THEO 3339: CHRIST THE SAVIOR
Spring 2016

T/Th 9:35 AM–10:50AM  Hughes House 108

Instructor: Chris P. Evans, Ph.D.

Office: Hughes House 205
Telephone: 713-831-7863   Email: evanscp@stthom.edu
Office hours: M/W 1:00pm-5:00pm. And by appointment (preferred).

COURSE DESCRIPTION & GOALS

“In Christ our Lord the whole revelation of God is summed up” (Vatican II, Dei Verbum, 7). Everything that Christians profess by faith is related in some way to the person and work of Jesus Christ. The subject matter of this course deals with what Christians profess by faith about the person of Jesus Christ and how the understanding of that mystery (or the intellectus fidei) developed in the life, worship, and teachings of the Church throughout the centuries (or what is called in systematic theology “Christology”). Special attention is devoted to the first seven century of the Church and to primary readings of key theologians and councils whose writings and solemn definitions have influenced subsequent theological reflection.

The first part of the semester considers the Christology of the primitive church. Special attention is given here to what can be known of the life and ministry of the historical Jesus and the understanding of the mystery of Christ as preached and confessed in the apostolic and sub-apostolic church. The second part of the semester considers the Christology of the post-apostolic and early church. As the apostolic preaching and doxological professions about the person of Jesus Christ was being transmitted in the life and worship of the Church, Christians found it necessary to make intelligible the mystery of Christ in their encounter with heretical teachings and with the pagan world and its philosophies. The theologians during this period were groping for intelligible explanations about the immense mystery that is Jesus Christ. Here we will encounter different approaches and competing formulas to make intelligible this mystery. The ambiguities and insufficient explanations of one generation of theologians is exploited by heretics of the next generation who in turn provide the impetus for more precious articulation and for the solemn definitions about the person of Christ in the early Ecumenical Councils. Finally, the semester concludes with the understanding of the hypostatic union as discussed and debated in the Middle Ages.

The outcomes of this course will be as follows: [1] a knowledge demonstrated in writing of what Christians profession about the person of Christ and the development of the understanding of that profession in the historical periods covered in class; [2] progress in the ability to read primary source material and to analyze critically the theological arguments in them; and [4] to make connections between theology and other disciplines like philosophy and history. These outcomes will be measure with the instruments listed in the course requirements.
COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

In order to assess how well students achieve the aforementioned goals, students must satisfy the following course requirements: quizzes (8%); executive summaries (22%), a research paper (25%), mid-term exam (20%), and final exam (25%).

Please note that attendance is expected. Students who are frequently absent will have difficulty passing the examinations and therefore the course. The professor reserves the right assign an “F” to any student that exceeds ten absences during the semester.

Five Quizzes—8%

There will be seven quizzes scheduled throughout the semester. The two lowest grades will be dropped. There will be no make-up quizzes whatsoever, even in cases of excused absences. And no quizzes will be distributed to student who come in late, so be sure to arrive on time. Note also that the quiz only covers the reading with which it is listed in the course schedule. For example, the first quiz covers “Kereszty, p. 72-92,” not the other readings schedule for that period.

12 Executive Summaries of Assigned Primary Reading—22%

A number of primary source materials will be assigned that will require the submission of an executive summary (see due dates in course schedule). Specifics regarding each summary are provided in the course schedule. Each submission is graded as pass or fail.

The purpose of these writing assignments is to allow students an opportunity to read carefully the primary source material and make intelligible in writing the teaching expressed therein. A number of these primary readings will require multiple readings and an appreciation of their full signification will be a process that starts with your own reading and summary, that continues into the class discussion where difficulties are worked out, and that come together in your preparation for the examinations.

These papers must be submitted electronically through Turnitin on before the start of the class period on which the paper is due (Class ID: 11520465; Password: THEO3339).¹ No late submissions will be accepted. Turnitin provides a confirmation of receipt (including date and time of submission), so assume the upload was not successful if confirmation was not received. This confirmation will be the sole criterion I use to determine timely submissions.

Two Exams—20% and 25%

The format of the midterm examination will be oral that covers the possible essay questions indicated in Study Guide I that is posted in Blackboard.

The format the final examination will include two parts. Part one contains objective questions (e.g., true/false and multiple choice questions) that are drawn from the readings and lecture notes assigned in the second part of the semester (i.e., assigned secondary readings from the first part

¹ To set up an account with Turnitin: 1) Navigate to www.turnitin.com 2) click on the “Create Account” line, select “Student” 3) Enroll in the course by entering the Class/section ID and Enrollment password.
of the semester will not be on this exam). Also contain in part one of the exam are the possible
essay questions from the first examination (i.e., I convert the essay question into objective
questions). Part two contains subjective questions (essays) that are drawn from the primary
readings. The possible essay questions are indicated in Study Guide II that is posted in
Blackboard. Please note that you will need to bring a pencil and at least two bluebooks with
you to the final.

Let me be very clear about my expectations with regard to the essay questions. Because you are
given the study guide with its list of possible questions, I expect all students to have formulating
written responses to the essay questions several times before the day of the exam, that is,
students should have written a response before class based on a careful reading of the secondary
and primary readings, after class based on the class lecture/discussion and further reflection on
the secondary and primary readings, and again while preparing for the exam. Consequently, I
expect your essays to be of a very high quality, that is, accurate, clear, concise, and intelligible. If
at any time you have trouble understanding the reading or formulating a written response, then I
have provided four occasions to work out these issues: 1) because you have carefully read the
assigned reading and tried to formulate a written answer before coming to class, whatever
problems or questions you have can be addressed in class on the day the subject matter is
discussed; 2) if after reformulating your answer after that class you still have questions, then
can be handled in the next class period when I open the class with a review; 3) if you
encounter more problems afterwards, then these can be handled in the in-class review on the
class period before the exam; 4) and if you still have problems, then come by my office or send
me an email.

Normally there are no make-up examinations. In the case of illness or some other personal
emergency the student may request a make-up examination. Note also that make-up exams are
essay examinations that are more difficult than the normal exams. In order to request a make-up
exam, please note the following instructions: 1) Request must be made well in advance of the
examination (i.e., not on the day of the exam); 2) After I approve the request, you must call the
Testing Center (713-525-3160) to schedule an appointment. The make-up exam must be taken
before the start of the class period that immediately follows the exam day. 3) After you
schedule an appointment with the Testing Center, send me your testing schedule via email (after
which, I can send the make-up exam over to the Testing Center).

Research Paper—25%

You will be responsible for a research paper (argumentative prose) of 8 to 10 pages (ca. 10 to 12
pages for MA students) that follows the Chicago Manual of Style (15th edition; which can now
be accessed through an online database in the library website). Your thesis must state an
argument pertaining specifically to Christology, not Trinity, soteriology, ecclesiology, et al.;
although, the thesis may certainly be defended in the body of the paper with arguments from
Trinitarian theology, soteriology, et al.. The bibliography must include the relevant primary
sources of the theologian/council, as well as at least five important secondary works of recent
scholarship. Because you will likely need to ILL these secondary sources, I strongly suggest that
you begin now.
Before a student can submit the final copy of their carefully written paper that has been thoroughly proofread, s/he must submit a series of gateway assignments. The gateway assignment are pass/fail and do not count directly toward the final grade. However, **no final paper will be accepted until all the gateway submission have been satisfied.** See below for submission dates.

**Gateway Submissions:**

1) **Thursday, February 4**—Submit a **topic statement** that simply and broadly indicates what you want to research. Most students will choose a topic situated in the sub-discipline of biblical or historical theology. For example, if you are interested in Paul’s Christology, then you could select research on the Christological hymn in Phil. 2. If you were interested in Thomas Aquinas, then you could select research on his Christology.

2) **Tuesday, March 29**—I consider this the most important phase of your research paper. Since the beginning of the semester, I expected that you gathered, read, kept or discarded as many secondary writings as possible relevant to your topic. On this class period, I want you to submit a properly formatted, annotated bibliography of the secondary writings you found relevant to you paper (that is, for each entry statement a brief rationale on why it is listed on your bibliography).

3) **Tuesday, April 5**—Thesis Statement

4) **Tuesday, April 14**—Due: At least three supporting arguments for your [revised] thesis statement

5) **Final Submission: Friday, April 29** (submit through Turnitin).

Posted in Blackboard are a number of aids for writings an argumentative prose. A writing guide is provided that offers information on what a thesis statement is, the different kinds of thesis statements, how to defend a thesis in the body of the paper, and so on. Also included in Blackboard is a list of possible topics from which a thesis can be developed, as well as some miscellaneous consideration to keep in mind while researching.

In place of the research paper I will accept English translation(s) of a Latin writing(s). This translation assignment is only for students who have completed at least two semesters of Latin (three semesters is highly recommended). Interested students should meet with the professor as soon as possible to discuss the details and feasibility of this translation assignment.

**Departmental Criteria for Grading Standards**

*A range = Superior, exceptional, outstanding.* The assignment demonstrates critical, informed, and creative theological inquiry that reflects superior understanding of essential theological/historical concepts. This means the student demonstrates depth of insight beyond what is normally expected. Carefully nuanced reasoning and writing, free from material, structural and grammatical error are presupposed in this grade.

*B range = Good.* The assignment demonstrates ready command of full range of concepts and shows some critical, informed, and creative inquiry that reflects above average understanding of essential theological/historical concepts. This means the student has produced an assignment that is free from material, structural and grammatical errors.
C range = Acceptable. The assignment demonstrates satisfactory ability to describe overall picture and essential concepts. This means the student has completed the assignment in a manner involving no significant errors. Material may not be free from structural and grammatical errors. Nuanced reasoning is not demonstrated.

D range = Below average. The assignment demonstrates reasoning that is neither carefully nuanced nor coherently presented; writing is insufficient in depth of insight and/or use of texts; presentation is not free from material error in structure, spelling and grammar. This means that the student failed to respond adequately to the assignment and its intentions.

F = Unsatisfactory. In one or more of the following ways the student: 1) failed to turn in the assignment; 2) did not respond to the assignment as given; 3) submitted work so thoroughly flawed as to indicate that the student did not make a serious effort, 4) was involved in plagiarism or cheating.

Grading Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores/Letters</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Scores/Letters</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100-95</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>94-90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>89-87</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>86-84</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>83-80</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students with Disabilities

Any student who feels that he/she may need academic accommodations in order to meet the requirements of this course—as outlined in the syllabus—due to presence of a disability, should contact the Office of Counseling and Disability Services (C&DS). The following statement was prepared by the C&DS:

Any student with a documented disability needing academic accommodations is requested to speak with Deborah Jones as early as possible. All discussions will remain confidential. Students with disabilities will also need to contact Counseling and Disability Services in Crooker Center. This office can be reached at (713) 525-2169 or 6953.

Academic Integrity

Students should be acquainted with the University's "Policy on Academic Dishonesty" found in the Undergraduate Catalog. According to that catalog:

Every offense against academic honesty seriously undermines the teaching-learning process for which the University exists, and such offenses will be dealt with expeditiously according to the following criteria. Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to:

1. Cheating on an examination or test; for example, by copying from another’s paper or using unauthorized materials before or during the test;
2. Plagiarism, which represents as one’s own the work of another, whether published or not, without acknowledging the precise source;
3. Knowing participation in the academic dishonesty of another student, even though one’s own work is not directly affected;
4. Any conduct which reasonable persons in similar circumstances would recognize as dishonest in an academic setting.

The penalty for an incident of academic dishonesty is, at the discretion of the faculty member, either a mark of zero for the work in question or the grade of “F” for the course.
REQUIRED TEXTS


All other readings will be provided in Blackboard (BB).

COURSE SCHEDULE

1. Tuesday, January 19—Introduction to Course

   Part One: Christology of the OT/NT

2. Thursday, January 21—Lecture 1: Christology of the OT
   o Bible: Proverbs 1:20-33, 8:1-36; Job 28:12-28
   o BB: Gerald O’Collins, The Tripersonal God, 23-34

3. Tuesday, January 26—Lecture 2a: Method of NT Christology (Quest for the Historical Jesus)
   o Kereszty, p. 3-17 (Note that there are study questions on p. 502-503 from which objective questions on quizzes and examinations are drawn).
   o BB: Gotthold Lessing (ed. Placher, 101-103); Albert Schweitzer (ed. Placher, 152-53); and Rudolf Bultmann (ed. Placher, 170-174).
   o Due: Executive Summary 1 of Lessing, Schweitzer, and Bultmann. Lessing is usually identified with the so-called Old Quest for the historical Jesus, Schweitzer the famous transitional figure into the Second Quest, and Bultmann as the most famous representative of the Second Quest. Compare and contract them with regard to the following issues. First, they all in their own way deny the “historical Jesus” (a term first used by Schweitzer). How do Lessing and Schweitzer do this? Second, focus on Bultmann since he is most important. According to Bultmann, what kind of information
is recorded in the Gospels? Where does this information derive? What specifically is “demythologization”? According to Bultmann, what is the resurrection of Christ?

4. Thursday, January 28—Lecture 2b: Method of NT Christology (Historical Foundation of Faith in Christ)
   - Kereszty, p. 17-33
   - BB: ITC, “Selected Questions on Christology” (1979), 185-88 (pp. 189-223 is provided as suggested reading)
   - Due: Executive Summary 2 of ITC “Selected Questions on Christology.” In your summary of the arguments of the ITC, be sure to keep the following question in mind. According to the ITC, what is the relationship between the historical Jesus and the Jesus of faith (i.e., what is the relationship between history and the faith)? What is the value of historical research for the faith, and what is the value of the faith for historical research? What errors do they specifically want to avoid? What is the genre of the Gospels? What kind of “history” do they contain (i.e., a modern notion or something else)? What is the “Christological synthesis” that, according to the ITC, the NT achieves?

5. Tuesday, February 2—Lecture 3: Death and Resurrection
   - Bible: Mk 16:9-20 || Jn 21:1-23
   - Bible: 1Cor 15:3-5
   - Kereszty, p. 33-75

6. Thursday, February 4—Lecture 4: Beginning of the Gospel (Virginal Conception and Jesus’ Family)
   - Bible: Mt 1:18-2:23 || Lk 1:5-2:52
   - Due: Topic Statement for your Research Paper

7. Tuesday, February 9—Lecture 5: Jesus and the Kingdom
   - Kereszty, p. 98-153. Quiz 2

8. Thursday, February 11—Lecture 6: The Kingdom and Death of Jesus (The implicit soteriology and Christology of the historical Jesus)
   - Bible: Mt 16:21 || Mk 8:31 || Lk 9:22 (see also Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33f; Lk 11:46-47; 13:33)
   - Bible: Mk 14:57ff || Mt 26:60ff || Jn 2:19ff (Narrative of the Temple’s Destruction)
   - Bible: Mt 26:26-29 || Lk 22:18-20 || Mk 14:17-25 || 1 Cor. 11:23-25 (Last Supper)

9. Tuesday, February 16—Lecture 7: Understanding the Mystery of Christ (the implicit and explicit ‘name-Christology’ of the NT tradition)
   - Kereszty, p. 154-175
10. Thursday, February 18—Lecture 7 (cont.): Understanding the Mystery of Christ (the implicit and explicit ‘name-Christology’ of the NT tradition)
   o Bible: Phil. 2:6-11
   o Kereszty, p. 176-193

  Part Two: Christology of the Early Church

11. Tuesday, February 23—Introduction to Patristic Christology
   o Kereszty, p. 197-229. **Quiz 3 over p. 197-229.**
   o Kereszty, 230-235

12. Thursday, February 25—Christology of the Apostolic Fathers: Irenaeus of Lyon
   o Norris, 1-12 (Intro); 49-60 (Irenaeus of Lyons).
   o Suggested Reading—BB: Tapia, 13-18
   o **Due: Executive Summary 3 of Irenaeus of Lyons (Norris, 49-60).** In our selected reading, Irenaeus is developing his Christology in a polemic against various heresies (for our purposes focus on his polemic against Docetism and Adoptionism). For this summary, strive for a clear, analytical presentation. For example, rather than simply conflate various information into a paragraph (all of which may be true per se) try to distinguish the various arguments. Also, identify key statements or phrases in the reading to support your analysis. When writing your summary you may consider the following. How does he describe Adoptionism and Docetism? How specifically are they contrary to the faith? With what arguments (soteriological, biblical, and moral) does he combat these heresies? With regard to the soteriological arguments, the heretical dualism or their denial of flesh (sarf) destroys human salvation? How specifically? How does Irenaeus’ view of salvation history (oikonomia) and his recapitulation theory necessitates the unity of Christ and the Logos (“Christ, one and the same”).

13. Tuesday, March 1—Latin Christology in the 3rd Century: Tertullian
   o Kereszty, 240-243
   o BB: Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrine*, 149-161. **Quiz 4**
   o Norris, 12-17 (Intro), 61-72 (Tertullian).
   o Suggested Reading—BB: Tapia, 80-82, 82-88.
   o **Due: Executive Summary 4 of Tertullian (Norris, 61-72).** Tertullian is the first Latin theologian to use key terms like “person,” “substance,” and “nature” in Christology. The question he asks is explicit to our assignment: “How did the Word become flesh?” You will also need to consider how, according to Tertullian, the Word did not become flesh. During the class discussion, we will need to determine whether Tertullian’s Christology leans more to a unitive emphasis or a divisive one. In *On the Flesh of Christ* (against a famous Gnostic heretic, Marcion), Tertullian discusses whether the incarnation was impossible or unsuitable. How does he respond?

14. Thursday, March 3—Greek Christology in the 3rd Century: Origen
   o Norris, 73-81 (Origen)
   o Suggestion Reading—O’Collins, 151-83; Tapia, 48-56; 56-63.
Due: Executive Summary 5 of Origen (Norris, 73-81). Discuss Origen’s Christology with regard to the following issues: What exactly is unified? What kind of union is this? What is the result of such a union (or what kind of result does Origen intend to achieve)? Where does he locate the distinction? How does his view of the union allow him to uphold the impeccability of the incarnate Word? What is the strength and weaknesses of his Christology?

15. Tuesday, March 8—Review

16. Thursday, March 10—Mid-Term Examination

17. Tuesday, March 15—Introduction to Christology in the Early Church
   - Kerészty, 235-237
   - TBD

18. Thursday, March 17—Pre-Nicene Christology. Arians and St. Athanasius
   - Hardy, 329-34 (Arius & the Arians);
   - Suggested Reading: Hardy, 335-40 (Eusebius of Caesarea)
   - Norris, 83-101 (Athanasius); Hardy, 70-73, 95-98 (Athanasius)
   - Executive Summary 6 on Athanasius (tr. Norris, 83-101). For this short summary answer the following questions: 1) Where is his emphasis? On the unity or the distinction in Christ? 2) Does Athanasius find a place for the human rational soul in Christ? 3) How does he deal with Christ’s human weaknesses, i.e., both his physical and psychological, e.g., hunger and ignorance?

Monday, March 21—Saturday, March 26: Spring Break

   - Due: Properly Formatted, Annotated Bibliography for Research Paper (that is, for each entry statement a brief rationale on why this book is listed on your bibliography).

   - Kerészty, 237-239; 243-256 (Quiz 5 over 243-256)
   - Norris, 103-11 (Apollinarius); Hardy, 343-45 (Synodical Letter of the Council of Constantinople, 382); Hardy, 215-232 (Gregory of Nazianzus).
   - Suggested reading: Hardy, 231 (Letter to Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople)
   - Executive Summary 7 on Apollinarius and Gregory of Nazianzus. Rather than a linear summary of the reading, compare and contrast the Christologies of Apollinarius and Gregory based on their understanding of the union and distinction in Christ. A union and distinction of what? What kind of union? What are their key formulas?

21. Tuesday, April 5—Cyril of Alexandria, Nestorius, and the Council of Ephesus, 431
   - Nestorius (Norris, 123-131; Hardy, 346-348)
   - Cyril of Alexandria (Hardy, 349-54; Norris, 131-135)
   - Executive Summary 8 on Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria. Rather than a linear summary of the reading, compare and contrast the Christologies of Nestorius and Cyril
based on their understanding of the union and distinction in Christ. A union and distinction of what? What kind of union? What are their key formulas?

- **DUE: Thesis Statement**

22. **Tuesday, April 7**—Monophysitism, Pope Leo the Great, and the Council of Chalcedon, 451
   - Formula of Union, 433 (Hardy, 355-58)
   - Lecture on Eutyches and the Monophysite tradition.
   - Pope Leo, *The Tome of Leo* (Hardy, 359-370)—I will cover key statements in class
   - Council of Chalcedon, 451 (Hardy, 371-374)

23. **Thursday, April 12**—Council of Constantinople II (553) & III (680-81)
   - Kereszty, 256-262 (*Quiz 6*)
   - Lecture on Post-Chalcedonian Christology
   - Councils of Constantinople II, 553 (Hardy, 377-381)
   - Councils of Constantinople III, 680-81 (Hardy, 382-85)

24. **Tuesday, April 14**—Theory of the Atonement: Gregory of Nyssa and Anselm of Canterbury
   - Gregory of Nyssa, *An Address on Religious Instruction* 20-26 (Hardy, 296-304)
   - Anselm of Canterbury, *Meditation on Human Redemption* (Blackboard)
   - **DUE: Executive Summary 9 on Atonement Theories**—All Christians profess by faith that the Christ “died for our sins,” and indeed, as we noted at the beginning of the semester, Jesus would have likely applied the Suffering Servant motif to his own death and thereby would have intended his death to be a benefit for others. However, there has never been a solemn definition of how Christ’s death has atoned for human sin. The Christian tradition will know of several theories two of which is important for our purposes: the Ransom Theory (defended by Gregory) and the Debt-Satisfaction Theory (defended by Anselm). The readings are short and the idea rather simple. Try to formulate in writing a comparison between the two doctrines. Note that in Anselm’s *Meditation* he is highly critical of the Ransom Theory. Why?
   - **DUE: At least three supporting arguments for your [revised] thesis statement**

25. **Thursday, April 19**—Peter Lombard and the Three Views of the Hypostatic Union
   - Kereszty, 263-278 (*Quiz 7*)
   - Add Book Chapter.
   - Peter Lombard, *Sent.* 3.6-7 (Blackboard)

26. **Tuesday, April 21**—Christology in the Post-Lombardian Period
   - Selected readings from Simon of Tournai and Prepositinus (Blackboard)
   - **DUE: Executive Summary 10-11 on the three views of the hypostatic union.** Based on a careful reading of Peter Lombard, Simon of Tournai, and Prepositinus, write a description of the three views of the hypostatic union: the Homo-Assumptus Theory, the Subsistence Theory, and the Habitus Theory. Try to decipher what the views have in common and especially what are their differences. Remember also to focus on key statements and phrases
     Peter Lombard (d. 1160) published his *Sentences* ca. 1156/7, and his description of the three theories or opinions of the Hypostatic Union in Book 3, Distinctions 6-7 will become the cornerstone of all future treatment. Today these models are called the Homo
Assumptus Theory (III.6.2.1-9; III.7.1.1-3), the Subsistence Theory (III.3.1-6; III.7.1.4-15), and the Habitus Theory (III.6.4-6; III.7.16-17). \(^2\) Also important for distinguishing these views is the statement in distinction two “a common species is not predicated of Christ” (in Domino Iesu Christo non est communem speciem accipere), \(^3\) the treatment in distinction ten on whether “Christ as man is something” (Christus secundum homo est aliquid), the treatment in distinctions 11 and 12 on whether Christ is a creature or whether he had a beginning, \(^4\) and the discussion in distinction twenty-two on whether Christ is a man in the grave.

Simon of Tournai flourished in the 1160’s and 1170’s as a very famous magister in Paris. His Institutiones in sacram paginem was written in the early 1160’s, and he provides us one of the earliest summa’s that relies extensively on Peter Lombard’s Sentences. While Simon was writing this, the Habitus Theory found widespread support (at least until its condemnation in 1173), and proponents of the Homo-Assumptus Theory were the fiercest critics (Robert of Melun labeled it “heretical” in the late 1150’s). Simon, who supports the Subsistence Theory, agrees with the criticisms of the Habitus Theory proposed by proponents of the Homo-Assumptus Theory, but he was also adamantly opposed the Homo-Assumptus Theory (he thinks it is heretical). Using the constitutive features of the Subsistence Theory, Simon very subtly navigates between the two competing theories and offers solutions that avoid their pitfalls. Thanks in part to Simon, the Subsistence Theory will become the dominate theory in the late 12\(^{th}\) century and the only acceptable theory in the 13th century. Prepositinus, writing some 30/40 years after Simon and whose importance cannot be stressed enough, supports the Subsistence Theory and adds greater clarity to it, specifically by making clear key terms like “substance” and “nature” that are used somewhat confusingly in the mid-12\(^{th}\) century.

27. Tuesday, April 26—Thomas Aquinas, ST IIIa.2, 3 (Blackboard)


Friday, April 29—DUE Final Paper

29. Final Exam—TBD (Please bring two bluebooks and a pencil).

---

\(^2\) See Sent. III.6-7 (SB 5, 49-66). The three views as described by Peter Lombard have been examined by Lauge Olaf Nielsen, Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 246-64. He also provides excellent treatments of and bibliography for Gilbert of Poitiers, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Abelard and his school, and Peter Lombard and his school. See also N. Håring, “The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée Bishop of Poitiers,” Mediaeval Studies 13 (1951), 26-39; W. Principe, William of Auxerre’s Theology of the Hypostatic Union, (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1963), 64-70; M. Colish, Peter Lombard (Leiden, Brill, 1994), 1.399-438.

\(^3\) See Sent. III.2.13 (SB 5, 28).

\(^4\) E.g., Sent. III.11.1 (SB 5, 77-78) and III.12.1 (SB 5, 80-81).