????????? (consubstantial) , the insisting of the distinguishable three individuals of the Godhead, a separate kernel and the subordination of the Son to Father. Contrarily, Athanasius affirmed the deity of Christ, the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and the ageless integrity of the distinguishable three individuals of the Trinity. Athanasius had built the land of the Trinitarian and Christological philosophy of the Church, and therefore established the theological foundation for centuries to come