

CURRENT THEOLOGY

THE ATHANASIAN DECADE 1974-84: A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REPORT

CHARLES KANNENGIESSER, S.J.

University of Notre Dame

Since the celebration of the 16th centenary of Athanasius' death in 1973, a decade of scholarship has both shed new light upon worn-out questions inherited from the past and introduced new problematics with further obscurities. The challenges faced by this relentless quest for the true Athanasius are considered here in four sections: (1) the biography of the Alexandrian bishop, (2) the Egyptian monastic context of his ministry, (3) the religious politics of contemporary emperors, (4) Athanasius as a theologian. Over a hundred publications will be referred to in this report, about 50 of them focusing on Athanasius' contribution to the intellectual history of the Christian Church.

BIOGRAPHY

1. When was Athanasius (=A.) born? A serious questioning of the traditional dating of A.'s birth was raised by Annik Martin in 1974.¹ Her brilliant restatement of the question depends upon a critical edition of the so-called *Historia acephala*, the "headless story" of A., in *Sources chrétiennes* 317 (1985). Rather than relying on a much later Coptic eulogy, the best indicator for the date of A.'s birth is preserved in a Syriac source, namely, in the *Index* of his festal letters, edited and translated in the same volume of SC by Micheline Albert. For the year 331 the *Index* notes: "having been installed [as a bishop] when he was too young, some enemies had denounced him (A.)" (PG 26, 1352; SC 317, 228-29). The only explanation for "youth" here as a canonical problem is provided by a reference to a synod held at Neocaesarea in 318/20, which had imposed the age of 30 for the episcopal office. Thus the critics conclude that A. was less than 30 years old in the summer of 328 (see, for instance, Gonzalo Fernández Hernández, "El cisma meleciano en la Iglesia egip-

¹ "Athanasie et les Méliens (325-335)," in Charles Kannengiesser, ed. *Politique et théologie chez Athanasie d'Alexandrie* (Théologie historique 27; Paris, 1974) 32-61. The collection of papers published in this volume after a colloquy held in Chantilly in September 1973 seems to be the most often quoted contribution to A.'s centenary. A complementary study by A. Martin, "Aux origines de l'Eglise copte: L'implantation et le développement du christianisme en Egypte (I^{er}-IV^{es} siècles)," *Revue des études anciennes* 88 (1981) 35-56. Add L. W. Barnard, "Some Notes on the Meletian Schism in Egypt," *Studia patr.* 12 (1975): TU 115, 399-405.

cia," *Gerión* 2 [1984] 168). The irregularity of age in A.'s consecration was later exploited by the schismatic Meletians, and it contributed to A.'s deposition by the synod of Tyre in 335. In my own research I also observed on several occasions that the dating of A.'s birth affects the chronology of his earliest writings.² In the light of these investigations, it becomes increasingly problematic to date the final draft of the apologies *Against the Heathen* and *On the Incarnation* before the outbreak of the Arian dispute in Alexandria around 318, as Timothy D. Barnes still insists in *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981) 206.³

2. General biographical data about A. are summarized in a traditional manner by Elia D. Moutsoulas, *Ho megas Athanasios* (Athens, 1974); or epitomized with more acuteness and with an extensive bibliography by G. C. Stead, "Atanasio," in *Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino, 1 (1983) 423–32⁴; or popularized in the light of a more recent doctrinal analysis of Athanasian writings by C. Kannengiesser, "Athanasius von Alexandrien," in *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Martin Greschat, 1: *Alte Kirche I* (1984) 266–83. An invaluable source of information about the writings of A., as well as about the "Pseudo-Athanasiana," is Mauritius Geerard's *Clavis patrum graecorum* 2: *Ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum* (1974) 12–60. No work, or part of a work, by A. has been edited during the last decade in the original Greek.⁵ In 1976 Micheline Albert provided a French translation of "La 10^e lettre festale d'Athanase d'Alexandrie (traduction et interprétation)," *Parole de l'orient* 6–7 (1975–76; *Mélanges offerts au R. P. François Graffin, S.J.*;

² "La date de l'apologie d'Athanase 'Contre les paiens' et 'Sur l'Incarnation,'" *RSR* 58 (1970) 383–428. See also *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte* 269–70, quoted infra in "general biographical data."

³ My dating of *C. gentes* and *De incarnatione* has been discussed in particular by J. C. M. van Winden, "On the Date of Athanasius' Apologetic Treatises," *Vig. chr.* 29 (1975) 291–95, and by A. Pettersen, "A Reconsideration of the Date of the *Contra gentes*—*De Incarnatione* of Athanasius of Alexandria," *Studia patr.* 17/3 (Oxford, 1982) 1030–40. It has met the agreement of a majority of experts in Athanasius, such as M. Tetz, L. Abramowski, A. Grillmeier, G. C. Stead, and others. In any case, the arguments found in the text itself of the double treatise for its dating need always to be confronted by the fact that the final redaction of this text included materials from an earlier stage in A.'s theological training.

⁴ In the same *Dizionario*, see my articles belonging to the historical context of A.'s biography: "Alessandro di Alessandria" (132–33), "Apollinare di Laodicea (Apollinarismo)" (281–85), "Costantinopoli 381" (813–16), "Epitteto di Corinto" (1183–84), "Eusebio di Nicomedia" (1296–99).

⁵ If one excepts G. M. Vian, *Testi inediti dal commento ai Salmi di Atanasio* (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 14; Rome, 1978). Vian's pointed textual criticism needs to be completed by a decision about the Athanasian authenticity of the alleged "commentary," according to G. Dorival, "Athanase ou Pseudo-Athanase?" *Riv. di storia e letter. relig.*, 1980, 80–89. Vian analyzed a few lexical data in the fragments edited by him: "*Kerygma e klesis ethnon* negli scritti atanasiani," *Kerygma und Logos*, quoted below.

Kaslik, Liban) 69–90. This translation is based on the Old Syriac version. The lack of new critical editions signals the most severe limitation of current Athanasian scholarship.

3. Of a more contextual interest for the biography of A. are Dieter Ahrens' intriguing remarks on "Geometric Patterns of 'Athanasian' Origin on Early Coptic Textiles: A Recent Acquisition of the Trierer Museum," *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 25 (1983) 77–81. A. "is supposed to have initiated a renunciation of classical forms and a new approach to the meditative treasures of ornament. In Trier an important change of style is to be noticed, which must have occurred during A.'s visits and when the Trier cathedral was still under construction. Between the northern and the southern portion of the cathedral a baptistry was built after 340, with a painted ceiling, the patterns of which were purely decorative and linear, differing greatly from the naturalistic style in force up to that date, and consisting of six-cornered fields surrounded by squares and triangles of the most abstract kind. These circular systems seem to penetrate each other and to fluctuate freely despite their cool geometry, thus creating a strong meditative stimulus similar to that of the abstract Coptic textiles mentioned above" (80). The author is a curator of the Städtisches Museum Simeonstift at Trier. Three plates illustrate his observations, which are, to my knowledge, the very first of their kind introducing A. into the history of Christian aesthetics.⁶

Another source of contextual information has been made available by the Ancient History Documentary Research Center, directed by E. A. Judge at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* is "A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976 (No. 1, by E. A. Judge, 1981), in 1977 (No. 2, by G. H. R. Horsley, 1982), in 1978 (No. 3, by G. H. R. Horsley, 1983)." The main sections in each issue are: New Testament Context, Minor Philological Notes, Biblical and Related Citations, Judaica, Ecclesiastica. Very detailed indexes add to the minute analysis of the numerous epigraphical and papyrological materials scrutinized by the reviewers. The clear presentation and a faultless typography add to the tremendous excitement which these volumes may yield to students of A. I noted in Vol. 2 that 32 of the 53 Greek words attested by newly edited papyri and discussed in "minor philological notes" (77–104) are also quoted in G. Müller, *Lexicon Athanasianum*. Thus a refreshing entry into A.'s basic language is provided by these attestations of the non-Christian and definitely nontheological usages of his usual vocabulary. Also of interest for Athanasian studies are, in Vol. 2, "no. 92. A Fourth-Century Hymn

⁶ Augustine's appraisal of A.'s taste for a sober psalmody in liturgical songs forshadowed somehow the more recent evaluations of A. by art historians like Ahrens.

to the Virgin Mary" (141–46), the Latin "Psalmus Responsorius," probably from Egypt, first published by R. Roca-Puig (reviewed by C. H. Roberts, *JTS* 18 [1967] 492–94; D. Bonneau, *Rev. des ét. latines* 45 [1967] 550–51); "no. 102, *chrèstianè* in a Christian letter" (172–74), and "no. 117. Ezana Again" (209–11), referring to A.'s *Apology to Constantius* 31, about the conversion of Ethiopia to Christianity. Similar observations could be made in No. 3 of the *New Documents*. I would only mention in it "no. 77. Athanasios" (90), with a survey of the frequency ("suprisingly less frequent") of this name in papyri, and "no. 106. Early Christianity in the Egyptian Sahara—New Finds" (159–62), giving precise geographical and archeological information about an area visited by A. during his third exile.⁷

A final contextual line of research concerns A.'s rhetorical education and the study of his literary gifts witnessed by an amazing variety of writings. This unexplored field of research may be illumined by Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* 1 (Munich, 1978), especially where he recapitulates the principles of the theory of rhetoric recognized in Alexandria in A.'s time (76–79).

4. In a biographical survey inspired by specific theological concerns, Martin Tetz analyzes several achievements in A.'s episcopal career: "Athanasius und die Einheit der Kirche: Zur ökumenischen Bedeutung eines Kirchenvaters," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 81 (1984) 196–219. Tetz mainly discusses the synod of Sardica in 342 and the 39th festal letter of 367. He concludes by laying an ecumenical stress on A.'s links with Coptic monasticism.

More directly, Tetz contributed "Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 90 (1979) 158–92, in an issue of the journal conceived as a Festschrift for W. Schneemelcher, "Von Konstantin zu Theodosius," which will be mentioned again later. Tetz starts by sketching the image of A. projected by two leading German scholars of this century, E. Schwartz and H. von Campenhausen. Then he examines the circumstances of what is usually called the fourth exile of A., dating from Oct. 24, 362, and an episode at the time of the third exile (356–62). In both cases Tetz hopes to offer a fruitful access to neglected sources, Arabic and Syriac. The third and most substantial part of Tetz's biographical notes is a response to the question: "What determined A.'s attitude in his episcopal office?" (173). The will for power, as Schwartz suggested? Fanaticism, as Barnes speculates today, even describing A. as a "gangster" (230)? In analyzing A.'s *Apology about*

⁷ Of the same informative expertise is E. A. Judge and S. R. Pickering, "Papyrus Documentation of Church and Community in Egypt to the Mid-Fourth Century," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 20 (1977) 47–71.

His Flight, his *Letter to Dracontius*, and the *Life of Antony*, together with other of his writings, Tetz recommends a more reflected and well-balanced self-understanding in the Alexandrian bishop.

More partial and mainly secondhand statements could be added here from a biographical viewpoint. For instance, Gonzalo Fernández, "Problemas históricos en torno a la muerte de Arrio," *Erytheia: Revista de estudios bizantinos y neogriegos* 5 (1984) 95–103. For a discussion of the significance of A.'s startling account on Arius' death, see my recent book mentioned at the end of this article.

There is only one conclusion that deserves to be stated at the end of this first section: the 20th century draws to a close without having produced, at least until the mid-80's, any comprehensive biography of A. A huge amount of new data and a rather lively interpretative debate around him should attract the gifted biographer whom A. deserves to meet in our times.

MONASTIC CONTEXT

One of the most promising developments of Athanasian studies during the last ten years belongs to the Coptic setting of A.'s pastoral activities. Old sources previously known only to a few experts have been made available to a broader public through recent translations. Coptic studies in general were promoted by new conferences and institutes, not least under the authoritative impetus of Tito Orlandi in Rome. International teams dedicated their joint efforts in a rigorous exploration and editing of the Nag Hammadi library, containing mainly Gnostic writings which were hidden in a cave in Upper Egypt during A.'s episcopacy. As a result, new insights enriched the study of A.'s links with monastic communities and the towering figures of the ascetic heroes of his homeland. His *Life of Antony*, even if still lacking its badly needed critical edition,⁸ will no doubt benefit in the near future from increasing familiarity with its immediate setting. A general survey of recent studies on the origins of Egyptian monasticism is provided by Jean Gribomont, "Monachisme II," *Dict. spir.* 10 (1980) 1536–47, with bibliography.

1. The sources newly published in English are: *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus*, translation and introduction by Robert C. Gregg (Classics of Western Spirituality; New York: Paulist, 1980); *Pachomian Koinonia 1: The Life of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples*; 2: *Pachomian Chronicles and Rules*; 3: *Instructions, Letters, and Other Writings of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples*, translated, with an introduction by Armand Veilleux (Cistercian Studies Series 45–47; Kalamazoo, Mich., 1980–82 (with an extensive Pachomian bibliog-

⁸ It is in the process of being prepared for Sources chrétiennes by G. J. M. Bartelink.

raphy); *The Letters of St. Antony the Great*, translated by D. J. Chitty (Fairacres Publication 50; Oxford, 1975); *The Letters of Ammonias, Successor of Saint Antony*, translated by Derway J. Chitty, revised and with an introduction by Sebastian Brock (Fairacres Publication 72; Oxford, 1979). Add here, in a Latin translation from the Georgian, G. Garitte, "De unius ex Ammonae epistulis versione iberica," *Muséon* 89 (1976) 123-31, editing and translating Letter 2 (= Syr. 3); *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers; The Alphabetical Collection*, translated by B. Ward (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1975); *Besa: The Life of Shenoute*, introduction, translation, and notes by David W. Bell (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1983); *The Life of Pachomius (Vita Prima Graeca)*, translated by A. N. Athanassakis, introduction by Birger A. Pearson (Missoula, Mont., 1975).

In French were the following publications: *Vie et conduite de notre père saint Antoine*, by Benoît Lavaud, O.P. (Spiritualité orientale 28; 3rd ed.; Bellefontaine, 1979); *Saint Antoine: Lettres* (Spir. or. 19; Bellefontaine, 1976); *Epîtres inédites d'Horsiesèe et de Théodore* (Commandements du Seigneur et Libération évangélique: *Studia Anselmiana* 70; Rome, 1977); *La Vie primitive de s. Antoine conservée en syriaque*. Discussion et traduction par René Draguet (CSCO 418, *Scriptores syri* 184; Louvain, 1980). The Syriac text is published in Vol. 417 (Tom. 183), Louvain, 1980, of the same series. Serious reservations must be expressed about the highly speculative "discussion" of this text by the late Prof. Draguet. Also published were *La Vie abrégée de saint Pachôme dans le ménologe impérial* (BHG 1401b), *Analecta Bollandiana* 96 (1978) 367-81, and *Une vie inédite de saint Pachôme*, *ibid.* 97 (1979) 5-55, 241-87, by F. Halkin.

In German, the powerful study on Horsiesius, with the Old Latin version and with a translation, by Heinrich Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs* 1 (Würzburg, 1972), has been completed in the meantime by a second volume. Two letters of A. to Horsiesius are transmitted (PG 26, 977-80). In addition, Hans Quecke, *Die Briefe Pachoms: Griechischer Text der Handschrift W. 145 der Chester Beatty Library. Anhang: Die koptischen Fragmente und Zitate der Pachombriefe (Textus patristici et liturgici* 2; Regensburg, 1975). In Italian, the oldest Latin version of the *Life of Antony*, contemporaneous with A. himself, was translated by P. Citati and S. Lilla, with an introduction by Chr. Mohrmann, a critical text and a lengthy commentary by G. J. M. Bartelink, *Vita di Antonio (Vite dei santi* 1; Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1974).

A. had a personal relationship with Antony before becoming a bishop. From the start he conceived his episcopal duty as a form of leadership over the fast-growing monastic population in the deserts of Egypt. He became a friend of the founders and earliest abbots of the most important Coptic monasteries. Thus, he opposed the Meletian schism within the

ranks of the monks (G. Fernández, above, following A. Martin). The overwhelming majority of his authentic writings, as far as we know, were addressed to monks. And it was a former monastic superior, Bishop Serapion of Thmuis, who was designated by him to be his replacement during his exile in 339–46. A. inaugurated a strategy of long-lasting importance for the Christian Church in East and West when he started to consecrate as bishops monks chosen by him. Sufficient reasons exist for insisting upon the need to foster the study of A.'s monastic setting.

2. Studies on this particular issue during the decade of 1974–84 are collected here in a chronological order, but without any pretense of being exhaustive. My grounds for their choice are purely utilitarian, because I found them helpful in studying A.: L. W. Barnard, "The Date of S. Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*," *Vig. chr.* 28 (1974) 1969–75 (late in 357 or early in 358); B. R. Brennan, "Dating Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*," *Vig. chr.* 30 (1976) 52–54 ("A. wrote his *Historia Arianorum* late in 358 and the *Vita Antonii* may have been written before this, at the same time as this, or after this"); G. Couilleau, "La liberté d'Antoine," *Studia Anselmiana* 70 (1977) 13–40 (on Antony's letters); E. A. Judge, "The Earliest Use of *Monachos* for 'Monk' (P. Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 20 (1977) 72–89 (men became a *tagma*, or a specific category of people, in the Church by "a change of residence, from ordinary domestic circumstances to a community house, and of dress"); L. Bouyer, *La Vie de S. Antoine: Essai sur la spiritualité du monachisme primitif* (2nd ed.; Bellefontaine, 1977); S. Sbordone, "Caratteristiche strutturali di alcune vite di santi dei secoli III–IV," *Koinonia* 2 (1978) 57–67; G. Viaud, *La liturgie des Coptes d'Égypte* (Paris, 1978); Fr. Morard, "Encore quelques réflexions sur monachos," *Vig. chr.* 34 (1980) 395–401 (she urges the literary evidence of a Gnostic use of *monachos* in its earliest stage and reinforces her position questioned by Judge); M. Krause, "Das christliche Alexandrien und seine Beziehungen zum koptischen Ägypten," *Alexandrien: Kulturbegegnungen dreier Jahrtausende im Schmelztiegel einer mediterranen Grossstadt*, ed. N. Hinske (Aegyptiaca Treverensia 1; Mainz am Rhein, 1981) 53–62; J. T. Lienhard, S.J., "'Discernment of Spirits' in the Early Church," *Studia patr.* 17; Oxford, 1982) 519–22 ("A.'s *Life of Antony* makes discernment of spirits into a grounding principle of the ascetic life," 520; the author stresses "the practical disappearance of the term 'discernment of spirits' from monastic writing at the beginning of the fifth century," 521); R. M. Peterson, "The Gift of 'Discerning Spirits' in the *Vita Antonii* 16–44," *ibid.* 523–27 (a gift for "the restoration to and maintenance of the soul in its natural state," 526); A. E. D. Van Loveren, "Once Again: 'The Monk and the Martyr,' Saint Anthony and Saint Macrina," *ibid.* 528–38; B. Ward, "'Signs and Wonders': Miracles in the Desert Tradition,"

ibid. 539–42; G. Stroumsa, "Monachisme et marranisme chez les Manichéens d'Égypte," *Numen* 29 (1982) 184–201; H. Chadwick, "Pachomius and the Idea of Sanctity" (*History and Thought of the Early Church*, reprint 14; London, 1982); M. Tetz, "Athanasius und die Vita Antonii: Literarische und theologische Relationen," *ZNW* 73 (1982) 1–30 (a first and happy attempt to interpret the peculiar features of the *Vita* in the light of its monastic setting); G. J. M. Bartelink, "Die literarische Gattung der Vita Antonii: Struktur und Motive," *Vig. chr.* 36 (1982) 38–62; L. Leloir, "Premiers renseignements sur la Vie d'Antoine en éthiopien," *Antidoros*, Festschrift M. Geerard, 1984, 9–11.

IMPERIAL POLITICS

Since the celebration of A.'s 16th centenary in 1973, it has become clear that his role as a bishop on the scene of the imperial politics of his time would continue to attract patristic scholars and historians. At the start of the decade under consideration, two publications illustrate best the new focus given to scholarly research in this matter: C. Kannengieser, ed., *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (n. 1 above), and W. Schneemelcher, *Athanasius von Alexandrien als Theologe und als Kirchenpolitiker* (*Gesammelte Aufsätze*; Thessaloniki, 1974). In both cases politics and theology are seen as two complementary poles in A.'s public career. More precisely, theological motives seem always to underscore the political attitude of the Alexandrian bishop. To insist on this point is not merely to repeat truisms, for it must be admitted that the confessional bias in Protestant and in Roman Catholic historical research about A. and imperial politics has been evident for a long time. Even today in current international debates it is difficult for historians to avoid projecting their own preconceptions in regard to Christianity, especially in the case of such a striking character in Church history as A. But at least in the more ecumenical awareness of the 70's, A. served less and less as a pretext for local church apologetics. On the Catholic side, the views developed in *Politique et théologie* are interconfessional. The collected papers are signed by Protestant, Anglican, Orthodox, and various Roman Catholic authors. On the Protestant side, W. Schneemelcher's *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, published at the Orthodox institute of Blatadon in Thessaloniki, witnesses a deliberate effort to overcome the passionate projection of Eduard Schwartz (*Gesammelte Schriften* 3: *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius* (Berlin, 1959; essays dating from 1904–11 and 1935; Schwartz died in 1940). Schneemelcher shows that it is a serious limitation to see A. as being motivated primarily by a tireless quest for clerical power. His position was established on a legitimate and canonical ground. His writings deserve more careful analysis in their own right and for their doctrinal message and are not to be mined for data discussing the

general politics in A.'s time. In his *G.S.*, Schneemelcher produced a fine analysis of "Die Epistula Encyclica des Athanasius" (290-337). A similar careful consideration of the literary nature of the document and the proper person of the author was exemplified by T. Orlandi, "Sull'Apologia Secunda di Atanasio," *Augustinianum* 15 (1975) 49-79, and M. Tetz, "Über nikänische Orthodoxie," *ZNTW* 66 (1975) 194-222. The latter study deals with the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, issued at the Alexandrian synod of 362, again a piece of information for which one would expect to possess a critical text very soon. Two central issues focusing historical research around the political role played by A. appeared between 1974 and 1984, and they continue to figure in lively debate: (1) the Constantinian establishment in the eastern half of the empire as highlighted by the Council of Nicaea in 325; (2) the tension between A. and the administration of Constantius II.

1. Athanasius, Constantine, and Nicaea

A juridical introduction is provided by W. Ullmann, "The Constitutional Significance of Constantine the Great's Settlement," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976) 1-16. I have already mentioned T. D. Barnes's *Constantine and Eusebius*.⁹ With its abundance of fresh materials, allowing a pluridisciplinary approach to the first "Christian" emperor, this aggressive book would have secured a much richer encounter with Constantine and his ecclesiastical contemporaries had its author tempered its Schwartzian-styled polemics with sounder theological judgment.¹⁰

The religious ideology imposed by Constantine and celebrated by Eusebius is remarkably well sketched by K. M. Girardet, "Das christliche Priestertum Konstantins d. Gr.: Ein Aspekt der Herrscheridee des Eusebius von Caesarea," *Chiron* 10 (1980) 569-92. A. Lippold, "Bischof Ossius von Cordova und Konstantin der Grosse," *ZKG* 92 (1981) 1-15, in a sober and rigorous discussion, seeks to relativize the importance of Ossius at Nicaea. The "second session" of Nicaea, one of the pointed contributions made by E. Schwartz after D. Seek and before H. G. Opitz, is reduced to a less solemn synodal procedure by R. Lorenz, "Das Problem der Nachsynode von Nicäa (327)," *ZKG* 90 (1979) 22-40. Two smaller contributions may be mentioned at this point: R. M. Grant, "Religion and Politics at the Council at Nicaea," *Journal of Religion* 55 (1975) 1-12, and C. Kannengiesser, "Nicée dans l'histoire du christianisme,"

⁹ See section on "Biography," no. 1.

¹⁰ Coincidentally, at the same time that Barnes completed his essay, in the close vicinity of Toronto where he teaches, a more classical presentation of Constantine, with an explicit hagiographical purpose, was elaborated by Paul Keresztes, *Constantine: A Great Christian Monarch and Apostle* (Amsterdam, 1981).

Concilium 138 (1978) 39–97. New and stimulating insights on Constantine are collected in the essays by F. Blanchetière, “L’Evolution du statut des Juifs sous la dynastie constantinienne”; J.-P. Callu, “Structure des dépôts d’or au IV^e siècle”; E. Demourgeot, “Constantin et la Dacie”; Ch. Pietri, “Constantin en 324: Propagande et théologie impériales d’après les documents de la *Vita Constantini*,” and others, in E. Frézouls, ed., *Crise et redressement dans les provinces européennes de l’Empire (milieu du III^e–milieu du IV^e siècle après J.-C.)*, Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, décembre 1981 (Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, AECR, 1983). Another valuable collection of essays is G. Ruhbach, ed., *Die Kirche angesichts der konstantinischen Wende* (Darmstadt, 1976).

More contextual help for the study of the Constantinian era has been offered by Brian Croke and Alanna M. Emmett, ed., *History and Historians in Late Antiquity* (Sydney, 1983), in particular with the articles of B. Croke, “The Origins of the Christian World Chronicle,” and of G. W. Trompf, “The Logic of Retribution in Eusebius of Caesarea.” To be mentioned in the same line of scholarship are E. A. Judge, “Gesellschaft und Christentum III, Neues Testament; IV, Alte Kirche,” *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 12 (1984) 764–73, and R. L. Wilken, *The Christians As the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven, 1984); B. Croke and J. Harries, *Religious Conflict in Fourth-Century Rome: A Documentary Study* (Sydney, 1982). Finally, it would be pure enjoyment for any student of Athanasius to consult the Constantinian era in the second edition of E. J. Bickerman’s *Chronology of the Ancient World* (Ithaca, 1980).

2. Constantius II vs. Athanasius

A solid and informative study on *Constance II et l’administration impériale* by Chantal Vogler (Groupe de Recherche d’Histoire Romaine de l’Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg: Etudes et travaux 3; Strasbourg, 1979) enriches the studies on Constantine’s younger son, Constantius II. Vogler discusses at length all the data concerning the taxation system, the imperial bureaucracy, and the status of higher officials under the administration of Constantius. K. M. Girardet leads the discussion straight to the core of Constantius’ religious politics in “Constance II, Athanase et l’édit d’Arles (353): A propos de la politique religieuse de l’empereur Constance II,” *Politique et théologie* (n. 1 above) 65–91. Against a view supported by Schwartz and picked up more recently by M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d’occident (335–430)* (Paris, 1967), Girardet advances considerable evidence that Constantius’ pressure on the Western churches in 353–55 included a theological statement against the Nicene dogma. The same historian made a broader case for the juridical distinction between imperial and ecclesiastical power in *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht: Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites*

(313–315) und zum Prozess des Athanasius von Alexandrien (328–346) (Bonn, 1975). Add “Appellatio: Ein Kapitel kirchlicher Rechtsgeschichte in den Kanones des vierten Jahrhunderts,” *Historia* 23 (1974) 98–127. Girardet also analyzed the dramatic clash between both powers under Constantius II in “Kaiser Konstantius II. als ‘episcopus episcoporum’ und das Herrscherbild des kirchlichen Widerstandes (Ossius von Corduba und Lucifer von Calaris),” *Historia* 26 (1977) 95–128. In the heat of a controversy verging on civil war between the two imperial brothers, Constans and Constantius II, Charles Pietri examined the attitude of the bishop of Rome in favor of A., first in “La question d’Athanasie vue de Rome (338–360),” *Politique et théologie* 93–126, then in his monumental *Roma Christiana: Recherches sur l’église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)* (2 vols.; Rome, 1976); see in particular Vol. 1, 187–237. For a quick survey, see Leslie W. Barnard, “Athanasie et les empereurs Constantin et Constance,” *Politique et théologie* 127–43. Barnard’s archeological account of “The Site of the Council of Serdica,” *Studia patr.* 17/1 (Oxford, 1982) 9–13, refers to a remark made by Ossius according to A., *Historia Arianorum* 44:2. On the eastern border of the empire, Constantius was often engaged in warfare against the Persian King of Kings, Sapur II. This political context determined several of Constantius’ decisions in religious matters. It is described by G. G. Blum, “Zur religionspolitischen Situation der persischen Kirche im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert,” *ZKG* 91 (1980) 11–32.

The problematic figure of Constantius II, with its contradictions and complexities, never fails to fascinate the historians of the Constantinian period. Often characterized as a despotic ruler, if not denounced as a heretic, Constantius found an ardent defender in Richard Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche* (W.B.G., Impulse der Forschung; Darmstadt, 1977); “Zur Glaubwürdigkeit historischer Aussagen des Bischofs Athanasius von Alexandria über die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Constantius II,” *Studia patr.* 17/3, 996–1017. In order to absolve the emperor, and to take a just revenge against the calumnies of too many historians about his political and ecclesial misadventures, Klein charges A. with full responsibility for all that went awry in Constantius’ religious politics. See also K. L. Noethliche, *Die gesetzgeberischen Massnahmen der christlichen Kaiser des vierten Jahrhunderts gegen Häretiker, Heiden und Juden* (Diss. Cologne, 1971); W. Tietze, *Lucifer von Calaris und die Kirchenpolitik des Constantius II* (Diss. Tübingen, 1976); and G. Gottlieb, “Les évêques et les empereurs dans les affaires ecclésiastiques du 4^e siècle,” *Museum Helveticum* 33 (1976) 41–43. Against a rather naively pro-Athanasian and uncritical presentation of religious politics at the time of A., it would be worth while to read the extensive review by H. C.

Brennecke, in *ZKG* 89 (1978) 395–99, of Karl Baus and Eugen Ewig, *Die Kirche von Nikaia bis Chalkedon*, in *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, ed. H. Jedin, Vol. 2: *Die Reichskirche nach Konstantin dem Grossen*, Erster Halbband (Freiburg, 1973). The same Hanns Christof Brennecke in 1980 wrote a fine dissertation on *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II: Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337–361)*, now published in the series *Patristische Texte und Studien* 26 (Berlin, 1984). Adopting the stance of the eastern coalition of bishops, supported by Constantius and hostile to A., Brennecke discusses in Part 1 (1–198) “Der Fall des Athanasius von der antiochenischen Kirchweihsynode (341) bis zur Synode von Mailand (355).” His work clearly offers a new challenge in the history of Athanasian studies concentrating on A.’s political dimension. In particular, Brennecke discusses Girardet’s thesis in *Politique et théologie* mentioned above.

ATHANASIUS AS A THEOLOGIAN

The decade under consideration allowed some progress in the theological appraisal of A.: (1) his anti-Arian position was questioned on the basis of a renewed understanding of Arius himself; (2) his theological anthropology attracted several studies, in particular, with regard to the notion of the human soul in Christ; (3) an attempt was initiated to try to reach a closer grasp on A.’s biblical hermeneutics; (4) the Trinitarian theory resting on the Alexandrian and Nicene doctrine of the “consubstantial” still maintains its favored place in Athanasian scholarship.

Without decrying these recent achievements with a kind of sterile skepticism, I would be irresponsible as a reviewer if I did not stress the lack of basic text analysis obvious in most of the collected essays. Even more than the lack of critical editions of A.’s dogmatic writings (which would hardly change the theological issues linked with those writings), it is a general neglect of *literary* criticism that weakens the *theological* discussion on Athanasian thought. By “literary” I mean the sort of criticism proceeding from a comprehensive familiarity with A.’s language in order to make explicit the inner logic proper to each of his writings. Only when the original setting of his thought is elaborated in this way can we claim to engage a relevant investigation about A.’s position in his time and in the history of Christian doctrine.

1. Athanasius’ Anti-Arian Position

In Manlio Simonetti’s brilliant synthesis *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 2; Rome, 1975), A.’s thought is placed among the conflicting currents of Origenian theologies. A. is

revealed as a thinker deeply indebted to the local tradition of the Alexandrian Church, but also as a systematic thinker able to reconsider central notions of the Origenian heritage in the light of the Arian controversy. Simonetti praises A.'s balanced views on God's unity in the Trinitarian theory, as well as his soteriological stress in his teaching on the relationship between Father and Son (268–79). Simonetti's synthesis on the Arian crisis as a whole is undoubtedly the best we have for the moment. On the other hand, at times his projections would need a sharper look at the sources to which they refer. Thus, Simonetti considers A.'s *De decretis Nicaenae synodi* in its "linee generali" as presenting a "tono di credibilità" (82), and he limits his talk on Nicaea to paraphrasing A.'s supposed report (cf. H. Karpp, "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Athanasius, De Decretis Nicenae Synodi 27, 1," *Vig. chr.* 28 [1974] 141–43). He gives access to the Arian sources transmitted by A. in insisting upon their importance ("dottrinalmente molto importante"); but at the same time, in omitting to check them critically himself ("Essi sono riprodotti in Bardy, *Recherches . . .*, p. 43"), Simonetti remains unaware of the hermeneutical problems caused by Bardy's fallacious "reproduction" of Arius' *Thalia*. Like so many others, he dates the three *Contra Arianos* from A.'s third exile for the sole reason that "A. ignores the controversy about *simile* and the Homeousian documents" (253). But this is no adequate reason, compared with the complexity of problems involved with dating these treatises since F. Loof and A. Stülcken (the latter not even mentioned) at the end of the last century (Elia Moutsoula, *To Problēma tēs chronologēseōs tōn "Triōn kata Areianōn" logōn tou Megalou Athanasiou*, separate print from *Theologia*, Athens, 1976). A brilliant synthesis indeed, diminished by the superficiality of the treatment of the sources exploited at ground level.

The next major contribution in this line of research is Thomas A. Kopeček's dissertation *A History of Neo-Arianism* (Patristic Monograph Series 8; 2 vols.; Philadelphia, 1979). I discussed this valuable work in *TS* 44 (1983) 463–64. Regarding A., a new dissertation could be written with the sole purpose of reshaping chapter 4 in the first of Kopeček's volumes. It would include a scrutinizing of the Athanasian dossier of Arian quotations and a full reconsideration of possible literary links between A.'s writings in the 60's and Aetius' own products. Perhaps it sounds too modest for a dissertation proposal, but I would venture to suggest that a critical evaluation of the technique of quoting "Arians" used by A. could lead to substantial discoveries. That was my own experience concerning the "Blasphemies of Arius" (*De synodis* 15), a central piece in Kopeček's argument, which I hope to have identified as belonging to the Arian literature at the time of Aetius. For this thesis in

a slightly reworked form, see C. Kannengiesser, "Les 'Blasphèmes d'Arius' (Athanasie d'Alexandrie, *De synodis* 15): Un écrit néo-arien," *Mémoires André-Jean Festugière, Antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, vingt-cinq études réunies et publiées par E. Lucchesi et H. D. Saffrey (Geneva, 1984) 143–51. This Oxford paper of 1983 will be included in the forthcoming collection edited by Robert C. Gregg, *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*, at Fortress Press.

In 1980,¹¹ Rudolf Lorenz' *Arius judaizans: Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 31; Göttingen) inaugurated a refreshing discussion of the Arian quotations transmitted by A. His analysis exemplifies the many new observations made available through a reading of these fragments that would not merely depend on the work done by G. Bardy over half a century ago. As an unexpected consequence, his quest for the true Arius (see my review in *RSR* 70 [1982] 600–607) implies that the soteriological interpretation of Arianism worked out by A. is missed. In the line of a heresy which he understood primarily from the viewpoint of his doctrine on salvation, A. was sharing several anthropological presuppositions with the "Arius" he rejected, among them a rather disconcerting silence about the human soul of Jesus. Lorenz points out in his last chapter that Arian Christology may well originate in the Origenistic theory of the soul as intermediary between the Logos and the flesh in the Son of God's incarnation. Here it should only be noted that the question of the soul in this context is as much unanswered in A.'s case as it is in that of Arius, according to contemporary critics.

Early Arianism: A View of Salvation, by Robert C. Gregg and Dennis E. Groh (Philadelphia, 1981), establishes, at least in my view, a very paradoxical relationship with the Athanasian position. The nucleus of Arianism, as seen by them, derives immediately from the third treatise *Against the Arians* and from the so-called "Blasphemies" quoted in *De synodis* 15, in both cases very problematic sources. The "Blasphemies" may not stem at all from Arius' *Thalia*, but offer a scholarly and truly Arian exercise of a much later period; the third *Contra Arianos* has its own literary and doctrinal identity, which separates it from *Contra Arianos* 1 and 2. Thus the image of Arius' thought projected by Gregg and Groh not only depends on limited Athanasian sources, but on specific sources in the literary legacy of A., both of which may be wrongly ascribed to their supposed authors. In particular, Gregg and Groh make much of a systematic set of New Testament quotations in *C. Ar.* 3. The one-sided low Christology with which Arius is credited in this central section of *C.*

¹¹ Not 1979, as indicated in *TS* 44 (1983) 456, after J. T. Lienhard, who reviewed the volume in *Religious Studies Review* 8 (1982) 331–37.

Ar. 3 is retroprojected over the fragments of Arius' *Thalia* quoted in C. Ar. 1, 5–6; and interpreting them primarily as “a view of salvation.” Thus the poor literary remains of Arianism, already carefully manipulated by fourth-century theologians, are called upon in defense of Arius to express the soteriology in the name of which Arius had been condemned. A very paradoxical status for them indeed! What Arian soteriology really looked like would need a more critical analysis of A.'s own doctrine of salvation on the one hand, and a comparative study with the neo-Arian salvation theory on the other. For more remarks on Gregg and Groh's innovating work, see C. Kannengiesser, “Arius and the Arians,” *TS* 44 (1983) 456–75, esp. 470–71. In the same issue (555–69) and inspired by the same work, Michael Slusser, “Primitive Christian Soteriological Themes,” discusses the major currents of patristic doctrines of salvation, the currents which underlie the central Athanasian categories.

Last but not least, Christopher Stead, “The Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy,” *Platonismus und Christentum*, Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie, ed. H.-D. Blume and F. Mann, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, Ergänzungsband 10 (Münster-W., 1983) 245–57, intends to surmount what he also calls “a paradox” in Arius' teaching, as reported by A., in the wording of Maurice Wiles: “While by nature he (the Logos) must be *treptos*, he can be and is in practice *atreptos*” (246). Stead relies on his paper “The *Thalia* of Arius and the Testimony of Athanasius,” *JTS* n.s. 29 (1978) 20–52, and confronts A.'s views on choice and free will with those of Arius.¹²

2. Theological Anthropology

A few titles in chronological order should be added to what has already been mentioned in regard to A.'s anti-Arian positions: A. Louth, “The Concept of the Soul in Athanasius' *Contra gentes-De incarnatione*,” *Studia patr.* 13 (1975): TU 116, 227–31; Angelo De Nicola, “La concezione e la storia del male nel *Contra gentes-De incarnatione* de S. Atanasio,” *Augustinianum* 16 (1976) 85–106; Marcel Richard, “Saint Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens,” *Opera minora* 2, no. 32 (Leuven, 1977; first publication in *Mélanges de science religieuse* 4 [1947] 5–540); Keith Edward Norman, *Deification: The Content of Athanasian Soteriology* (Diss., Duke University, 1980); Andrew Hamilton, S.J., “Athanasius and the Simile of the Mirror,” *Vig. chr.* 34 (1980) 14–18; G. Christopher Stead, “The Scriptures and the Soul of Christ in Athanasius,” *ibid.* 36 (1982) 233–50; Rudolf Lorenz, “Die Christusseele im arianischen Streit:

¹² For more of a contextual use, I would like to recommend here the excellent article “Häresie,” with its particular references to A., by Norbert Brox in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 13 (1984) 248–97.

Nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Quellenkritik des Arius und zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Athanasius," *ZKG* 94 (1983) 1–51. The last article mentioned pleads for a more critical sorting out of Arian literary data and for closer attention to the Athanasian picture of Arius.

There is little doubt that a promising topic for a doctoral dissertation could be formulated in the frame of the lively current debate on the human soul of Christ as taught—or ignored—at the time of A. and Arius, long before the rise of a heresy, when A.'s most gifted disciple, Apollinarius of Laodicea, was denounced and anonymously censured in Rome (380) and in Constantinople (381).

3. Biblical Hermeneutics

The need for a serious re-evaluation of A.'s hermeneutics as a "biblical" theologian was clearly expressed by Hermann Josef Sieben, "Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase," *Politique et théologie* 195–214. In the meantime, only a chapter of a general survey and a few sparse remarks have been added to Sieben's initial observations: Bertrand de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse 1: Les Pères grecs et orientaux* (Paris, 1980) chap. 5: "L'Exégèse polémique, doctrinale et spirituelle de saint Athanase" (137–64); Charles Kannengiesser, "La Bible et la crise arienne," in *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*, ed. Claude Mondésert in the Beauchesne Bible de Tous les Temps series (Paris, 1984) 301–12; *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament: Sa formation et son histoire*, ed. J. D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger (Labor et Fides; Geneva, 1984), includes a discussion of A.'s 39th festal letter by Eric Junod (124–30). A rich field of hermeneutical discoveries is still waiting for exploration, if someone would undertake a comprehensive research on the role of the Bible in A.'s thought and writings.

4. Trinitarian Theology

The second, revised edition, in English, of Aloys Grillmeier, S.J., *Christ in Christian Tradition 1: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, appeared in 1975. Chapters 2 to 5, pp. 249–328, give a full account of the setting and the content of A.'s Christology, with its inner tensions between the categories of the Logos and of the human flesh.¹³ Before this synthesis was re-edited, *Politique et théologie* (1974) had included at least five theological essays: Ekkehard Mühlenberg, "Vérité et bonté de Dieu" (on *De incarnatione* 6); G. Christopher Stead, "'Homoousios' dans la

¹³ The German "second, improved and enlarged" edition of Grillmeier's *opus magnum*, which originated at the celebration of the 15th centennial of Chalcedon in 1951, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Band 1, was published by Herder in 1982.

pensée de saint Athanase";¹⁴ James B. Walker, "Convenance épistémologique de l'homousion dans la théologie d'Athanase"; Dimitri Staniloae, "La doctrine de saint Athanase sur le salut"; and Helmut Saake, "La notion de la Trinité à visée pansotériologique chez Origène et son déplacement intra-ecclesial chez Athanase d'Alexandrie." The latter author had put forward his views a few months earlier in *Pneumatologica: Untersuchungen zum Geistverständnis im Johannesevangelium, bei Origenes und Athanasios von Alexandria* (Frankfurt-M., 1973). On the same issue of A.'s doctrine on the Spirit, one may note Alasdair Heron, "The Holy Spirit in Origen and Didymus the Blind: A Shift in Perspective from the Third to the Fourth Century," *Kerygma und Logos: Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum*, Festschrift für Carl Andresen (Göttingen, 1979) 298–310; and my article "Athanasius of Alexandria and the Holy Spirit between Nicaea I and Constantinople I," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 48 (1981) 166–80, together with Wolfgang A. Bienert, "The Significance of Athanasius of Alexandria for Nicene Orthodoxy," *ibid.* 181–95.

A singular and probably dated attempt to recuperate the treatises *Contra Apollinarem* for A.'s theology has been essayed by Georges D. Dragas, "Saint Athanasius' Two Treatises 'Contra Apollinarem': Second Thoughts on the Research of the Critics," *Abba Salame* (Athens) 6 (1974) 84–96. E. P. Meijering, in *God Being History* (Amsterdam, 1975), included an essay, first published in *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 55 (1974) 1–14, entitled "Athanasius on the Father as the Origin of the Son," in which he stressed the absence of any philosophical notion of a theogony in A.¹⁵

The mention of a few other titles would complete this survey: C. Kannengiesser, "Le mystère pascal du Christ selon Athanase," *RSR* 63 (1975) 407–42;¹⁶ G. Larentzakis, *Einheit der Menschheit—Einheit der Kirche bei Athanasius: Vor- und nachchristliche Soteriologie und Ekklesiologie bei Athanasius von Alexandrien* (Graz, 1978; a specimen of Eastern Orthodox actualizing hermeneutics; see my review in *TLZ* 106 [1981]

¹⁴ Compare with G. Christopher Stead, "The Concept of Divine Substance," *Vig. chr.* 29 (1975) 1–14, and with the remarks of the same scholar in his book *Divine Substance* (Oxford, 1977). On the central notion of the Nicene *homousios*, see the valuable article of Wolfgang A. Bienert, "Das vornicaenische *homousios* als Ausdruck der Rechtgläubigkeit," *ZKG* 90 (1979) 5–29. Bienert relies on Frauke Dinsen, *Homousios: Die Geschichte des Begriffs bis zum Konzil von Konstantinopel (381)* (Diss., Kiel, 1976), unfortunately unpublished.

¹⁵ Add E. P. Meijering, "HN POTE OTE OUK HN O YIOS: A Discussion on Time and Eternity," *Vig. chr.* 28 (1974) 161–68.

¹⁶ Add Mariette Canévet, "La mort du Christ et le mystère de sa personne humaine divine dans la théologie du IV^e siècle," *Les Quatre Fleuves* 15–16 (1982) 71–92.

899–900); M. Tetz, “Das kritische Wort vom Kreuz und die Christologie bei Athanasius von Alexandrien,” *Theologia Crucis—Signum Crucis*, Festschrift für Erich Dinkler, ed. C. Andresen and G. Klein (Tübingen, 1979) 447–65; Hermann Josef Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der alten Kirche* (Paderborn, 1979) chap. 1: “Werden und Eigenart der Konzilsidee des Athanasius von Alexandrien (+373),” pp. 25–67, first published in *Theol. und Philos.* 45 (1970) 353–89; Luise Abramowski, “Dionys von Rom (+268) und Dionys von Alexandrien (+264/5) in den arianischen Streitigkeiten des 4. Jahrhunderts,” *ZKG* 93 (1982) 240–72; Vincent Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos: The Primacy of Rome As Reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the Historico-Apologetic Writings of Saint Athanasius the Great* (Münster-W., 1982) (“two thirds of the book concern Athanasius. In reading this volume, it must be asked whether eisegesis does not sometimes prevail over exegesis”: R. B. Eno, *TS* 44 [1983] 323); A. L. Kolp, “Partakers of the Divine Nature: The Use of II Peter 1:4 by Athanasius,” *Studia patr.* 17, 1018–23; J. L. North, “Did Athanasius (Letter 49, to Dracontius) Know and Correct Cyprian (Letter 5, Hartel),” *ibid.* 1024–29; R. P. C. Hanson, “The Transformation of Images in the Trinitarian Theology of the Fourth Century,” *ibid.* 97–115; Enrico Cattaneo, S.J., “Il tema della grazia in S. Atanasio d’Alessandria,” *Una Hostia*, Studi in Onore del Card. Corrado Ursi, ed. S. Muratore, S.J., and A. Rolla (Naples, 1983) 163–86; Frances M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background* (Philadelphia, 1983) chap. 2: “Athanasius and Some Fellow Alexandrians of the Fourth Century” (57–91); Charles Kannengiesser, *Athanasie d’Alexandrie évêque et écrivain: Une lecture des traités Contre les Ariens* (Théologie historique 70; Paris, 1983). This last book has been welcomed in *TS* by M. Slusser as “an important event for patristics and for the history of Christology.” In *Theol. und Philos.*, H. J. Sieben considers the analyses condensed in this volume as “the key” (“den Schlüssel”) for any future interpretation of the *Contra Arianos*. In a more negative way, R. P. C. Hanson admits in *Patristics* 13 (1985) 4 that “it would take more space than could be available in any review to examine this theory in detail,” including this present one.