

## **FHS Paper: The Development of Doctrine in the Early Church to A.D. 451**

### **Essay Topics and Suggested Readings**

In each week choose one of the two topics!

Books that are held by the Trinity Library are marked with an \*.

Material that is part of the Digital Library of the Theology Faculty is marked with two \*\* (<http://resources.theology.ox.ac.uk>).

The following books contain useful introductions into, or summaries of, the period and the problems dealt with in the tutorials, and you may wish to consult them throughout the term alongside the more particular items:

- I.Hazlett (ed.), *Early Christianity*, London 1991;  
J.N.D.Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958;  
S.G.Hall, *Doctrine and Practise in the Early Church*, London 1991;

#### **1a) Should Gnosticism be regarded as a Christian heresy?**

- Irenaeus, *Against the Heresies* I (<http://www.ccel.org/cCEL/schaff/anf01.ix.ii.html>)  
Chr. Marksches, *Gnosis. An Introduction*, London 2003\*  
K.Rudolph, *Gnosis*, Edinburgh 1983, 275-366\*  
B.Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures*, London 1987, read the ‘Historical introduction’ to parts I to III (5ff., 217ff., 267ff.)\*  
S.Pétrement, *A Separate God*, London 1991, 1-213.  
R.Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*, London 1956, 162-71.

#### **b) What prompted the development of a fixed canon of NT writings from the second century?**

- R.Williams, The Bible in: I.Hazlett (ed.), *Early Christianity*, London 1991, 81ff.  
J.Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus*, London 1941, 23-111\*  
W.Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, London 1972, 195ff.  
B.Layton, op cit, xvii-xxii\*  
R.M.Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, Oxford 1980, 126-41  
J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, Chicago 1942

#### **2a) To what degree is Irenaeus' soteriology conditioned by his anti-Gnostic polemics?**

- Irenaeus, *Against the Heresies* III (<http://www.ccel.org/cCEL/schaff/anf01.ix.iv.html>)  
D. Minns, *Irenaeus*, London 1994\*  
A.Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* I, London <sup>2</sup>1975, 98-104\*  
J.Lawson, op cit, 140-98\*  
B.Studer, *Trinity and Incarnation. The Faith of the Early Church*, Edinburgh 1993, 55ff.\*  
J.T.Nielsen, *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons*, Assen 1968 (difficult to get hold on here)

**b) Did Tertullian's theology provide for more than convenient formulas?**

Tertullian, *Treatise against Praxeas* (ed. E. Evans), London 1948 (online at: [http://www.tertullian.org/articles/evans\\_praxeas\\_eng.htm](http://www.tertullian.org/articles/evans_praxeas_eng.htm))\*  
E.Evans, Introduction in: id. (ed.), op cit., 1-85\*  
E.F. Osborn, *Tertullian. First Theologian of the West*, Cambridge 1997  
A.Grillmeier, op cit, 117-31\*  
J.Daniélou, *The Origins of Latin Christianity*, London 1977, 343-404\*  
E.J.Yarnold, "Videmus duplicem statum" in: StudPatr 23 (1989), 237-41

**3a) How Christian was Clement of Alexandria's Theology?**

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* V (transl. Wilson, ANF vol.2, 220ff.; online at: [http://www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-02/anf02-65.htm#P7190\\_2189438](http://www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-02/anf02-65.htm#P7190_2189438))  
E.F.Osborn, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria*, Cambridge 1957  
S.Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria*, Oxford 1971  
H.Chadwick, Philo and the Beginnings of Christian Thought in: A.H.Armstrong (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, read: ch.10, 168ff.\*  
Id., *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1966, chapter on Clement\*

**b) Was Origen's understanding of the Bible inspired by philosophy or was his understanding of philosophy inspired by the Bible?**

Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John* I & II online at:  
(<http://www.ccel.org/cCEL/schaff/anf09.xv.iii.i.i.html>)  
B.Studer, op cit, 77-87  
R.P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, London 1959  
J.Daniélou, *Origen*, London 1955, 209-89\*  
H.Crouzel, *Origen*, Edinburgh 1989\*  
M.Edwards, *Origen against Plato*, Aldershot 2002\*

**4a) Why did the Council of Nicaea call the Son *homousios tō patri*?**

Eusebius, Letter to His Church concerning the Synod at Nicaea in: W.G.Rusch (ed.), *The Trinitarian Controversy*, 57ff. (\* and online at:  
<http://www.ccel.org/cCEL/schaff/nPNF204.ix.ii.html>)  
Athanasius, *Defence of the Nicene Definition* (transl. Newman in: NPNF), 161-9 (online at:  
<http://www.ccel.org/cCEL/schaff/nPNF204.xiv.ii.i.html>)  
Theodoreetus, *Church History* I 7 (online at:  
<http://www.ccel.org/cCEL/schaff/nPNF203.iv.viii.i.viii.html>)  
Ch.Stead, Divine Substance, Oxford 1977, 242-266\*  
R.P.C.Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 163-72\*  
A.Logan, Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325: Antioch, Ancyra, and Nicaea in: *JTS* 43 (1992), 428ff.\*

**b) What was the part of Arius in the so-called Arian controversy?**

Athanasius, *Against the Arians* I in: Rusch (ed.), op cit, 63ff.\* (online at: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf204.xxi.ii.i.i.html>)  
Hanson, op cit, xvii ff.; 3-128\*  
R.Williams, *Arius. Heresy and Tradition*, London 1987, 95-178\*  
M.Wiles, Attitudes to Arius in the Arian Controversy in: Barnes/Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius*, Edinburgh 1993, 31ff  
Ch.Stead, Rhetorical Method in Athanasius in: *VigChr* 30 (1976), 121-37  
id., Arius in Modern Research in: *JTS* 45 (1994), 24ff.\*

**5a) What was the contribution of Athanasius towards the development of Christian doctrine?**

Athanasius, *On the Incarnation of the Word* in: Hardy (ed.), *Christology of the Later Fathers*, London 1954 (LCC 3), 55-110\*;  
Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* I, London <sup>2</sup>1975, 308-28\*;  
A.Pettersen, *Athanasius*, London 1996\*;  
L. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, Oxford 2004, ch. 5-7 (the book is available online in full at: <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/public/content/religion/0198755066/toc.html>)  
B.Studer, op cit, 115-9;  
C.Stead, The Significance of the *Homoousios* in: *StudPatr* 3 (1961), 397-412;  
D.Bradley, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, Oxford 1995.

**b) Did the Cappadocians achieve a satisfactory settlement of the trinitarian controversy?**

(Basil), ep.38.1-4 in: Wiles/Santer (eds.), *Documents in Early Christian Thought*, 31ff\*  
Gregory of Nyssa, *An Answer to Ablabius* (...) in: Hardy (ed.), op cit, 256ff.\*  
A.Meredith, *The Cappadocians*, London 1995, esp. 102ff.\*  
R.P.C.Hanson, op cit, 676-737\*  
S. Coakley, ‘Introduction’, in: id., *Re-thinking Gregory of Nyssa*, Oxford 2003 (this has previously been published in *Modern Theology* 18 (2002), 431-443; from within the Oxford network it can be read in full online)  
L. Ayres, *op. cit.*, ch. 8 & 14  
Ch.Stead, On ‘Why Not Three Gods’ in: Hubertus R.Drobner/Christoph Klock (eds.), *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*, Leiden 1990, pp.149-163;  
A.Grillmeier, op cit, 267-77

**6a) In what sense was Apollinaris a heretic?**

R.A.Norris (ed.), *The Christological Controversy*, Philadelphia 1980, chapter on Apollinaris, (103-111)\*  
Gregory of Nazianzus, *Letters on the Apollinarian Controversy* in: Hardy (ed.), op cit, 215-32\*  
Norris, *Manhood and Christ*, Oxford 1963, 79-122\*  
Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, London 1948, 94-119\*

K.McCarthy Spoerl, Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition in *JTS* 45 (1994), 545ff.\*  
A.Grillmeier, op cit, 329-43\*

**b) Was Theodor of Mopsuestia a ‘Nestorian’**

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Fragments of the Doctrinal Works* in: R.A.Norris (ed.), op cit, 113-23\*

R.A.Norris, *Manhood and Christ*, Oxford 1963, 123-234\*

A.Grillmeier, op cit, 421-39

L.Abramowski, The Theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia, in id., *Formula and Context*, London 1992

Frederick G. McLeod, ‘The Christological Ramifications of Theodore of Mopsuestia’s Understanding of Baptism and the Eucharist,’ in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10 (2002) 37-75

D. Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*, Oxford 2003, 1-62 (full online access at:

<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/public/content/religion/0199256144/toc.html>)

**7a) Was the conflict between Cyril and Nestorius all about christology?**

R.A.Norris (ed.), *The Christological Controversy*, 123-45\*

F.Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, London 1983, 213-65\*

J.A.McGuckin, *St.Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology and Texts*, Leiden 1994

Th.G. Weinandy & D. Keating (eds.), *The Theology of St Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*, London 2003, contributions by Weinandy and Young\*

A.Grillmeyer, op cit, 443-83\*

H.Chadwick, Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy in: *JTS* 2 (1951), 145-64\*.

**b) Was Chalcedon the end or rather the beginning of the Christological controversy?**

Leo the Great, *Tome to Flavian*, in: Hardy (ed.), op cit, 359ff.\*

*The Chalcedonian Decree*, in: Hardy (ed.), op cit, 371ff.\*

R.V.Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon*, London 1953\*

A.Grillmeier, op cit, 488-557\*

D. Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ*, Oxford 2004, ch. 1 (pp. 9-59)

S. Coakley, ‘What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does it Not? Some Reflections on the Status and Meaning of the Chalcedonian “Definition”’, in: S.T. Davis, D. Kendall, & G. O’Collins (eds.), *The Incarnation: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God*, Oxford 2002, pp. 143 ff.; Online at:

<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/private/content/religion/0199248451/p055.html#143>

J.Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*, 54-66

**8a) Why could Augustine not accept Pelagius' account of grace and human activity?**

- Augustin, *The Spirit and the Letter* in: Augustine's Later Works, ed. J. Burnaby, London 1955 [LCC 7], 195ff.
- Gerald Bonner, 'Pelagianism and Augustine', in: *Augustinian Studies* 23 (1992) 33-51
- Id. 'Augustine and Pelagianism', in: *Augustinian Studies* 24 (1993) 27-47
- J.Rist, *Augustine*, Cambridge 1994, 256-89
- P.Brown, The Patrons of Pelagius in: *JTS* 21 (1970), 56ff\*
- E.W.Kemp (ed.), *Man: Fallen and Free*, London 1969, 142-71\*
- James Wetzel, 'Snares of Truth: Augustine on Free will and Predestination,' in Robert Dodaro & George Lawless (eds.), *Augustine and His Critics*, London 2000, 124-141

**b) Is Augustine's 'psychological' analogy a convincing model for the illustration of the Trinity?**

- Augustine, *The Trinity* IX-XIV (transl. E.Hill, Brooklyn 1990, 270-395)
- E.TeSelle, *Augustine the Theologian*, London 1970, 223-37, 294-309
- D.Brown, *The Divine Trinity*, London 1985, 272-301
- M.Wiles, Some Reflections on the Origins of the Doctrine of the Trinity in: *JThSt* 8 (1957), 92-106\*
- Michel R. Barnes, 'Re-reading Augustine's Theology of the Trinity,' in: S.T. Davis, D. Kendall, & G. O'Collins (eds.), *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Oxford 2002, ch. 7 (p. 145 ff.)\*; Online at:  
<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/private/content/religion/0199246122/p057.html#145>
- Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, Oxford 2004, 364-383 (for online access see above)
- C.N.Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, Oxford 1940, 399-455