

Marcellus of Ancyra and the Arian Controversy:  
A Bishop in Context

Sara D.E. Parvis

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
University of Edinburgh  
2002



This is to confirm that I, Sara Dudley Edwards Parvis, have composed this thesis. It is my own work, and no part of it has been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.



## ABSTRACT

# Marcellus of Ancyra and the Arian Controversy: A Bishop in Context

Sara D.E. Parvis

The 1980s saw an explosion of scholarly work on the 'Arian controversy', which sought to rethink the categories of the controversy *ab initio*. Building on this, a number of figures connected with the controversy came in for individual study in the 1990s, including the bishop Marcellus of Ancyra, who was the subject of a number of books and articles in that decade, nearly all of which concentrated on his theology and touched his place in the historical events of the wider controversy only tangentially. This thesis attempts to situate Marcellus in relation to the major ecclesiastical events of the controversy between 314 and 345, arguing that attention to his role gives a better picture of how the 'anti-Arian' party in particular understood itself during these years. Marcellus' skills as administrator and canonist, displayed in the 314 Synod of Ancyra, over which he presided, form the background to the portrait of him that emerges. His roles before and during the synod of Nicaea, before, during and after the synods of Tyre and Jerusalem, in Rome for fifteen months during the years 339-341, and at the synod of Sardica are examined, and furnish a number of new suggestions for ways to understand these events. The synod of Ancyra which was moved by Constantine to Nicaea, it is suggested, was not originally called by the emperor, but by Alexander and his allies, with the express purpose of condemning Eusebius of Nicomedia and his allies, with Marcellus as the intended president. Gerhard Feige's view that Marcellus was doubtless, like Eustathius of Antioch, unhappy with the actual synod of Nicaea, and contrary to popular assumption had little to do with the writing of the creed (which he did not even personally sign), is endorsed, although Marcellus' greater involvement in the writing of the canons is suggested. The synod of Tyre is shown by careful examination of the various accounts of it, particularly that of Eusebius of Caesarea, to have been a travesty, a view which builds on Girardet's analysis of its views of its own authority in relation to the canonical traditions of the time. Marcellus' role in the creation of the myth of 'Arianism' is examined, a myth which is shown to have taken its characteristic form in Rome during the period he and Athanasius spent there together. Marcellus is argued to be the author of the 'Western Creed of Sardica', as Klaus Seibt suggested, which was provisionally accepted by Ossius and Protogenes and the groups they headed as the faith of the synod, but referred in the face of Athanasius' opposition to Julius of Rome, who vetoed it in favour of privileging the 'ecumenical' creed of Nicaea. Marcellus' silence after Sardica is ascribed to his refusal to desert his former pupil Photinus, while recognising that he was generally considered theologically intolerable even by Marcellus' own allies. Works after that synod which are sometimes ascribed to Marcellus are therefore to be ascribed either to his school, to the continuing Eustathians at Antioch, or to some other group. The Canons of Ancyra 314, the *Contra Asterium* (not appropriately named *Opus ad Constantinum Imperatorem*, since it was not originally written for the emperor), the *Letter to Julius* and *De Sancta Ecclesia*, as well as the Western Creed of Sardica, are argued on the other hand to be either wholly or mainly by Marcellus. Following the line taken by Martin Tetz and Joseph Lienhard, Marcellus is argued never to have been dropped by his former allies as such, merely himself to have withdrawn from communion with them on account of his loyalty to Photinus; the creed of Eugenius the Deacon was a formula which allowed those in communion with Marcellus to repudiate Photinus without Marcellus himself having to do so.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my warmest thanks to all those who have supported me in various ways over the past four years while I have been writing this thesis, particularly the following: my supervisors, Professor David F. Wright and Professor John S. Richardson; Dr Jane Dawson, Professor Stewart J. Brown, Dr Denis Minns O.P. and Professor Maurice Wiles; Bonnie Dudley Edwards, Owen Dudley Edwards and Betty Lee; my inspirational siblings, Dr Leila Prescott and Dr Michael Edwards; and my husband Paul. I would also like to thank the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Edinburgh, for their financial support, and the staff of the libraries of New College, Edinburgh; the Bodleian, Oxford; Eberhard Karls University, Tübingen; and the Evangelisches Stift, Tübingen. My thanks are also due to Alexandra Riebe for lending me her own copy of her M.A. thesis.

Most of the translations are my own, but I have also made use of the following, sometimes with alterations: L.R. Wickham for Hilary's *Fragmenta Historica*, J.H. Newman for Athanasius and NPNF for Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, the Dominican Sisters of Newcastle, Natal, and my husband Paul.

# Marcellus of Ancyra and the Arian Controversy: A Bishop in Context

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgements  | i   |
| Contents  | ii  |
| Abbreviations   | iv  |
| Introduction  | 1   |
| 1. The Ancyran Synod of 314                                   | 11  |
| The Convoking of the Synod                                    | 13  |
| Previous synods in Asia Minor                                 | 18  |
| The emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Ancyra             | 24  |
| The canons  | 29  |
| The transmission of the canons of Ancyra                      | 47  |
| 2. The Road to Nicaea   | 52  |
| <i>Hoi Peri Eusebion</i>                                      | 52  |
| Alexander and Friends   | 76  |
| The Road to Nicaea  | 97  |
| The Synods of Antioch and Nicaea                              | 117 |
| 3. From Nicaea to the Death of Constantine                    | 135 |
| Marcellus and the deposition of Eustathius                    | 140 |
| The writing of the <i>Contra Asterium</i>                     | 153 |
| The Synod of Tyre   | 159 |
| The Synod of Constantinople                                   | 164 |
| Conclusion  | 172 |
| 4. From the Exiles' Return to the Dedication Synod of Antioch | 177 |
| The Exiles' Return  | 177 |
| The events of 337-341   | 197 |
| The Dedication Synod of Antioch                               | 219 |
| Conclusion  | 239 |
| 5. Rome and Sardica   | 240 |
| Marcellus and Athanasius in Rome                              | 241 |
| The Synod of Rome   | 258 |
| The Road to Sardica   | 270 |
| Sardica and after   | 283 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Conclusion   | 333 |
| Appendices   |     |
| 1. The order of the fragments of the <i>Contra Asterium</i>              | 338 |
| 2. Marcellus' <i>Contra Asterium</i> : A translation of<br>the fragments | 386 |
| 3. The deposition of Eustathius of Antioch                               | 408 |
| Bibliography   | 435 |

## Abbreviations

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <i>AW</i>    | <i>Athanasius Werke</i>   |
| <i>EOMIA</i> | <i>Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima</i> ,<br>ed. C.H. Turner                         |
| <i>FH</i>    | Hilary, <i>Fragmenta Historica</i> , ed. A. Feder (= CSEL 65)   |
| <i>GS</i>    | <i>Gesammelte Schriften</i> (E. Schwartz)   |
| <i>PNN</i>   | <i>Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina</i>   |
| <i>Urk</i>   | <i>Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites</i> ,<br>ed. Hans-Georg Opitz (= <i>AW</i> III.1-2) |

## Introduction

As recently as 1992, Alexandra Riebe, reviewing literature on Marcellus of Ancyra, could lament, ‘The most recent monograph on Marcellus dates from 1940, and the only other one extant in what could be called modern scholarship dates from 1867.’<sup>1</sup> Ten years later, the situation is quite otherwise: following the explosion of scholarship on the Arian controversy in general in the 1980s, the 1990s saw a number of studies on individuals connected with that struggle, including no fewer than three monographs on the bishop of Ancyra, together with new editions of his three most securely attributed works, and a number of articles.<sup>2</sup>

Marcellus had by no means been neglected in the past, at least in German scholarship, however. Theodore Zahn made a compelling case in 1867 for seeing Marcellus as one of the most impressive and original thinkers of the fourth century, and the German critical tradition has never lost sight of that view: the great proponents of *Dogmengeschichte* in the late nineteenth and very early twentieth centuries, Adolf von Harnack and Friedrich Loofs, both gave Marcellus a central role in their accounts of fourth-century theology along the lines Zahn had suggested, as a heroically ‘biblical’ theologian in a century of theology driven by an unhealthy interest in philosophy, and a welcome heir of Irenaeus at a period wedded to the thought of Origen. Wolfgang Gericke in 1940 to some extent took his distance from such a view (Joseph Lienhard points out that he is in effect more interested in Loofs’ thought than in Marcellus’), arguing that Marcellus was a ‘biblicist’ only in the sense that he read his own ideas into scripture.

Marcellus found a new champion, however, in Martin Tetz, who from 1964 onwards published a series of major articles on Marcellus, defending his orthodoxy

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexandra Riebe, ‘Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research’, MA Dissertation (Durham, 1992), p. vii.

against the likes of Manlio Simonetti and Marcel Richard (sometimes on distastefully sectarian grounds).<sup>3</sup> Tetz's articles were initially written to propose or support the ascription to Marcellus of various pseudo-Athanasian works, and are not without their flaws, but as a study of the theology and influence of Marcellus, they are full of insights and interest. Tetz considers such important questions as Marcellus' relationship to Theophronius of Tyana (the proponent of the Third Creed of Antioch), the embassy of Eugenius the deacon of Ancyra to Athanasius on behalf of Marcellus' followers in 371, and the text of the 'Western' Creed of Sardica.

Joseph Lienhard is an interesting case: an American Jesuit whose major work on Marcellus was done in Germany (a 1986 dissertation at Freiburg im Breisgau), developed in a series of articles over the next fifteen years, and finally published in 1999. Lienhard's approach to Marcellus is both original and important. He analyses Marcellus' thought as part of a stream of 'one-hypostasis theology' (which sees Father, Son and Spirit as one hypostasis together), as against 'two-hypostasis' theology (which is really three-hypostasis theology), pointing out that one-hypostasis theology was far more widespread in the fourth century than is often thought, and hence Marcellus far less isolated than is sometimes imagined. These categories are rather more important for the latter half of the controversy, I would argue, than for the former: Marcellus allied himself with the 'dyohypostate' Alexander at Nicaea, after all, and Alexander preferred the company of Eustathius and Marcellus to that of his fellow dyohypostates Eusebius of Caesarea and Paulinus of Tyre. Nonetheless, Lienhard's work is a real breakthrough in rethinking the categories of the controversy.

---

<sup>2</sup> The publication details of all works cited in passing in this introduction will be found in the Bibliography.

<sup>3</sup> M. Tetz, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I: Eine markellische Schrift De incarnatione et contra Arianos', ZKG 75 (1964), 217-70, at pp. 254-5.

Gerhard Feige's 1987 Erfurt thesis (published in 1991) approached Marcellus from the point of view of his opponents, which had the unfortunate effect that all Feige's work tends (often unconsciously) to view Marcellus more or less as a heretic. Feige's thorough study of Marcellus in the presentation of Eusebius of Caesarea is rather more interesting for what it tells us of Eusebius than for what it tells about Marcellus. His 1992 article on Nicaea, however, makes some useful points on Marcellus' involvement, or lack of it, in the constructing of the Nicene creed, and particularly on the history of interpretation of the word 'homoousios'.

Klaus Seibt, in a 1992 Tübingen doctoral thesis published in a slightly different form in 1994, has produced the most major recent work on Marcellus. Seibt's central thesis, that Marcellus was as much of a 'Reichstheologe' in his own way as Eusebius of Caesarea, is more interesting than persuasive, but it draws attention to an interesting parallel between the theological language of Marcellus and that of Constantine, showing that Constantine at Nicaea could use the words *dynamis* and *energeia* to describe the Son's potential existence in the Father before he was actualised. Seibt's claim that Marcellus introduced these words and the words 'monas' and 'trias' into his (essentially biblical) theology in order to please Constantine convinced none of his reviewers, so far as I am aware, but the parallels he has drawn cannot be ignored. Nonetheless, it should be noted that Marcellus' use of δύναμις and ἐνέργεια represents a rather different understanding of the words than that which Eusebius claims was proposed by Constantine at Nicaea: the latter approximates to 'potential' and 'actual', whereas Marcellus uses the words in the medical sense of an organ or faculty displaying its powers in activity.<sup>4</sup>

Seibt's major contribution to Marcellan scholarship, however, besides an exhaustive study of Marcellan scholarship up to the time of his thesis, was the reordering of the fragments of the *Contra Asterium* (Seibt calls it the *Opus ad*



*Constantinum Imperatorem*, which I will argue the work was not) from Rettburg's arbitrary 1794 order (refined and republished by Klostermann (2<sup>nd</sup> edn, 1972)) to an order based on the indications given in the works of Eusebius of Caesarea and Acacius of Caesarea which contain them. This gives us a far better view of the overall scope of the work. (I have been able to improve on Seibt's ordering still further, by comparing Eusebius' linking phrases with the linking phrases he uses in his works of biblical exegesis, as will be shown in the appendices.)

The most recent German to work on Marcellus has been Markus Vinzent (now teaching in England). Vinzent's original interest in Marcellus derived from his own work on Asterius the Sophist, which means his primary focus is on the theology Marcellus is combating. His major contribution to the field has been to re-edit the fragments of Marcellus' book against Asterius (which he refrains from naming) in Klaus Seibt's order, together with the text of the Letter to Julius given in Epiphanius' *Panarion*, to which he gives its full due as a complete separate work (Klostermann lists it among the fragments).

From this brief sketch it may be seen that Marcellus (perhaps above all thanks to Theodore Zahn) has generally been seen as a mainstream figure in German scholarship, if sometimes an isolated one. His theological idiosyncrasies have been forgiven him for his many virtues, above all his 'biblicism' and his preservation of the 'healthy' theology of Irenaeus. Even Klaus Seibt's thesis is largely trying to preserve Marcellus' status as a biblicist, who merely used philosophical terms in communicating with Constantine as a language the latter could understand.

With Anglophone scholarship it is otherwise. Of the three long studies devoted to Marcellus in English, one (Lienhard's) was originally written in Germany (and has therefore been treated as part of the German scholarly tradition, with which it

---

<sup>4</sup> See M.F. Wiles, 'Person or Personification? A Patristic Debate about Logos', in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament, Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*, ed. L.D.

primarily engages) and one by a German (Alexandra Riebe); the remaining unpublished PhD thesis (M.J. Dowling's), while it has some important observations to make on Marcellus' theology and on the pseudo-Athanasian works ascribed to Marcellus, largely concludes he is a heretic. There is no published English translation of the fragments (or of the two Eusebian works which contain most of them, for that matter).

When we turn to more general studies of the Arian controversy, the picture is no brighter. J.H. Newman rejoiced that the friend of his own hero Athanasius, whom Athanasius so often defended and with whom he had shared so much, seemed at the end of his life (divinely prolonged for this very reason, perhaps) to have repented of his heretical notions and been reconciled to the great Alexandrian, but he has no doubt that Marcellus was a heretic for most of his life. H.M. Gwatkin calls him half heathen and accuses him of lacking the most basic knowledge of the Bible.<sup>5</sup> J.N.D. Kelly (whose *Early Christian Doctrines*, first published in 1958, is still so generally employed by Anglophone scholars as a primer for aspects of patristic theology) counts him as an extremist from whom ordinary moderate bishops shied away in fear, a view which R.P.C. Hanson reproduces almost exactly. For L.W. Barnard he is an 'arch-trimmer',<sup>6</sup> for T.D. Barnes a 'pathetic figure.'<sup>7</sup> The only notable exceptions to this generally negative Anglophone view of Marcellus are one article of Maurice Wiles' in 1987 and several by Alastair H.B. Logan since.

The reason for this enormous difference in Marcellus' standing in German and in Anglophone scholarship is largely ideological. German scholarship, ever Hegelian,

---

Hurst and N.T. Wright (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 281-9, at p. 288, note 41.

<sup>5</sup> 'The speculations of Alexandrian theology were hardly better appreciated by the Celts of Asia than is the stately churchmanship of England by the Celts of Wales': Henry Melvill Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism, Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction Which Followed the Council of Nicaea* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900), p. 80. The quotation appears on p. 76 of the first edition (1882).

<sup>6</sup> L.W. Barnard, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Eusebians', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 25 (1980), 63-76, at p. 64.

has tended to see the ‘Arian controversy’ (like everything else) in terms of two opposing forces: biblical and philosophical (or biblical and Origenist), Alexandrian and Antiochene, Church and State. Marcellus’ definite, uncompromising views come out well against such a background, and his idiosyncrasy is a positive advantage. Anglophone scholarship, meanwhile, particularly Anglican scholarship, has tended to look for a *via media* and imagine a large collection of moderates caught between two extremes, whose greatest concern is to avoid contact with the politically and theologically vulgar views and behaviour at either end of the spectrum. Perhaps I would take the ‘Anglican’ view of the latter part of the controversy; for the part with which this thesis is concerned (314-345), and particularly on the subject of Marcellus, it should already be clear that I am on the side of the Germans. One of the central aims of this thesis will be to show that there was no ‘middle ground’ of moderate Eastern bishops who voted one way at Nicaea to avoid the extremes of Arius, and another way at the Dedication synod and Sardica to avoid the extremes of Marcellus, pausing only to depose Eustathius for extreme Sabellianism and Athanasius for conduct unbecoming a gentleman. Instead, there were two quite separate groups and their allies, one considerably larger than the other, who outmanoeuvred each other at different stages; Athanasius and Marcellus and their supporters were not, between 323 and 345, in the smaller group.

This thesis does not attempt to fill the large gap between German and English-speaking appreciations of Marcellus’ theology (which would be much less large if only Maurice Dowling and Alexandra Riebe would publish their dissertations, as Lienhard has done). Rather, it takes some such picture of Marcellus’ theology as Zahn’s for granted (in a slightly more Catholic mode, perhaps), and attempts to investigate his role in the events between 314 and 345. The *via media* ideology of so much Anglophone scholarship has meant, in my view, that the years between

---

<sup>7</sup> Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius, Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 93.

326 and 345, in which Marcellus' role was so crucial, are precisely the least studied and the most misunderstood of the controversy in English-speaking scholarship. Even the extremely fruitful rethinking of the categories of the Arian controversy in the 1980s, largely (though by no means entirely) led by the English-speaking world, passed this period almost completely by, turning from a rethinking of the theology of Arius and the 'early Arians' up to the time of Nicaea to a rethinking of the theology of the 'neo-Arians' after the mid 350s. For this reason, even the important studies of individuals in the controversy of the 1990s and beyond (T.D. Barnes' *Athanasius*, Joseph Lienhard's *Contra Marcellum*, Richard Vaggione's *Eunomius of Cyzicus*) concentrate on fairness towards the 'Arian' side, without rethinking the categories on the 'Nicene' side other than in political terms.<sup>8</sup> Hanson, the author of the major recent study of the controversy in English, virtually admits his lack of understanding of the portion of the controversy with which this thesis deals: he calls the years from 326 to 361 a 'period of confusion', and devotes to the twenty-three years from 326 to 349 (more than a third of the controversy as he dates it) a mere 106 pages out of 875, claiming, 'If there was any controversy from 330 to 341, it was a controversy about the behaviour of Athanasius in his see of Alexandria,' and 'There was a long period of confusion and uncertainty from 341 to 357 when it was far from clear what the controversy was about, if there was a controversy.'<sup>9</sup>

That there was a controversy taking place during these years is the contention of this thesis, which seeks to document its ebb and flow (particularly as regards Marcellus) closely. What the controversy was about theologically, as far as the author of this thesis is concerned, will be sketched here, by way of background to

---

<sup>8</sup> Joseph Lienhard, who so impressively rethinks the theological categories of the later controversy, is not an exception here: his 'mihypostatic' versus 'dyohypostatic' categories, important though they are, do not make sense of the earliest part of the controversy -- nor of the fact that Athanasius thinks the two categories reconcilable against a third, 'Arian' party.

<sup>9</sup> R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God, The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), p. xviii.

the positions that will be taken up in greater detail in the course of discussing the historical events.

The first twenty years of the fourth century saw a widespread controversy in the East over the teachings of Origen, which became eventually most focused of all within Origenist circles themselves, to the extent that by the time of Nicaea, the Origenist Alexander saw himself as having more in common with the anti-Origenist Eustathius of Antioch than with his fellow Origenists Eusebius of Caesarea and Asterius. The one issue above all which had come to divide the Origenists was the eternity or coming to be in or before time of the Word, in effect a code for two entirely different views of the way God related to the world, against the background of a general agreement that God the Father was now unreachably distant. This radical two-way theological divide held until the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, the brilliant leader of the 'coming to be before time' party, in 341; the political divide he had been so instrumental in creating continued another twenty years, but both parties involved fragmented among themselves in the early forties along theological lines, distancing themselves from former allies. By the late 350s, there were a myriad of theological views in the East, many evolved in attempting to make sense of the political divisions that were already there, while the conquest of the West by Constantius meant that most theological thinkers of the West were forced to draw abreast of thirty years of Eastern ecclesiastical history overnight. There were now no longer two different views; the difficulty, between the web of political and theological allegiances and enmities which had been built up, was to find two views that were the same. Nonetheless, the great theological divide had been once more closed up: God was reachable, knowable again to the new generation of theologians of the 360s. The rest of the controversy was a process of working out who would put up with what, theologically, politically and in terms of personal allegiance, as a basis for bringing the church back to some kind of unity. That unity was less easily, less completely, and less early achieved than is sometimes thought (Constantinople 381 was not a particularly representative

synod), but it was achieved eventually, to a considerable extent as a legacy of the theology (a widely appealing mix of Origenism and Logos/sarx Christology), the prestige (as leader over many years of the powerful Egyptian Christian population, and as the resister of and sufferer from 'Arian' emperors), the historiography (brilliantly coherent and persuasive) and the ecumenism (he died reconciled with nearly all of his former enemies) of Athanasius of Alexandria.

The so-called 'Arian controversy' is the only widespread theological controversy that the Church as a whole has ever actually resolved. Prior to the fourth century, theological controversies (for example the late third-century Origenist controversy) were so far as we know local; after the Christological controversies of the fifth century, considerable portions of the Church which still exist (the Nestorians, the monophysites) were left outside the agreed pale, divisions to which the passing centuries have added many more. But no group which refused to sign up to Nicaea (that is, Nicaea as reinterpreted by Constantinople 381) has survived to modern times. Although the dispute at the time was long and bitterly fought, and by the late fourth century had produced so many splinter groups and differently nuanced views that it might well be imagined they would never come together again, they largely did; well after 381, in many cases, but on the whole within a couple more generations.

This is one among many factors which makes it a perennially interesting subject of study. Another, of course, is the sheer complexity of the issues involved: theology, philosophy, canon law, the changing nature of the Church after the 'Constantinian turning-point', and of course all the background questions of the changing nature of Roman government, law, society, cities, identity and allegiance, as well as a great deal of politics, both ecclesiastical and civil. The Arian controversy to a large degree dominated the fourth-century ecclesiastical landscape, at least in the cities: by the end of the reign of Constantius most large cities in the East had two or three congregations not in communion with one another. It was a period when people



were constantly forced to take sides, whether they wanted to or not; first the major bishops and the intellectuals, then their congregations and those of the smaller cities. It was probably one of the major causes of the growth of monasticism; long before it was over, most of the parties concerned were heartily sick of it.

It will be observed that I have retained the title 'Arian controversy', despite the criticism it has come under in recent years. This is not because I believe in a group called 'Arians' (other than perhaps in the very restricted sense of Arius' original allies in Alexandria and their congregations), but because it seems to me that both sides in a sense chose Arius as their shibboleth, not once but several times. Eusebius and his friends chose to unite behind him at first, using him as a stick with which to beat Alexander, and then to abandon him and their theology together to be labelled heretical at Nicaea. Marcellus chose deposition and exile at Jerusalem rather than accept Arius' theology as orthodox; the Eusebians used Arius as a tool to procure Marcellus' condemnation, and to attempt to procure that of Alexander of Byzantium, now Constantinople. Arius's ignominious death rendered him an embarrassment to his own party, and a powerful weapon in the hands of their enemies. Thereafter the controversy was to a great extent the attempt of one group to make the name stick on their opponents, and of those who had been stuck with it to escape it. From first to last, it was a controversy over the person and name of Arius.

## CHAPTER ONE

### The Ancyran Synod of 314

Marcellus enters the fourth-century stage at the Synod of Ancyra, generally agreed to have taken place in the Eastertide of 314.<sup>1</sup> This is also his only appearance in the contemporary literature unconnected with any overt controversy, and the canons of this synod provide us with the only work so far to be ascribed to him which is pastoral rather than doctrinal. For the picture it gives us, therefore, of Marcellus' earliest known concerns, before the onslaught of the Nicene and post-Nicene campaigns, this synod's importance cannot be too highly regarded.

Despite this, its importance for an understanding of Marcellus' character and pastoral aims has been very much disregarded in scholarly discussion over the past century and a half, partly because nearly all Marcellus' commentators are more interested in his theology than the details of his life, and partly because his presidency at the synod of Ancyra was only recently defended in full detail. For Zahn, Marcellus' first modern defender, writing in 1867, the synod serves only as the first example of the later church's injustices against him, since his name has been replaced by Vitalis' as president.<sup>2</sup> Gericke, author of the next major work on Marcellus (in 1940), also asserts the probability of Marcellus' having presided without particularly arguing the case, but does make two additional points about the synod's bishop-list, both in line with his book's general argument: that it shows Marcellus' importance, and that it shows the close theological links between Antioch and Asia Minor at large.<sup>3</sup> Klaus Seibt relegates the synod to two lines and a very general footnote in his Marcellan chronology.<sup>4</sup> Nor do the authors of the various articles and theses on Marcellus

---

<sup>1</sup> See K.-J. Hefele and H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles I* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1907), pp. 298-9 and note 50 for the usual arguments, which there seems no serious reason to doubt.

<sup>2</sup> Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra*, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>4</sup> Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, pp. 10-11.



show any more interest in the synod, although some commentators (Hanson, Logan)<sup>5</sup> do assume his presidency of it.

I hope to show in this chapter, nonetheless, that the synod of Ancyra was one of the most important events in Marcellus's career. As ever in this period, there is less information about the synod than we would like. We do not know whether anyone (the bishop of Ephesus, for example) was invited to the synod but failed to appear. We have no details of the debates behind the canons, or of exactly who proposed which matter for discussion.<sup>6</sup> We have no access to what the relations between the various bishops present were: did the hostility that Marcellus and Narcissus of Neronias were to display towards one another in the Nicene controversy already exist, for example, or did it even begin with this synod? And why was Narcissus, not a metropolitan, there at all -- was he at this stage an associate of Vitalis of Antioch's, or Lupus of Tarsus', perhaps? We do not know, as we do for the councils of Iliberris and Arles,<sup>7</sup> whether there were presbyters and lay-people present, or whether each bishop was accompanied by a deacon acting as secretary. But there is considerable information to be gleaned from the evidence we do have, about the synod in general and about Marcellus' role in it in particular.

I think it is possible to establish that Marcellus himself chose whom to invite to the synod; possible to establish also (despite some evidence to the contrary) that Marcellus presided over it. I would claim in addition that the legislative function of the synod was uppermost in Marcellus' mind when he convoked it, and for a particular reason. Finally, I claim that its legislation is unusually

---

<sup>5</sup> Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, p. 217; Logan, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325: Ancyra, Antioch, Nicaea', *JTS* ns 43 (1992), 428-46, at p. 433.

<sup>6</sup> As we do for later synods, such as Serdica, Constantinople 394 and most of the African councils. See P.-P. Joannou, *Discipline Générale Antique* I.2, *Les canons des Synodes Particuliers*, Pontificia Commissione per la redazione del codice di diritto canonico orientale, *Fonti* 9 (Rome: Tipografia Italo-Orientale 'S. Nilo', 1962), pp. 156-9, 437-44 and Munier, *Concilia Africae*, *passim*.

<sup>7</sup> Victor C. De Clercq, *Ossius of Cordova, A Contribution to the History of the Constantinian Period*, *The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity* 13 (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954), pp. 107-9 and Munier, *Concilia Galliae*, pp. 15-22.

lenient, especially to women, and unusually systematic, in the course of which discussion it will be necessary to refute the view, first argued in 1938 and since widely accepted, that the last six canons of Ancyra in fact belong not to that synod but to one held in Caesarea in the same year, which Marcellus did not attend.

From this reading of the evidence emerges a Marcellus who is ambitious, far-sighted, intelligent and also humane; an able administrator, a capable legislator, a thoughtful pastor, and one who intended his own influence to be wide. It was.

### **1. The convoking of the synod.**

Eusebius of Caesarea tells us that after Maximinus's death in the summer of 313 and the letters of toleration and restoration of Christians sent to provincial governors of the East by Licinius, came to pass the sight for which all had longed: festivals of dedication in the cities and consecrations of the newly established oratories, comings-together of bishops, gatherings of those from foreign lands far off, thoughts of kindness of congregations for congregations, oneness of the members of the body of Christ as they came together in harmony.<sup>8</sup> He goes on to describe a speech he himself gave (as is usually assumed) at a large assembly for the dedication of the temple at Tyre, in honour of Paulinus, who had built or rebuilt it. Barnes dates this to 315, presumably to allow time for the building work.<sup>9</sup>

Eusebius' interest in the gatherings which were able to take place at this time is primarily liturgical, or so he would have it appear; he says nothing of the administrative, judicial or legislative sides of the episcopal gatherings as such, of regulations about *lapsi* or the other legislation recorded from this period. And yet the synod of Ancyra was presumably among the most important of

---

<sup>8</sup> Eusebius, *HE* X.3.1.

these gatherings. It may have been initially called, as the assembly at Tyre / Jerusalem was, to celebrate the consecration of a new or rebuilt church at Ancyra. If Marcellus had ulterior motives in doing so, this would not have been unusual.<sup>10</sup>

Eusebius gives us no details about the distance bishops were prepared to cover for these gatherings, or about the areas they represented. His picture suggests rather haphazard affairs, depending on chance and whim. This is misleading, perhaps deliberately so. In any case, an examination of the bishops present at Ancyra shows a scheme of invitation anything but haphazard. It covers the principal sees of virtually all of Asia Minor, as well as Cilicia and Syria Coele (but is not to be considered a general council of the Prefecture of the East, as some have thought).<sup>11</sup> The intended catchment area can be seen from the list of those who signed:<sup>12</sup>

1. Marcellus of Ancyra [Galatia, diocese of Pontica].
2. Agricolaus of Caesarea [Cappadocia, diocesan capital of Pontica].
3. Lupus of Tarsus [Cilicia, diocese of Oriens].
4. Vitalis of Antioch [Syria, diocesan capital of Oriens].
5. Basil of Amasia [(Dios)pontus, diocese of Pontica].
6. Philadelphus of Iuliopolis [Galatia, diocese of Pontica].
7. Eustolus of Nicomedia [Bithynia, imperial capital, diocese of Pontica].
8. Heraclius of Zela [(Dios)pontus, diocese of Pontica].

---

<sup>9</sup> Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 162. The favourable mention of Licinius, he argues, precludes a later date.

<sup>10</sup> The same was true, for example, of the synod Basil held at Ancyra in 358, ostensibly for the rededication of a church there, actually to forge a new alliance among the anti-Nicene moderates. (See Sozomen, *HE* IV.13.)

<sup>11</sup> E.g. Hefele and Leclercq (*Conciles*, I, p. 301). The mistake of assuming an equal weight of diocese of Oriens bishops to those from the two Asia Minor dioceses, Pontica and Asiana, comes from acceptance of the added names in the *Dionysia Hadriana* Ancyran list (see Turner, *EOMIA* II,1, p. 51), which have in fact simply been fished out of the list of episcopal names of the synod of Caesarea later the same year (for a discussion of this synod and the list of names, see below and Table 1 at the end of this chapter), and the assumption that, since this would give two bishops of Caesarea, one must therefore be from Palestinian Caesarea.

<sup>12</sup> For the five extant recensions of the Ancyran names (three Latin, two Syriac), see Table 1. The version given here is *Isidore vulgata* (*EOMIA* II,1, p. 50), which I will argue to be the most reliable witness to the original list.

9. Peter of Iconium [Pisidia, diocese of Asiana].
10. Nunechius of Laodicea [Phrygia, diocese of Asiana].
11. Sergianus of Pisidian Antioch [diocese of Asiana].
12. Epidaurus of Perge [Lycia et Pamphilia, diocese of Asiana].
13. Narcissus of Neronias [Cilicia, diocese of Oriens].

It is difficult to know what exactly was the state of the reorganisation of the Eastern provinces in 314, since we have only piecemeal evidence for which divisions were made by Diocletian, which by Licinius and which by Constantine.<sup>13</sup> Exactly how far the bishops of Asia Minor of 314 had caught up with such Diocletianic reorganisation of the provinces as there had been is not a settled question either, given the hostile relations that had subsisted between church and empire over the previous decade or so. The list itself would be useful evidence in addressing either of these questions; this discussion, however, will content itself with some general observations.

It cannot but be significant, first of all, that all the capital cities of the old third-century provinces of Asia Minor are represented in this list, with the exception of Ephesus: Ancyra of Galatia, Caesarea of Cappadocia, Nicomedia of Bithynia, Amasia of Pontus (whose existence as a province separate from Bithynia is attested before 284),<sup>14</sup> Perge of Lycia et Pamphilia, and Tarsus of Cilicia.<sup>15</sup> Three more of the cities in the list were traditionally important centres, and may also have been capitals in the late third century: Laodicea (possibly capital of a province of 'Phrygia et Caria' created in the 250s)<sup>16</sup>, Antioch (capital of Pisidia), and, interestingly, Iconium, second city of Pisidia, which was to become the

---

<sup>13</sup> See Timothy D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), chapters 12-13 for a general discussion of established facts about the Diocletianic rearrangement of the provinces.

<sup>14</sup> Barnes, *New Empire*, pp. 216, 223.

<sup>15</sup> If we deem Cilicia to be in Asia Minor, as seems to have been usual for these purposes (see the discussion of earlier synods of Asia Minor below).

<sup>16</sup> See Barnes, *New Empire*, p. 215.

capital of Lycaonia in the 370s (but seems to have been considered a metropolitan see much earlier).<sup>17</sup>

Three bishops may have come as *socii* instead of deacons or presbyters, being allowed to sign because of their episcopal rank: Philadelphus of Iuliopolis in Galatia, Heraclius of Zela in (Dios)pontus, and, most intriguingly of all, Narcissus of Neronias in Cilicia. The status of Vitalis of Syrian Antioch, the other metropolitan bishop in the list, often considered to have presided over the synod, will be discussed below.

An examination of this list shows clearly that it must have been Marcellus who invited these bishops, and Marcellus, rather than Vitalis, who presided over them. The selection is designed to present Ancyra as the centre and heart of Asia Minor. The coastal province of Asia, historically the richest and most important of the Roman Anatolian provinces, is sidelined, or has sidelined itself: for whatever reason, Ephesus, capital of the new, much smaller province of Proconsular Asia, is not even represented. Nicomedia and Syrian Antioch, the two great imperial capitals, are geographically at the fringes of the group, neither counting within its sphere of influence a majority of the bishops present, and both serving to balance one another's power. Caesarea, administrative capital of the diocese of Pontica in which Ancyra was situated, still counts a minority of represented sees in its territory: six, of which two are in Galatia itself. (The synod held at Caesarea itself shortly afterwards would include many more Syrian bishops, giving it a central position in its turn.)<sup>18</sup> The whole selection seems carefully chosen to place a city which was neither an imperial nor a diocesan capital in a position to mediate between and preside over three cities which were. Vitalis of Antioch would have been in no real position to preside over this group, most of whom must have known each other far better than they knew him. Eustolus of Nicomedia, in particular, is likely to have held his own see to be of quite as much importance as that of Antioch.

---

<sup>17</sup> A third-century synod took place there, and its bishop attended the synods of Antioch of the 250s and 60s. See below for discussion of these.

The manuscript evidence, I would argue, although it seems to support Vitalis' presiding, is better explained in Marcellus' favour.<sup>19</sup> Lists of the bishops at Ancyra appear in five manuscript traditions, three Latin and two Syriac: *Prisca*, *Isidore vulgata*, *Dionysia Hadriana*, Syriac A and Syriac E.<sup>20</sup> Unlike the lists of the bishops at Caesarea which accompany those at Ancyra in all the manuscripts, the Ancyran lists all follow more or less exactly the same order,<sup>21</sup> which is that given above, apart from one important difference. In all the collections, apart from *Isidore vulgata*, Vitalis' name appears at the top.

To some, this is conclusive proof of Vitalis' having presided;<sup>22</sup> others support Marcellus' claims, pointing out that Marcellus' name would tend to be removed by scribes who knew him as a heretic.<sup>23</sup> In fact, this argument could work either way; Marcellus might be placed at the top because his name was known to a scribe, and Vitalis' was not. A better argument is that the early canonical collection on which all the translations are probably based originated in Antioch, or at least went through a formative stage there: an Antiochene scribe in the later fourth century might well have assumed that the bishop of Antioch would naturally have taken precedence at this gathering, though protocol had been much less firmly established at the beginning of the century.<sup>24</sup> But a better

---

<sup>18</sup> See Table 1 below.

<sup>19</sup> For fuller discussion of this point, see my article 'Marcellus or Vitalis: who presided at Ancyra 314?', *St Pat XXXIV* (2001), pp. 197-203.

<sup>20</sup> See Table 1 below. For the Latin lists, see *EOMIA* II.1, pp. 32, 50-51; for the Syriac, see F. Schulthess, *Die syrischen Kanones der Synode von Nicaea bis Chalcedon nebst einigen zugehörigen Dokumenten*, A.G.G., phil.-hist. Kl. NF 10 (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1908), pp. 29-30. For a description of these Latin ms. traditions, see J. Gaudemet, *Les Sources du droit de l'Eglise en Occident* (Paris, 1985), pp. 77-79, 134; for the Syriac traditions involved, see Schulthess, pp. v-vii, x-xii.

<sup>21</sup> If we discount the 'five' extra names added by *Dionysia Hadriana* (really seven, the other two masquerading as episcopal sees); see *EOMIA* II.1, p. 51, and n. 11 above.

<sup>22</sup> E.g. Hefele and Leclercq, *Conciles*, I, p. 301; Pierre L'Huillier, 'Origine et developpement de l'ancienne collection canonique grecque', in "*Messenger*" de l'exarchat du patriarcat russe en Europe occidentale, 93-96 (1976), pp. 53-65, at p. 57; X. Le Bachelet, 'Ancyre, conciles d', *DTC* I, 1173-7, at col. 1173.

<sup>23</sup> See above.

<sup>24</sup> For a discussion of the Pontican and Antiochene options for the genesis of the Greek conciliar canonical collection, see L'Huillier, 'Origine et developpement'; G. Bardy, 'Antioch (Concile et canons d')', *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique* I, 689-98; E. Schwartz, 'Die Kanonensammlungen der alten Reichskirche', *GS* IV, 159-275, at pp.186-203.



argument still is the place of Vitalis' name in the *Isidore vulgata* list. If Vitalis had presided and his name been replaced by Marcellus', his name would be second on the list, or else possibly last. It would be very unlikely to have been moved to fourth place, with the other names remaining in exactly the same position. If Marcellus' name had stood first and Vitalis' had been pulled out of fourth place to be placed first instead, Marcellus' would then be second in the list, which in fact it is, in all of the other traditions.

If Marcellus did indeed preside over the Synod of Ancyra, it seems almost certain that he also summoned it: who else would have reason to invite just this group of bishops? He was nothing if not systematic in his invitations. We have no way of knowing whether the bishops who signed the canons brought presbyters, deacons or lay-people with them, whether Eusebius' mention of kindnesses from lay members of one congregation to another would have taken place in this kind of setting, either by lay representatives or through the clergy, but we do know that, if others accompanied the bishops, it was the authority of the bishops alone which was given to the canons, unlike the canons of Iliberris or of Arles.<sup>25</sup> Whoever else was present at whatever sessions the synod involved, liturgical, judicial or legislative, the authority owned by the legislation of the synod was the authority of a self-conscious network of metropolitan bishops covering systematically a discrete geographical area. They were not a simple gathering of whoever was nearest or happened to be in the area. The man who sent their invitations had the mind of a high-level administrator, or one who intended to become one.

## **2. Previous synods in Asia Minor.**

The conceptual scale of the 314 synod of Ancyra can be further seen by comparing it to the previous synodal tradition of the region, which also

demonstrates a lack of fixity in place and presidency that Marcellus was able to take advantage of. Asia Minor, like the city of Rome and the province of Africa Proconsularis, had one of the earliest and strongest traditions documented of inter-church judicial and legislative gatherings: unlike the councils at Rome and Carthage, which could widen their catchment areas as desired but tended to keep to the same city and the same president, the synods of Asia Minor had no natural centre and no natural head.<sup>26</sup>

We first hear of Anatolian church synods in the province of Proconsular Asia. Eusebius' early anti-Montanist source, the polemic by an anonymous presbyter to Avircius Marcellus, records, 'The faithful across Asia having gathered together many times and in many places of Asia ... [the Montanists] were put out of the church and excommunicated'.<sup>27</sup> He is probably writing in the early 190s about events in the previous decade or so;<sup>28</sup> the synods he describes are at least assumed by Eusebius to have taken place before the synods under pope Victor on the date of Easter. The former synods were small-scale, possibly at parish level: if the later synod he describes at Galatian Ancyra<sup>29</sup> is comparable, they involved disputations among the adherents of the new prophets and their opponents, including presbyters and possibly also lay-people. Bishops are mentioned as involved in the controversy: Claudius Apolinarius, Bishop of Hierapolis, Julian of Apamea, possibly Zoticus of Cumane, and later Serapion

---

<sup>25</sup> See n. 7 above.

<sup>26</sup> The words 'synod' and 'council', though used as equivalents in Greek and Latin church literature, have different overtones in those two languages: *concilium* is, for example, the usual word for a city council (*βουλή* in Greek), whereas a *σύνδοδος* can often be a much more informal affair, and is commonly used in the context of guilds and clubs. This does, I think, reflect a real difference of perception in what is taking place, at least in the early stages, in the two halves of the Empire. For further discussion on this point, see A. Lumpe, 'Zur Geschichte der Wörter *Concilium* und *Synodus* in der antiken christlichen Latinität', *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 2 (1970), pp. 1-21. For a discussion of early councils in Rome and Carthage, see Hefele-Leclercq I.

<sup>27</sup> Eusebius, *HE* V.16.10. The writer may be a bishop, if *συμπρεσβύτερος* (*HE* V.16. 5) is used in imitation of 1 Pt 5.1.

<sup>28</sup> Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 30; see pp. 26-42 for a full discussion of the dating of the early events of Montanism, which favours the 170s as the decade of conflict with and condemnation by Asian churches.

<sup>29</sup> Eusebius, *HE* V.16.4.



of Antioch and those who signed his letter to Caricus and Pontius.<sup>30</sup> But on the whole, Montanism seems to have been a popular movement popularly resisted, with the action taken by presbyters and people as much as by bishops.

Larger-scale were the *σύνοδοι* and the *συγκροτήσεις ἐπισκόπων* described on the occasion of the paschal controversy under pope Victor (189-198).<sup>31</sup> Synods in Palestine, Rome, Pontus, Gaul and Osrhoene issued letters at Victor's behest, so Eusebius claims, stating that Easter was to be celebrated on a Sunday; the gathering of bishops of the province of Asia, however, headed by one Polycrates, claimed the right to follow their own apostolic tradition and celebrate Easter on the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisan, on whatever day that should fall. The other synods, though headed by bishops whose names Eusebius gives, may have included presbyters and others; the text of Polycrates' synodal letter, as Eusebius gives it, speaks of his companions only as *ἐπίσκοποι*, and refers to them as *πολλὰ πλήθη*.

According to this account, the bishops of proconsular Asia were capable of holding what saw itself as a provincial synod by the 190s, and one which covered areas both coastal and inland: Polycrates mentions Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardis, Laodicea and Hierapolis, in discussing the province's venerable tradition handed down by its apostles and martyrs. The bishops of Pontus (whether the region or the province of Pontus et Bithynia is unclear), led by a certain Palmas, had also held a synod and issued a letter, according to Eusebius, coming down on Victor's side of the question, but we know nothing about the number who attended or where they were from. No mention is made of any synod in the rest of Asia Minor. This is more or less what we might expect: the cities of proconsular Asia were older, more self-confident and more equal to one another in power and prestige than those in other parts of Asia Minor; it is not surprising that that province's secular provincial assemblies, and its guilds of athletes and

---

<sup>30</sup> Eusebius, *HE* V.16.17 (Zoticus may simply be a presbyter or teacher: *ἄνδρας δοκίμους καὶ ἐπισκόπους* may imply he and Julian are one of each, especially since Cumane is only a village); Eusebius, *HE* V.19.

<sup>31</sup> Eusebius, *HE* V.23.1 - V.24.8.

actors, should have been imitated relatively early on by the Christians of its various cities.<sup>32</sup> What is interesting is that they took place at the same time as the networks of much smaller synodal gatherings of the Montanist crisis -- unless we assume the one had given way to the other in a matter of a decade or so.

By the second quarter of the third century, the net has widened again, and the centres of gravity moved inland. There were two famous synods in Asia Minor around the 230s which are mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria, at Synnada in Phrygia (still in the province of Asia at this point, we assume) and Iconium in southern Galatia.<sup>33</sup> The latter was attended by Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, the neighbouring province, who says of those who assisted, 'We assembled together in Iconium, a place in Phrygia, with those from Galatia, and Cilicia, and other neighbouring regions.'<sup>34</sup> Both synods, at Synnada and at Iconium, met to consider the same question, whether those who had been baptised in a heretical church should be rebaptised if they asked to join the catholic Church. Both decided in the affirmative.

The context Firmilian gives to the synod at the time was again the Montanist crisis, though both he and Dionysius of Alexandria cite its ruling in the context of the Novatian schism. Given the Montanist interest, it is not surprising that the two synods should have taken place in cities of Phrygia (as Firmilian's description shows he clearly understands Iconium to be at this period, probably reflecting local rather than official terminology). What is interesting is the division of attendance. Firmilian mentions nothing of the synod of Synnada, so it can only be assumed he did not attend it, especially given that it met to discuss the same question and produced the same answer as that of Iconium. Those whose presence he mentions at Iconium are all from the West, North and

---

<sup>32</sup>See W.M. Calder et al., 'Asia, Roman Province', *OCD*, pp. 189-90; for synods of actors and athletes, see H. Chadwick, 'The origin of the title "Oecumenical Council"', *JTS* ns 23 (1972), 132-5. See also S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power, The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

<sup>33</sup>Eusebius, *HE* VII.7.5.

<sup>34</sup>Cyprian, *Letters* 75.7 (by Firmilian).

South (here again, we see Cilicia included with Asia Minor); the synod of Synnada presumably covered Asia (including the major part of the Phrygian region), Pamphilia and perhaps Bithynia, if Montanism was a problem there. We begin to see a gathering of provinces into larger jurisdictional areas for the purpose of episcopal legislative assembly, though the boundaries of these areas are not very clear. Firmilian unfortunately gives us no clue on the numbers of bishops attending, or whether any other clergy or lay people were present.

A series of synods which did not take place in Asia Minor, but which included a number of bishops from there, were those of Syrian Antioch, first that which discussed the Novatian question in the early 250s<sup>35</sup> and then those which eventually deposed Paul of Samosata in the 260s.<sup>36</sup> The Anatolian contingent was powerful in all of these.

In the first, described in a brief summary by Eusebius of a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Cornelius of Rome, the situation is not entirely clear, but it seems that Fabius, bishop of Antioch, was ready to support Novatian, while Firmilian, Helenus of Tarsus and Theoctistus of Palestinian Caesarea were trying to enlist Dionysius to come and take part in the synod against him. Fabius died, but there must have been some kind of split before or after this synod between the various churches, because Dionysius writes to Stephen a couple of years later that the Eastern churches which were *διεσχισμένοι* are now united (*ἡνώνται*), mentioning among others Demetrian at Antioch (Fabius' successor), Theoctistus, Helenus and Firmilian. Dionysius never mentions the name of a Galatian bishop (although he does refer to *πάντων τῶν ... Γαλατίας*<sup>37</sup> on another occasion): then as later, Galatia was clearly not on the same political circuit as Cappadocia, Cilicia, Syria, Palestine and Alexandria.

---

<sup>35</sup> Eusebius, *HE* VI.46.3.

<sup>36</sup> Eusebius, *HE* VII.27-30. See H. de Riedmatten, *Les actes de procès de Paul de Samosate: Étude sur la christologie du III<sup>e</sup> au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paradosis 6 (Fribourg, 1952).

<sup>37</sup> Eusebius, *HE* VII.5.4.

Firmilian, Helenus and their Anatolian associates also feature largely in the Samosatene episode. Eusebius gives first of all his own list of those involved, and later provides the text of the final synodal letter excommunicating Paul, with a list of signatories, addressed to 'all the provinces of the empire'. Eusebius' list begins with the Anatolians (whom he places before even the incumbent of his own see, Palestinian Caesarea): Firmilian, Gregory (the Wonderworker) and his brother Athenodorus, of Pontus, Helenus of Tarsus, and Nicomas of Iconium, followed by only three others, the bishops of Jerusalem, Palestinian Caesarea and Bostra. Firmilian had died by the time of the actual deposition of Paul, but Helenus heads the list of signatories to his deposition.

The deposition of Paul of Samosata was, in disciplinary terms, the most powerful act a synod had yet undertaken (at least among those we find in the records). The power which brought him to book, so far as we can tell from Eusebius' account, was that of the Anatolians Firmilian and Helenus. Although Firmilian was dead by the time of the final synod, the synodal letter makes clear it had looked to him and to Dionysius of Alexandria (who wrote to the parties concerned, but refused to become too involved) for legitimation, and found it in Firmilian's even having been present at the earlier sessions. Helenus, who presumably wrote that letter, equates Firmilian's authority by implication with that of Dionysius of Alexandria, and annexes it to his own. Whether or not Firmilian would have finally acquiesced in Paul's deposition, we cannot tell: Helenus clearly means to maintain that he would. And it was Helenus who, on whatever authority, finally carried the day.

The role of five bishops from Asia Minor (who may have acted as a cabal, from the evidence of Eusebius' list) was decisive in this series of synods, even though it took place outside Anatolian territory. This may well have been at least partly due to a self-confidence and cohesion drawn from their own synodal tradition, with its greater room for power shifts and alliances caused by the absence of an established episcopal presidency, a tradition no other part of the Empire seems

to have developed in quite the same way.<sup>38</sup> They owed this tradition originally to the bishops of proconsular Asia, but by now the centre of gravity in ecclesiastical as in secular affairs had moved far to the east, to the central highlands of Anatolia.

Marcellus was to exploit to the full this unanchored synodal tradition of Asia Minor. In summoning the Synod of Ancyra, he spread his net wider than any recorded synod so far, drawing representatives from virtually the whole Anatolian land mass. As bishop of Ancyra, by this stage the major crossroads of Anatolia and the midway station on the road between Thrace and the eastern frontier, he was ideally placed to do so.

But if the advantage in prestige to Marcellus of presiding over a synod on such a grand scale is obvious, that cannot have been his only motive in calling it, and cannot have been a motive at all to most of those who attended it. What made Marcellus call and the other bishops come to a synod of all the old provinces (bar one, if Ephesus was a deliberate exclusion) of Asia Minor? Earlier synods had been convoked to deal with some crisis of heresy, of challenge to provincial liturgical practice, or with the knotty problem of disciplining a metropolitan bishop. Even the *lapsi*, Ancyra's main subject, was certainly not a new problem in 314. What moved Marcellus to summon Asia Minor's metropolitans to council? The answer may lie in the canons themselves.

### **3. The emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Ancyra.**

The first known collection of canons, ecclesiastical rulings on various disciplinary matters in numbered sequence, was issued at the council of Iliberris in Spain, c.300 (attended by bishops, priests and deacons from thirty-seven communities, mostly from the province of Baetica, but representing at least the

---

<sup>38</sup> That we know of. The conciliar centres of Rome and Carthage had clear leaders, as did Egypt and Syria. Greece itself, another discrete geographical area with many ancient cities arguably equal in prestige, might well also have developed an acephalous synodal tradition, but we have no record of one. Spain and Gaul were to do so in the ensuing centuries.

metropolitans of all the other Spanish provinces).<sup>39</sup> Before this council, there were two separate forms of ecclesiastical ruling, apart from those in the scriptures, which we find attested in the literature. On the one hand there was the pseudo-apostolic literature represented by the *Didache*, the *Didascalia* and the Hippolytan *Apostolic Tradition*, generally liturgical in focus, and presented as a continuous exhortatory treatise. On the other, there were individual letters issued by synods, notifying some decision they had come to.

The pseudo-apostolic traditional material would be reworked into canon form in the fourth century, but none of the canonical collections in which these later forms appear is earlier than the council of Nicaea.<sup>40</sup> The synodal letters, known to us primarily from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* and from the letters of Cyprian, tended to give a ruling or set of rulings on one issue, and to confine themselves to matters of moment, at least so far as we know. The letters Eusebius cites that were issued by the synods of Palestine, Rome et al. on the question of the date of Easter, and by the synod of Antioch on the condemnation of Paul, addressed themselves to all Christians everywhere.<sup>41</sup> The letters of councils held at Carthage which we know of through Cyprian's collected letters<sup>42</sup> are preserved as letters to individuals, but are likely to have been circulated more widely, though probably still to specific bishops rather than as letters addressed to Christians at large.

---

<sup>39</sup> For a full discussion of the date of the council of Iliberris, see De Clercq, *Ossius of Cordoba*, pp. 87-103. For the text of the canons, and the list of those attending, see Vives et al., *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos*.

<sup>40</sup> See Gaudemet, *Sources*, ch. 1, for a survey of this material and of the current scholarly consensus on the dating of individual works. Literature in the category includes the *Canons of Hippolytus* (a resume of the *Apostolic Tradition* in canon form, now dated to the late 330s), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (adapting the *Didache*, *Didascalia* and *Apostolic Tradition*, with an additional 85 *Canons of the Apostles*, dated to around 380, and linked to the long recension of the letters of Ignatius of Antioch), the *Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ* (fifth century). The *Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Apostles* (c. 300: see A. Faivre, 'La documentation canonico-liturgique de l'Eglise ancienne', *R.S.R.* 54 (1980), pp. 204-215, 279-295, at pp. 31-42) are unlikely to have been published originally in canon form. See Connelly, *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Related Documents*, for discussion of this text.

<sup>41</sup> *HE* V.23.2; VII.30.2.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. letters 57, 64.



The pseudo-apostolic disciplinary literature reflects above all biblical and rabbinical literature, into which tradition it wishes to insert itself.<sup>43</sup> In being presented in letter form, the rulings of church synods imitate imperial governmental legislation, which on the whole was also issued in letter form, either as rescripts or as letters of instruction to magistrates, a form which would be well known to all inhabitants of the empire through being posted in monumental inscription form.<sup>44</sup>

But at Iliberris, for the first time, so far as we know, conciliar decisions were issued as a series of discrete, succinct ordinances, each with a similar form. It can hardly be an accident that the first comprehensive and organised collection of imperial ordinances, the *Codex Gregorianus*, was published in 291, and was immediately widely used by lawyers in both the Eastern and Western parts of the empire, running to a whole series of editions. A similar collection, the *Codex Hermogenianus*, was published in 295, gathering the laws of the previous four years, and was similarly popular.<sup>45</sup>

These codices were in a position to appeal to Church lawgivers in a way previous Roman legal tomes had not been. By the time of Diocletian, the study and practice of Roman law had altered considerably from that of the classical juridical writers. Imperial case law, mainly in the form of rescripts, had supplanted the case law formerly represented by the *responsa* (opinions) of practising lawyers as the basis of civil law (though the imperial rescripts were of course still themselves usually written by practised lawyers). Previous legal

---

<sup>43</sup> For a discussion of the emergence of this genre from rabbinical origins, see L. Buisson, 'Die Entstehung des Kirchenrechts', *Z.S.S.K.A.* 52 (1966), pp. 1-175.

<sup>44</sup> The variety of models influencing church synodal legislation throughout the patristic period means that the development of ecclesiastical law and structures has a far from straightforward relationship to the structures of the Empire, even when it reflects one or other of them. In judicial administration, for example, the church's practice is a reverse image of the civil structures: at city level, the bishop is paramount, while the civil structures are conciliar, whereas at a higher level, the church can only legislate by mutual agreement of the prelates, while the Emperor has absolute power. For this reason, among others, the Church's legislation can borrow a form from any level of civil law-giving it happens to be aware of. For a discussion of the rescript form, see Simon Corcoran, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs, Imperial Prouncements and Government AD 283-384*, revised edn, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), chapter 3.

compilations, such as collections of *responsa*, legal commentaries, teaching manuals and monographs on legal subjects, were aimed at highly educated career lawyers, and not adapted to easy use as models by the Church. But by the time of Diocletian, legal judgements drew not on the learned written opinions of a professional body of lawyers but on legislation given by emperors.

The two new codices, though not official publications, provided a much handier access to the bulk of relevant civil legislation than had ever been previously available, reflecting the popularising (in every sense) of law since the grant of general Roman citizenship under Caracalla had so greatly increased the number of people with the right of going to law, and hence the number of lawyers needed to try their cases. The reliance on rescripts and the availability of the codices made law much less of an expert occupation than it had been (the codex form, vulgar but handy, the same form the Church used for its scriptures, itself symbolises this). In the period of the codices, before they went out of date and Constantine began pouring out legislation at his own slightest whim without even keeping a record of it, the period of the 290s, collected legal statutes were about as accessible as they ever had been, or would be again until the *Codex Theodosianus* a century and a half later.<sup>46</sup>

It was these collections, surely, which caught the attention of the bishops of Southern Spain, and recommended themselves as a suitable model for a means of organising Church law also. It was these collections, perhaps, which even inspired them to gather in Illiberis, or to turn a liturgical gathering into a legislative one. It was these collections, possibly, which brought them together for a council which had no doctrinal aim, and does not seem to have been provoked by any crisis other than a general sense that Hispanic Christians were getting rather lax in their general moral and social standards. In other words, I

---

<sup>45</sup> See T. Honoré, 'Codex', *OCD*, 355; Corcoran, *Tetrarchs*, ch. 2.

<sup>46</sup> For a discussion of Roman law in the Diocletianic and Constantinian periods, see Corcoran, *Tetrarchs*; A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602, A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey* (3 vols and map folder, Oxford: Blackwell, 1964), vol. 1, ch. 14; T. Honoré, 'Law and Procedure, Roman: 1. Civil Law', *OCD*, 827-9, 'Lawyers, Roman', *OCD*, 835-6, and 'Legal Literature', *OCD*, 838-9.



would suggest, the bishops who came to Iliberris gathered with the intention of issuing their own legal code-book, and promulgated 81 laws by way of doing so.<sup>47</sup>

In general, Latin literature does not travel well across the language divide of the empire. The exception is legal literature.<sup>48</sup> Diocletian had decreed that all imperial law was to be in Latin throughout the empire; a legal training would certainly now include a training in Latin. The two codices were in use in the East as much as in the West.

Ancyra was the second synod, so far as we know, to issue canons (beating Arles by a couple of months), and the first in the East to do so. It was the first gathering of the sort to have been possible in the East (at least in Maximinus' regions, which included Asia Minor) since the persecution began in 303.

It is difficult to know exactly how detailed a knowledge of the council of Iliberris the bishops of Ancyra might have had. That they knew it had taken place, especially if it really was the only previous council to have issued a collection of canons, seems probable. Whether they had actually seen the canons or merely heard about them is another question: the last seven Ancyran canons, in particular, may display some knowledge of specific rulings from Iliberris, but this is not certain.<sup>49</sup> (The canons of Iliberris were never included in the Eastern collections, which begin with Ancyra, suggesting its legislation either was not available or was not accepted there. Certainly the last seven canons of Ancyra, if they do know of the rulings of Iliberris, reject them as too

---

<sup>47</sup> It has been argued (Meigne, 'Elvire: Concile ou collection?', *RHE* 120 (1975), 361-387) that Iliberris includes the canons of three different councils (at least), partly on the grounds of canons which seem to be dependent on later legislation (especially at Arles in 314), and partly simply because there are so many more of them than any other fourth-century synod has (except for Laodicea, itself almost certainly a compilation). Without ruling out the possibility that a few of the Iliberris canons may indeed be later, the fact of its being a council specifically called in order to produce a body of legislation might well explain the large number of rulings.

<sup>48</sup> For a discussion of the transmission of secular law from West to East, see M.A. De Dominicis, 'Il problema dei rapporti burocratico-legislativi tra "Occidente" ed "Oriente" nel Basso impero.', in *RIL*, Cl. di lettere, 87 (1956), 283-441.

<sup>49</sup> For a more detailed discussion on this point, see below.

severe, but the Latin language would be another barrier to general use.) But what Ancyra does seem to be is a gathering convoked once again for the express purpose of producing legislation in canon form, and fairly comprehensive legislation on at least the question of the *lapsi*. It is not impossible that it was an invitation to do this specifically which drew the bishops together from the whole of Asia Minor. The challenge of producing their own body of legislation as the Hispanic bishops had done might well be more of a pull than the simple question of the *lapsi* on its own, which all of their churches had had to grapple with and legislate on many times in the previous century.

We know nothing of Marcellus's background. But when we observe that he seems to have invented canon law in the East, gathered the first Asia Minor-wide synod and, for a time, broken up the Pontus / Cappadocia / Cilicia / Syria / Palestine cabal, we know something about his mind.

#### 4. The canons.

Regulations on those who had sacrificed or taken part in pagan cultic banquets loom large in the canons of Ancyra, which is the main evidence for the date normally ascribed to it.<sup>50</sup> In addition, there are addressed six general disciplinary questions, on marriage (of deacons and of abducted girls), the power to ordain of χωρεπίσκοποι (country bishops), clerical abstinence from meat, the restoration of church property, and bishops who are not accepted by the people of their appointed see. Finally, there are nine canons which lay down penances for various forms of sexual transgression and of homicide. The argument, first made in 1938 and since fairly widely accepted, that the last six canons of Ancyra are in fact those of a council of Cappadocian Caesarea in the same year, I will also consider here.

---

<sup>50</sup> It seems, due to the immediacy of the issues addressed, to have taken place the Easter after Maximinus's defeat. Canon 6 assumes that penance done until the following Easter will be roughly a year, indicating a date in Eastertide.

Samuel Laeuchli attempted in 1972 to reconstruct some of the debates (and, indeed, the emotions) behind the canons of the Council of Iliberris with the use of sociological tools.<sup>51</sup> Although his analysis is fatally flawed by a lack of sufficient attention either to the history of the development of the clerical role in the patristic period, or to the norms of Roman lawmaking, as well as by inapposite parallels with the Second Vatican Council, the questions he asks are important ones, and he points out some important signs of tension and disagreement at the debating stage in the final form of the canons. Likewise, canon 11 of Nicaea seems to show that serious opposition was present during its debate to the penitential position that was there finally agreed on.<sup>52</sup>

The canons of the council of Serdica, the council of Carthage held c.348 (together with the whole series of Carthaginian councils from the later fourth and fifth centuries), and the 394 synod of Constantinople reveal something of their procedures in the form in which their canons were transmitted.<sup>53</sup> The Serdican and Carthaginian canons are given in the form of minutes, with a name attached to the proposer of each topic, and sometimes to those who made other interventions. At Serdica, the proposer was usually, though not always, the president Hosius of Cordova; at the 348 council of Carthage, it was often, though not always, the Carthaginian bishop Gratus. The 394 synod of Constantinople provides only a partial record, but does include some interesting named interventions (including a suggestive one from Arabianus, then bishop of Ancyra, and signing up for the first time to the 381 synod, on the number of bishops necessary to depose another bishop). No such full record survives for Ancyra, if there ever was one, but it is likely to have followed roughly the same procedure as that which appears in the Serdican and African canons, which was

---

<sup>51</sup> Samuel Laeuchli, *Power and Sexuality: The Emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Elvira* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1972).

<sup>52</sup> See the discussion on canon 6, below.

<sup>53</sup> For the canons of Serdica, see Joannou, *Discipline Générale Antique*, I,2, pp. 156-89; for a discussion of the authenticity of their form, and that of the other councils whose canons are in this form, see Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica A.D. 343, A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), pp. 24-41. For the African councils, see Munier; *Concilia Africae*, pp. 3-10 *et passim*; for Constantinople, see Joannou, I,2, pp. 437-44.

a common secular conciliar procedure: *relatio* of the problem by the proposer, debate, agreement, formal unanimous assent.<sup>54</sup>

The ratio of president-proposed to non-president-proposed canons at Serdica is 3:1; at Carthage 5:8, but the president proposes the first four and intervenes in all the rest; at Constantinople there is more account given of the debates, and less of the decisions, and there are two leaders, a president and a master of ceremonies, but the president, Nectarius of Constantinople, does at least half of the talking. It seems we can assume that a synod's president would generally propose at least the first couple of canons, and play an important role in the acceptance or rejection of those proposed by others.

In all the fourth-century synodal lists of canons, it is possible to tell canons based on a particular case, as opposed to some general problem: these will either have been brought by one of the bishops, or been presented to the synod for its ruling by some petitioner. There are at least two such cases evident from the Ancyran canons, canon 6 and canon 25.

The canons of Ancyra give little away about the extent of agreement or disagreement behind them, a feature of their systematic self-presentation. The first nine were obviously the main subject of the synod, and were conceived together as a series, with the penalties cohering as a reasonably logical tariff (unlike the canons of Iliberris, for example). Penalties given in later canons more or less cohere with these (with one notable exception), with sexual faults being more leniently treated than usual.

If we accept that there is every reason to think Marcellus proposed the initial subject of the synod, and that there is no evidence that its decisions were contrary to his wishes (the record of a religious meeting in which the chair lost many of the points at issue will generally make that fairly obvious), we can conclude that the views the canons reflect are largely his, if not necessarily on

---

<sup>54</sup> See Hess, pp. 29-35.

every detailed point, at least in general. In canons 16 and perhaps 17 I think we can recognise a rather different mind at work from the measured, restrained proponent of the rest of the legislation, although one which was allowed to carry its point: I shall consider this in due course. Many if not most of canons 10-25 (apart, probably, from canon 13 and canons 22-23) may be reactions to specific cases: canon 25, as noted, certainly is. We cannot say that these rulings necessarily would represent Marcellus' intervention (his influence is likely to have been strongest in the initial subject proposed, that of the *lapsi*), but they use a similar vocabulary to the first nine, which may be more securely assumed to represent Marcellus' way of thinking, and show a similar relative leniency, which are strong indications that he had a common interest in at least some of them. That Marcellus could allow the unrealistic penalties of canon 16 to be passed does show that he was prepared to allow legislative thinking to stand that was different from his own, whatever he thought of the question itself.

**a. The persecution canons (nos. 1-9, 12).**

The first nine canons of Ancyra (in the Greek numbering), and the twelfth, deal with the problem of those who have apostatised during the recent persecutions. This was not a new problem for the Church: it was one that had had to be faced on and off from the time of Decius in the middle of the third century, who first required that those throughout the Empire, including Christians, join in sacrificing before cultic statues and eat food offered ritually to them, on pain of persuasive judicial measures and possible execution (apparently at the governor's discretion).<sup>55</sup> Information on church regulations for those who had apostatised is reasonably abundant for the decade of the 250s, the first time the Church was forced to address this problem on such a scale; it is difficult to find thereafter, in the general absence of material from the late third century. The attitudes and rulings from this period are therefore important to an

understanding of the attitudes and rulings of the bishops of Ancyra, who seem to have taken the earlier tradition as their point of departure.

Cyprian's *Letter 55 to Antonianus*, a bishop showing signs of Novatian leanings, giving the conclusions of the Carthaginian council of 251, is the classic work of this period on the position of those who had sacrificed or obtained letters attesting to their having sacrificed. (Cyprian's views are here much more considered than those which he expresses in *De Lapsis*, as will be discussed below.) As a picture of the discipline of the period, they may be supplemented from what is known of the practice of Cyprian's contemporary bishops Cornelius of Rome, Dionysius of Alexandria, Fabian of Antioch and Firmilian of Caesarea, as well as that of the schismatic Roman bishop Novatian, all of whom corresponded with one another.<sup>56</sup>

Cyprian, Cornelius and Dionysius all held that a penitent should be allowed to receive communion on his deathbed; Cyprian hints (with some humour) and Dionysius explicitly states that one who has been received back to full communion and then recovers cannot then be deprived again simply for that reason.<sup>57</sup> Cyprian's considered view is that *libellatici* (those who have obtained certificates falsely stating that they have sacrificed) cannot be treated simply as those who have actually sacrificed; even those who have sacrificed are to be considered case by case, since some came forward to sacrifice immediately the persecution was announced, or even persuaded others to sacrifice, while some held out for a considerable time, even helping others who were fleeing persecution. He gives little idea of what a normal length of time to be given for penance might be on the whole, leaving such decisions to the bishop: however,

---

<sup>55</sup> For a discussion of the legal basis of the persecution, and of the various forms of constraint and punishment used, see Michael M. Sage, *Cyprian*, Patristic Monograph Series 1 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), chapter 4.

<sup>56</sup> Eusebius, *HE* VI.41-46.

<sup>57</sup> Cyprian, *Letters*, 55.9; Eusebius, *HE* VI.44; Charles Lett Feltoe, ed., *The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria*, Cambridge Patristic Texts (Cambridge: University Press, 1904), p. 60, line 8- p. 61, line 5.



he does grant immediate readmission to some who sacrificed after much torture and have done three years of penance.<sup>58</sup>

Novatian and his followers (who had a considerable following in Asia Minor) denied reacceptance to *sacrificati* and *libellatici* alike; this position at least seems to have been rejected by Firmilian, who is likely to have held a similar position to Cyprian on most such points, as he did on the question of rebaptism.<sup>59</sup> Fabius, by implication,<sup>60</sup> was closer to Novatian's position: Dionysius tries to persuade him to relent with harrowing tales of what has been happening in Alexandria, and of the extent of the terror to which the church there has been subjected, arguing also (as Cyprian certainly had not done) for the acceptance of letters of pardon from martyrs. In particular, Dionysius recounts the story of an old man, Serapion, who, having led a blameless life, gave in and sacrificed, and while on his deathbed was miraculously preserved until he received communion.<sup>61</sup> The 'division' between Antioch and Firmilian and Helenus of Tarsus to which Dionysius refers<sup>62</sup> was presumably caused by difference of opinion on treatment of the lapsed.

The bishops of Asia Minor are liable to have had access to these debates, perhaps through the published correspondence of Dionysius, certainly through Firmilian's friendship with Cyprian (from the closeness of points between the Ancyran canons and Cyprian's letter 55, it looks very much as though they consulted a copy of this letter or of the synodal letter behind it, or at least knew its rulings well), and through the presence of the Novatians. Those Anatolian sees with links to Firmilian at least (Caesarea, Tarsus and the Pontic bishops) are likely to have inherited a position close to Cyprian's: *lapsi* were to be treated case by case, obtaining affidavits of sacrifice was less culpable than actually sacrificing, communion was to be allowed to penitents at least on their

---

<sup>58</sup> Letter 56.

<sup>59</sup> Cyprian, Letter 75.

<sup>60</sup> See the extracts from letters to him of Dionysius and Cornelius in Eusebius, *HE*, which show their attempts to persuade him on these points: VI.41-42, 43.3 - 22, 44.

<sup>61</sup> Eusebius, *HE* VI.44.

<sup>62</sup> See above.



deathbeds, sacrificing after undergoing actual torture or confiscation of goods was less culpable than merely sacrificing at the first threat of persecution, clergy who had sacrificed were to be deprived of their clerical status.<sup>63</sup>

The canons of Ancyra, which addressed the cases of those who had apostatised in persecutions of the previous ten years under Diocletian, Galerius and Maximinus, drew on this tradition, but refined it, laying down specific lengths of time of penance for the various types of offence and treating in particular the more difficult cases where there was some mitigating circumstance or some aggravation of the offence. They show the maturer appreciation of the choices that faced individuals during this time that is to be found in Dionysius or the later Cyprian, the appreciation of those who have seen the scenes of persecution and know the realities of it.

Six years was the basic length of penance prescribed for aggravated apostasy at Ancyra: those who had sacrificed more than once (canon 8), those who joined in the feasts at pagan festivals with alacrity, dressing up for the occasion (canon 4), and those who sacrificed merely at the threat of confiscation of goods or exile, and had since made no attempt to return until the present synod (canon 6). In this, particularly in the last case, Ancyra was more lenient than any regulations known of before or afterwards.<sup>64</sup> In each of the new outbreaks of persecution which caught a generation off its guard, there was always a number who gave in immediately and sacrificed. (Cyprian is scathing, in *De Lapsis*, about those who did so in Carthage.) These were often the higher-born, who feared the loss of property and position,<sup>65</sup> presumably many of them converts from the last generation, when Christianity was becoming prestigious, and presumably some did give up their exotic new religion without much struggle and return to the gay camaraderie and popular rejoicing of the pagan city feasts without much regret. Those who knew they were most likely to be subjected to torture in its

---

<sup>63</sup> Letter 75.4,11,9,10,8.

<sup>64</sup> Cyprian does not discuss such a case specifically, but does rule that those who have shown no previous signs of penitence are not to be received if they repent on their deathbeds (Letter 55.19). For the rulings of Iliberris and of Nicaea in this regard, see below.

more brutal forms on account of their status (e.g. slaves) would also have had very good reason not to wait for a personal summons to discuss their position.

The language used by the canon to describe the desire to return (Περὶ τῶν . . . θυσάντων καὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καιροῦ μὴ μετανοησάντων μηδὲ ἐπιστρεψάντων, νῦν δὲ παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς συνόδου προσελθόντων καὶ εἰς διάνοιαν τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς γενομένων, ‘Concerning those who sacrificed and until the present time have not repented or returned, but now approach at<sup>66</sup> the opportunity of the synod, having come to a frame of mind for repentance’), suggests that these may be people who either have come to Ancyra to petition the synod, or have spoken to their local bishop and had their case brought by him there. Either way, the bishops at Ancyra decided they wanted a church of the many rather than only of the proven and committed, and smoothed the way for those belatedly returning, both the well-to-do and slaves. They added the proviso that any even of this category who found themselves in danger of death before the period of six years’ penance had elapsed were to receive communion. The canon uses the form ἐπὶ ὄρω with regard to this rule: Dionysius Exiguus<sup>67</sup> took it to mean on condition that the penitential exclusion would begin again should they recover, which would be a hardening of the position of Cyprian and Dionysius of Alexandria, but it is far from clear that the Greek text actually does mean this.<sup>68</sup>

Nicaea<sup>69</sup> would grit its teeth over the precedent this canon gave to people returning with the same tardiness after Licinius’ persecution, declare they were unworthy of clemency and raise the time of penance to twelve years, but it upheld the rule that they were to be allowed to return. (This is one ruling at

---

<sup>65</sup> As Cyprian describes some in *De Lapsis* 11-12.

<sup>66</sup> Παρὰ would be more usually translated ‘after’ in this context, but the sense would seem to make ‘at’ a more likely rendering here.

<sup>67</sup> *EOMIA* 2.1, p. 73.

<sup>68</sup> Εἰ μέντοι τις κίνδυνος καὶ θανάτου προσδοκία ἐκ νόσου ἢ ἄλλης τινος προφάσεως συμβαίη, τούτους ἐπὶ ὄρω δεχθῆναι. Ἐπὶ ὄρω (‘on terms’) could mean according to the agreed ruling (that of Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyprian et al.) on penitents in danger of death, for example, i.e. unconditionally.

<sup>69</sup> Canon 11.

Nicaea which shows fairly clear evidence of a split among those who eventually passed it.)

The one category concerning the persecution on whom Ancyra is tougher is that of those who compelled others or had them compelled to sacrifice (canon 9). What exactly is involved here is not clear: certainly Cyprian's case<sup>70</sup> of parents who bring their children to sacrifice or people who persuade their friends, but possibly also more violent methods, such as masters coercing slaves or people having their family or friends subjected to some form of physical persuasion. These may be the perpetrators of the actions described in canon 3 to force people to sacrifice against their will.

The other canons on the persecution consider mitigating factors. Canons 1 and 2 consider clergy (priests in canon 1, deacons in canon 2) who sacrificed but repented, recanted and returned to suffer the penalties; canon 3 considers those who had incense forced into their hand or food offered to cultic statues into their mouths despite their protestations; canons five and seven consider those who did attend a pagan public feast, but attended mourning and wept throughout, or did not eat, or brought their own food. In the first case, Ancyra struck a nice balance between generosity and the rigour exacted by the climate of the time, leaving such priests and deacons their clerical status and honour but depriving them of the right to fulfil their clerical functions; in the second, those concerned were entirely exonerated, and any action already taken against them was to be immediately reversed; in the third, four years are accorded to those who actually ate the pagan cultic food, three to those who attended but did not, with bishops being encouraged to take the tenor of the person's life before and afterwards into account, with a view to possibly lessening the period.

The general persecutions were a time that deeply marked the growing churches, and threatened to tear them apart. The accounts we have of them tell us more about the general make-up of the churches and the tensions between the various

---

<sup>70</sup> Cyprian, *De Lapsis* 9.

classes than any literature since the New Testament. Cyprian's *De Lapsis*, written when he returned from hiding, though a great work, is the work of one who has not yet understood the realities he is dealing with: not himself subject to torture for class reasons, and able to be supported in exile by friends and by the cushion of his wealth, he harangues those who have been faced with the stark choice of torture or sacrifice, painting a harsh Christ who will not be quick to forgive their apostasy. He seems quickly to have realised that the situation was much more complex than he had thought, and to have begun to take account of exactly what some people had gone through: we see the fruits of this realisation in the theology of hope and comfort he preaches to Antonianus in letter 55, in place of the latter's Novatianist leanings. The Novatian and Donatist schisms on the one hand, and the letters of reconciliation of the martyrs and confessors on the other, each show how complex the reactions of ordinary church-goers were: some who suffered resented those of their own class who lapsed, some the upper-class clergy who did, while some were prepared to suffer on behalf of and share their merit with those who did not have their strength. Public penance was a vital way, perhaps the only possible way at the time, of satisfying to some degree the rent community's irreconcilable demands for a way of making sense of what had happened. The bishops of Ancyra, unquestionably led by Marcellus in this, followed what had been the practice established by the mature thinking of the previous generation, but added their own touches of understanding, of generosity and of *φιλανθρωπία* to the procedures.

#### **b. The general disciplinary canons.**

Canons 10, 11, 13, 14 and 18 represent general rulings, interesting in various ways, but not on the whole as telling anything about Marcellus. Canon 10 specifies that, although deacons, like priests, are only allowed to be married if they marry before they are ordained, if a deacon has declared to his bishop while being ordained that he cannot live without marrying and the bishop has

continued with the ceremony, this is tantamount to permission to marry and should be accepted as such. This is presumably a case presented to the synod for their ruling.

Canon 11 returns a kidnapped affianced girl to her fiancé, even if she has suffered violence from the kidnapper. Constantine, twelve years later, also legislated about such cases: his assumption was that the kidnapping was often arranged between the girl and the kidnapper as a way of circumventing her parents' choice of husband.<sup>71</sup>

Canon 13 is extremely interesting, and has been the subject of a great deal of discussion,<sup>72</sup> because the text (which is corrupt) could support the reading 'It is not permitted that country bishops ordain priests or deacons, but nor [*sic*] that priests of the city [do], without permission from the bishop in writing in another parish' (Χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ). The city priests could also be the object of the country bishops' ordaining. Various solutions have been proposed to the ecclesiological and linguistic difficulties of the text, but it seems to me the most economical would be to remove the 'μὴ . . . δὲ', which would give the perfectly satisfactory 'It is permitted that country bishops ordain priests and deacons, but not [that they ordain] priests of the city without the permission in writing of the bishop, should he be in another parish.' The addition would be perfectly explicable: the synod of Antioch of 329<sup>73</sup> of which we have the canons forbade country-bishops to ordain clergy higher than subdeacons (canon 10),<sup>74</sup> and the collection in which Ancyra was preserved was assembled at Antioch. It would be an obvious correction to an Antiochene scribe who knew the later ruling. This canon would reflect the practice of

---

<sup>71</sup> See Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 220.

<sup>72</sup> See Le Bachelet, 'Ancyre', cols 1174-1176 (nearly two-thirds of the space allotted to the 314 synod); C.H. Turner, 'A note on Canon 13 of Ancyra', in Charles Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*; 5<sup>th</sup> edn, rev. C.H. Turner, (London: Longman and Co., 1919), pp. 327-330; Hefele-Leclercq, pp. 314-315.

<sup>73</sup> See chapter 3 below.

Galatia and Cappadocia, areas which relied heavily on country-bishops because they had so few cities in them.

Canon 14 (clergy are not to abstain from meat because of a horror of it, but only for ascetic reasons, tasting a little to show willing) is an obviously anti-Manichee ruling. It anticipates the synod of nearby Gangra later in the century,<sup>75</sup> at which the question of ascetics bordering on the heretical received consideration,<sup>76</sup> and which would be attended by Marcellus' rival bishop of Ancyra, Basil.

Canon 18 (bishops elected to a see but rejected by their flock being asked to remain presbyters and not to stir up trouble) is interesting evidence of the people's role in the election of a bishop even at this date, and the tensions there could be if an alien candidate were foisted on them. Ancyra itself would see the kind of disturbance this canon refers to in 337, when Marcellus returned after the death of Constantine.

### **c. The canons on various offences.**

In order to discuss the remaining canons (16-17, 19-25) as a unity, we must first consider the argument, originally put by J. Lebon in 1938 and since widely accepted,<sup>77</sup> that the last six canons of Ancyra (20-25) were promulgated not by the synod of Ancyra, but by a synod at Caesarea later in the same year.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Joannou, p. 112.

<sup>75</sup> On the problem of the date of this council, see T.D. Barnes, 'The Date of the Council of Gangra', *JTS* ns 40 (1989), 121-4.

<sup>76</sup> Joannou, pp. 83-99.

<sup>77</sup> J. Lebon, 'Sur un concile de Césarée', *Le Muséon* 51 (1938), pp. 89-132; E. Honigmann, 'Two Alleged "Bishops of Greater Armenia" as members of the Synods of Ancyra (314 AD) and Caesarea in Cappadocia' in *Patristic Studies*, ST 173 (Rome, 1953), pp. 1-5; *CPG* IV, p. 3; L'Huiller, 'Origine et développement'.

<sup>78</sup> For a fuller discussion of this point with additional bibliography, see my article, 'The Canons of Ancyra and Caesarea (314): Lebon's Thesis Revisited', *JTS* ns 52 (2001), 625-36.



Lebon's argument for the existence of the synod, based as it is on the Armenian version of the early Eastern councils bolstered by the evidence of the Greek, the earliest Syriac and four of the earliest Latin traditions, is extremely persuasive. This can be seen, he shows, from the introduction to the canons of Neocaesarea, common to the *Syntagma*, Syriac A, Isidore *Vulgata*, Isidore *Antiqua*, and both editions of Dionysius Exiguus: 'These canons are posterior to those which were promulgated at Ancyra and Caesarea; but they are found to be prior to those of Nicaea.' The *Prisca* tradition renders 'Caesarea' as 'Neocaesarea' in the same introduction, thus making the latter's canons prior to themselves.

Lebon takes this to be conclusive: there was a synod at Caesarea between those of Ancyra and Neocaesarea, which promulgated canons. The same conclusion was reached for entirely different reasons by Armenian historians. In particular, P. Ananian,<sup>79</sup> to be vindicated by the redating of early Armenian history by Toumanoff,<sup>80</sup> took a 314 synod at Cappodocian Caesarea as the necessary venue for the consecration of Gregory the Illuminator, founder of Christianity as the Armenian state religion, by the bishop of Caesarea, an event described in Agathangelos' *History of the Armenians*, but previously dated to the mid- or late third century. Ananian attempted to explain the large number of bishops at Gregory's consecration (twenty) by their being gathered already for a disciplinary synod, but the consecration itself (an extremely important political event in the varying relations between Rome, Persia and Armenia) could well have been a sufficient draw on its own.<sup>81</sup>

Lebon also points out the close textual links between the bishop-lists of Ancyra and those of 'Neocaesarea' in both Syriac and Latin traditions, showing that the latter are in fact clearly lists of bishops from the same synod at Caesarea. He fails to make use of another good argument in his favour: that the bishops listed, when their sees (which have to be furnished from Ancyra and Nicaea,

---

<sup>79</sup> P. Ananian, 'La data e le circostanze della consecrazione di s. Gregorio Illuminatore', *Le Muséon* 64 (1961), pp. 43-73 and 317-60, esp. pp. 336-8.

<sup>80</sup> C. Toumanoff, 'The Third Century Armenian Arsacids -- A Chronological and Geneological Commentary', *REÁ* 6 (1969), pp. 233-181



admittedly, since the Caesarea list omits these) are examined on a map, make far more sense as bishops summoned to Caesarea than to Neocaesarea in Pontus Polemoniacus, being mainly from Cappadocia, Syria, Mesopotamia and Osrhoene.

Caesarea promulgated canons, Lebon demonstrates, according to the earliest canonical manuscript traditions in all three languages. Yet there are no canons given for its synod. Why does the name survive in the lists, but not the canons? Where have they gone? The answer, Lebon suggests, is that they have inadvertently been added to the canons of Ancyra, because the similarity of the names Caesarea and Neocaesarea caused an early scribe to conflate the two lists.

He finds confirmation for this suggestion in the Armenian collection of canons, which dates from the eighth century, but contains older material. These end the Ancyran canons at no. 19, and give ten canons under the heading of Caesarea, the last six Ancyran canons interspersed with canons from the letters of Basil of Caesarea to Amphilochius.<sup>82</sup>

Lebon does not suggest this list reflects the original Caesarean canons very closely: the language and the sentiments, as those of the earlier Ancyran canons in its list, is far removed from those of the Greek, Latin and Syriac versions. The Caesarean synod is styled 'A synod on the sins of women', while still retaining the even-handedness of the originals in various details. But he does think the splitting off of the six Ancyran canons reflects the order of the primitive Greek collection.

Lebon does characterise this particular conclusion as rather more tentative than the article's others (the existence of the synod, its issuing of canons). But those who have followed him have tended to ignore this distinction in Lebon's

---

<sup>81</sup> Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 65 sees this as an important part of Licinius's foreign policy.

<sup>82</sup> For the Armenian 'text of the canons of Caesarea', with Latin translation, see Lebon, 'Concile', pp. 101-12; for a full text of the Armenian canons of Ancyra, Caesarea and Neocaesarea, see V. Hakobian, *Kanonagirk' Hayoc' I* (Erevan, 1964), pp. 151-87.

claims.<sup>83</sup> Current scholars appear either to accept all the article's conclusions or to ignore them altogether.<sup>84</sup>

And yet this part of his theory has not, in fact, much to recommend it. No synod of the period issued as few as six canons. The similarity of the names 'Caesarea' and 'Neocaesarea' in no way explains why the former synod's canons should have been added to an earlier synod, rather than the one whose name it resembled. The careful preservation of the name of the other synod in the introduction to Neocaesarea's canons is very difficult to explain on this assumption of scribal negligence and stupidity (even so ignorant a scribe as the Prisca translator preserved some record of the synod). Canons 20-25 of Ancyra are by no means inconsistent with the earlier canons of that synod, showing rather a close affinity with its tariff of penalties, as will be seen shortly -- certainly best explained on the assumption that Marcellus was involved with their promulgation (and he is not listed among the names of those at Caesarea). The Armenian list of canons cannot be original, and is at least as likely to have been generated by extracting the final Ancyran canons to fill the inexplicable gap in the manuscript, or out of some ideological need to cite a synod on penances for women, as the gap in the original is likely to have been created by splicing the Caesarean canons with the Ancyran. Significantly, the Armenian canons have no memory at all of the major event of the synod of Caesarea, of such fundamental importance in their own history, the consecration of their revered founder, unless they are deliberately trying to cover up Armenia's dependence on Caesarea in this period. The close linking of the titles and episcopal names of Ancyra and Caesarea, with often a particularly intimate conjunction ('δῆ' '-que' 'vel'), has a much better possible explanation than that some folk memory lingered of their canons having been accidentally combined.

---

<sup>83</sup> E.g. L'Huillier, 'Origine'.

<sup>84</sup> Surveys of the history of canon law tend not to discuss the point: Gaudemet (*Sources*, p. 47) and Ferme (*Introduzione alla storia delle fonti del diritto canonico*, p. 66), make no mention of Lebon's thesis.

The best explanation for the close linking of the synods, the juxtaposition of their bishop-lists and the absence of canons peculiar to Caesarea despite the references to its having promulgated some, is that Caesarea simply ratified those of Ancyra all over again. There are many possible reasons why this might have been done. Gregory might have wanted a disciplinary code-book to take back with him to Armenia. The newly-consecrated (in the few months since Ancyra) bishop of Caesarea Leontius might have wanted to imitate Marcellus' success, or steal his thunder, and seen this as the best way of doing it. Or they might all have decided this was a good way to keep the already apparent ambition of Marcellus under control.

The synod of Caesarea was a return to something nearer the synods of the late third century – a gathering of bishops from Cappadocia, Pontus, Cilicia and Syria. It may have represented a rejection of Marcellus, who was not present. But it certainly represented, in its adoption of the canons of Ancyra, a triumph of Marcellus's ideas, of his chairmanship, of his pastoral ability, of his legislative mind.

Having rejected Lebon's claims to dismember the last section of the Ancyran legislation, I will take their unity with the rest of the synod for granted. Canons 16-17 and 19-25, in that they give penances, which allows us to establish some kind of a tariff of offences from less to more serious and to compare them to previous rulings, are in fact easier to fingerprint than the middle section of Ancyran legislation, although we cannot say with any confidence which of them were actually introduced by Marcellus. One which I would argue was not is canon 16, which gives penance for twenty years, thirty years and life for different degrees of bestiality, or possibly homosexuality.<sup>85</sup> We have no access

---

<sup>85</sup> The word is ἀλογεύομαι, which Lampe translates as 'have carnal relations with animals', citing this as the only passage; the form is unknown in classical Greek. TLG lists four uses, three in Theodore the Studite and one in the thirteenth-century lexicon of Pseudo-Zonaras. Theodore clearly takes the word to mean bestiality, for it twice (Letters 22 and 31) occurs in a list of vices referring explicitly to the Canons of Basil. The passage in Basil which Theodore has in mind (Letter 188.7) uses the word ζωοφθόροι, which is replaced on each occasion in Theodore with a form of ἀλογεύομαι. Pseudo-Zonaras (Lexicon Alpha 138) understands the verb as referring to being corrupted with irrational animals. Of the Latin versions of the canons

to Marcellus' views on these questions, but the terms involved are completely unrealistic, and count as an expression of disapproval rather than a serious sanction;<sup>86</sup> they do not square with the attitude to penance evidenced by the other rulings.

Canons 19-25 lay down other penances, generally more lenient than those laid down before or afterwards. They have an odd affinity with some of the canons of Iliberris, although they are not close enough to argue securely for influence.

Canon 19 prescribes the penance for consecrated virgins who have broken their vow as equal to that for second marriages (in other words, one year): Iliberris canon 13 forbade to give them communion even at death, unless they only fall once and do penance for the rest of their lives. (Iliberris is presumably describing fornication and Ancyra marriage. Basil of Caesarea, it may be said, took a much more serious view of this.)<sup>87</sup> It also forbids virgins to live as sisters with men. Iliberris canon 27 forbade clerics to have any woman unrelated to them to live with them.

Canon 20 of Ancyra accords seven years to adulterers, male or female: Iliberris canon 8 refused communion at death to a woman who leaves her husband and takes up with another; canon 7 refused it to a man committing a second sexual offence of any kind; canon 47 allowed a married man committing adultery many times to receive communion on his deathbed; canon 63 refused communion at

---

of Ancyra, Prisca gives the titulus 'De his qui in animalibus sunt fornicati', and takes the meaning so in the canon, but adds 'vel in masculis' in the text of the succeeding canon. The two Isidorian versions tell us the Greek is untranslatable, and explain it has three possible meanings, bestiality, marriage in the forbidden degrees, or homosexuality. Dionysius I has the same three possibilities, while Dionysius II only has the first and the third. The Isidorian epitome has the first and the second. Zonaras and Balsamon, the mediaeval Greek commentators, took it as homosexuality. The jury is out.

One factor which militates against commentators' being able to take the charge of bestiality seriously is a Woody Allen-esque, sheep-in-a-suspender-belt picture of what is involved. It is much more likely that this was a form of prank indulged in by groups of country boys against the flocks of rival villages, as is suggested by the role of the age differential in the length of penance to be given.

<sup>86</sup> Though Basil of Caesarea mentions in letter 188.7 to Amphilochius of Iconium a case he has come across of a man doing thirty years under what is presumably this canon; he considers the length of the penance excessive.

death to a woman who became pregnant while her husband was away and killed her child; canon 64 allowed a woman who left her new man to return to her husband to be received after ten years; canon 69 allowed a married man or woman who fell only once to be reconciled after five years.

Canon 21 gave prostitutes and women committing abortion or infanticide ten years, declaring this to be an amelioration of previous statues;<sup>88</sup> canon 63 of Iliberris refused communion at death to a wife who killed her adulterously conceived child.

Canons 22 and 23 gave life to voluntary murderers and five years (brought down from seven)<sup>89</sup> to involuntary ones. It is just possible that this is an allusion, which has been misunderstood and so miscopied, to Iliberris canon 5, which gave seven years to a woman who deliberately beat her slave-girl to death in anger, five if she accidentally did so. But killing one's own slave did not normally count as homicide in Roman law.

Canon 24 gave five years for those who consult sorcerers: Iliberris canon 6 refused communion at death to anyone who killed someone else by sorcery.

Canon 25, a particular case, gives ten years to the accomplices of a man who impregnated his fiancée's sister and then deserted her, so that she hanged herself. In avenging the woman's death in this way (which the man would not be directly guilty of in modern Western law), this ruling follows the tendency of the Ancyran canons in general to be rather pro-women (giving men and women equal penances for adultery, being lenient to women's crimes, such as prostitution, abortion and infanticide, being harder on male crimes such as homicide). The accomplices, though, may well themselves be female slaves.

---

<sup>87</sup> *Letters* 199.18.

<sup>88</sup> 'Ο μὲν πρότερος ὅρος μέχρις ἐξόδου ἐκόλυσεν.

<sup>89</sup> 'Ο μὲν πρότερος ὅρος ἐν ἑπταετία κελεύει τοῦ τελείου μετασχεῖν κατὰ τοὺς ὀρισμένους βαθμούς, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος τὸν πενταετὴ χρόνον πληρῶσαι.

As with the persecution canons, these later canons show, I would argue, a consistent picture, and are the product largely of a single mind, if not in every case, at least in the overall emphasis. As with the persecution canons, they are also the product of a new optimism, the optimism described so well by Eusebius,<sup>90</sup> the optimism that at this stage led to generosity and φιλανθρωπία, although later it was to be so swallowed up in controversy. If these canons do, as I have argued, largely reflect the mind and pastoral concerns of Marcellus of Ancyra outside of any controversy, they were also his first and one of his greatest achievements. The canons of Ancyra are the formal beginning of Eastern Canon Law. In some ways, they are Marcellus' most lasting monument.

## 5. The transmission of the canons of Ancyra.

How many copies of the canons of Ancyra were made after the original synod, it is impossible to tell. If my proposed reconstruction of the relationship between canons of Ancyra and the synod of Caesarea is correct, however, all the earliest versions to which we have access come from the text endorsed at the latter synod. The earliest Syriac manuscript (Schulthess' Syriac A), all the earliest Latin manuscripts (both early Isidorian versions, Prisca and both Dionysian versions) and the earliest Greek witness (the *Syntagma*) all add the name 'Caesarea' (or a 'correction' of it) to the canons of Ancyra. Prisca, Isidore *vulgata* and Syriac A, three of the four versions which give lists of episcopal names, give the Caesarean names immediately after those of Ancyra.

However, divergence of traditions after the synod of Caesarea seems to have been immediate. The various names in the episcopal lists remain extraordinarily accurate through their translations into the different languages, even when the scribes clearly had no recognition of the personal names or even, in some cases, of the sees. No more than a name or two ever goes astray, though the sees are occasionally misassigned, and the agreement between the

---

<sup>90</sup> Eusebius, *HE* X.1-3.



lists is remarkable.<sup>91</sup> The same cannot be said, however, for the order of the names. The Ancyran names remain relatively uniform, and changes in order can easily be shown to result from a scribe reading names written in column form down instead of across.<sup>92</sup> But the Caesarean names (which have no sees supplied) vary so enormously in their order that they may well come from more than one copy of the original document.

There are six lists of Caesarean names, for the Isidorean evidence here divides and produces two completely different lists, Turner's mss. Θ V F Sp and his S v C Q.<sup>93</sup> Isidore Θ V F Sp and Prisca are the same, and Schulthess' Syriac A is the same list read down instead of across columns; Schulthess' Syriac E (the other Syriac tradition to include names) is recognisably related to these, with a couple of names out of place and the second half of the list read down instead of across columns. Isidore S v C Q and Dionysia Hadriana, however, are so different from the others (although related to each other, being the same in the second half of the list, and related by the same process of reading down or across two columns in the first half), that it is impossible to reconstruct a process that could have turned the one order into the other in any reasonable number of moves. These same traditions preserve versions of the Ancyran names which closely resemble all the others, or are only one step removed from the other versions.<sup>94</sup> When the Ancyran list is preserved so well, scribal idiosyncrasy alone cannot explain the enormous variations in the Caesarean. These can only be accounted for by some oddity in the original.

---

<sup>91</sup> We owe it to the work of C.H. Turner, who reduced the confusion of Latin lists known to earlier scholars to three basic archetypes, that this can now be seen so readily. Hefele and Leclercq could still claim the lists were so varied they must be spurious.

<sup>92</sup> *EOMIA* 2.1, p. 50, n.

<sup>93</sup> See Table 1.

<sup>94</sup> Dionysia Hadriana confuses the later sees, and begins to add the bishops of Caesarea on to the end of the Ancyran names in a completely different order again. Two Isidore codices (Θ and Q) have no Ancyran names; S v and C take the names down instead of across columns, each also displacing the second name, Agricolaus of Caesarea (which S v replace third to last, and C omits), and placing Vitalis of Antioch second. F omits Marcellus' name and places Agricolaus' first. But the relationship of each to the lists of Prisca and Dionysia Hadriana is clear enough, and the various separate changes easily explicable.



I would posit the following process. A scribal copy of the canons of Ancyra, complete with list of names neatly copied out in two columns, was produced at Caesarea and signed by the bishops there. For some reason, the bishops did not include their sees: either because the first two signatories (Vitalis and Lupus) were already on the list above, and saw no need to, or else because there was too little room left on the page. The copyists then had one neat list of scribally copied names and one collection of untidy, birthday-card signatures to work from. They produced a list in four or five columns, possibly irregular ones, from this exemplar, reflecting the scrawl of names across the page. These later became two columns, in imitation of the Ancyran names, but by now at least three utterly different orders of the names were in existence.

Some time after these two synods, a third took place at Neocaesarea.<sup>95</sup> No names survive from it, and its decisions are for the most part minor. But it produced fifteen canons which were appended to those of Ancyra-Caesarea, and appear in all the canonical collections. Either the Ancyran tradition dates from one exemplar, or the canons of Neocaesarea were appended to those of Ancyra in all the archives which survived. In the latter case, we can assume that Neocaesarea was attended by the major sees of Eastern Anatolia.<sup>96</sup>

Scholars differ on the place of assembly of the early canonical collection used by all the versions discussed. Some favour an original collection in the diocese of Pontica (presumably at Caesarea in Cappadocia), since all the early synods have a Pontican provenance apart from Nicaea, which all attended: this would have included the canons of Ancyra and Caesarea, Neocaesarea, Nicaea and

---

<sup>95</sup> The date of the synod of Neocaesarea is even less secure than is usually assumed. Hefele-Leclercq date it between 314 and 319 (the death of Vitalis of Antioch), preferring a later date because there is no mention of the persecution. But if the episcopal names generally attached to Neocaesarea belong in fact to Caesarea, we know nothing at all about who attended the former, and the *terminus ad quem* becomes Nicaea itself. (L'Huillier, 'Origine', p. 58, who accepts the Lebon thesis on the Caesarean names, assumes a further list of Neocaesarean names, which, however, he takes from a list in Hefele-Lerclercq which Lebon assigns to Caesarea.)

<sup>96</sup> See chapter 2 for a suggested list of participants at this synod.

Gangra.<sup>97</sup> At some point after Gangra, a copy of the collection was brought to Antioch, where the canons of an earlier Antiochene council were added (out of sequence, as is the case in all the versions).

The other main reconstruction has the canons assembled in Antioch from the beginning, on the grounds that the bishop of Antioch attended all of them.<sup>98</sup> The main quirk of this collection would be that it did not contain, at first, the canons of Nicaea, because Antioch was anti-Nicene. After Constantinople, they were added, out of place at the beginning of the collection.

Either way, this collection, sometimes with the addition of Constantinople 381 and Chalcedon, became the basis of the collections of the fifth and sixth centuries, and of both Eastern and early Western canon law. Ancyra was acknowledged in the collection to be chronologically the first of its synods, although it stood second after Nicaea, and although it must cede to Iliberris the position of being the first council to actually issue canons, it played a vital role in galvanising conciliar canonical legislation throughout the Church. Its mildness and generosity were also certainly a restraining influence on later legislation.<sup>99</sup> If Marcellus achieved nothing else as bishop, he achieved that.

---

<sup>97</sup> E.g. F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Graz, 1870); L'Huillier, 'Origine', pp. 58-59; Barty, 'Antioch', cols 589-598.

<sup>98</sup> E.g. Gaudemet, *Sources*, pp. 75-76.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Nicaea Canon 11.

**Table 1: The bishop-lists of Ancyra (normalised)**

| <i>Isidore Vulgata</i>              | <i>Prisca, Syriac A [with provinces]<sup>100</sup><br/>&amp; Syriac E</i> | <i>Dionysius Hadriana</i>           |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Marcellus of Ancyra              | Vitalis of Antioch [of Syria]   | Vitalis of Antioch                  |
| 2. Agricolaus of Caesarea           | Marcellus of [Galatian] Ancyra  | Marcellus of Ancyra                 |
| 3. Lupus of Tarsus                  | Agricolaus of [Cappadocian] Caesarea                                      | Agricolaus of Caesarea              |
| 4. Vitalis of Antioch               | Lupus of Tarsus [of Cilicia]  | Lupus of Tarsus                     |
| 5. Basil of Amasia                  | Basil of Amasia [of Greater Armenia] <sup>101</sup>                       | Basil of Amasia                     |
| 6. Philadelphus of Iuliopolis       | Philadelphus of Iuliopolis [of Galatia]                                   | Philadelphus of Iuliopolis          |
| 7. Eustolus of Nicomedia            | Eustolus of Nicomedia [of Bithynia]                                       | Eustolus of Nicomedia               |
| 8. Heraclius of Zela                | Heraclius of Zela [of Greater Armenia]                                    | Heraclius of Zela                   |
| 9. Peter of Iconium                 | Peter of Iconium [no province given]                                      | Peter of Iconium                    |
| 10. Nunechius of Laodicea           | Nunechius of Laodicea [of Phrygia]  | Nunechius of Laodicea               |
| 11. Sergianus of Antioch of Pisidia | Sergianus of Antioch of Pisidia   | Sergianus of Antioch                |
| 12. Narcissus of Neronias           | Epidaurus of Perge [of Pamphilia]   | Epidaurus of Pisidia <sup>102</sup> |
| 13. Epidaurus of Perge              | Narcissus of Neronias [no province given]                                 | Narcissus of Perge                  |
|                                     |   | 14. Leontius of Neronias            |
|                                     |   | 15. Longinus of Dicaeus             |
|                                     |   | 16. Amphion Alphios                 |
|                                     |   | 17. Selaos                          |
|                                     |   | 18. Germanos                        |

<sup>100</sup> These have been supplied by a scribe from provinces given in Nicene bishop-lists.

<sup>101</sup> A mistaken designation: see E. Honigsmann, 'Two alleged "Bishops of Greater Armenia" as members of the Synods of Ancyra (314 AD) and Caesarea in Cappadocia' in *Patristic Studies*, ST 173 (Rome, 1953), pp. 1-5 for a reconstruction of the process which led to it.

<sup>102</sup> The scribe has mistakenly displaced the adjective 'Pisidian' from the previous see and hence supplied the remaining sees out of order.



## CHAPTER TWO

# The Road to Nicaea

### 1. *Hoi Peri Eusebion*

Much more than by Alexander or Marcellus or Athanasius, and certainly much more than by Arius, the shape taken by the 'Arian controversy' was determined by Eusebius, bishop of Berytus, then Nicomedia, then Constantinople.<sup>1</sup> It was he who largely orchestrated the campaign on Arius' behalf carried on throughout the East in the years before 325, he who rallied the proponents of the Father's temporal priority to the Son on his return from exile in 328, he who led the attacks on Athanasius and Marcellus in the 330s, and the exoneration of Arius at the same period, he who led the resistance to the 'interference' of the West in 340, and probably also he who held the Dedication synod to its hard and satirical line. Alexander feared him, Athanasius reviled him, and Julius saw him and his henchmen as the cause of all the ecclesiastical disturbances in the East. On his death the unity, both theological and political, of the powerful party he had led fell apart almost instantly and was never recovered. Thereafter the band of his theological fellow-travellers fragmented and fragmented again, some seeking peace, some taking further the ideas and policies the earlier group had developed, and some drifting off in new directions or combining with their previous enemies against their former friends.

However one estimates Eusebius' character, no one can deny that his talents were extraordinary. His ability to turn the situation in the East from almost total defeat to almost total triumph for his party in a matter of ten years is impressive; it is even more impressive when one considers that by the time of his death he virtually ruled the church in the East, and bequeathed that leadership to his successors, had they had the talent to wield it as he had done, with the aid of a group of bishops which never numbered more than about twenty committed

---

<sup>1</sup> On Eusebius, see Gustave Bardy, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son École*, Études de Théologie Historique (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils, 1936), pp. 296-315.

members, and never had control of more than a handful of the Eastern metropolitan sees. No one who knows anything of institutional politics can be surprised that such a feat should be possible, but its achievement still demands brilliance- a brilliance which might be put to much better use, but brilliance all the same.

The few facts that are known about Eusebius' background, as well as his thought, have been given many times: his blood relationship to Julius Julianus,<sup>2</sup> his discipleship of Lucian of Antioch, his few surviving letters and fragments of letters<sup>3</sup> which prove him to have been, or to have made himself out to be, very close to Arius in his Trinitarian theology, at least initially.<sup>4</sup> Less attention, on the whole, has been given to the composition of the group he led; even the disciples of Lucian, some of whom formed an important part of that group, though they have received a great deal of study from time to time, have largely been thought of as a unit, and not as individuals; where they have been studied as individuals, it is above all their theology which has been considered. Here it will be above all the political involvement of the individuals concerned which will be considered, and offset against the choices made by some of their friends and colleagues.

#### **a. The Sullukianistai**

Arius, in appealing to Eusebius for help, famously addressed him as 'Sullukianistes'. We know from Philostorgius that Eusebius had been a pupil of the martyr Lucian, whether or not Arius was (Arius is never mentioned by Philostorgius as such). We will consider later in this chapter why Eusebius

---

<sup>2</sup> Ammianus reports that Eusebius was related to Basilina (*PLRE* I, 148), the daughter of Julius Julianus (*PLRE* I, 478-9).

<sup>3</sup> *Urk* 2 (p. 3), to Arius; *Urk* 8 (pp. 15-17), to Paulinus of Tyre; *Urk* 21 (p. 42); and *Urk* 31 (pp. 65-66) = *CPG* 2046, 2045, 2047, 2048.

<sup>4</sup> On Eusebius of Nicomedia's theology, see Hanson, *Search*, pp. 29-31. For one telling example of affinity to Arius (in the use of the title 'God' rather than 'Father'), see Vinzent, 'Gegner', p. 312.

responded so vigorously to Arius' appeal, but first it is worth looking at the rest of those mentioned by Philostorgius as being pupils of Lucian.

The main list given by Philostorgius (*HE* II.14)<sup>5</sup> consists of Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicaea, Leontius, afterwards bishop of Antioch, Antonius of Tarsus in Cilicia, Menophantus (of Ephesus), Numenius, Eudoxius, Alexander and Asterius the Cappadocian. Elsewhere, Athanasius of Anazarbus in Cilicia is also mentioned as having studied under Lucian.<sup>6</sup> In the late fourth-century *Life* of Lucian (in the fragments of it which survive in Symeon Metaphrastes), four women are also mentioned: Eustolia, Dorothea, Severia and Pelagia.<sup>7</sup>

Firstly, it is important to consider the nature of this group. They have sometimes been considered as virtually synonymous with *hoi peri Eusebion*<sup>8</sup>. H.C. Brennecke has even gone so far as to suggest that the list represents a self-conscious group of those who devoted themselves to the cult of Lucian for political reasons after the dedicating of a church to him in Helenopolis in c.327,<sup>9</sup> who may have had no other connection with him at all.<sup>10</sup> However, they neither

---

<sup>5</sup> Bidez, p. 25.10-15.

<sup>6</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* III.15 = p. 46.1-3.

<sup>7</sup> On the *Vita Luciani* reconstructed by Bidez as Anhang VI of his edition of Philostorgius (pp. 184-201), see Bardy, *Lucien*, and Hanns Christof Brennecke, 'Lukian von Antiochien in der Geschichte des Arianischen Streites', in *Logos, Festschrift für Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993*, ed. Hanns Christof Brennecke, Ernst Ludwig Grasmück and Christof Marksches, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), pp. 170-192, at 182-184. The women disciples are listed in Anhang VI.10 (p. 192.19-22).

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Williams, *Arius*, p. 63.

<sup>9</sup> On the date of the refoundation of Drepanum as Helenopolis, see Barnes, *New Empire*, p. 77 with n. 130.

<sup>10</sup> See Brennecke, 'Lukian', pp. 184-187. There are major problems with Brennecke's thesis: he has no real explanation for Arius' use of the term *συλλυκיאριστής* before Nicaea, or Alexander's reference to Lucian in *He philarchos*; the list Philostorgius gives of Lucian's pupils does not represent a group who were ever all in power at the same time (Leontius was only made bishop of Antioch after the death of Eusebius and Theognis); several of those on Philostorgius' list were never prominent in the politics of the time (see below). In addition, Brennecke's argument that the choice of the martyr Lucian as object of veneration on the part of Eusebius and his friends was simply arbitrary is not convincing: doubtless saints have often been venerated by groups with no historical connection to them, but they are always singled out for a reason. Why would the Eusebians, if simply looking for a suitably impressive heavenly sponsor, not have chosen Anthimus, a bishop and the first Nicomedian martyr of the 303 persecution, especially in the light of their statement at the Dedication synod 'Why should we



include all the most prominent supporters of Eusebius, nor do they necessarily represent allies, above all political allies, of Eusebius of Nicomedia at all.

Everything that is known of their theology<sup>11</sup> suggests they all (certainly the nine we know anything about) believed Father and Son were two distinct, separate entities,<sup>12</sup> the Father eternal and the Son created in time (or just before time) by the will of the Father; this may or may not also have been Lucian's theology,<sup>13</sup> but it certainly marked them out as being on one side of the early fourth-century Trinitarian divide. Epiphanius tells us that Lucian and his disciples believed Christ had no human soul, which was rather replaced by the Logos:<sup>14</sup> this would not be surprising (Marcellus and Eustathius were unusual at this time in having a full role for Christ's human soul to play), but it has been used by Hanson<sup>15</sup> and Gregg and Groh<sup>16</sup> to give an attractive (if a little suspiciously modern) picture of their distinctive soteriology. There are some very positive features of the group: their inclusion of women as fellow-students and friends, and their acceptance of Asterius back into the fold (beginning apparently with Lucian),<sup>17</sup> despite his former apostasy. But what there was of personal closeness between them dating from their time together with Lucian (if indeed they were all ever with him at the same time) seems to have been, on the one hand, transmittable (outsiders,

---

who are bishops follow a presbyter?' (Athanasius, *De Synodis* 22.3). Eusebius of Caesarea certainly found him equally impressive. See Eusebius, *HE* VIII.13.2 and IX.6.3 for Lucian and VIII.6.6 and 13.1 for Anthimus, and note the eloquent silence which envelopes the name of Lucian at *VC* IV.61.1. Brennecke's point (p. 192) that Lucian should be seen primarily as a martyr rather than a proto-heresiarch (in which he follows Bardy) is nevertheless to be welcomed, and not merely for sectarian reasons.

<sup>11</sup> For surviving fragments of their writings, see below.

<sup>12</sup> See, for example, the unambiguous statements in Asterius, frs 10-11 in Marcus Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien, Die Theologische Fragmente, Einleitung, Kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* XX (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 86-88, from Eusebius of Caesarea, *C Mar* I.4.

<sup>13</sup> On the methodological problems involved in trying to reconstruct Lucian's theology by working backwards from that of his pupils, see the salutary remarks of Brennecke, 'Lukian', pp. 173-4 and 180.

<sup>14</sup> Epiphanius, *Anc* 33.4; *Pan* 69.19.7 and 69.48-49.

<sup>15</sup> See Hanson, *Search*, pp. 111-12.

<sup>16</sup> Robert C. Gregg and Dennis E. Groh, *Early Arianism, A View of Salvation* (London: SCM Press, 1981). Though Gregg and Groh remain agnostic on Lucian's beliefs (p. 164), the central thesis of their provocative book revolves around the soteriological significance of 'the obedient Logos' (title to chapter 3).

<sup>17</sup> Both Asterius and Alexander were 'helped towards repentance' by their teacher; see Philostorgius, *HE* II.14 (p. 25.16-18).



such as Paulinus of Tyre, seem to have been as close to many members of the group as they were to each other), and on the other not unlimited, for closeness to Eusebius of Nicomedia seems to have come at a considerable price, which not everybody wanted to pay.

Of the twelve male disciples (if we include Arius), Numenius and Alexander<sup>18</sup> are completely unknown to us and seem never to have taken any part in the events of the period important enough to leave a trace in its writings. The same may be true of Eudoxius, if Bardy is correct in arguing that Philostorgius would surely have told us if he were to be identified with Eudoxius of Germanicia.<sup>19</sup> Antony of Tarsus, who seems to have become bishop there in the early 330s,<sup>20</sup> and who is twice described in the *Vita Luciani* as Lucian's most faithful disciple,<sup>21</sup> and even once by Philostorgius as one who never strayed from Lucian's doctrine,<sup>22</sup> never took any part that is recorded in the events of the 330s and early 340s (although he might have been one of the bishops at Tyre in 335); there is no bishop of Tarsus at Eastern Sardica. Athanasius of Anazarbus<sup>23</sup> clearly held theological views close to those of Arius and Eusebius of

---

<sup>18</sup> It is just conceivable that this is the same Alexander as the bishop of that name who appears not at Nicaea but at the two Antiochene synods of 324 and 329, having somehow managed (unlike Asterius) to be ordained despite having apostatised in the Great Persecution (Philostorgius, *HE* II.14 (p. 25.15-16)). If so, Nicaea canon 10 is presumably partly aimed at him, and Eustathius presumably deposed him on the strength of it, only to have him reinstated after Eustathius' own deposition. But this is a particularly long shot; the name is a very common one.

<sup>19</sup> Bardy, *Lucien*, p. 194.

<sup>20</sup> This dating is based on the career of Aetius as described by Philostorgius, *HE* (see Richard Paul Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, OECS (Oxford: OUP, 2000), pp. 19-21). Aetius studied under Paulinus of Tyre until his death in 328, then under Athanasius of Anazarbus, then Antony of Tarsus until the latter's elevation to the episcopacy. Since he seems to have spent at least a year each with Athanasius and Antony, judging by the studies he pursued, this brings us to at least 330.

<sup>21</sup> *Vita Luciani* 10 and 14 (= Philostorgius (Anhang VI), pp. 192.16 and 196.16-17).

<sup>22</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* II.15 (p. 25.19-20), supported by II.3 (p. 14.7-9).

<sup>23</sup> See in general Bardy, *Lucien*, pp. 204-210. There survives a fragment of a letter to Alexander of Alexandria (*Urk* 11 (p. 18) = *CPG* 2060) and three short fragments edited by D. De Bruyne, 'Deux lettres inconnues de Théognius, l'évêque de Nicée', *ZNW* 27 (1928), 107-10. The latter are classed as *CPG* 2061. Curiously, the *CPG Supplementum* does not record the important reedition of the fragments in R. Gryson, ed., *Scripta Arriana Latina, I, Collectio Veronensis, Scholia in Concilium Aquileiense, Fragmenta in Lucam Rescripta, Fragmenta Theologica Rescripta*, CCL LXXXVII, Pars I (Turnhout: Brepols, 1982), p. 235.

Nicomedia,<sup>24</sup> but he came neither to the synod of Nicaea nor to either of those at Antioch in 325 and 329, nor is there any record of his being involved in Eusebius' political intrigues, other than one intervention in the period before Nicaea.<sup>25</sup>

Two of the other disciples of Lucian who were active in the post-Nicene controversy only seem to have become so after Eusebius' death. Menophantus of Ephesus was at Nicaea,<sup>26</sup> and he was active enough by the time of Sardica to be included among the list of deposed 'Arian' leaders by the West (unlike Maris of Chalcedon, it may be added),<sup>27</sup> but he was not present at Tyre,<sup>28</sup> and seems not to have been prominent at the Dedication synod either. Leontius only became bishop of Antioch in 344<sup>29</sup> (after which he is given dishonourable mention by Athanasius for mocking him over his flight from Alexandria in 356),<sup>30</sup> and is only mentioned previously as affording some protection while presbyter in Antioch to the young Aetius.<sup>31</sup>

It is the remaining five pupils of Lucian who belong to the close-knit group politically and theologically active between 317 and 341: Eusebius, Maris, Theognis, Asterius and Arius. Arius appeals to Eusebius,<sup>32</sup> and probably adjusts his theology in the direction of Asterius;<sup>33</sup> Eusebius defends Arius;<sup>34</sup> Asterius<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> For examples, see R.P.C. Hanson, 'Who Taught ΕΞ ΟΥΚ ΟΝΤΩΝ?', in *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments, Papers from The Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, September 5-10, 1983, Oxford, England*, ed. Robert C. Gregg, Patristic Monograph Series 11 (Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985), pp. 79-83, at p. 80, and Williams, *Arius*, p. 59.

<sup>25</sup> Williams suggests that Athanasius of Anazarbus may have seen Alexander's *He philarchos* before replying in defence of Arius: *Arius*, p. 270, note 59 and p. 59.

<sup>26</sup> *PNN* 'Index restitutus', p. LXII.

<sup>27</sup> See Chapter 5.

<sup>28</sup> See Chapter 3.

<sup>29</sup> For the date, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 87-88.

<sup>30</sup> Athanasius, *Ap de Fuga* 1.1.

<sup>31</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* III.15 (p. 46.9-12).

<sup>32</sup> *Urk* 1 (pp. 1-3).

<sup>33</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 15.1 claims that Arius was pushed into writing his *Thalia* by 'those around Eusebius' (on this controverted text, see Williams, *Arius*, pp. 62-63). Williams takes this to mean that the work was written 'as a fairly direct result of Arius' new contacts with the Lucianist circle [including Asterius] after 321 or 322' (p. 63). In no small measure the question depends on the view one takes on the integrity of the material ostensibly from Arius in Athanasius, *C Ar* I.5-6. Some of it has a very 'Asterian' ring. Thus, Vinzent, *Asterius* reassigns

defends Eusebius.<sup>36</sup> Maris and Theognis are staunch allies of Eusebius, associated with his every action, and at least in Theognis' case with his theology.<sup>37</sup> Four of the five seem to have died within six or seven years of one another (Eusebius and Theognis within two); Maris outlived them all.<sup>38</sup>

From this sketch it may be seen that the closeness of the disciples of Lucian as such to one another is rather less than is often suggested, even if they had at some stage formed enough of a self-conscious group to be remembered as such. In particular, a number of them seem to have been wary of Eusebius, perhaps all the more because they knew him fairly well. But it is clear that most of the group did not see Eusebius simply as Lucian's natural successor, any more than Lucian himself probably did. Philostorgius may mean that it was Lucian who nicknamed Eusebius 'the great';<sup>39</sup> in a school context, that is not likely to have

---

four fragments which had been regarded by Bardy, *Lucien*, as part of the *Thalia* to Asterius: in *C Ar* I.5.4 (*AW* I,1,1, p. 114.15-18 Metzler), Bardy's *Thalia* fr. 4 = Vinzent's Asterius, *Syntagmation* fr. 73; in *C Ar* I.5.5 (p. 114.18-20), Bardy's fr. 5 = Vinzent's fr. 65; in *C Ar* I.5.8 (p. 114. 28 - p. 115.34), Bardy's fr. 9 = Vinzent's fr. 43; and in *C Ar* I.6.1-2 (p. 115.1-6), Bardy's fr. 10 = Vinzent's fr. 63. The fragments clearly have an Asterian ring, as Vinzent's commentary amply demonstrates. But the text runs smoothly, and Athanasius refers all four passages to a 'he' which is Arius ('he says', 'he says', 'he says', 'he dared'). And therefore these fragments all differ significantly from the very Asterian passage in *C Ar* I.1.7 (p. 114.23-28). Stuart Hall wrings his hands over the fact that the latter 'should warn us that Athanasius is not being scholarly or exact in his method' (Stuart G. Hall, 'The *Thalia* of Arius in Athanasius' Accounts', in *Arianism*, ed. Gregg, pp. 17-58, at p. 50). But in fact Athanasius says explicitly that this idea is found 'in other writings of theirs' (p. 114.23-24). If Arius may be left in possession of any of the fragments here reassigned by Vinzent, Asterian influence on the *Thalia* seems clear.

<sup>34</sup> *Urk* 8 (pp. 15-17) to Paulinus of Tyre, especially 8.1-2 (p. 15) and 8.8 (p. 17). Note also *Urk* 2 (p. 3) to Arius himself.

<sup>35</sup> For the fragments, see Vinzent, *Asterius*. Wolfram Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius* has demonstrated conclusively on both theological and stylistic grounds that the Homilies on the Psalms ascribed to Asterius the Sophist by Marcel Richard cannot in fact be by him.

<sup>36</sup> Asterius, fr. 6 Vinzent (p. 84) and fr. 8 Vinzent (p. 86), both from Eusebius of Caesarea's *C Marc* I.4.

<sup>37</sup> On Theognis, see Bardy, *Lucien*, pp. 204-210. Three short fragments of Theognis were edited by De Bruyne in 1928 = *CPG* 2070. As with Athanasius of Anazarbus (see note 22 above), *CPG Supplementum* has failed to notice the reedition by Gryson, *Scripta Arriana Latina*, I, p. 235.

<sup>38</sup> For the deaths of Eusebius and Arius, see below. For the deaths of Maris and Theognis, see Bardy, *Lucien*, p. 202: the former outlived Julian and died under Jovian or even Valens, the latter was dead by the time of Sardica. And for the death of Asterius (last attested at the Dedication Synod of 341), see Kinzig, pp. 18-19 with notes 44 and 46.

<sup>39</sup> The relative οὗ in *HE* I.8<sup>a</sup> could of course be either masculine or neuter. In the former case, it must refer to Lucian; in the latter, not to a specific referent, but to the general idea of Eusebius' conspicuous virtue.

been meant as an unmixed compliment. At worst, it would have satirised Eusebius' towering ambition; at best, it probably satirised his size.<sup>40</sup>

Two distinct groups seem in later years to have attempted to claim Lucian as their own, which may rather reflect earlier divisions among his own pupils: the homoiousians and the Eunomians. The former connected him with their favourite creed;<sup>41</sup> the latter with their 'apostolic succession'.<sup>42</sup> It is likely, however, that divisions among the group at an earlier stage were less on theological lines (Arius, Asterius, Maris and Eusebius all differed somewhat in their theological approaches, for all their defence of one another; Arius was closer to Athanasius of Anazarbus than to Asterius, and Maris<sup>43</sup> to Asterius than to Arius, so far as we can tell) than on personal; in other words, on whether individuals were prepared to let Eusebius of Nicomedia in practice inherit their teacher's authority over them all.

## **b. The Oriental party**

If the former pupils of Lucian seem to have ended up largely in Bithynia, Asia and Cilicia, with Arius in Alexandria, there was another group, loosely connected to them, dotted around the diocese of Oriens, who sometimes acted independently of the Bithynians, sometimes together with them, but usually to similar ends. Eusebius of Caesarea was its leader insofar as it had one, although its members were also loosely included by Athanasius in *hoi peri Eusebion* of

---

<sup>40</sup> Nothing is known of Eusebius' size, but it seems a reasonable conjecture from the nickname that he was either unusually large or unusually small.

<sup>41</sup> On the homoiousian espousal of a connection between Lucian and the so-called Second Creed of Antioch, see Hanns Christof Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer, Der Osten bis zum ende des homöischen Reichskirche*, Beiträge zur historische Theologie 73 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck, 1988), p. 221, note 265 and Winrich Alfried Löhr, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien, Studien zur Synodalgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte (Witterschlick / Bonn: Verlag Wehle, 1986), pp. 14-15.

<sup>42</sup> See Vaggione, *Eunomius*, pp. 43-47.

<sup>43</sup> In 360 Maris signed the creed and probably presided over the homoean synod of Constantinople: see Brennecke, *Homöer*, p. 54 with note 81 and Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 148.

Nicomedia; it included Paulinus of Tyre, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theodotus of Laodicea, Narcissus of Neronias, and to some extent Macedonius of Mopsuestia.

Eusebius of Caesarea<sup>44</sup> was a man whose primary characteristic was loyalty. Without ever having met him he was loyal to Origen, by way of being loyal to his own predecessor Pamphilus, Origen's follower and defender. He was loyal to his friends Theodotus of Laodicea and Paulinus of Tyre, to each of whom he dedicated important works,<sup>45</sup> risking his see for the former<sup>46</sup> and defending the latter vigorously, even after his death, from the attacks of Marcellus.<sup>47</sup> He was loyal to Constantine, who had rescued bishops from the threat of persecution and replaced it with tax-breaks and banquets, even when the emperor seemed for a time to be supporting the wrong side. He was loyal to those of his own theological opinions, until that loyalty clashed with loyalty to the emperor. And as far as he could be, he was loyal to the wider Church, whose history he wrote, whose most renowned bishops he enumerated, whose scriptures he loved and worked on. The difficulty came when these loyalties came into conflict, for Eusebius was also a man who believed that everything was for the best in the best of all possible worlds. He had no real mental strategy for coping with his own disloyalty to whichever object of his erstwhile loyalty lost out on any given occasion, other than to pretend it had never happened. Only Eusebius of Caesarea could have written a history of the synod of Nicaea which never mentions Arius, of the deposition of Eustathius without mentioning his own part in it, of the synod of Tyre without mentioning Athanasius.<sup>48</sup> The church

---

That implies that, at that period at least, Maris held a much more positive view of the knowability of the Father by the Son than that allowed by Arius.

<sup>44</sup> On Eusebius' life, see Barnes, *Constantine*; for his theology, see Holder Strutwolf, *Die Trinitätslehre und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea, Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* 72 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1999).

<sup>45</sup> Theodotus received both the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and the *Demonstratio*, while the *Onomasticon* as well as the tenth book of the *Church History* is dedicated to Paulinus (*HE* X.1.2).

<sup>46</sup> See the account of the Council of Antioch below.

<sup>47</sup> Eusebius praises the 'thrice-blessed' Paulinus in *C Marc* I.4.2-3 (and says explicitly that he is dead). See also I.4.17 and I.4.48 and 50.

<sup>48</sup> The guarded accounts of these events are in *VC* III.4-22, III.59 and IV.41 respectively.



historian who delighted in reporting the incumbents of the major sees since Christianity began was involved in unseating the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch and Ancyra; in each case, he did his absolute best to claim the matter had nothing to do with him.

Eusebius' attitude towards his namesake in Nicomedia, however, was deeply ambiguous. The latter is never mentioned in either the *Historia Ecclesiastica* or the *Vita Constantini*.<sup>49</sup> Only in the *Contra Marcellum*, where he was sure of his ground and of their common enemy, does Eusebius defend his namesake by name.<sup>50</sup> He is still keen to distance himself from Marcellus' trial, however, stressing that he has merely been brought in as a theological witness.<sup>51</sup> He had seen too much of Constantine's anger at those he suspected of plotting to want to bring it on himself.

Eusebius' lukewarmth towards Eusebius extends to the latter's master Lucian, about whom Eusebius is decidedly restrained in his enthusiasm, despite Lucian's glorious martyrdom.<sup>52</sup> The reason for this may be that they were to some extent rivals in textual scholarship; Lucian sought to produce (and presumably circulate as widely as possible) a clear, accessible text of the Septuagint, whereas Eusebius favoured Origen's text, corrected by Pamphilus and himself.<sup>53</sup> If so, Constantine favoured the Caesarean text; it was to Eusebius

---

<sup>49</sup> With the possible exception of the 'Eusebius the Bishop' mentioned in the *kephalaion* to VC III.11 (p. 8.29 Winkelmann). 'Eusebius' is mentioned in the *kephalaia* eight times in all. The other seven clearly refer to Eusebius of Caesarea himself, but in none of them is he called 'Eusebius the Bishop'. On the origin of the *kephalaia*, see Winkelmann, pp. XLVI-XLIX (added 'schon bald nach Eusebs Tod', p. XLIX) and T.D. Barnes, 'Panegyric, History and Hagiography in Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*', in *The Making of Orthodoxy, Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 94-123, at pp. 98-99.

<sup>50</sup> See Eusebius, *C Marc* I.4.4, I.4.17 and especially I.4.9.

<sup>51</sup> Eusebius, *C Marc* II.4.29.

<sup>52</sup> See references above.

<sup>53</sup> On the thorny problem of the Lucianic text, see Bruce M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, New Testament Tools and Studies IV (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), pp. 1-41 and especially pp. 3-7 ('Ancient Testimonies to Lucian and His School'). Jerome notes in the Preface to his translation of Chronicles, 'Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem, Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat, mediae inter has provinciae palaestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt' (*Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. Robertus Weber O.S.B. et al., 3<sup>rd</sup> edn Bonifatius Fischer et al. (2 vols, Stuttgart:

Pamphilus that he turned, at an unknown date, for copies of the Scriptures for the new churches in Constantinople.<sup>54</sup>

At the beginning of the controversy, however, Eusebius was full of zeal in supporting Arius; Eusebius of Nicomedia chides Paulinus for being less so.<sup>55</sup> The argument the Nicomedian bishop uses to Paulinus -- that it ill becomes a wise man when contrary opinions are put forward not to defend the truth<sup>56</sup> -- was clearly that which weighed with Eusebius of Caesarea: in writing to Alexander, he says, *πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἠτιῶ λέγοντας ὅτι ‘ὁ ὢν τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐγέννησε’*. *θαυμάζω δέ, εἰ δύναται τις ἄλλως εἰπεῖν*.<sup>57</sup> How can anyone conceivably object to ‘ὁ ὢν begot the one who is not ὁ ὢν’? Anything else is self-evidently either the worst kind of polytheism or simply patripassianism. The wisdom of becoming embroiled in this particular debate was clearly not at that point something which troubled him, despite the fact that he must have known his beloved Origen was in fact the source of Alexander’s ‘always God, always Son, Father and Son together’;<sup>58</sup> presumably the fact that all his theological contemporaries with whom he was on friendly terms thought as he did blinded him to the presence of another tradition even in the work of his own great hero.<sup>59</sup> Rivalry with Macarius of Jerusalem (now that city was beginning to attract pilgrims again after the end of the persecution in the East), who was known to think differently from him, may also have played its part.

---

Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983), I, 546. Brennecke, ‘Lukian’, pp. 189-198, is dismissive of the tradition of a Lucianic recension, but he seems to make the methodological mistake of conflating the question of the existence in antiquity of a recension identified as such and its recoverability by the textual critic now.

<sup>54</sup> See Constantine’s letter to Eusebius in *VC* IV.36. For an excellent discussion of the much canvassed possibility that the codices included Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, see T.C. Skeat, ‘The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine’, *JTS* ns 50 (1999), pp. 583-623.

<sup>55</sup> *Urk* 8.1 (p. 15.1-5).

<sup>56</sup> *Urk* 8.2 (p. 15.6).

<sup>57</sup> *Urk* 7.4 (p. 15.2-3).

<sup>58</sup> Arius cites the phrase in *Urk* 1.2 (p. 2.1) as a slogan used by Alexander. Origen, in *De Prin* I.2.3-4, for example, asserts the eternal generation of the Son from one who is always Father.

<sup>59</sup> On the theological shift from Origen to Eusebius, see Rebecca Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology, Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).



Paulinus of Tyre is an interesting figure. He was probably a holy and good man, and certainly a rich and educated one.<sup>60</sup> Marcellus calls Asterius Paulinus' 'father',<sup>61</sup> and conversely Paulinus the 'father' of Asterius and perhaps of Eusebius of Caesarea;<sup>62</sup> Marcellus may only know this from one conversation over dinner in Ancyra,<sup>63</sup> but it is an important and not implausible link between the Orientals and the pro-Eusebian Lucianists, since Asterius seems clearly to have been the leading theologian of the latter group. Eusebius of Caesarea dedicated the tenth book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* to Paulinus, which suggests he only came to know him well after the persecution, but he can already be found around 315 giving a speech in Paulinus' honour at a synod in Tyre to dedicate the church Paulinus has rebuilt there.<sup>64</sup> Eusebius, not yet of Nicomedia but still of Berytus in Phoenicia, was presumably there also.

Paulinus seems to have become involved in Arius' case only reluctantly, as noted above. What his relations with Eusebius of Nicomedia were we can only guess, but they were obviously close enough (perhaps for class reasons?) for Eusebius to feel he had the right to hector his former metropolitan, and even to succeed in persuading him to write on the subject of Arius' theology, probably

---

<sup>60</sup> He is called 'blessed Paulinus' by Asterius (fr. 7 Vinzent (p. 84)) and Eusebius of Caesarea (*C Marc* I.4.17 and 50), who also speaks of him as 'the man of God' (*C Marc* I.4.48), who lived blessedly and died blessedly (*C Marc* I.4.3). The dedication of the tenth book of the *Church History* addresses him as 'most holy Paulinus' (X.1.2). The fulsome praise in X.4.2 speaks of Paulinus' 'venerable φρόνησις'. The florid reference in X.4.26 to the building work on the new church in Tyre being accomplished by Paulinus 'great-mindedness and rich and boundless hand of understanding' as well as by the contributions of the congregation may imply that the bishop had money to put into the project as well. Philostorgius claims that he was one of the teachers of Aetius (*HE* III.15 and 15<sup>b</sup> (p. 45.1-3 and 28-30)).

<sup>61</sup> Marcellus, frs 84 and 87 K (pp. 114.11 and 18.7-10 Vinzent).

<sup>62</sup> Marcellus fr. 84 K (p. 114.11 Vinzent): 'Paulinus the father of Asterius'. In fr. 40 K the referent of τοῦτου may be either Asterius, who has been briefly mentioned *C Marc* I.4.48, or – if that reference is deemed parenthetical – to Eusebius, the previous subject.

<sup>63</sup> Marcellus, fr. 40 mentions something Paulinus said 'to us one time, passing through Ancyra'. In the immediate context Eusebius reports that Marcellus referred to homilies which he, Eusebius, had given one time 'in Laodicea' (*C Marc* I.4.42) and again 'in passing through Ancyra' (*C Marc* I.4.45). Each time Eusebius says that Marcellus claimed to have learned this 'from a report' (ἐξ ἀκοῆς). Alastair Logan sees these two homilies as part of 'some kind of Arian propaganda campaign in the region involving an attack on him [Marcellus] in Ancyra before Nicaea' (Alastair H.B. Logan, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325: Antioch, Ancyra, and Nicaea', *JTS* ns 43 (1992), 428-446, at p. 436).

<sup>64</sup> The oration is proudly reproduced in Eusebius, *HE* X.4.2-72. For the date, see Barnes, *Eusebius*, p. 162 with p. 360, note 108.

to Alexander. The tiny fragments we have of his letter, all from Marcellus,<sup>65</sup> show that Paulinus' approach was fairly eirenic, simply attempting to explain why he and his friends believed what they did about the Father's relationship to the Son: 'Paulinus wrote these things, confessing "some to have been moved thus by themselves, but others to have been led this way by the reading of the men spoken of before."'”<sup>66</sup> One of the 'men spoken of before' was Origen; who the others were we can only guess, but they may well have included Dionysius of Alexandria. Marcellus reproaches Paulinus for preferring these authorities to the Scriptures, but this actually shows Paulinus' restraint; he is treating the disagreement between Alexander and Arius not as a difference between a right, scriptural teaching and a wrong, unscriptural one, but as a difference between two possible interpretations of Scripture. Arius' interpretation is a perfectly reasonable and long-standing one with a good pedigree, is Paulinus' point, which is currently believed by a large number of people. Paulinus argues that it is unreasonable of Alexander to condemn Arius for holding this view; he is not accusing Alexander himself of heresy, as he would be if he insisted that the Scriptures demand a reading like Arius', as Marcellus wants him to.

Marcellus may have had good reason in his own mind to sneer at Paulinus, however, because at some point Paulinus became a great deal more involved than he had been initially. The real difficulty with assessing Paulinus' later role in the Arian controversy is one of chronology. At some point, Paulinus was translated from the see of Tyre to that of Antioch, and we do not know whether it was on the death of Philogonius in December 323 or 324, or on the deposition of Eustathius in 328. The question will be more fully considered in Chapter 3, but I will anticipate my answer there by stating that, despite a very full and careful argument to the contrary by R.W. Burgess,<sup>67</sup> I think Paulinus is more

---

<sup>65</sup> The fragments are cited by Eusebius in *C Marc* I.4.19-20, 49 and 50 (*Urk* 9 (p. 17-18) = *CPG* 2065).

<sup>66</sup> Marcellus, fr. 37 K (p. 18.13-15 Vinzent).

<sup>67</sup> Richard W. Burgess, with the assistance of Witold Witkowski, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronology*, 1. *The Chronici canones of Eusebius of Caesarea: Structure, Content, and Chronology, AD 282-325* and 2. *The Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii: A Chronicle of Antioch and the Roman Near East during the Reigns of Constantine and Constantius, AD 325-350*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 135 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999). For Burgess' theory

likely to have replaced Eustathius than Philogonius. This admittedly leaves us with the problem of Zeno of Tyre, to whom Alexander addressed a letter and who signed for the see at Nicaea, but the whole Antiochene episcopal sequence is deeply problematic at this stage in any case. It may be possible that Paulinus had a period of bad illness and went into semi-retirement around the time of Nicaea; he certainly only lasted six months whenever he did take up the see of Antioch, and we can only guess that he bitterly regretted it. Eusebius of Caesarea certainly had the sense to turn down such a poisoned chalice when it was offered to him in his turn.<sup>68</sup>

Theodotus of Laodicea is another, somewhat more shadowy, friend of Eusebius of Caesarea's. Eusebius dedicated both the *Preparatio Evangelica* and the *Demonstratio Evangelica* to him; Arius mentions him second after Eusebius of Caesarea in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia as one of those who believe that the Father pre-exists the Son.<sup>69</sup> At the synod of Antioch of early 325 led by Ossius of Cordoba and Eustathius, Theodotus is one of those, together with Eusebius of Caesarea and Narcissus of Neronias,<sup>70</sup> placed under a provisional ban; since he is named first, it is not unlikely that he was the first to object to the theology put forward by the synod, and that Eusebius first spoke up in support of him, as Narcissus seems to have spoken up in support of Eusebius.<sup>71</sup> Eusebius' central role in the deposition of Eustathius<sup>72</sup> was doubtless by way of revenge for his friend as well as for himself; the synod of Antioch of 329 may begin defiantly with the names 'Eusebius, Theodotus, Narcissus' once that revenge has been accomplished.<sup>73</sup> Marcellus knew of at least one occasion

---

on the date of the death of Philogonius (323) and the tenure of Paulinus in the see of Antioch, see especially pp. 184-191.

<sup>68</sup> See Constantine's letter to Eusebius cited in *VC* III.61.2 and his letter to Theodotus and the other bishops in Antioch (*VC* III.62.2).

<sup>69</sup> *Urk* 1.3 (p. 2.4).

<sup>70</sup> *Urk* 18.14-15 (p. 40.6-18 Syriac), discussed below. Eusebius enthusiastically commends Theodotus in *HE* VII.32.23.

<sup>71</sup> See the interrogation recorded in Marcellus, fr. 81 K (p. 108.11-15 Vinzent) = *Urk* 19.1 (p. 41).

<sup>72</sup> See below.

<sup>73</sup> For the names of the signatories to the synod, see Turner, *EOMIA* II, 231, reordered by Turner on p. 313. The first and third names on the list are Eusebius and Narcissus. The second is Theodore, which I would like to emend to Theodotus. Turner emends no. 17, Theodolus, to

when Eusebius preached at Theodotus' church, probably to shed crocodile tears at Eustathius' downfall.<sup>74</sup>

For Athanasius at least, however, Theodotus is definitely one of *hoi peri Eusebion*, in a list which must mean Eusebius of Nicomedia.<sup>75</sup> Whether he was part of that group out of friendship for the bishop of Nicomedia, or friendship for others that were also part of it, and indeed whether it was itself a self-conscious circle or merely a description of a group of people who seemed to disgusted onlookers to be acting in concert, we cannot tell. He is not one of Philostorgius' 'Ariophrones';<sup>76</sup> perhaps his see's proximity to Antioch acted as something of a brake on his involvement in the controversy, at least at first.

Patrophilus of Scythopolis, also one of Athanasius' early group of *hoi peri Eusebion*,<sup>77</sup> was considerably longer-lived than the three Orientals mentioned so far, who were all dead by the time of the Dedication synod; he can be found attempting to avoid his own deposition by not attending the synod of Seleucia in 359, nearly twenty years later.<sup>78</sup> For whatever motive, he is frequently to be found taking part in intrigue with a variety of people, while avoiding as many occasions as possible which might involve him in trouble himself: he can be found absenting himself from the Antiochene synod of 325 and Sardica, as well as Seleucia, while he is a prominent player at the Palestinian synod which received Arius, Tyre, the Dedication synod, the synod at Antioch which condemned Athanasius in 349,<sup>79</sup> and the synod which replaced Maximus of

---

Theodotus. In the Syriac list given by Schulthess, pp. 65-66 Eusebius and Narcissus are again 1 and 3. Number 2 is 'Theodorus of Tyre in Phoenicia' while no. 10 is 'Theodotus of Laodicea of Syria'. But there is considerable diversity of order throughout both within the Syriac tradition (see MS E in Schulthess' apparatus) and between the Syriac lists and the Latin. In addition to 'Theodolus' (no. 17), Turner's list has two Theodores (nos 2 and 31) as well as one Theodosius (no. 32). Scribal confusion is hardly surprising.

<sup>74</sup> Eusebius, *C Marc* I.4.42; tears are mentioned in Eusebius' report of Marcellus' report of his words (fr. 99 K).

<sup>75</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 17.1.

<sup>76</sup> See below.

<sup>77</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 17.1.

<sup>78</sup> Sozomen, *HE* IV.16.1; see Vaggione, p. 218.

<sup>79</sup> For the date, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 98-99

Jerusalem with Cyril. He is also the teacher of Eusebius of Emesa<sup>80</sup> and the jailer of Eusebius of Vercelli.<sup>81</sup>

Patrophilus seems to have been involved in such events for love of the events rather than of the people; he seems equally happy colluding with Eusebius of Caesarea and his successor Acacius (through all the latter's theological vagaries), and is mentioned along with Theodotus in Theodoret as one of the potential supporters of Arius at Nicaea.<sup>82</sup> He is not named, however, by Arius in his list of the more notable of those who believe as he does that the Father precedes the Son;<sup>83</sup> perhaps his love of intrigue was just a little stronger than his love of doctrine.

Narcissus of Neronias (by now in fact renamed Irenopolis) is one of at least nine bishops of Cilicia who ally themselves with the 'Arian' cause either politically or theologically at various points; it is the province most consistently so aligned. Narcissus, however, was the most active if not the most eminent of them. We first meet him at the synods of Ancyra and Caesarea in 314;<sup>84</sup> he can last be seen as a signatory to a creed issued at Sirmium which Liberius signed in 351,<sup>85</sup> although there is no sign of him by the time of Seleucia. In between, he is generally to be found in the thick of things; he is the only one of Athanasius' original group of *hoi peri Eusebion* to be condemned at Sardica by the Westerners, a compliment of a sort to his effectiveness and fidelity. He famously remarked, probably at the 325 synod of Antioch, that he believed in three *ousiai*,<sup>86</sup> there is no reason, pace Hanson, to assume that he meant the word in the sense of *prosopon*.<sup>87</sup> Narcissus does not appear on Arius' list of those who believe the Father pre-exists the Son, but there is no reason to doubt

---

<sup>80</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.9.3; Sozomen, *HE* III.6.2.

<sup>81</sup> On Eusebius and his exiles, see L. Dattrino, 'Eusebius of Vercelli', *EEC* I, 302.

<sup>82</sup> Theodoret, *HE* I.7.14.

<sup>83</sup> *Urk* 1.3 (p. 2.4-5).

<sup>84</sup> See above.

<sup>85</sup> See the list of signatories in Hilary, *FH*. B.VII.9 (p. 170.3-8 Feder). On confusion surrounding the date, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 109 with pp. 272-273 note 1.

<sup>86</sup> Marcellus, fr. 81 K (p. 108.15 Vinzent) = *Urk* 19.1 (p. 41.4).

<sup>87</sup> Hanson, *Search*, p. 150.

his theological sincerity; he gives the clearest possible statement of his theology in the very beginning, and was prepared to undergo conditional deposition at Antioch rather than abandon it -- unlike one or two of those whom Arius believed shared his views. He may have been a pupil of Antony of Tarsus or of Athanasius of Anazarbus; if so, he went far beyond either of them in his zeal for the party which shared their theological views. He would have had good reason to dislike Marcellus, but it is against Athanasius that he seems to have been implacable: besides his presence at Tyre and at the Dedication synod, he can be found plotting to depose Athanasius in 349,<sup>88</sup> and mocking him after his flight in 356.<sup>89</sup> It is the last we see of him. Narcissus does not seem to have been particularly close to Eusebius of Nicomedia or anyone else active in the controversy; he can be found grouped with various people at various times, including the homoiousians Basil of Ancyra<sup>90</sup> and George of Laodicea,<sup>91</sup> but he is always in the front row at every stage of the controversy.

The other Cilician active in the controversy whose name appears at Nicaea is Macedonius of Mopsuestia. Macedonius was one of the Mareotis commission at Tyre, one of the leaders at the Dedication synod and one of those who brought the 'Long-Winded Creed' to the West,<sup>92</sup> but he appears in none of the lists of those active on the side of Arius before Nicaea, nor was he deposed at Sardica. It is uncertain at what point he began to take a more leading role, or why, but he was clearly never seen as one of the greatest threats by Alexander, Athanasius, Marcellus and their friends.

### **c. Philostorgius' 'Ariophrones'**

---

<sup>88</sup> Sozomen, *HE* IV.8.4. For the date, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 98-99 with p. 268 note 35.

<sup>89</sup> Athanasius, *Ap de Fuga* 1.1.

<sup>90</sup> Among the signatories from the small synod at Sirmium listed in Hilary, *FH* B.VII.9 (p. 170.3-8 Feder).

<sup>91</sup> Athanasius, *Ap de Fuga* 1.1.

<sup>92</sup> Named in Athanasius, *De Syn.* 26.1. The translation of *makrostichos* is borrowed from Vaggione, p. 70.



Another group, which partially overlaps with the previous two, worth considering is that which Philostorgius calls (or Nicetas says he calls) Ἀρειοφρόνες. The early thirteenth-century historian Nicetas Acominatos cites a list given by Philostorgius in the first book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* of those thinking the same way as Arius at Nicaea.<sup>93</sup> E. Honigmann has long since shown that such an ascription is impossible, since one of the bishops on the list was already dead by the time of Nicaea.<sup>94</sup> Several others were not present there; Philostorgius' list has been dubbed wildly optimistic at the very least.<sup>95</sup>

But although Nicetas takes this to be Philostorgius' list of those at Nicaea who supported Arius, Philostorgius need not necessarily have meant it as such. Nicetas may well be blinded by his desire to add another list of such names to those he had found in Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia,<sup>96</sup> and used a list meant to describe those thinking like Arius *before* Nicaea, or Philostorgius may have done so with his own source. For if so, Philostorgius' list makes perfectly good sense -- so long as one is prepared to believe that Athanasius' prose can sometimes be less straightforward than it appears.

The list contains the names of twenty-two bishops from nine provinces, some of whom are well known to us, some little known, and some scarcely known at all. Secundus of Ptolemaeus and Theonas of Marmorike, the two Libyan bishops who remained faithful to Arius at Nicaea when his other supporters deserted him, are there, together with four more Libyan bishops, three of whom signed at Nicaea. Melitius of Thebes (who did not sign at Nicaea) is the only Egyptian

---

<sup>93</sup> Philostorgius, H.E. I.8<sup>a</sup> (p. 9.10-23). This cannot be a list of those who supported Arius at Nicaea, despite the number of scholars who assume that it is at least meant to be such. So, for example, Williams, *Arius*, p. 67, who recognizes that 'the list bristles with problems' but who nonetheless assumes that what Philostorgius was trying to record was 'the names of twenty-two bishops sympathetic to Arius at the council'.

<sup>94</sup> See Ernst Honigmann, *Patristic Studies*, Studi e Testi 173 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1953), pp. 6-27 ('Basileus of Amasea (314, about 320 A.D.)', especially pp. 14-27).

<sup>95</sup> Vaggione calls it a 'very optimistic list' (p. 61, note 159). Williams thinks that, when the well-established names and the impossible names are removed, the residue is 'for the most part, wildly unlikely' (*Arius*, p. 68).



bishop, nor, surprisingly enough, is there any bishop from Syria. The well-known names of Eusebius of Caesarea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis represent Palestine; Paulinus of Tyre and the otherwise unknown Amphion of Sidon (whom Williams believes, probably correctly, to be Amphion of Epiphaneia in Cilicia)<sup>97</sup> are the two Phoenician bishops mentioned. Beyond these, there were three Cilician bishops (Narcissus of Neronias/Irenopolis, Athanasius of Anazarbus and Tarcondimatus of Aegea), three ‘Cappadocian’ bishops with no sees given (probably Leontius of Caesarea, Eulalius of Sebasteia in Armenia Minor and Longinus of Neocaesarea in Pontus Polemoniaca), two ‘Pontic’ bishops (Basil of Amasia and Melitius of Sebastopolis in Armenia Minor) and the three ubiquitous Bithynians Theognis, Maris and Eusebius ‘the great’.

The provenance of this list seems difficult to determine. It must date from slightly before Nicaea, since it includes Basil of Amasia, who died under Licinius.<sup>98</sup> It must date from no earlier than 317, since Eusebius is already at Nicomedia. What it might mean to think like Arius, so far as this list is concerned, is obviously key. In his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, Arius argues that in condemning him Alexander has condemned nearly all the bishops of the Oriens (the civil diocese of), since nearly all of them believe ὅτι προὔπαρχει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀνάρχως.<sup>99</sup> This is about the broadest possible definition of thinking like Arius; people who happily anathematised ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων at Nicaea and afterwards had to resort to considerable ingenuity to explain their condemnation of πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν.<sup>100</sup> On the other hand, Arius himself mentions several people by name as believing this doctrine who are not on Philostorgius’ list: Theodotus of Laodicea in Syria, Gregory (probably of Berytus in Phoenicia) and Aetius (presumably of Lydda in

---

<sup>96</sup> PG 139, 1367-8.

<sup>97</sup> Williams identifies Nicetas’ Amphion with the Amphion whose name appears in the list of those responsible for the letter of the synod of Antioch of 325 [*Urk* 18.1 (p. 36.4 Syriac)]; ‘this is probably Amphion of Epiphaneia in Cilicia’ (p. 297, note 131). The Amphion of *Urk* 18 had been identified as Amphion of Epiphaneia by Schwartz (*GS* III, 153).

<sup>98</sup> See Honigmann, *Patristic Studies*, pp. 14-27.

<sup>99</sup> *Urk* 1 (p. 2.4-6).

<sup>100</sup> E.g. Eusebius of Caesarea (*Urk* 22.16 (p. 46.16-21)).

Palestine).<sup>101</sup> Philostorgius' list should then represent something slightly more than merely holding this belief, but it cannot be the case that those included in it believed exactly as Arius did on every point of theology; we know from Philostorgius that they did not.<sup>102</sup> Nor is this simply a list of those bishops who were vaguely on the same side as Arius theologically or politically around the time of Nicaea -- if it were, we would certainly expect to see at least Theodotus of Laodicea there, since he was one of the three bishops provisionally deposed by the 325 synod of Antioch for siding with Alexander's enemies, and presumably also Macedonius of Mopsuestia and Menophantus of Ephesus, both present at Nicaea and both active in the post-Nicene 'Arian' party.

I would suggest this list in fact represents those who wrote or signed letters on Arius' behalf, those letters which eventually ended up in Arius' dossier of letters of support.<sup>103</sup> All those bishops whom we know to have written such letters are on the list: the two Eusebii,<sup>104</sup> Paulinus of Tyre,<sup>105</sup> Athanasius of Anazarbus,<sup>106</sup> Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon.<sup>107</sup> The others are not difficult to imagine in such a context. We would have to conjecture that a group of six Libyan bishops and Melitius of Thebes wrote to Alexander on Arius' behalf (not a difficult supposition), that Patrophilus of Scythopolis wrote on his own account although no trace of the letter survives (not difficult either), that

---

<sup>101</sup> The three are named in *Urk* 1.3 (p. 2.4-5). The identification of the sees is offered by Theodoret, *HE* 1.5.5.

<sup>102</sup> See Philostorgius, *HE* II.3 (p. 14.5-9) on the unknowability of God, both to human beings and to the Only-begotten Son.

<sup>103</sup> On the files of letters collected by various parties, see Socrates, *HE* I.6.41 and Schwartz, *GS* III, 118-20.

<sup>104</sup> For Eusebius of Caesarea, see *Urk* 7 (pp. 14-15) to Alexander of Alexandria and 8.1 (p. 15.2-4), in which his 'zeal' is commended by Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre. For Eusebius of Nicomedia, see *Urk* 2 (p. 3) to Arius; *Urk* 8.1-2 and 8 (p. 15.2-9 and p. 16.7-9), urging Paulinus of Tyre to write to Alexander.

<sup>105</sup> For Paulinus, see *Urk* 8.1-2 and 8 (p. 15.2-9 and p. 16.7-9), in which he is urged to write to Alexander, and Sozomen, *HE* I.15.11 = *Urk* 10 (p. 18), stating that Paulinus, Eusebius of Caesarea and Patrophilus were approached by Arius and convoked a synod which replied in his favour.

<sup>106</sup> For Athanasius of Anazarbus, see *Urk* 11 (p. 18) to Alexander of Alexandria.

<sup>107</sup> Theognis and Maris are mentioned in Athanasius, *De Syn.* 17.1 as being among those who 'before the synod in Nicaea wrote things like these'. Athanasius is obviously referring to a letter file of documents in support of Arius, which includes *Urk* 11, from the letter of Athanasius of Anazarbus to Alexander of Alexandria (= *De Syn.* 17.4) and a letter of George of Laodicea to Alexander (*De Syn.* 17.5). On this letter file, see *De Syn.* 18.1 and Schwartz, *GS* III, 118.

Amphion of Sidon should be emended to Amphion of Epiphaneia (as Williams suggests), and so that the remaining eight (all from Cilicia, 'Cappadocia'- i.e. Pontus Polemoniachus, Armenia Minor and Cappadocia- and Pontus), perhaps along with Athanasius of Anazarbus again, wrote collectively, perhaps from a synod in Neocaesarea.<sup>108</sup> The synods which took place later in Bithynia<sup>109</sup> and Palestine<sup>110</sup> would not be represented, as it would be partly for these synods that the collection was assembled (as Athanasius' dossier of letters would later be assembled to win him the support of various bishops in the West).

It may be noted that several of the names from my putative synod of Neocaesarea are later mentioned by Athanasius in a list which suggests he thinks them to represent the height of orthodoxy: Leontius of 'Cappadocia' (Caesarea), Amphion of 'Cilicia' (Epiphaneia), and 'those great bishops' Melitius (of Sebastopolis), Basil (of Amasia), Longinus (of Neocaesarea) and 'the rest from Armenia and Pontus' -- i.e. Eulalius of Sebasteia? -- all, in other words, except Tarcondimantus of Aegea and Narcissus of Neronias.<sup>111</sup> Williams therefore follows Gwatkin in thinking that the list of 'Ariophrones' involves some wishful thinking on Philostorgius' side.<sup>112</sup> Any trickery involved is in fact at least as likely to be Athanasius'. What Athanasius is doing in the list in question is not entirely clear, but it is likely to involve 'rescuing for orthodoxy' some characters already revered by waverers among his addressees. He might reasonably claim that Leontius, Longinus, Eulalius and Amphion were 'right-thinking' on the grounds that they signed at Nicaea,<sup>113</sup> and the fact that Melitius of Sebastopolis and Basil are martyrs is enough to place them among the

---

<sup>108</sup> We have canons for a synod of Neocaesarea which took place before Nicaea and some time later than Ancyra, but no longer any names, since Lebon reassigned these to a synod of Caesarea in Cappadocia in 314. See above.

<sup>109</sup> Sozomen, *HE* I.15.10 = *Urk* 5 (p. 12).

<sup>110</sup> Sozomen, *HE* I.15.11 = *Urk* 10 (p. 18). For the dates of the two synods, see below.

<sup>111</sup> Athanasius, *Ad Episc Aeg et Lib* 8.

<sup>112</sup> Williams, *Arius*, p. 273 note 132, appealing to Henry Melvill Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism, Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction Which Followed the Council of Nicaea*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900), p. 34, note 4.

<sup>113</sup> Leontius, *PNN* 'Index restitutus', no. 94 = *EOMIA* I,1,1, pp. 58-59, no. 95; Eulalius, *PNN*, no. 104 = *EOMIA*, pp. 60-61, no. 105; Longinus, *PNN*, no. 111 = *EOMIA*, pp. 62-63, no. 112; Amphion, *PNN*, no. 84 = *EOMIA*, pp. 56-57, no. 85.

‘orthodox’.<sup>114</sup> (We have already met Leontius, in any case, as the president of the synod of Caesarea which seems to have stolen Marcellus’ thunder in 314, and Basil and Longinus as two of the only five bishops who attended the second synod as well as that which took place in Ancyra.)

We hear of the activities after Nicaea of ten of these twenty-two bishops, none of whom is on the list of the ‘orthodox’ given by Athanasius in his letter to the bishops of Egypt and Libya: the Bithynian trio Eusebius, Theognis and Maris; Eusebius of Caesarea, Paulinus of Tyre, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Narcissus of Neronias, Athanasius of Anazarbus and Secundus and Theonas. Secundus and Theonas seem to have kept themselves largely apart from the others, perhaps after their experience of their treachery at Nicaea; they come within the orbit of *hoi peri Eusebion* and their successors from time to time (Secundus ordains Pistus, whom the bishops at Tyre unsuccessfully choose as successor to Athanasius of Alexandria,<sup>115</sup> and welcomes the deacon Aetius when he has to flee from Antioch shortly after 344<sup>116</sup>). The ‘Arian’ activities of Athanasius of Anazarbus seem also to have been confined to helping to educate the young Aetius in the late 320s,<sup>117</sup> presumably on the recommendation of Paulinus of Tyre. But the other seven were to remain in the thick of controversy, both theological and political, until their deaths, however little at least two of them may have believed they relished the fact.

#### d. ‘All the bishops of the East’

---

<sup>114</sup> Melitius of Sebastopolis would at least have been a fugitive from persecution, in the rather unlikely event that Lawlor and Oulton (following Valesius) are right in identifying him with the Meletius of Pontus extolled by Eusebius in *HE* VII.32.27-28: Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, *The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*, tr. Hugh Jackson Lawlor and John Ernest Leonard Oulton, II, *Introduction, Notes and Index* (London: SPCK, 1928), p. 263.

<sup>115</sup> For the ordination of Pistus by Secundus, see Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 24.2 and 4. Schwartz, *GS* III, 278-9 claims that the ‘ordination’ is as bishop of the Mareotis. This is an inference from the absence of a bishop of the Mareotis in the list of signatories to *Urk* 4b (pp. 10-11) and involves the somewhat gratuitous assumption that the name ‘Pistus’ should stand in the list of bishops signing *Urk* 6b (p. 13.23-24), but that the words ὄν κατέστησαν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν οἱ Ἀρειανοί are an interpolation.

<sup>116</sup> See Philostorgius, *HE* III.19-20 (p. 48), and, for the date, Vaggione, pp. 26-7.

<sup>117</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* III.15 (p. 46.1-4).

One more group who should be briefly considered at this point are those whom Arius lists in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia as believing that the Father pre-exists the Son. Arius says that ‘Eusebius your brother in Caesarea and Theodotus and Paulinus and Athanasius and Gregorius and Aetius and all those throughout the East’ believe this.<sup>118</sup> Commentators have often taken Arius literally here, or nearly so,<sup>119</sup> and assumed that Philogonius and, after him, Eustathius were islands of miahypostatism (or, indeed, Sabellianism) in a Syrian sea of subordinationism. There is little to warrant this view. The fact that even Gregory of Berytus, Eusebius of Nicomedia’s successor, and Aetius of Lydda (on whatever grounds Arius singled them out) signed at Antioch 325 against Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodotus and Narcissus may not be particularly significant,<sup>120</sup> given that the majority headed by Ossius must have been formidable. But the same cannot be said for the 329 synod of Antioch headed by Eusebius of Caesarea himself, if the Syrian bishops had been strongly of the same opinion as he was. Nearly all the Cilician bishops who had attended Nicaea were at the 329 synod. The underrepresentation of the provinces of Isauria, Arabia, Palestine, Mesopotamia and even Phoenicia can be explained away to some extent by the distance, on the assumption that the synod was called in haste. But nothing can explain the fact that no more than nine bishops attended from Syria when twenty-one had attended the 325 synod, other than that Eusebius’ presidency was not the liberation it ought to have been, if the Syrian bishops had shared his beliefs as closely as Arius thought.

#### **e. The Seventeen Supporters of Arius at Nicaea.**

---

<sup>118</sup> *Urk* 1.3 (p. 2.4-5).

<sup>119</sup> Williams thinks that in *Urk* 1 Arius ‘can speak confidently of the virtual unanimity of the bishops of the Oriens in favour of his views’ (p. 54), while the fact that by mid-323 ‘a good number of Syrian and Palestinian bishops’ sign the encyclical letter *Urk* 15 ‘suggests that many of Arius’ initial supporters were wavering’ (*Arius*, p. 57).

<sup>120</sup> Gregory’s name appears in *Urk* 18.1 at p. 36.4 Syriac; Aetius’ at p. 36.8 Syriac. The sees are identified by Schwartz, *GS* III, 153 and 152, respectively.

Rufinus and Sozomen both assert that seventeen bishops at Nicaea were broadly favourable to Arius,<sup>121</sup> although only Secundus of Ptolomaeus and Theonas of Marmorike actually refused to sign the Nicene creed. On the information we have gathered so far, we can more or less name them (by provinces), with one or two uncertainties:

**Libya:** Dachius of Berenice, Secundus of Tauchira, Zopyrus of Barce, Secundus of Ptolomaeus, Theonas of Marmorike

**Palestine:** Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Eusebius of Caesarea

**Syria:** Theodotus of Laodicea

**Cilicia:** Narcissus of Neronias, Tarcondimantus of Aegeae

**Cappadocia:** Leontius of Caesarea

**Armenia Minor:** Eulalius of Sebasteia

**Pontus Polemoniacus:** Longinus of Neocaesarea

**Bithynia:** Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicaea

**Asia:** Menophantus of Ephesus.

It is unlikely that either of Paulinus of Tyre or Athanasius of Anazarbus was present, since Zeno signed from Tyre<sup>122</sup> and no one signed from Anazarbus. Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Gregory of Berytus or Aetius of Lydda might replace Leontius, Eulalius or Longinus, if one gives Athanasius the benefit of the doubt rather than Philostorgius, and assumes they were talked round to Alexander's position by the time of Nicaea.

A very important feature of this list should be noted, to which this thesis will return throughout: the names of the provinces showing support for Arius. Throughout the part of the controversy under study, these remain the provinces which make up the Eusebian party and its heirs: Libya, some of the diocese of Oriens (although Palestine is generally divided, since it has essentially two

---

<sup>121</sup> Rufinus, *HE* X.5; Sozomen, *HE* I.20.1.

<sup>122</sup> *PNN*, 'Index restitutus', no. 40 = *EOMIA* I,1,1, pp. 46-47 (no. 41). Epiphanius claims that an encyclical of Alexander of Alexandria was sent to Ζήνωνί τινι ἀρχαίῳ (*Pan.* 69.4 (p. 155 Holl)).



metropolitans), and the Eastern and Western edges of Asia Minor- Cappadocia, Pontus, Bithynia and Asia. The whole of central Asia Minor- most of the subcontinent, in other words- as well as Egypt, remains largely aligned with Marcellus and Athanasius, even when being so becomes increasingly difficult, as far as Sardica and beyond. Marcellus was not the lone figure Zahn and Simonetti have presented him as: there was a great deal of life in Asia Minor theology yet.

## **2. Alexander and Friends**

If ‘those around Eusebius’ were a close-knit, well-shepherded, theologically focused group, surrounded by a number of other figures who shared their theology if not necessarily their politics, their opponents have rather the appearance (and probably had it to each other) of so many loose cannons. The theologies of Alexander, Athanasius, Eustathius and Marcellus differ from one another markedly, as did those of Macarius of Jerusalem, Hellanicus of Tripolis and Philogonius of Antioch, if we can believe Arius.<sup>123</sup> Of the theology of Ossius of Cordoba we know little, and of that of Asclepas of Gaza almost nothing. That this ragbag group should unite shows us something interesting: that despite all their differences from one another, and the large terminological overlap between some of them and some of their opponents, they knew that the doctrine which united them and divided them from their opponents was more essential to their theology than any shared terminology with the latter. That doctrine was the Son’s coeternity with the Father. Those who agreed with them on that, agreed on what had come to be the foundation-stone of early fourth-century Christian thought; those who agreed with one another against them likewise. The doctrine of the Son’s coeternity with the Father or otherwise is the key that locks the door between the two theologies of the time, and all those of any theological bent at all knew whether they and their acquaintance were on the one side of the door or the other. Arius’ allies might accept or reject



different parts of his package, Alexander's allies might differ sharply in even so apparently fundamental a matter as how many natures or hypostaseis there were between Father and Son; it is their stance on the eternity of the Word which determines to which camp each belongs.

### a. Alexander of Alexandria

Alexander's theology<sup>124</sup> was the most purely Origenist of the 'Nicene' group, which makes it all the more strange that the controversy should have broken out initially on his territory, however intensely it had been simmering elsewhere.<sup>125</sup> He and Arius could have agreed on a good deal; he and Eusebius of Caesarea or Asterius on even more. Almost every expression he uses is implicitly attacked by Marcellus of Ancyra. And yet even the expressions he shares with his opponents, even all his attempts to come as close to their theology as possible, are part of a theology which is utterly different from theirs, a fact he and his friends well knew, though we have forgotten it.

The verbal parallels between Alexander and his opponents are legion. He can speak of Father and Son as two πράγματα,<sup>126</sup> two ὑποστάσεις, two φύσεις.<sup>127</sup> He takes the tag 'First-born of all creation' of the cosmic rather than the incarnate Christ,<sup>128</sup> as he does 'from the womb before the dawn I gave birth to

---

<sup>123</sup> *Urk* 1.3 (p. 2.6-8).

<sup>124</sup> On Alexander's theology, see Manlio Simonetti, *La Crisi Ariana nel IV Secolo*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 11 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975), pp. 55-60 and Hanson, *Search*, 138-45. Because it will be argued below that *Henos somatos* (*Urk* 4b) should be treated as the work of Athanasius, Alexander's thought is illustrated in this discussion from his letter to Alexander of Byzantium, *He philarchos* (*Urk* 14).

<sup>125</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, pp. 55-9 argues the Arian controversy to have begun as a disagreement within the Origenist tradition. I would certainly endorse this view, with the proviso that that did not mean Alexander's alliance with Eustathius and Marcellus and others who distanced themselves from Origen was merely tactical. Origenism as such had come to be less important to him than the status of the Word.

<sup>126</sup> *Urk* 14.15 (p. 22.7).

<sup>127</sup> Father and Son are τὰς τῆ ὑποστάσει δύο φύσεις (*Urk* 14.38 (p. 25.23)); the Logos has his own distinctive hypostasis (*Urk* 14. 16 (p. 22.10)).

<sup>128</sup> *Urk* 14.24 (p. 23.21-22): the tag is from Col 1.15.

you.<sup>129</sup> The Logos as ‘unvarying image of the Father’ is one of his favourite terms;<sup>130</sup> the Son is also τέλειος.<sup>131</sup> He stands in the middle between the uncreated Father and created things.<sup>132</sup> The generation of the Son by the Father is incomprehensible: ‘Who can declare his generation?’<sup>133</sup>

All of these expressions are accepted and used by the Eusebian party, and all are objected to by Marcellus.<sup>134</sup> Both Eusebius of Nicomedia and Asterius speak of two natures, Eusebius saying ‘entirely other in nature and power [is the one begotten from the Unbegotten]’,<sup>135</sup> and Asterius explaining this by speaking of ‘the nature of the Father and the nature of the Begotten’.<sup>136</sup> Marcellus replies that Asterius should have left the depths (one of Marcellus’ characteristic puns) of Eusebius’ theology to lie hidden, rather than bringing its wickedness to light by trying to explain it.<sup>137</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea speaks of ‘two πράγματα’ (as indeed does Athanasius), as part of the list ‘two οὐσίαι and πράγματα and δυνάμεις and θεοί’<sup>138</sup> (the other three of which terms Alexander and Athanasius would have indignantly denied, it should be said); Marcellus is unconvinced. Two (or three) ὑποστάσεις would be ascribed by all the Eusebian party, so far

---

<sup>129</sup> Ps 109 (110):3, applied in *Urk* 14.34 to ‘the natural [φυσικὴν] Sonship of the Father’s birthing’.

<sup>130</sup> Ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν occurs in *Urk* 14.38 (p. 25.25) and 14.47 (p. 27.14); εἰκὼν is also used with reference to the Son (without ἀπαράλλακτος) in 14.27 (p. 24.4-5) and 14.52 (p. 28.5).

<sup>131</sup> *Urk* 14.29 (p. 24.11) and 14.47 (p. 27.14).

<sup>132</sup> *Urk* 14.44 (p. 26.25-27).

<sup>133</sup> The tag from Is 53:8 appears in *Urk* 14.21 (p. 23.5-6) and 14.46 (p. 27.7-8).

<sup>134</sup> Probably including the last (Is 53:8), which was applied to the incarnate Christ by Athanasius (*De Inc* 37 (p. 224 Thomson)), though no interpretation of the phrase by Marcellus survives.

<sup>135</sup> Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre, *Urk* 8.3 (p. 16.4-5).

<sup>136</sup> Marcellus, fr. 35 K = Asterius, fr 8 Vinzent = *C Marc* I.4.11.

<sup>137</sup> Marcellus, fr 35 K = *C Marc* I.4.11.

<sup>138</sup> Two *ousiai*, two *pragmata* and two *dunameis* are securely attested in the fragment of the letter to Euphraton of Balanea cited in Eusebius, *C Marc* I.4.41 = Marcellus, fr. 82 K = *Urk* 3.4 (p. 6.1-2). Two *theoi* is added to the list in Marcellus’ report of the homily Eusebius gave while passing through Ancyra: Marcellus, fr. 83 K = *C Marc* I.4.46. Eusebius of course could have spluttered indignantly that he does not believe in two Gods (as he does in *Eccl Theol* II.23.1). But he is by no means averse to the phrase δεύτερος θεός (see for example the references collected in Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, Patristic Monograph Series 8 (2 vols, Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), I, 47, note 2). It is not inconceivable that in order to make a particular point he could, like Origen in *Dial Heracl* 2, have replaced that phrase with the much more provocative δύο θεοί.

as we know: certainly Asterius,<sup>139</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea<sup>140</sup> and the Dedication Creed<sup>141</sup> make them explicit.

Marcellus applied ‘First-born of all creation’<sup>142</sup> and ‘From the womb before the dawn I begot you’<sup>143</sup> and a great many other texts taken by most commentators of the pre-incarnate Logos to the incarnate Christ, by way of avoiding their apparent reference to a birth as one of the creatures, or a birth in time (in the former case he persuaded at least some of the synod of Sardica to go along with his reading). Eusebius of Caesarea pours scorn on these readings, claiming (in return for a similar smear on himself from Marcellus) that Marcellus only believes the Word came to be at the incarnation.<sup>144</sup>

The same is true of Colossians 1.15. Ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς is one of Alexander’s favourite ways of describing the Son’s relationship to the Father; he interprets εἰκὼν in the sense of ἔσοπτρον,<sup>145</sup> combining it with the Hebrews text χαρακτηρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ (1.3).<sup>146</sup> Asterius is also happy to call the logos ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν,<sup>147</sup> much to Philostorgius’ disgust,<sup>148</sup> as does the Dedication Creed.<sup>149</sup> But Marcellus reads εἰκὼν as statue rather than mirror, something intended to make an invisible power visible (as the emperor’s statue does), and once more (and very powerfully) ascribes it to the incarnate Christ.<sup>150</sup>

In the same way, τέλειος appears in the Dedication creed,<sup>151</sup> as commented on by Asterius,<sup>152</sup> and is taken exception to by Marcellus. Likewise, ‘Who can

---

<sup>139</sup> See, for example, Marcellus, fr. 69 K = Asterius, fr. 61 Vinzent.

<sup>140</sup> See, for example, Eusebius, *Eccl Theol* I.10.4.

<sup>141</sup> ‘Three in hypostasis’ (Athanasius, *De Syn* 23.6).

<sup>142</sup> See Marcellus, frs 4-6 K = Eusebius, *C Marc* II.3.6-7.

<sup>143</sup> See Marcellus, fr 31 = *C Marc* II.3.30-31.

<sup>144</sup> For the discussion rumbling on from the passages cited in notes 142 and 143, see especially *C Marc* II.4.21-22.

<sup>145</sup> *Urk* 14.39 (p. 26.2-3), picking up the language of *Wisd* 7.26.

<sup>146</sup> *Urk* 14.28 (p. 24.5-6), 14.48 (p. 27.18-19), 14.52 (p. 23.5).

<sup>147</sup> Marcellus, fr 96 K = Asterius, fr 10 Vinzent.

<sup>148</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* II.15 (p. 25.25-27).

<sup>149</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 23.3.

<sup>150</sup> See Marcellus, frs 92-96 K.

<sup>151</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 23.3. For the relation of this creed to Asterius, see below.

<sup>152</sup> Marcellus, fr. 96 K = Asterius, fr. 10 Vinzent.

declare his generation?’ as a get-out clause when one has written oneself into an exegetical corner is employed by both Eusebii,<sup>153</sup> after already (as also in Alexander’s case) being very specific about various aspects of that generation themselves.

The great void which has suddenly opened up in early fourth-century consciousness between the Father and the created order is also all too familiar to Asterius and his friends, whatever Alexander may think, and the role of the Logos in inhabiting it is equally a concern of Asterius and Eusebius of Caesarea. Creation could not bear the Father’s hand, argues Asterius, and so the Logos was generated for that purpose as one less terrible.<sup>154</sup> For Eusebius, the Logos steers the world like a helmsman, looking up to the Father.<sup>155</sup>

Origen had such a mediatory function for the Son in his scheme: it is the Son as Wisdom which receives wisdom from the Father, and the Son as Logos who transfers it to the created order, and is the principle whereby that order runs. It is this scheme which Alexander, Eusebius and Asterius are trying to hold on to. But none of them can. As the conceptual cracks in the cosmos widen, theologians have to jump to one side or the other. Crucially, Alexander’s Logos mediates from the Father’s side of the gulf, as inseparably united to the Father. Alexander never uses the word οὐσία, but in saying that the Logos is the Father’s δύναμις he expresses their organic link: they are both necessary entities, who naturally exist together and cannot exist without one another, like the sun and its rays. The Son stretches into the void like the sun’s rays, which even reach the earth; but they really belong to the sun itself.

With Asterius and Eusebius, never mind Eusebius of Nicomedia and Arius, it is otherwise. Eusebius’ helmsman looks to the Father, but his hold is on the

---

<sup>153</sup> Is 53.8 appears, for example, in the programmatic introduction to Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Church History* (1.2.2); see Hanson, *Search*, p. 50 on Eusebius’ fondness for the text. Eusebius of Nicomedia must be influenced by the Isaiah tag when he describes the beginning of the Logos as ἀδιήγητος (*Urk* 8.3 (p. 16.6)).

<sup>154</sup> See Athanasius, *De Decr* 8.1 = Asterius, fr. 27 Vinzent.

<sup>155</sup> See the (for Eusebius) almost lyrical passage at *Eccl Theol* I.13.3 (p. 72.16-20 Klostermann).

world. Asterius' Logos may be unvarying image, but it is the unvarying image of the Father's will and glory and δύναμις (and οὐσία), rather than of the Father, and rather than actually being the glory and δύναμις of the Father. The Father has another wisdom and Logos and power, another glory of which the Son is the image; the Son is creation's copy of all these things, the lesser, domesticated version creation can cope with, that exists and was brought into being for creation and not for itself. Eusebius' Son and Asterius' Son both belong primarily to the world.

It is for this reason that although Alexander seems to have so much in common with them, and so little with Marcellus, it is with Marcellus that he sides, and Marcellus with him. For both of them, the Word belongs to the Father; and however differently they express that conviction, it is that which is the basis of their view of salvation.

## **b. Athanasius**

The extent to which Athanasius was theologically active before and during Nicaea is a matter of some dispute. Some recent scholars, notably Hanson, partly in reaction to an earlier view which saw Athanasius as wielding a power at Nicaea impossible for a mere deacon, have protested against any great involvement by the future bishop of Alexandria at this stage of the controversy, arguing that he only actually begins to write his theological works after his exile in 335.<sup>156</sup> My views on Athanasius' involvement at Nicaea (which I think was considerable) will become clear later in this chapter; at this point, I am concerned with his theology as demonstrated in two early works, *De Incarnatione* and *Henos somatos*.

---

<sup>156</sup> Hanson, *Search*, pp. 157, 275.

*De Incarnatione*, even if Kannengiesser's dating of it to the first exile is accepted,<sup>157</sup> is (together with its companion piece *Contra Gentes*) still universally recognised to be Athanasius' earliest theological work – with the possible exception of *Henos somatos*. As early as 1842, J.H. Newman suggested that Athanasius might be the author of this work, but the view used to be dismissed as another example of the general tendency to inflate Athanasius' role in the whole controversy.<sup>158</sup> The case has recently been powerfully put once again by Christopher Stead, largely on the grounds of style and of the work's very large number of parallels with the *Orationes Contra Arianos*.<sup>159</sup> These arguments are extremely persuasive, and can only be disagreed with on the grounds of the general lack of probability that Alexander would have made over so important a task to so insignificant a figure as a secretary.<sup>160</sup> Prescinding from any estimate of the large number of secretaries who have drafted vital documents in their time, it may be noted that both Socrates and Sozomen describe large numbers of non-episcopal 'experts' as involved in the debates before and during Nicaea; Alexander's use of the abilities of a brilliant young deacon would have not been unusual in such a climate.

The other possible argument against the attribution is Athanasius' age: if he was born in 300, he would only have been nineteen according to Opitz' dating of *Henos somatos* at the time it was written.<sup>161</sup> But I will argue for a much shorter period for the pre-Nicene Arian controversy as such than Opitz', as Schwartz, Telfer and Williams have in different ways suggested.<sup>162</sup> If a dating of 323 is

---

<sup>157</sup> See especially Charles Kannengiesser, 'La date de l'Apologie d'Athanase "Contre les païens" et "Sur l'incarnation du Verbe', *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 58 (1970), 383-428, reprinted in Kannengiesser, *Arius and Athanasius, Two Alexandrian Theologians*, Collected Studies Series CS 353 (Hampshire: Variorum, 1991), no. VI. For a brief survey of the arguments, see Athanasius, *Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*, ed. and tr. Robert W. Thomson, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. xxi-xxiii.

<sup>158</sup> J.H. Newman, *Select Treatises of St Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*, Library of Fathers, 2 vols (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842-44), II, 5.

<sup>159</sup> G.C. Stead, 'Athanasius' Earliest Written Work', *JTS* n.s. 39 (1988), 76-91.

<sup>160</sup> Hanson (*Search*, p. 151) calls this a 'desperate remedy'.

<sup>161</sup> Hanson (*Search*, p.151), who accepts Opitz' dating, objects that Athanasius would have been eighteen or twenty and not yet ordained. Rowan Williams uses this problem as an argument for a later dating of *Henos somatos* than Opitz', assuming an age of twenty-two for Athanasius in 319 (Williams, *Arius*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, p. 254).

<sup>162</sup> See below.



accepted for *Henos somatos*, Athanasius would not be extraordinarily young to be writing such a document: he would not be the first young theologian to be all the more capable of clarity and sharpness of thought because unconscious of the full weight of the experience of his elders on the subject on which he was writing.

The document's place in and effect on the controversy will be considered in the next section: here we are concerned with what it might tell of Athanasius' theology. The answer is, a little more than is sometimes allowed.<sup>163</sup>

The writer of *Henos somatos* condemns the proposition ὁ ὢν θεὸς τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος πεποίηκε.<sup>164</sup> This is the proposition at which Eusebius of Caesarea so marvelled: since there can only be one ὁ ὢν (as there can only be one ἀγέννητος), the Son *must* be ὁ μὴ ὢν.<sup>165</sup> Athanasius has got instantly to the heart of what is wrong with his opponents' theology, and has done so with a formula we shall meet again: it is one that is used by Marcellus of Ancyra.<sup>166</sup>

Elsewhere in the letter Athanasius uses language and arguments very similar to Alexander's: the Son is the ἀπαύγασμα τοῦ πατρὸς,<sup>167</sup> the εἰκὼν τελεία (rather than ἀπαράλλακτος) of the Father;<sup>168</sup> to say that the one who is Word and Wisdom once did not exist is equivalent to saying God was once destitute of both.<sup>169</sup> The texts 'My heart has uttered a good word' (Ps 44 (45).2) and 'From the womb before the morning star I gave birth to you' (Ps 109 (110).3),<sup>170</sup> 'I and

---

<sup>163</sup> Barnes (*Athanasius*, p. 64) ironically praises Athanasius for revealing as little as possible of his own theology in the letter, in contrast to Alexander's *He philarchos*.

<sup>164</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.20). In *C Ar* 22.4 the proposition is put forward as a question representing one horn of a dilemma propounded by 'those around Arius from the teaching of Eusebius [of Nicomedia]'. Vinzent appropriates it for Asterius and numbers it fragment 44.

<sup>165</sup> See Eusebius' letter to Alexander, *Urk* 7.4 (p. 15.2-6).

<sup>166</sup> The Logos is ὁ ἀεὶ ὢν (Marcellus, fr. 6 K); the flesh which the Word assumed is τὸ μὴ ὄν (fr. 11 K).

<sup>167</sup> *Urk* 4b.13 (p. 9.4).

<sup>168</sup> *Urk* 4b.13 (p. 9.3).

<sup>169</sup> *Urk* 4b.13 (p. 9.4-6).

<sup>170</sup> The two texts appear together at *Urk* 4b.12 (p. 9.2-3).



the Father are one' (Jn 10.30)<sup>171</sup> are all used in both letters (and also by Marcellus, of course).

But *Henos somatos* uses a number of formulations which neither Alexander nor Marcellus uses, so far as we know. Firstly, Athanasius is not afraid to use the word οὐσία (which neither Alexander nor Marcellus ever uses by choice), and comes as close as anyone does at this stage to using the term ὁμοούσιος: he condemns the proposition that the Son is not ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ πατρὶ,<sup>172</sup> and the proposition that the Logos is ξένος τε καὶ ἀλλότριος καὶ ἀπεσχοινησμένος ... τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίας,<sup>173</sup> as well as asking rhetorically how the one who is perfect image of the Father could be ἀνόμιος τῇ οὐσίᾳ τοῦ πατρός.<sup>174</sup>

He is also prepared to use φύσις in a similarly ambiguous way, which excludes neither Alexander's two natures language nor Marcellus' 'one nature': he condemns the proposition that the Son is not 'by nature' (φύσει) the Father's true Logos or true Wisdom,<sup>175</sup> and that he is changeable and alterable 'by nature', which would make him ξένος ... τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίας.<sup>176</sup> The letter avoids ὑπόστασις language altogether.

Athanasius uses the language of Platonist theoria, seeing and knowing, frequently in this letter (as he does in *De Incarnatione*); but like Alexander's Origenism, the context has shifted: it is not we who do the seeing and knowing of the Father (according to *De Incarnatione* we no longer can), but the Son.<sup>177</sup> It is the reciprocal contemplation of Father and Son which has become vital; it is on their understanding of one another that the world's hope of salvation rests.

---

<sup>171</sup> *Urk* 4b.14 (p. 9.8).

<sup>172</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.21-22).

<sup>173</sup> *Urk* 4b.8 (p. 8.3-4).

<sup>174</sup> *Urk* 4b.13 (p. 9.3).

<sup>175</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.22).

<sup>176</sup> *Urk* 4b.8 (p. 8.2-4).

<sup>177</sup> See *Urk* 4b.15 (p. 9.13-19) and, negatively, *Urk* 4b.8 (p. 8.4-5).

In cosmology, then, and in his understanding of the relationship between God and the Word, Athanasius is rather closer to Alexander than to Marcellus. In the matter of the economy, of what we would call soteriology, however, it is otherwise. In *De Incarnatione*, we can see Athanasius use very different language and a very different philosophical approach to describe concepts which yet are surprisingly close to those of Marcellus.

For Athanasius, *theoria* ought to have worked. Human beings ought to have been able to avoid the corruption inherent in their contingent natures by contemplating the Logos; but they looked down and fell, and so that way was closed to them, and they became liable to death and corruption. Then they ought to have been able to work out that the Logos was there, and how divine providence worked, even without being able to see the Logos any longer, by looking at God's works as displayed in the created order; but they turned away from nature towards the unnatural, and began worshipping the wrong things and sleeping with the wrong people, unable either to learn the lessons of the inherent harmony of the created order.<sup>178</sup> So God sent the Law, to tell them explicitly how to live rightly, which ought to have worked, but they could not keep the Law either. So God sent the holy ones of the Old Testament, to show them how to live rightly; but they ignored them.<sup>179</sup> And so, like a teacher who has tried everything else with recalcitrant and unintelligent pupils, the Logos (the one whose function it is to reveal God) still had the patience to find another way, to condescend to enter a particular part of creation and take on a body, and to demonstrate by works in that body that the Logos could control all those things which were wrongly worshipped by human beings, demons and magic, the weather, water, and the minor local mischievous powers, and even control death itself.<sup>180</sup>

So far, so theophanic. But Athanasius, though he keeps using the language of theophany, keeps feeling his way beyond it to something further. Athanasius

---

<sup>178</sup> Athanasius, *De Inc* 4-5 (pp. 142-144 Thomson); see also *C Gen* 2-3 (pp. 6-8 Thomson).

<sup>179</sup> *De Inc* 12 (pp. 162-164).

rejoices in the vulgarity of the incarnation, in the vulgarity of the language of the gospels, virtually taunts his upper-class pagan interlocutors with it -- because it works. Their best, most beautifully phrased, most traditional writings intended to inculcate virtue have had no effect in actually persuading anyone to be virtuous, he argues. Only the incarnate Christ can meet people where they really are; only Christianity can persuade them to live rational, virtuous lives, and lives whose virtue is beyond what pagans think possible, so that even women and young children can overcome their fear of death, and even men can be sexually continent.<sup>181</sup>

For Athanasius, the Good News is that the Word really did become incarnate, really did come down to our level, the immeasurable distance to be crossed only serving to show God's still more immeasurable generosity. And though the incarnation was theophanic, it was something more. Life itself took a body and burned corruption out of it, made human beings once again heirs to incorruption and ended the universal death sentence by the death of the Word's own body, which summed up the general death God had visited on humankind.<sup>182</sup> The Logos did not just teach, but by being joined to it changed the nature of human flesh itself.

Marcellus shares with Athanasius the teaching that it is the Incarnation which has bridged the gulf that separates us from God, and brought God near to us, when nothing else could do so; and hence that it is here that God is to be known. The theophanic function of the incarnation in Athanasius is supplied by Marcellus' doctrine of the incarnate Logos as 'image of the invisible God', but in a rather more starkly apophatic manner. No one can know either the Word or the Father of the Word apart from this image, as far as Marcellus is concerned; we were made worthy of knowing the Word only by the Incarnation itself.<sup>183</sup> It is the incarnate Word who makes the invisible God visible and tangible. It is

---

<sup>180</sup> *De Inc* 13-16 (pp. 166-172).

<sup>181</sup> *De Inc* 50-51 (pp. 258-262).

<sup>182</sup> *De Inc* 8 (p. 152) and 44 (p. 246).

<sup>183</sup> Fr. S/V 55 (K 59).

not clear whether things were otherwise, for Marcellus, before the Fall; but now real knowledge of God is only possible at all through the Word's flesh. The knowledge made possible by the Incarnation is no longer a substitute for raising the mind to contemplate the Logos with one's own little logos which is in the image of God's,<sup>184</sup> for direct knowledge of God is not possible by that means in any case: it is looking to Christ's life as lived on earth. It is one's own human flesh which is now according to the image of God, not (or not just) one's soul or one's mind, for the image of God human beings are made according to is precisely the incarnate Christ, the Word's flesh, the image of the Word.<sup>185</sup>

The Word does not transform the nature of human flesh by its mere presence, in Marcellus' extant fragments (it is the Resurrection which makes that immortal and incorruptible), but does change its status, glorifying it by *κοινωνία* with it and making it worthy to know God, before glorifying it again with 'more than human glory' at the Ascension by carrying it back redeemed to God as a gift to sit at God's right and reign over the now defeated Devil. But the one who sits at God's right, for Marcellus, has a will and a soul of his own; an attribute he probably does not share with Athanasius' Christ,<sup>186</sup> but certainly does share with the Christ of Eustathius of Antioch.

### c. Eustathius of Antioch

Eustathius<sup>187</sup> ought to be a crucial figure to the understanding of the pre-Nicene theological climate; unfortunately, only enough survives of his work to make us long for the rest, and to enable us to form a very few general and extremely

---

<sup>184</sup> See Athanasius, *C Gen* 30 and 34 (pp. 82 and 94 Thomson).

<sup>185</sup> Fr. S/V 56 (K 95)

<sup>186</sup> See the discussion in Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, Vol. I, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, revised edn, tr. John Bowden (London: Mowbrays, 1975), pp. 308-328.

<sup>187</sup> Fragments are collected in Michel Spanneut, *Recherches sur les écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche avec une édition nouvelle des fragments dogmatiques et exégétiques*, Mémoires et Travaux publiés par des professeurs des Facultés Catholiques de Lille 55 (1948). The important fragments in Theodoret are re-edited in Theodoret, *Eranistes*, ed. Gerard H. Ettliger (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

tantalising ideas of his thought. He seems to have been part of a group of anti-Origenists which included Methodius of Olympus and Eutropius of Hadrianopolis (both of whom, the former posthumously, he praises in *De Pythonissa*, which is dedicated to the latter), and was a writer of some literary pretension in the slightly overblown style of his day.<sup>188</sup> He wrote a great deal, so far as we can tell; the short work *De Pythonissa* survives in its entirety, and fragments survive from some fifteen others, including a work *Contra Arianos* in at least eight books.<sup>189</sup>

He must have been a formidable opponent of Arius and his allies, from the fragment which survives of his description of Nicaea,<sup>190</sup> with whose failure to condemn his enemies he was clearly extremely unhappy. His eight books *Contra Arianos* must have been the major anti-Arian/Eusebian theological work of the twenties, whichever side of Nicaea they are dated, as Marcellus' *Contra Asterium* was of the thirties and Athanasius' *Orationes Contra Arianos* of the forties. Marcellus, in particular, seems to have carried forward a number of his ideas.

His name is usually coupled with Marcellus' (usually alongside the word 'extreme') and they certainly had a number of important points in common: the designation of Father and Son as one hypostasis,<sup>191</sup> the description of the Logos as the δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ,<sup>192</sup> the use of the term 'spirit' to describe the divine as opposed to the human in Christ,<sup>193</sup> the application of Proverbs 8:22 ('The Lord created me the beginning of his ways for his works') to the man Jesus, and the teaching that the one who reigns in glory at the Father's right hand is in fact the

---

<sup>188</sup> See Spanneut, p. 62.

<sup>189</sup> See Spanneut, p. 73. *CPG* 3350-3369 lists nineteen titles for Eustathian texts classed as authentic, but there may be some duplication.

<sup>190</sup> Discussed below.

<sup>191</sup> Eustathius, fr. 38 Spanneut.

<sup>192</sup> Fr. 29 Spanneut.

<sup>193</sup> Fr. 29 Spanneut.

man Jesus,<sup>194</sup> or slightly less divisively, that it is to Christ as human being, on behalf of human beings in general, that that glory is given.<sup>195</sup>

But there are also important points of difference. Firstly, there is one point on which Eustathius' theology is closer to that of the Alexandrians: his description of the pre-incarnate Logos as 'image', and the man Jesus as 'image of the image': here we can see Eustathius thinking his way out of the Middle Platonic system, but not being able quite to think himself all the way out of it:

For Paul did not say "conformed to the Son of God", but "conformed to the image of his Son", showing that the Son is one thing and his image is something else. For the Son, bearing the divine tokens of the Father's virtue, is image of the Father. Since also those who are born -- like begotten from like -- appear [to be] true images of their begetters. But the ἄνθρωπος whom he wore is image of the Son.<sup>196</sup>

Elsewhere, we see Adam's body described as the 'impressed likeness of the most divine image', the 'prototypical statue of God',<sup>197</sup> which seems closer to Marcellus' usage, but in fact goes further than he does in adopting Irenaeus' view that it is the human body, not the soul or mind, which is in the image of God; Marcellus makes a sharp distinction between the flesh of Christ, which is really the image of the invisible God, and the rest of human flesh, which is in the image of Christ's flesh.

It is not clear whether Eustathius is prepared to use the word *ousia* in the sense of divine substance, either of Father or Son or both. There are only two genuine fragments which might reflect this usage, one surviving in Theodoret's *Eranistes*, the other in Latin translation in Gelasius' *De duabus naturis*. Theodoret quotes from Eustathius' exegesis of Proverbs 8.22: 'The temple' -- i.e. the body -- 'suffers, but the *ousia* abides without spot.' This might mean 'the divine essence', but it might also mean merely 'that which is essential', i.e. 'what it really is'.<sup>198</sup> The Gelasius fragment gives us 'Deus Verbum eandem

---

<sup>194</sup> Fr. 60 Spanneut.

<sup>195</sup> Fr. 43 Spanneut.

<sup>196</sup> Fr. 21 Spanneut.

<sup>197</sup> Fr. 5 Spanneut.

<sup>198</sup> Fr. 31 Spanneut.



quam Genitor portat imaginem, imago quippe existens divinae substantiae',<sup>199</sup> but this would seem not to be a very close translation of Eustathius' original, since it seems to suggest both Father and Son are images. If it is accurate, it would suggest surprisingly enough that Eustathius believed, like Asterius, that the Logos was the image of the divine *ousia* (or the *ousia* of God); but it seems more likely that the Greek was *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ* (echoing Heb 1:3).

Eustathius' main contribution to anti-Arian polemic, so far as we can tell from the extant fragments, was an insistence on the two natures in Christ as a way of combating Arius' doctrine of the mutability of the Logos. All the passages which ascribe weakness, emotion and suffering to Christ, which (according to *He philarchos*) Arius predicated of the Logos, Eustathius at length and explicitly ascribed to the *ἄνθρωπος θεοφόρος* (*homo deifer*).<sup>200</sup> The impression given by the extant fragments that this was Eustathius' main objection to Arius is probably exaggerated (most of the fragments do come from Theodoret, after all), but it cannot be ignored as a central feature of his theology.

In combating the doctrine of the mutability of the Logos, Eustathius developed a full theology of an aspect of Christ ignored by Alexander, Athanasius and so far as we can tell, all of Arius' allies: his soul. It could be unkindly argued that, as with so much Antiochene Christology, the soul of Christ in Eustathius' thought is primarily there not to show solidarity with us so much as to protect the immutability of the divine nature, but the following fragment, from the *Orationes Contra Arianos*, shows that this is not so: 'homo autem deum ferens, qui mortis passionem sponte censuit sustinere propter hominum utilitatem, palmam quidem et certaminis, ut ita dicendum sit, honorem, potestatem percepit et, ubi recipitur, gloriam, quam nequaquam prius habuerat' ('but the God-bearing man, who thought off his own bat to sustain the passion of death because of the utility to human beings, received indeed the prize of the struggle,

---

<sup>199</sup> Fr. 44 Spanneut.

<sup>200</sup> E.g., fr. 43.

so to speak, honour, power and, when it is received, glory, which he never had previously’).<sup>201</sup> The incipient Nestorianism of this might be alarming, but it does show that Christ (in other words, Christ’s soul) has work to do, a choice to make, merit to earn, and glory to receive in Eustathius’ system in a way that Athanasius’ enfleshed Logos does not; and in the way that Arius’ enfleshed Logos problematically does.

Because his work survived largely in fifth-century citations, what we know best about Eustathius is his Christology; the references to his Trinitarian theology in the extant fragments are scanty. We know he spoke of one hypostasis;<sup>202</sup> in the case of φύσις, when he is not using it to distinguish the two natures in Christ, his usage is, like Athanasius’, ambiguous: the Son is ‘by nature’ Son of God (by nature Son or by nature God?),<sup>203</sup> the one anointing is ‘by nature’ θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθείς (by nature God or by nature God from God?). The Logos is the Wisdom of God and the Power of God, the Son is εἰκὼν of the Father; the Son is pre-cosmic.<sup>204</sup> Whether Eustathius would have said ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς or ὁμοούσιος *sua sponte*, he certainly defended *homoousios* after Nicaea -- but then, so did Eusebius of Caesarea. He may be behind Nicaea’s γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, since he is one of the earliest to argue that the one excludes the other.

Eustathius may have enough in common with Marcellus to warrant the two of them being bracketed together, as they so often are. But their theologies have a very different feel. Both took their distance from Origen (without being able to escape him completely), both proclaim one hypostasis, both have their moments of Nestorianism. But Eustathius fits quite happily into the tradition of normal fourth- /fifth-century ‘Antiochene’ theology in general, with his two natures Christology and one divine hypostasis (Theodoret, after all, thinks that the Christian meaning of *hypostasis* as different from *ousia* is only a matter of

---

<sup>201</sup> Fr. 43 Spanneut.

<sup>202</sup> Fr. 38 Spanneut.

<sup>203</sup> Fr. 35 Spanneut.

<sup>204</sup> Frs 30, 21, 19 Spanneut.

convention).<sup>205</sup> Marcellus, meanwhile, is the outstanding fourth-century representative of a rather different tradition.

#### d. Marcellus

Nothing is known of Marcellus' theology until at least five years after Nicaea (other than that he was active there in debates with the Eusebians, in which he was reckoned both by himself and others to have come off the victor).<sup>206</sup> His theological views are so distinctive when they do appear, however, that it seems reasonably safe to assume they did not alter much between Nicaea and the writing of his major work, the *Contra Asterium*.

Many of his positions on the fundamental questions in view at Nicaea have already been referred to: he teaches one hypostasis, condemns two φύσεις and δυνάμεις and πράγματα and πρόσωπα (not exactly the same as teaching one of each of these), makes the incarnate Christ rather than the eternal Logos the image of God, and avoids the language of οὐσία altogether. It should be added that despite accusations to the contrary, he certainly believed in the eternity of the Logos; it was one of the first points he argued in the *Contra Asterium*.<sup>207</sup>

The strand of German *Dogmengeschichte* which sees Marcellus as so commendable, however, is less interested in the number of hypostaseis he assigns to the Trinity than in other aspects of his thought. The tradition which tries to understand Marcellus in positive terms sees him as representative of an 'Asia Minor theology' which largely eschews philosophical questions in favour of a biblical, Spirit-driven, poetic faith as represented by figures as diverse as

---

<sup>205</sup> See Theodoret, *Eranistes* I (p. 64.10-13 Ettlinger).

<sup>206</sup> Marcellus, *Letter to Julius* (Vinzent, *Markell*, p. 124); Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 32.2.

<sup>207</sup> Marcellus, fr. P 14, 15 (S/V 68, 6; K 51, 53).

Ignatius of Antioch, Melito of Sardis, the author of *The Acts of Paul and Thekla*, and the Montanists, but most of all by Irenaeus of Lyons.<sup>208</sup>

Both Zahn<sup>209</sup> and Loofs<sup>210</sup> built their commendations of Marcellus on his theological closeness to Irenaeus. Like Irenaeus, Marcellus is 'biblical', or can be, citing proof-text after proof-text in support of his theses. For both Irenaeus and Marcellus, ἐνσάρκωσις is a two-way affair: God becomes perceptible among human beings and they are led back to the goal of their creation, life with God. Both use what might be described as 'Word-Flesh Christology' and 'Word-Man Christology' indiscriminately, now concentrating on the Logos as subject of Christ's actions, now on the 'Son of Man'. Both make some use of the notion of recapitulation (Marcellus less fully than Irenaeus) in describing the process of salvation. For both, it is a process, a history, a journey in which each stage of Christ's life, death, resurrection, ascension and return has its full weight. But most of all, for Zahn and Loofs, Marcellus almost uniquely in his age avoids the evils of Origenism and eschews the categories of Middle Platonism so all-pervasive in early Christianity, and particularly post-Constantinian early Christianity, and it is his closeness to Irenaeus which allows him to do so.

I would largely endorse these views (which both authors in any case somewhat qualify). From the point of view of an age (or at least a culture) which no longer has any use for a mediating principle of cosmic order, Marcellus' doctrine of the incarnate Christ as image of the unseen God is far more theologically useful than the image theology of his contemporaries. However, Marcellus' theology may be seen in some ways precisely as an attempt to make sense of an Irenaean tradition in philosophically reputable terms.

---

<sup>208</sup> On the theology of Irenaeus, see Denis Minns, *Irenaeus, Outstanding Christian Thinkers Series* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994).

<sup>209</sup> Zahn, *Marcellus*, pp. 234-45.

<sup>210</sup> Friedrich Loofs, 'Die Trinitätslehre Marcell's von Ancyra und ihr Verhältnis zur älteren Tradition', SAB (1902), 764-81, reprinted in Loofs, *Patristica*, at pp. 134-7.

What for Irenaeus is the 'hand of God' -- the Logos -- is for Marcellus either 'Logos' in a strict sense, or the 'faculty (δύναμις) of God to act'. This view was to attract a great deal of criticism from his contemporary Eusebius of Caesarea, and from the two generations after Sardica (Basil of Caesarea accuses him of believing in a ψῖλος λόγος, 'mere word'), but it is actually a perfectly reasonable reading, in its own terms, of two eminently biblical notions, which gives some account of the way in which the Logos both seems to act to some extent independently of God (it is not the Father who took flesh), and yet is one with God. The classic example of this which ancient theologians always used was that of the sun and its rays; the rays come from the sun and are not divided from the sun, but they reach where the sun *per se* does not. The Logos, who exists in God as a faculty, also acts to some extent apart from God as an activity (ἐνέργεια), but an activity which is not dissipated but returns to God.

Otherwise, Marcellus is more strictly apophatic than Irenaeus, as befits the age which has seen the Great Chain break apart, and also even more anxious to retain strict monotheism, so more willing to address the gap between the monotheism of the Old Testament and apparent revelation of a second divine being in the New. For Marcellus, the Old Testament is to be given its full weight: the task of the Law and the prophets was to teach people the vital truth that there is one God, and he praises the Markan scribe who welcomes Jesus' thus summing up the Law (Mk 12:28-34), preferring the Markan version to the more hostile Matthean and Lucan versions (fr P 100, S/V 91). On the other hand, for Marcellus, the Old Testament provides no way of actually knowing God, as opposed to knowing about God, because only the Logos can reveal God to human beings, and the existence and power of the Logos are revealed for the first time in the New Testament, by John the Evangelist (fr P 14, S/V 68); those who think they know God apart from the Logos (including Sabellius) are deceived, therefore (fr S/V 69). Human beings would never have known God, for Marcellus, had God not chosen to be revealed by the Logos enfleshed.

More problematic is Marcellus' account of relations within the Trinity: Theodoret thought the only thing that was wrong with Marcellus' theology was his doctrine of the broadening of the Monas out into a Trias.<sup>211</sup> Klaus Seibt has shown the affinities of this doctrine with neo-Pythagorean geometry;<sup>212</sup> it might also be noted that this explanation of the Trinity (a point lengthening into a line, then broadening into a surface) would make Marcellus the first Eastern to believe that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son, in a theology not dissimilar to that of Thomas Aquinas (if lacking the essential concept of eternal generation which would have safeguarded Marcellus against any accusation that his Trinity is only economic, not immanent). It is, in fact, quite difficult to put together Marcellus' doctrine of the Holy Spirit from the information we have; he clearly had one, for the Spirit's continuing presence in the Church was one of his central beliefs,<sup>213</sup> but we cannot tell whether the Spirit was to usher in a third dispensation, that of the Church (as Loofs suggested), or what precisely was its relation to the Logos; we can merely note that the Spirit (the non-human part of Christ, i.e. the Logos) is different from the Paraclete (as breathed on the apostles by Jesus in John's gospel).

Turning to the economy, it is very likely that Marcellus had a notion of *anacephalaisis* akin to that of Irenaeus. He only uses the word once in the extant fragments, and that in passing,<sup>214</sup> but it is exactly in the way we would expect. Irenaeus' Christ sums up the cosmos; likewise, the 'most holy Logos' becomes 'first-born of all creation', the first *καίνος ἄνθρωπος*, and the *ἀρχή* of all things in earth and heaven, by becoming united to human flesh (fr. P 22, S/V 11). Irenaeus' Christ also sums up human experience, explicitly living through every age of a human being, from birth to old age, since he died at age fifty: 'You are not yet fifty years old, and you say that you have seen Abraham?' (Jn 8:57). Marcellus probably accepted the same lifespan for Christ, which would

---

<sup>211</sup> Theodoret, *Compendium Fabularum Haereticarum* II.10 (PG 396C - 397A); Marcellus, fr. P 69 (S/V 48).

<sup>212</sup> Klaus Seibt, 'Ein Argumentum ad Constantinum in der Logos- und Gotteslehre Markells von Ankyra', *St Pat XXVI* (1993), pp. 415-420.

<sup>213</sup> See the discussions of Marcellus's pneumatology and ecclesiology in Chapters 4 and 5.

<sup>214</sup> Marcellus, fr. P 26, S/V 15.



see him born in about 25BC, for he constantly uses the phrases 'about four hundred years ago' or 'not four hundred years' to describe the beginning of the new dispensation: if he reckoned Christ to have been born in 4BC, he would have rounded the consequent figure of 335 years or so down to three hundred, whereas a birth in 25BC produces a figure of 355 years since Christ's birth, more likely to be rounded up.

Like Irenaeus, Marcellus' favourite image for the plight of humankind is bondage in slavery to the Devil (e.g. fr. P 115, S/V 83, cf. Irenaeus, *Adv Haer* III.18.7), who is overcome by the obedience of Christ as human being, replaying the old contest but this time winning. At the same time, the one who saves has to be God, or the salvation would not be secure: the Word of God prepared the human being to become immortal through the Resurrection, and has taken a seat at the right hand of the Father wearing it like a crown of victory (fr. P 116, S/V 84). And like Irenaeus, Marcellus marvels at the generosity of God. Irenaeus explains the sign from Heaven above and earth beneath unlooked-for by human beings of Isaiah as the doubly saving incarnate Word, saying 'quod non postulavit homo, quia nec speravit Virginem praegnantem fieri posse quae erat virgo et parere filium, et hunc partum Deum esse nobiscum, et descendere in ea quae sunt deorsum terrae quaerentem ovem quae perierat' (*Adv Haer* III.19.3). Marcellus expresses very much the same thought: 'For who would have believed before the demonstration of the facts that the Word of God would assume flesh, having been born through the Virgin, and that he would display the whole Godhead in it bodily?' (fr P 38, S/V 33).

It is a paradox that Marcellus was better served by Eusebius of Caesarea's hostile account of his theology than Eustathius was by those who quoted him as orthodox; we have a far clearer picture of his thought. Perhaps if we had the rest of the *Contra Asterium* it would be clearer how Marcellus attempted to solve some of the problems his theology gives rise to; if Eusebius cited only what he thought was worst in the work, the best must have very good indeed. But it is perhaps fitting that Eusebius should pass on almost all of Marcellus that

survives, just as Marcellus and Athanasius together pass on almost all of Asterius that survives. Marcellus had a sense of humour, but God's is better.

### **3. The Road to Nicaea**

Long before Arius' altercation with Alexander, the stage had been set for the Nicene controversy. The theologians of the East had come to be divided between two irreconcilable understandings of what the Word of God was, how it came to be, how it operated, how it related to the void which had opened up between God and the world, and how it might enable humanity to cross that void, or see that void crossed on its behalf. The answer of Asterius and Arius and their friends was to say that something divine still lingered on our side of the void, though some way into it, something in which the reflection, the imprint of the distant God could be seen and grasped and followed, a second God, willed by the first for our sake and perfectly in harmony with that will, who was not distant but in a certain manner one of us, one of the perishable order who transcended perishability by obedience, who could be with us, and who would give us also back the old harmony with the created order we had lost. The answer of Alexander and his friends was to say that somewhere out beyond the void lived the unbreakably bonded Father with the Son, God with the Word, knowing and understanding one another, the one link of the Great Chain that had not broken and could never break because its unity was in their very nature(s); and that the Word saved, not by being on our side of the void but precisely by being on the other side of it, and therefore having the power to leap it altogether, be joined to our nature, heal it definitively and even carry it back.

To each side, the theology of the other destroyed their hope of salvation: for Asterius, Arius and the rest, placing the Son on the wrong side of the void from us removed the only God we could hope to approach from us forever, and made a mockery of the real God by making that God one of a category which could be divided and numbered, while for Alexander and the others placing the Son's

origin on the wrong side of the void from God left the Son as part of the perishable world of coming to be and passing away, as helpless as the rest of creation to cross back to the Father. No wonder the extremists on both sides expressed the view that the others were not Christians but fools or even demons attempting to deprive the elect of their hope of salvation; the more moderate figures on both sides probably thought, if they did not say, the same thing.

#### **a. The outbreak of the controversy.**

Much of the theological debate about the nature of the Logos, including the staking out of the positions involved in this stage of the controversy, had very likely already happened by the time of the debacle in Alexandria. Eusebius of Nicomedia, when writing to chide Paulinus for not having involved himself so far in the controversy, shows that he knows perfectly well what Paulinus' opinions on the matters in question actually are.<sup>215</sup> The scriptural proof-texts have already a well-worn look in all the documents of the pre-Nicene controversy, and the broad lines of each side's alternative exegeses have been thoroughly worked out. When Arius says, in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, 'Before he was γεννηθῆ, or κτισθῆ, or ὀρισθῆ, or θεμελιωθῆ, he was not,' he is referring to Prov 8.24-25, and using the three verbs there applied to Wisdom, together with one from Rom 1.3;<sup>216</sup> he clearly does not need to explain to Eusebius what move he is making. Eustathius (to be followed by both Marcellus and Athanasius) countered by applying the passage to the incarnate Christ.<sup>217</sup> Alexander and Athanasius (as later Marcellus) both quote 'My heart has uttered a good word' to counter Arius' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων; he is obviously replying to this text when he accuses his enemies of believing the Logos is an ἐρπυγή.<sup>218</sup> 'From the womb before the morning star I gave birth to you' is used by both sides, Alexander and Athanasius against ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων,

---

<sup>215</sup> *Urk* 8.1-2 and 8 (p. 15.1-9 and p. 17.7-11).

<sup>216</sup> *Urk* 1.5 (p. 3.3).

<sup>217</sup> See above.

<sup>218</sup> *Urk* 1.3 (p. 2.7).

their opponents to suggest a birth in time; against this second reading, Marcellus will apply the text to the birth of the incarnate Christ before the star appeared to lead the Magi to his dwelling-place.<sup>219</sup> ‘Begotten’ does not suggest a likeness of nature to Eusebius of Nicomedia, since one can also find the text ‘I have begotten and brought up sons, and they have rebelled against me’;<sup>220</sup> Alexander counters that ‘they have rebelled against me’ shows this cannot be the sort of son the Son is.<sup>221</sup>

From this it will be seen that I cannot accept the argument that a date as early as 318 (Opitz’ dating)<sup>222</sup> is necessary for the first documents of the controversy on the grounds that the theological positions would have taken some time to work out; clearly by the time of Opitz’ earliest document (Arius’ letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia), the debate is already ripe and has probably been going on for years, perhaps even decades.<sup>223</sup> Nor is it any longer necessary to place Eusebius’ transferral to Nicomedia before the synod of Neocaesarea, in the belief that the Gregory listed there is Eusebius’ replacement in the see of Berytus.<sup>224</sup> I would suggest a date for the outbreak around the spring of 322, that is the year after Williams’ suggested date<sup>225</sup> and the year before that of Schwartz<sup>226</sup> (proved impossible in its details by the finding of new evidence, but based on a sense of events moving very quickly)<sup>227</sup> and Telfer.<sup>228</sup> The reason for this is a remark in

---

<sup>219</sup> Marcellus attacks Asterius’ exegesis of Ps 109 (110).3 and defends his own in frs 28-31 K. In the profession of faith of Arius and his friends to Alexander, the text can be evoked simply by the shorthand phrase ἐκ γαστρός (*Urk* 6.5 (p. 13.17)).

<sup>220</sup> Is 1.2, *Urk* 8.7 (p. 17.1-5).

<sup>221</sup> *Urk* 14.34 (p. 25.3-7).

<sup>222</sup> Opitz dates Arius’ letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia to ‘ca. 318’ (*Athanasius Werke*, III,1,1, p.1). The rationale is given in his influential article ‘Die Zeitfolge des arianischen Streites von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 328’, *ZNW* 33 (1934), 131-159, especially 142-3 and 146. His dating is closely followed by Hanson, *Search*, pp. 133-134.

<sup>223</sup> This is suggested by, for example, Richard Vaggione, pp. 376-377.

<sup>224</sup> The Gregory listed in the names ascribed to that synod is really Gregory the Illuminator at the synod of Caesarea in 314; see above.

<sup>225</sup> Williams regards Arius’ credal letter (Opitz’ *Urk* 6) as the earliest document of the controversy and argues that ‘the pace of events was fairly brisk once it had begun’ (*Arius*, p. 56 with p. 58).

<sup>226</sup> See Schwartz, *GS* III, 165-8: ‘... der ganze Streit unter Konstantin zu setzen ist; er kann erst im Herbst 323 ausgebrochen sein’ (p. 165).

<sup>227</sup> Schwartz wanted to place the defeat of Licinius in 323, though he eventually recanted and accepted 324; see the note by Eltester and Altendorf at *GS* III, 191, note 1.

Alexander's letter *He philarchos* (whose place in the sequence of events I shall discuss presently). Alexander chides Arius for 'daily exciting seditions and persecutions against us', in a context which must mean by pagans, but still declares the present time 'a period of peace'.<sup>229</sup> This would seem to belong in a period of heightened tension, when relations between Licinius and Constantine had broken down and Licinius was beginning to regard Christians with a jaundiced eye and to legislate accordingly, but before any really serious measures had been taken: synods were still possible, for example. The period between spring 321 (after Licinius had begun to show his hand by refusing to recognize Constantine's consuls)<sup>230</sup> and spring 323 (soon after which time Licinius' ban on ecclesiastical synods must have come into play)<sup>231</sup> would seem to fit this best; spring seems a likely period for the controversy to have begun, if we imagine the first flurry of letters to have taken most of one summer (autumn and winter being less propitious times for friends to take the relevant letters back and forth). *He philarchos* would be written the following spring, by which time tension with pagans would have become very overt, although Alexander might still optimistically say that it was not a time of persecution. Further synods would be planned, but quickly become impossible.

---

<sup>228</sup> Telfer's compressed chronology takes 'July 323 as the starting date for the controversy' (W. Telfer, 'When Did the Arian Controversy Begin?', *JTS* 47 (1946), 129-42, at p. 140). The date of the outbreak of the Alexandrian debacle, and the order of events which followed it, are some of the most written about questions in the whole of patristic scholarship, and cannot be considered in full in a thesis devoted specifically to Marcellus of Ancyra. I will, however, consider these questions briefly and sketch in my own suggestions concerning them, concentrating above all on the question which most nearly concerns Marcellus, that of the nature of the abortive synod of Ancyra of 325.

<sup>229</sup> *Urk* 14.5 and 59 (p. 30.13-14 and p. 29.11). According to Hanson, 'This no doubt describes what has been happening in Alexandria during the period of prohibition of meetings' (*Search*, p. 136). Williams, on the contrary, thinks that these statements would be 'very odd ... if the letter was written in 323 or 324, at the time of Licinius' anti-Christian legislation' (*Arius*, p. 51).

<sup>230</sup> See Barnes, *New Empire*, pp. 93-4.

<sup>231</sup> On Licinius' motley collection of anti-Christian measures, see Barnes, *Constantine*, pp. 70-2 and Simon Corcoran, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs, Imperial Prouncements and Government AD 283-324*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 195. The ban on synods is mentioned in Eusebius, *VC* I.51.1-2 (but not in the account of Licinius' anti-Christian measures in *HE* X.8). The date of the ban is uncertain. Barnes puts it 'perhaps as early as 320' (*Constantine*, p. 376 note 154). Stein settles for 320 (Ernst Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, I, *De l'État Romaine à l'État Byzantin (284-476)*, ed. and tr. Jean-Remy Palanque ([Paris]: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959), p. 103 with p. 465 note 39). If so, it is surprising that ecclesiastical turmoil was not even worse that it in fact was at the accession of Constantine (Eusebius notes that the canons require bishops to gather to ordain a bishop (*VC* I.51.2)), and the chronology of the early phases of the Arian controversy becomes quite drawn out.

Turning to the order of the documents themselves, there are eight original documents from the controversy itself which have an important bearing on the sequence of events leading up to Nicaea, as well as later accounts from Epiphanius and Sozomen which may or may not have any reliable information behind them. These are (in the order in which Opitz prints them) the Letter from Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia (*Urk 1*), the Letter from Alexander to his clergy (*Urk 4a*), *Henos somatos* (Letter from Alexander to all bishops, *Urk 4b*), the Creed of Arius and his companions to Alexander (*Urk 6*), the Letter from Eusebius of Caesarea to Alexander of Alexandria (*Urk 7*), the Letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre (*Urk 8*), *He philarchos* (Letter of Alexander to Alexander, *Urk 14*) and the Tome of Alexander to all bishops (*Urk 15*). The other documents printed by Opitz fit around these, but do not really contribute to their dating.

The most intractable problem, which is the key to the dating of the whole sequence, is the relative placing of *Henos somatos* and *He philarchos*. This is disputed, and with good reason: there are strong reasons for arguing both that each should come before and that each should come after the other.<sup>232</sup>

*Henos somatos* is addressed to ‘Our beloved and most honoured fellow-liturgists of the catholic Church everywhere’, and signed by seventeen presbyters and twenty-four deacons of Alexandria, headed by the problematic Colluthus, and nineteen presbyters and twenty deacons of the Mareotis. This begins commandingly *in medias res*, after a couple of citations from scripture to justify the sending round of an encyclical: ‘Now, in our *paroichia* there have gone forth lawless and Christ-fighting men teaching an apostasy which one may

---

<sup>232</sup> Opitz (‘Zeitfolge’, pp. 149-50), following Schwartz (*GS III*, 133-4) placed *Henos somatos* first. In 1987 Rowan Williams challenged this widely held view and argued strongly for the priority of *He philarchos* (*Arius*, pp. 50-6). Opitz’ chronology – and above all the priority of *Henos somatos* – was defended by Uta Loose, ‘Zur Chronologie des arianischen Streites’, *ZKG* 101 (1990), 88-92. Williams defended his position doggedly in the second edition of *Arius*, published in 2001 (pp. 253-4).



justly consider and call the forerunner of the Antichrist.<sup>233</sup> The writer (writing as Alexander, and using the first person singular in this passage for the only times in the letter) claims,

I for my part wanted to consign such a thing to silence, so that the evil might spend itself among the champions alone, and such a thing not go forth to other places and defile the ears of some of the simple. But since Eusebius, now in Nicomedia, having thought the affairs of the churches to lie with him, because having deserted Berytus and having eyed up the church of the Nicomedians he got away with it, has placed himself at the head also of these apostates and dared to write around in all directions recommending them, so that he might seduce some of the ignorant into this most wicked and Christ-fighting heresy, I felt compelled, knowing what is written in the law, to be silent no longer, but to send word to you all, in order that you may know both those who have become apostates and the wretched propositions of their heresy, and if Eusebius should write, that you may pay him no heed.<sup>234</sup>

The letter goes on to give various other potential clues to the events that have preceded it: there has been some former malevolence on Eusebius' part, possibly before he became bishop of Nicomedia, who then lay dormant for a time;<sup>235</sup> the list of those condemned at this point, headed by Arius and Achillas, includes twelve persons of unspecified clerical rank, together with the (Libyan) bishops Secundus and Theonas;<sup>236</sup> the form of Arius' theology that is condemned includes an alleged doctrine of a double Logos and a double Wisdom,<sup>237</sup> and condemns a version of the proposition ὁ ὢν τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐγέννησε;<sup>238</sup> 'τοὺς περὶ Ἄρειον, together with τοὺς συνακολουθήσαντας αὐτοῖς have been anathematised by 'us' (Alexander, or the clergy of Alexandria?) in synod with nearly one hundred bishops of Egypt and Libya;<sup>239</sup> 'we' are grieved but not particularly surprised by the apostasy, seeing that Christ himself warned that such things would happen; the bishops should forbear even

---

<sup>233</sup> *Urk* 4b.3 (p.6.6 - p. 7.2).

<sup>234</sup> *Urk* 4b.4-5 (p. 7.2-11).

<sup>235</sup> *Urk* 4b.5 (p. 7.11-13).

<sup>236</sup> *Urk* 4b.6 (p. 7.14-17).

<sup>237</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.12 - p. 8.2).

<sup>238</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.20).

<sup>239</sup> *Urk* 4b.11 (p. 8.11-13).

to greet such people, ‘lest we should become sharers in their sins’ (2 Jn 10-11).<sup>240</sup>

Opitz placed this letter fourth in his collection of documents, dating it to 319. This position assumes that almost the first thing that happened in the controversy after its eruption is that Alexander held a synod of one hundred bishops of Egypt and Libya, who (other than Secundus and Theonas) condemned Arius and those who received him; Arius then wrote to Eusebius of Nicomedia (*Urk* 1), recently translated to Nicomedia, and Eusebius wrote to various friends, some of whom (for example, Eusebius of Caesarea, cf. *Urk* 3) accepted Arius as orthodox. Alexander therefore wrote to the clergy of Alexandria (*Urk* 4a), requesting them to sign the condemnation already signed by the bishops of Egypt and Libya, expelled Arius from the city, and wrote (or commissioned) the encyclical letter *Henos somatos* (4b), warning other bishops not to receive Arius or listen to Eusebius. This extremely undiplomatic letter merely provoked Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends further; Eusebius convened a synod in Bithynia which exonerated Arius (note in Sozomen, based on a lost document in Sabinus, *Urk* 5), Arius and his friends sent a creed to Alexander asking him to reconsider (*Urk* 6), Eusebius of Caesarea wrote complaining about the condemnation of ὁ ὢν τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐγέννησε (*Urk* 7), Eusebius prompted Paulinus of Tyre to get involved (*Urk* 8), which he did (*Urk* 9), a Palestinian synod received Arius (note in Sozomen, based on a lost document in Sabinus, *Urk* 10).<sup>241</sup> This brings us to 322 and Licinius’ ban on Christian synods; after Constantine’s victory over Licinius in 324 the battle had to be virtually waged all over again. Alexander had to send out another encyclical (*He philarchos*, *Urk* 14), a much more defensive one, together with a Tome giving the faith as Alexander understood it, and asking bishops everywhere to sign it if they accepted it, which nearly 200 did. Constantine then got involved, and the dating of the rest of the events (Constantine’s letter (*Urk*

---

<sup>240</sup> *Urk* 4b.20 (p. 10.12-16).

<sup>241</sup> For this whole sequence, see the table and discussion in Opitz, ‘Zeitfolge’, pp. 146-9.

17), the 325 synod of Antioch (*Urk* 18), the synod of Nicaea itself (May-June 325)) is largely fixed.

As Williams has noted, however, there are also a number of aspects of *Henos somatos* which would suggest it came later in the order of events<sup>242</sup> (Williams places it even after Constantine's admonitory letter to Alexander and Arius, as Alexander's way of firmly pointing out that the weight of Eastern ecclesiastical opinion was on his side).<sup>243</sup> There is no known referent for 'Eusebius' former malevolence' if *Henos somatos* is early, whereas setting it later leaves the possibility of a lull during Licinius' ban on ecclesiastical synods, with a renewal of hostilities. It seems odd that Colluthus should form a schismatic church in anger at Alexander's leniency on Arius (as *He philarchos* states he has done)<sup>244</sup> after the firm measures against Arius described by *Henos somatos*, with which Colluthus seems proudly to have concurred.<sup>245</sup> The theology of Arius described in *Henos somatos* seems more developed than that described in *He philarchos* (particularly the theology of the two Logoi and two Wisdoms), and seems to reflect a knowledge of Arius' dinner-party pastiche the *Thalia*, whose theology seems now partly influenced by Asterius' (hence the two Logoi). The terminology used by *Henos somatos* is far more extreme than that of *He philarchos*, and might seem therefore to suggest a later, more embattled, stage of the controversy: the writer's enemies are forerunners of the Antichrist, and the bishop of Nicomedia is denounced in the strongest and most open terms, such as could only lead to a complete breach with him if this had not already happened.

Suppose, then, with Williams, we see *He philarchos* as the first of the two encyclicals. It makes no reference to Eusebius of Nicomedia at all (surprising if this letter comes after *Henos somatos*, with its determined denunciation of him), but speaks of three unnamed 'Syrian bishops' who have agreed with them and

---

<sup>242</sup> See Williams, *Arius*, pp. 50-2.

<sup>243</sup> *Henos somatos* on this theory belongs to a 'very late stage of events before Nicaea', in fact to 'January / February 325' (Williams, *Arius*, pp. 55 and 58).

<sup>244</sup> *Urk* 14.3 (p. 19.11 - p. 20.2).

thereby inflamed Arius and his friends all the more.<sup>246</sup> Colluthus is now a schismatic, but Williams disposes of the difficulty of this by suggesting that he was reconciled again by the time of *Henos somatos*, as noted above.<sup>247</sup> Arius and Achillas have ‘lately’ formed a conspiracy, and seem to be still in the environs of Alexandria, ‘dwelling in caves’, and bringing actions in the law-courts.<sup>248</sup> The letter’s description of their theology is rather different from that of *Henos somatos*, and seems as though it may reflect an earlier stage of the argument; what is emphasised is their concentrating on the weaknesses of Christ, and declaring him to be ‘on a level with other men’, ‘one of many brothers’, as well as the more stock ascription to them of the slogans ‘there was when he was not’ and ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων and the doctrines of the Son’s mutability and creaturely status.

On the other hand, there are various indications that *He philarchos* cannot be very early in the controversy, and even some that would encourage us to set it after *Henos somatos*. The anti-Alexander reaction seems to be theologically in full swing; he is very much on the back foot in this letter. *He philarchos*, in fact, is as much an appeal to the correspondent to sign and approve Alexander’s own faith as included in the letter as it is a letter intended to bring the correspondent up to date with events in Alexandria. It is not always recognised that *He philarchos* is not simply a letter to another Alexander, whether of Thessalonike or of Byzantium,<sup>249</sup> but a circular letter, versions of which have been sent all over the East. In particular, not all modern commentators

---

<sup>245</sup> His name stands first in the list of signatories at *Urk* 4b.21 (p. 10.19-20).

<sup>246</sup> *Urk* 14.37 (p. 25.15-17).

<sup>247</sup> Williams, *Arius*, pp. 55-6. In fact, Williams sees Colluthus’ signature as a prized scalp – ‘an important political counter in the attempt not to alienate Constantine in the crucial months of Ossius’ mission’ (p. 56).

<sup>248</sup> *Urk* 14.3-5 (p. 19.11 - p. 20.16).

<sup>249</sup> Theodoret, who alone preserves *He philarchos*, clearly thinks that the Alexander to whom it is addressed is Alexander of Byzantium (*HE* I.3.3-4). Both Schwartz (*GS* III, 131-2) and Opitz (*Zeitfolge*, p. 150 note 90 and note to *Urk* 14 Überschrift (p. 19)) were persuaded that the latter did not become a bishop until after Nicaea. Schwartz solved the difficulty by assuming that the letter was (for some reason) addressed to the future Bishop of Byzantium before he became such; Opitz identified the recipient as Alexander of Thessalonica. But in the premise both were wrong. See T.D. Barnes, ‘Emperors and Bishops, A.D. 324-344. Some Problems’, *American Journal of Ancient History* 3 (1978), 53-75, at p. 66, and *Constantine*, p. 376 note

recognise the significance of its links with *Urk 15*, a Syriac résumé of a version of the same letter sent to Melitius (probably of Sebastopolis).<sup>250</sup> This letter, which differs slightly from *He philarchos* as Theodoret gives it and may be a later exemplar,<sup>251</sup> has collected around two hundred episcopal signatures, including (standing first in the list) signatures from the bishops of Egypt and Libya. Even *He philarchos* itself refers to signatures already attached to it, besides those of Egypt, the Thebaid and Libya, of those in Syria, Lycia, Pamphilia, Asia, Cappadocia and ‘the adjoining countries’.<sup>252</sup> Surely *Henos somatos* would have referred to such signatures, if they existed at the time when it was written?

One possible answer to this point, of course, is that the version of *He philarchos* Theodoret actually gives is later than *Henos somatos*, but the original is not. It is clear from the *Tome to All Bishops (Urk 15)* that *He Philarchos* existed in more than one version, after all, and additional points could well have been added as it was thought necessary to circulate the letter more widely. On the other hand, it can hardly be much earlier either, or it would have had time to collect the signatures which it was its task to elicit, and which would hardly have been ignored by *Henos somatos*.

Is it possible that the two letters were issued at more or less the same time? That viewed together, they represent Alexander’s first widespread communication on the controversy, but also come from a time when the controversy was already fairly far advanced? There can be no watertight proof of this proposal, but I would suggest that it is no more implausible than either of the other two orders, and would avoid some of the problems inherent in both.

---

151. From the fact that Schwartz and Opitz were wrong it does not, of course, follow that Theodoret was right: his identification could have been based on guesswork. See below.

<sup>250</sup> Opitz, ‘Zeitfolge’, p. 50, recognised the connection and describes *Urk 15* as another draft of *He philarchos*. The connection seems to have been lost sight of by Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 205 and by Willaims, *Arius*, p. 57. The Melitius who is the recipient is identified as Melitius of Sebastopolis by Schwartz, *GS III*, 130-1 and by Opitz, ‘Zeitfolge’ p. 150 note 92.

<sup>251</sup> The relationship between the two documents is discussed below.

<sup>252</sup> *Urk 14.59* (p. 29.14-17).

First of all, there is a formula in *He philarchos* 59 reading ‘And these things have I sent to you, by my son Apion the deacon: τοῦτο μὲν πάσης Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θεβαΐδος, τοῦτο δὲ Λιβύης τε καὶ Πενταπόλεως καὶ Συρίας καὶ ἔτι Λυκίας and Pamphilia, Asia, Cappodocia, and all the parts round about, according to the likeness of which things I trust to receive from you also.’ Τοῦτο μὲν would be, in fact, *Henos somatos*, written (though in Alexander’s name) from the synod of the bishops of Egypt and the Thebaid. It is clear that *Henos somatos* was meant to be more than a private document from Alexander alone, since Athanasius’ copy has the signatures of the clergy of Alexandria and the Mareotis on it.<sup>253</sup> The copy circulated with *He philarchos* would have had the signatures of the bishops of Egypt and the Thebaid on it; the copy signed by the clergy of Alexandria would have ‘and Libya’ added into the text after some of these, too (however reluctantly) had signed.

*Henos somatos* is the letter of a strong-minded, intelligent individual who sees the situation in black and white, and expects that his readers will do the same. The situation is perfectly simple: Eusebius of Nicomedia is motivated by nothing but ill-will and political ambition; Arius’ doctrines are self-evidently outrageous. Despite all the grandstanding about the heresy which is the forerunner of the Antichrist, *Henos somatos* seems to give a perfectly reasonable statement of what Arius (or his friends) actually taught: that the Son was in principle (though not, Arius would say, in fact) mutable, that he came to be in time, that he came to be out of nothing, that he was part of the created order (if unlike creatures in general, Arius would say), that he was a reflection of God’s own wisdom and rationality, rather than actually being God’s wisdom and rationality, and that the Father is partly hidden from even the Son’s knowledge and sight. Unlike the statement in *He philarchos* (or Athanasius’ own later statement in *Contra Arianos* I, for that matter), this is not really an unfair characterisation of Arius’ theology, but a fairly straightforward one; it is expected to shock its audience on its own terms. The writer has no notion that

---

<sup>253</sup> *Urk* 4b.21 (pp. 10-11). On the transmission of the text, see Schwartz, *GS* III, 73-4 and 127.



there could possibly be any other view of the situation, or that tact of any sort might be called for.

If Athanasius wrote this letter when he was about twenty-three, having picked up the rights and the wrongs of the situation from Alexander in the latter's more unguarded moments, he may well not have been aware that Arius' theology was likely to receive quite so much support on its own terms (divorced from any question of mere politicking) as the older, more experienced Alexander probably knew it would. Alexander must have realised from the number of letters in support of Arius he was receiving that the situation was rather more delicate than his eager young deacon imagined. Athanasius' letter may have made his heart sink, even while he smiled at its brilliant encapsulation of the politics and theology involved.

Alexander's solution, it would seem, was to send round this letter (Eusebius of Caesarea picks up a line in it,<sup>254</sup> so it must have been circulated), but to send round with it another of his own which, while it made substantially the same points in much more diplomatic a manner, expounding at length on Arius' behaviour in a way calculated to draw the sympathy of fellow-bishops and stressing the most generally unpalatable aspects of his teaching, took a further and most useful step. Arius' friends had been hawking around a fairly innocuous-looking creed in his name, asking recipients either to sign it or specify which part of it they could not accept.<sup>255</sup> Alexander drew up a statement of faith of his own, added it to his letter, and sent it around likewise with a request for signatures. By the time it reached Melitius of Sebastopolis, it had nearly two hundred signatures.<sup>256</sup> If I am right in suggesting that he had been part of a synod which had previously signed Arius' creed, he was probably one of the last to be circulated, having been targeted with the most impressive list of signatures that could be mustered in order to persuade him to change his mind.

---

<sup>254</sup> See Opitz, 'Zeitfolge', p. 148 and his note to *Urk* 7.3 (p. 14.14).

<sup>255</sup> This connects Arius' Confession, *Urk* 6 (pp. 12-13) with Sozomen, *HE* I.15.8-9.

<sup>256</sup> According to the excerptor's prefatory note to *Urk* 15 (pp. 29-30).

*He philarchos* is therefore itself τοῦτο δεῖ,<sup>257</sup> itself the *Tome to All Bishops* sent round for them to sign to which it refers. The *Tome* printed by Opitz as *Urk 15* is another version of the same document,<sup>258</sup> with more signatures and another short paragraph on the theology of Arius et al.<sup>259</sup> (specifically on Asterius, perhaps, since it includes the text ‘Christ, Power of God and Wisdom of God’ whose exegesis by Asterius Athanasius would mock in later years).<sup>260</sup>

Based on these assumptions, my suggested narrative, including the order of the eight important documents, is as follows:

Eusebius of Nicomedia, while still in the see of Berytus, shows some form of malevolence towards Alexander of Alexandria -- possibly trying to prevent his being chosen as bishop there, perhaps in order to advance Arius’ candidacy.<sup>261</sup> Alexander is chosen bishop in any case, of a diocese which already has at least two schismatic factions, that of the bishop Melitius of Lycopolis, and that of the presbyter Colluthus.

Eusebius is translated to Nicomedia. Arius, who has by now a strong following, including most of the bishops of Upper Libya, nine deacons, two other clerics and a number of upper-class women, either has a high-profile dispute with the schismatic Colluthus, or provokes a showdown with Alexander, accusing him of heresy. Alexander takes some form of action against Arius, either through friends in the civic administration or by the use of vigilantes, and succeeds in ejecting him from his church. Arius remains in the area, probably holding

---

<sup>257</sup> *Urk 14.59* (p. 29.16).

<sup>258</sup> *Urk 15.2* (p. 30.7-10 Syriac; 30.7-11 Schwartz’ retroversion) is parallel to *Urk 14.53-54* (p. 28.8-19; *Urk 15.3* (p. 30.11-15 Syriac; 30.12-17 Schwartz’ retroversion) is parallel to *Urk 14.55-56* (p. 28.20-28).

<sup>259</sup> *Urk 15.4* (p. 30.17 - p. 31.2 Syriac; p. 30.19 - p. 31.2 Schwartz’ retroversion).

<sup>260</sup> For Asterius’ exegesis of 1 Cor 1.24, see especially the fragments cited by Athanasius in *C Ar II.37.2* and 3, numbered as frs 64 and 66 in Vinzent, *Asterius*.

<sup>261</sup> Philostorgius, for what it is worth, claims that Arius had been an alternative candidate at the time of Alexander’s election (*HE I.3* (p. 6.8-10), and Theodoret seems to support the idea that they were then rivals (*HE I.2.9*). Williams, *Arius*, p. 40, is agnostic on the possible worth of this report.

services in various monastic settlements on the fringes of Alexandria,<sup>262</sup> and brings various actions in the civic courts against Alexander.

Arius writes to Eusebius of Nicomedia, who has been kept up to date with these events (and may well have instigated them), to let him know the names of those in the diocese of Oriens he believes to be of the same opinions as he, the precise theological formulations Alexander has used, and the formulations of his own which Alexander has condemned (*Urk* 1). Eusebius begins a letter campaign, to encourage as many bishops as possible to write to Alexander protesting at his treatment of Arius. Some bishops of Libya, various individuals in the diocese of Oriens, a synod at Neocaesarea in Pontus Polemoniacus and a synod at Bithynia all do so. At some point, Arius and his friends produce a statement of their faith which is calculated to annoy Alexander intensely but seem relatively innocuous to neutral parties (*Urk* 6), Alexander predictably rejects it, and Arius or his supporters circulate it around the East, asking people to either sign it or specify what part of it they disagree with. An ordinary journey from Alexandria to Nicomedia in spring, summer or autumn takes fifty days by road, averaging thirty miles per day, perhaps half that time by sea, depending on winds and the quality of ships available (the return journey would be faster). We may imagine two epistolary round trips (assuming friends rather than the imperial post carried most of the letters) from Alexandria to Nicomedia at this stage, together with various shorter epistolary journeys (with Asterius as the ferryman?); this phase probably therefore lasts most of a year. Eusebius' letter to Paulinus chiding him for his lack of involvement (*Urk* 8) probably comes towards the end of it. During this period, a number of bishops (almost certainly including Philogonius, and quite likely Eustathius of Beroea and Marcellus) write to Alexander in support, filling him in on the wider theological views of those who side with Arius, and probably urging him to take action.

Alexander, finally realising he must take some wider action, begins a large-scale counter-attack. He calls a synod of the bishops of Egypt and the Thebaid and

---

<sup>262</sup> This could be the point of the jibe about 'robbers' caves' in *Urk* 14.3 (p. 20.3-4).

has them condemn Arius. He has his deacon, Athanasius, write an encyclical giving Alexander's version of events (*Henos somatos*, *Urk* 4b), which, however, he does not circulate immediately beyond the Egyptian bishops. He uses the condemnation by the synod of Egyptian bishops as leverage to make as many Libyan bishops as possible also sign up to the condemnation of Arius. He sends *Henos somatos*, now with the authority of nearly one hundred bishops behind it,<sup>263</sup> to the clergy of Alexandria and the Mareotis to sign (*Urk* 4a), which they do. Colluthus, seeing which way the wind is blowing, makes a great show of signing it and claiming his former schism was because of Arius' heresy; Alexander allows him to sign, and presumably allows him back into communion, but is not won over.

Alexander writes another encyclical himself (*He philarchos*, *Urk* 14), which goes over the same ground as *Henos somatos* somewhat more allusively, and includes a creed which he asks recipients to sign. He sends out at least two copies: one goes to Philogonius to sign, presumably with as many other Syrian bishops as possible (not many, perhaps, as synods are quite likely now no longer possible), and is then sent on through Asia Minor (perhaps via Marcellus) to Alexander of Byzantium, who sends it back with all the signatures it has collected en route, while the other copy is sent to Palestine and Arabia, with the goodwill of Macarius of Jerusalem and doubtless the ill-will of Eusebius of Caesarea, and thence taken (presumably by sea) to Achaia, Thrace and the Hellespontus, and back to Asia Minor. At least three copies (those of Philogonius, Eustathius of Beroea and Alexander of Byzantium) seem to have ended up in Antioch,<sup>264</sup> which may have had the job of collating all the signatures and sending a good copy back to Alexandria, as well as chasing up possible further signatories. This takes us, according to our current chronology, as far as probably the autumn of 323, the collecting of the signatures having taken the better part of a year. Eusebian activities presumably slowed somewhat

---

<sup>263</sup> The figure comes from *Urk* 4b.11 (p. 8.12-13).

<sup>264</sup> Theodoret, the sole source for *He philarchos*, knew of similar letters (συνωδὰ τούτοις) addressed to Philogonius of Antioch and Eustathius, then of Beroea (*HE* I.4.62). The Syriac

during this time; Eusebius of Caesarea (*Urk* 7) and possibly Paulinus of Tyre (*Urk* 9) wrote to Alexander after they had seen *Henos somatos*, and the synod of Palestine<sup>265</sup> may have taken place just before the ban as a tardy attempt at a reconciliation. But all in all events were not in Eusebius of Nicomedia's favour. Licinius executed some of Arius' former supporters for treasonous activity of some kind,<sup>266</sup> which must have made Eusebius' friendships at court look extremely suspect to even his former allies. Meanwhile, it was becoming extremely clear where the weight of theological and ecclesiastical-political opinion lay. The *Tome* of Alexander to all bishops had two hundred signatures by the time the second copy returned to Philogonius.

#### **b. The Synod of Ancyra**

The *Tome* of Alexander to all bishops had two hundred signatures by the time the second copy returned to Philogonius. Not only did it have two hundred signatures, it had two hundred signatures from very largely the same provinces which were represented at Nicaea. This fact has been rather lost sight of in modern discussions of the synod of Nicaea. The bishops at Nicaea did not turn up to the synod there with open minds; Nicaea was not a synod 'full of people with no very deep theological commitment one way or the other'.<sup>267</sup> It was a synod full of people who were already committed before they arrived, some very deeply committed, to one party or the other; and the majority to Alexander.

It might reasonably be argued, nonetheless, that those who attended Nicaea were not exactly the same people who signed the *Tome*. Nearly one hundred of those who signed the *Tome* were from Egypt and Libya and the Thebaid, for example, whereas only nineteen signed from these provinces at Nicaea. Bishops from Thracia and Augusta Euphratensis signed the *Tome* (unless Schwartz is correct

---

*Tome*, *Urk* 15, is preserved in the great Monophysite collection B.M. Add 12,156, which must also have a Syrian origin.

<sup>265</sup> *Urk* 10 (p. 18) = Sozomen, *HE* I.15.11.

<sup>266</sup> For Basil of Amasia in Philostorgius' list of Ariophrones, see above.

in thinking Augusta Euphratensis a later scribal addition),<sup>268</sup> whereas none signed under the names of those provinces at Nicaea. Some, meanwhile, signed at Nicaea (including eleven bishops of Bithynia, more bishops from the West, and bishops from Paphlagonia, the Isles, Cyprus, Dacia, Moesia, Thessalia, Macedonia and Europa) who are not listed as signing the *Tome* (although those from slightly less accessible places might have had their signatures to the *Tome* sought separately). But this still leaves us with around 110 signatures from provinces which produced 163 at Nicaea, plus the nineteen bishops of Egypt and Libya; and we must remember that at least some of the Western bishops (e.g. Ossius, the Roman presbyters) were also firm supporters of Alexander. For Alexander to have 130 plus bishops of the 250-odd bishops at Nicaea already committed to his creed when they arrived can only be considered an extremely powerful base, especially when only seventeen are widely held to have come to Nicaea as card-carrying supporters of Arius.<sup>269</sup>

The existence of the *Tome* and its signatures a year and a half or so before Nicaea suggests something further, particularly when taken together with a phrase in *He philarchos*. *He philarchos* speaks of three bishops, ordained somehow or other in Syria, who have inflamed Arius and Achillas and their band still further, and states 'I refer their sentence to your decision.' There are at least four different possibilities for the three bishops meant here,<sup>270</sup> but whoever they are, Alexander has referred their case to judgement. A judgement implies a synod. The recipients of the *Tome* of Alexander, in other words, were expected to come together at some point as a synod. And we know of a synod which was supposed to come together to make a final judgement on some

---

<sup>267</sup> Williams, *Arius*, p. 67.

<sup>268</sup> Schwartz, *GS* III, 129, followed by Opitz (*Urk* 15.4 (p. 31.6-7 Syriac; 31.7-8 Schwartz' retroversion)) excises the names of the provinces after Syria. Schwartz' most solid argument was his claim that Euphratensis was not divided from Syria Coele till after 325. But this is far from certain: see Barnes, *New Empire*, p. 324.

<sup>269</sup> The numbers present at Nicaea will be discussed in the next section.

<sup>270</sup> Opitz (note to *Urk* 14.37 (p. 25.16)) identifies them as Eusebius of Caesarea, Paulinus of Tyre and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, but he is merely assimilating them to Sozomen, *HE* I.15.11.



episcopal cases, whose intended members represent virtually all the provinces to which Alexander wrote: the Synod of Ancyra.

The 'great and hieratic' synod of Ancyra,<sup>271</sup> which Constantine moved to Nicaea, was an established fact at the synod of Antioch in the winter of 324/5, which is also almost the only reason we know of its planned existence. The decision of the synod of Antioch early in 325 to depose Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodotus of Laodicea and Narcissus of Neronias was respectfully made conditional on the decision of the coming synod of Ancyra.<sup>272</sup> It is normally assumed that it was Constantine who had originally summoned it.<sup>273</sup> It is not at all impossible, however, that this synod had already been summoned by Alexander and his allies two years previously, but prevented from taking place by Licinius' ban on episcopal synods (a ban possibly instigated at least partly on the request of Eusebius of Nicomedia, in these circumstances).<sup>274</sup> On Constantine's victory over Licinius, he would immediately have been petitioned to allow the synod to take place, inquired into the cause, and taken various initial steps to end the matter more quietly (presumably owing some of his information about the controversy to Eusebius of Nicomedia, since no one of Alexander's party would have represented the affair as a low-level philosophical disagreement confined to a few individuals in Alexandria). Ossius' investigations into the situation in Alexandria, and his own discovery of the strife in the see of Antioch after the death of Philogonius (which had lasted most of the previous year), would have persuaded Constantine to allow the synod to go ahead, but also persuaded him that he wanted himself to take an active role in it. He therefore wrote shortly after the synod of Antioch over which Ossius presided early in the year 325 to all the bishops of the East, shifting their formerly agreed synod of Ancyra to Nicaea, and offering the imperial palace on

---

<sup>271</sup> *Urk* 18.15 (p. 40.18 Syriac; 40.17 Schwartz' retroversion).

<sup>272</sup> The synod of Antioch and its letter are discussed in the next section.

<sup>273</sup> So, for example, Hanson, *Search*, p. 148 and Williams, *Arius*, p. 58. Against this 'often repeated modern assertion', see Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 378 note 35.

<sup>274</sup> For the suggestion that the ban may have been instigated by Eusebius of Nicomedia, see Barnes, p. 376 note 154. That possibility would be greatly strengthened by the explanation here offered.

the shores of the lake there as a venue for their meeting, by way of a palliative.<sup>275</sup> It was a bribe the Eastern bishops were in no position to refuse.

This is speculative, and of course extremely controversial, but it would explain a number of puzzling facts very well, which are not so well explained by the usual thesis that Constantine called the synod from the first. If Constantine called the synod, why was it first called for Ancyra, and then moved to Nicaea? Nicaea may have been more accessible to those coming from Italy and Europe, as he claims, but very few bishops actually did come from 'Italy and Europe'; Ancyra would have been more accessible to almost everyone from the East, since it lay on their route in any case. The weather at Nicaea in May and June is undoubtedly likely to be cooler than that of Ancyra, but why should that matter to those who live in Egypt and Syria? Most commentators are suspicious of these reasons, and suggest that the real reasons were political, which they undoubtedly were. But why choose Ancyra in the first place?

The answer which is almost always given is that Marcellus of Ancyra had initially won the emperor's (or Ossius') favour, and looked like a plausible candidate for host, but that the emperor then became alarmed by the extreme nature of Marcellus' theology or ecclesiastical politics or both, and decided to hold the synod somewhere where he could have more immediate control. Klaus Seibt, indeed, has built a whole thesis (or half of one) on this assumption.<sup>276</sup> But is it not more plausible to imagine that Marcellus had been chosen as host to the synod by his own political allies than by Constantine?

Ancyra would have been the perfect place to hold a synod aimed expressly at condemning Eusebius of Nicomedia, which, once he had collected enough signatures to demonstrate his widespread support, Alexander must have been

---

<sup>275</sup> *Urk 20* (pp. 41-42).

<sup>276</sup> See Klaus Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 59 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), p. 461. Seibt sees Constantine's reference to the temperateness of the climate in Nicaea as a metaphor for his programme of harmonising contending factions in the Church. Opitz (note to *Urk 20* (p. 42.3) refers somewhat more prosaically to Theodore Metochites' enthusiasm for the weather in his native city.

ready to do, since he circulated *Henos somatos*, whose intemperate language was tantamount to breaking off communion with Eusebius. An Asia Minor-based synod would be in a position to condemn Eusebius of Nicomedia, imperial capital or no imperial capital, as a synod at Antioch or Alexandria would not. Alexander and his friends would have known that, outside Egypt, his support was firmest in central Asia Minor; Syria, including Antioch itself, was too divided and volatile to be a safe place for a large synod. Ancyra would be accessible from the Greek-speaking parts of Europe that had signed the *Tome*, as well as having good connections with Antioch and beyond. It was a large city, which presumably had plenty of suitable accommodation for the bishops and their attendants; a slightly smaller number of bishops than actually attended at Nicaea was probably envisaged. And finally, Ancyra had Marcellus, who had already gathered and presided over one Asia Minor-wide synod, who was an experienced legislator, an able speaker, and an implacable opponent of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his theology. His theology was a long way from Alexander's, but it was very close to that of Eustathius of Beroea, one of the stars of the Syrian scene, and quite possibly also to that of Philogonius.

If it was Alexander's friends, rather than Constantine, who had originally called the synod, it is easy to see why Eustathius, when bishop of Antioch, was so unhappy about what had happened there, why Alexander of Byzantium and Eutropius of Hadrianopolis and most of the Egyptian bishops did not even attend, and why Marcellus did not himself sign the Creed of Nicaea. Constantine had hijacked the synod; he had diverted it to his own purposes, and in the name of peace he had prevented its main purpose, the condemning of Eusebius of Nicomedia for his campaign against Alexander. The synod still managed to pass a creed, however, which definitively rejected Arius' theology. For by the treachery of his friends, Arius was made the scapegoat of all that they had done on his behalf; and they even managed to sign up to the theology they had previously ridiculed and condemn that which they had proclaimed essential in their eagerness to distance themselves from him.

#### 4. The Synods of Antioch and Nicaea

Constantine, as he prepared to take the reins over that part of the Empire which included the land of Christ's birth, was devastated to learn (not improbably from a letter from Antioch petitioning for the right to hold a general synod to address the Arian question) that Church affairs there were not less but more divided than those of the West.<sup>277</sup> Initially, he attempted to solve them swiftly, so that he could undertake a triumphal tour of the whole East, presenting himself as God's chosen liberator and the champion of Christianity. This dream was soon to fade before the unhappy reality of contemporary church politics: Constantine seems never to have gone East at all.<sup>278</sup>

The situation in Antioch, and probably in the whole diocese of Oriens, must have been viciously divided by this stage, particularly if all parties had known for two summers that Alexander had already assembled the forces and appointed the occasion to condemn Eusebius of Nicomedia as soon as the ban on synods should be lifted. Philogonius' death can only have added fuel to the fire.<sup>279</sup> A significant portion of the Antiochene presbyterate and their hangers-on (including George, Stephen, Eudoxius and Eustathius, later bishops of Laodicea,

---

<sup>277</sup> So he remarks in the document presented in Eusebius, *VC* II.64-74.3 as Constantine's letter to Alexander and Arius (printed by Opitz as *Urk* 17 (pp. 32-35; I cite from Winkelmann's edition of *VC* (GCS, 1975)). That it cannot be such was argued by Stuart G. Hall, 'Some Constantinian Documents in the *Vita Constantini*', in Samuel N.C. Lieu and Dominic Montserrat, eds, *Constantine: History, Historiography and Legend* (London, 1998), pp. 86-103. Hall points out that passages like *VC* II.66.2 and 72.3 make more sense if addressed to a synod than to two individuals, while II.67.2 (from which the reference to the place of Christ's birth comes) makes more sense if addressed to Syria or Palestine than to Egypt (Hall, 'Constantinian Documents', pp. 87-89). Specifically, he thinks that it is 'addressed to Antioch early in 325, and related to the council which met there' (p. 87). For Constantine's professed shock at divisions in the East, see *VC* II.68.1.

<sup>278</sup> Constantine had clearly intended to travel to the East. That is amply shown by *VC* II.72.2-3. It is also shown by the *ADVENTUS* issue from Antioch (cited by Barnes, *New Empire*, p. 76 = *RIC* VII, 685). They do not show that he actually got there.

<sup>279</sup> It is clear that Philogonius died on 20 December, but it is not clear whether it was 20 December 324, as traditionally assumed (for example, by Schwartz, *GS* III, 147) or 20 December 323, as maintained by Burgess, *Chronography*, pp. 183-9. Burgess' date is connected with his theory that Paulinus is to be placed before Eustathius rather than after him, but is not dependent on it. Had Philogonius died in 323, there would be a ready explanation of the turmoil

Antioch, Germanicia / Antioch / Constantinople and Sebaste)<sup>280</sup> were leaders of the groups which succeeded to 'those around Eusebius' in later years, and were soon to be expelled from the Antiochene church by Eustathius; they are not likely to have sided at this point with Philogonius' theology or that of his allies, and are far from likely to have supported Eustathius' candidacy as his successor. By the time of Constantine's letter, there are whole congregations as well as bishops who are not in communion with one another.

Constantine despatched an official, probably with Ossius of Cordoba, to take this letter to the East;<sup>281</sup> because we do not know how much of the letter Eusebius has cut, we do not know to how many people it was addressed, although it was certainly to more than Alexander and Arius -- at the very least, Eusebius of Caesarea himself was presumably one of the recipients. It may well have been on Ossius' way back from Egypt,<sup>282</sup> after settling affairs in Alexandria as far as possible, that he presided over the synod at Antioch whose synodal letter, in the Syriac in which it survives together with Schwartz' Greek retroversion, Opitz gives as *Urk* 18.<sup>283</sup>

The letter of Constantine to Alexander, Arius et al., if it is replying to a request for permission to hold a synod in Ancyra, gives it, but asks that the synod not excommunicate anyone. By the time of the Antiochene synod the position has

---

which the letter of the Antiochene synod reports that 'I' -- that is, Ossius -- found there (*Urk* 37.3-4 (p.37.1-12 Syriac; 37.2-14 Schwartz' retroversion) .

<sup>280</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 4.

<sup>281</sup> The traditional view is that the letter-carrier was Ossius. See, for example, recently H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops, The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore, 2000), p. 250. But the letter-carrier is not given in *VC* II.63. B.H. Warmington, 'The Sources of Some Constantinian Documents in Eusebius' Church History and Life of Constantine', *St Pat* XVIII.1 (1985), pp. 93-98 pointed out that the description there given fits a lay official better than it does a bishop. Socrates (*HE* I.7.1) and Sozomen (*HE* I.16.5) make the identification, but it is clearly a guess.

<sup>282</sup> Ossius was present at a 'common synod' in Alexandria, according to Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 74.4 and 76.3. This was probably (but not quite certainly) before Nicaea, as assumed, for example, by Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 213.

<sup>283</sup> For the retroversion and Schwartz' discussion, see *GS* III, 134-55. On the authenticity of the letter and for some corrections to Schwartz' retroversion, see L. Abramowski, 'Die Synode von Antiochien 324/25 und ihr Symbol', *ZKG* 86 (1975), 356-66, translated as 'The Synod of Antioch 324/25 and Its Creed' in Abramowski, *Formula and Context: Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Collected Studies Series CS 365 (Ashgate: Variorum, 1992), no. III.

changed somewhat; either Constantine's desire for peace and reconciliation has died its usual early death (perhaps once he is reminded of Eusebius of Nicomedia's role in Licinius' regime), or else Ossius has become so involved in the politics of Egypt and the East that he has lost sight of the emperor's pleas, for the synod at Antioch draws up a fairly precise statement of faith and excommunicates three bishops, including one metropolitan, for refusing to subscribe to it.<sup>284</sup> The excommunication is provisional, however: Ossius may have wanted to leave a door open for general peace and reconciliation, should that turn out to be imperial policy -- as indeed it was, for another few months.

#### **a. The faith of Antioch 325.**

The faith published by the synod of Antioch can be shown to be largely modelled on the creed of *He philarchos* (that is, the *Tome*) which the forces in support of Alexander had already signed, but with some differences of emphasis. The apologetic tone of the *He philarchos* creed has been dropped, including the initial description of the Father as ἀγέννητος (with which Arius' creed also begins),<sup>285</sup> and the defensive move (replying to the implied accusation of Arius' creed) of excluding the interpretations of Sabellius and Valentinus; the Son's generation is declared to be incomprehensible to any but Father and Son, with the appropriate Scripture tags, with no other apology. On the other hand, this creed is occasionally closer to Arius' in wording than that of *He philarchos* (perhaps reflecting a slightly different redaction of the *He philarchos* creed?), though not at significant points: the Father is pronounced to be 'Lord of the Law and the Prophets and of the New Covenant', as in Arius' version, rather than of 'the Patriarchs and Prophets and all the saints', for example.<sup>286</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> *Urk* 18.14 (p. 40.4-14 Syriac; 40.3-14 Schwartz' retroversion).

<sup>285</sup> *Urk* 14.46 (p. 27.1) and *Urk* 6.2 (p. 12.4).

<sup>286</sup> *Urk* 18.8 (p. 38.16-17) and *Urk* 6.2 (p. 12.6-7) as opposed to *Urk* 14.46 (p. 27.3-4). In this discussion I normally cite *Urk* 18 by page and line of the retroversion.



Elsewhere, the creed of *He philarchos* is altered to address points in Arius' creed which were not dealt with at first. Arius called the Son a 'κτίσμα, but not as one of the κτίσματα, a γέννημα, but not one of the γεγεννημένων';<sup>287</sup> Antioch 325 insists that the Son is not a κτίσμα (this translation is to be preferred to Schwartz' ποιητόν), and is a γέννημα in the strict sense, though in an unknowable fashion.<sup>288</sup> Against Arius' claim that the Son of God was created by the will of God, Antioch defines the Son as not θελήσει ἢ θέσει γεννηθῆναι ἢ γενέσθαι.<sup>289</sup>

Other points are largely carried over from *He philarchos*, although a little more sharply worded. The Virgin is still Theotokos, presumably used because it was a word avoided by Arius and his supporters, though we have no evidence for its being so. The description of the Son as εἰκὼν of the Father (sometimes varied to χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως) is still central,<sup>290</sup> but the Son alone (μόνος) is εἰκὼν instead of being ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν, and it is specified that he is not image of the Father's will, but of his ὑπόστασις -- the word Schwartz translates as εἰκὼν can also represent χαρακτήρ. The Son is eternal, and only-begotten Son of God.<sup>291</sup> Father and Son are still both separately called ἄτρεπτος and ἀναλλοίωτος.<sup>292</sup>

The Son is ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς:<sup>293</sup> οὐσία and its compounds are once again avoided, and ὑπόστασις and φύσις are used, as *Henos somatos* used them, ambiguously. (The opening of *Henos somatos* is also borrowed for the synodal letter.) The positions that the Son of God is a κτίσμα or γενητόν or a ποιητόν or not truly γέννημα, or that ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, are anathematised;<sup>294</sup> further (presumably after some discussion) the positions that he is immutable by his own free will,

<sup>287</sup> *Urk* 6.2 (p. 12.9-10).

<sup>288</sup> *Urk* 18.9 (p. 38.18-19). Though *ebada* (p. 38.14 Syriac) regularly means ποίημα and the like, it is also used to translate δημιουργημα. See R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus* (2 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879-1901), col. 2773.

<sup>289</sup> *Urk* 6.2 (p. 12.8-9) as opposed to *Urk* 18.10 (p. 39.5).

<sup>290</sup> *Urk* 18.10 (p. 39.1), 18.11 (p. 39.9) and 18.13 (p. 40.1). On the choice between εἰκὼν and χαρακτήρ, see Abramowski, 'Antiochien 324/25', pp. 357-358.

<sup>291</sup> *Urk* 18.9 (p. 39.1 and p. 38.18).

<sup>292</sup> *Urk* 18.8 (p. 38.15) and 18.10 (p. 39.4).

<sup>293</sup> *Urk* 18.9 (p. 38.18).

that he is generated out of not being, or that he is not by nature immutable, ‘for as our Saviour is proclaimed to be the image of the Father in every respect, he is so especially in this particular’.<sup>295</sup>

The synodal letter in which this creed is to be found is addressed to Alexander of Byzantium, by this time known to be the future New Rome; perhaps he is here being treated as an alternative leader of Constantine’s newly-conquered region to Eusebius of Nicomedia. It is no surprise that this synod commends Alexander of Alexandria and largely uses the creed he put together; it very much presents itself as taking up things where they were interrupted by Licinius’ ban, deposing those who do not agree with the faith of Alexander (as currently modified), and looking forward to the ‘great and holy synod at Ancyra’, which will finish the task.

Eustathius’ role at this synod is interesting, and is a good refutation of those who imagine that he and Alexander, as Origenist and anti-Origenist, only ever partook in an armed truce against Arius, which was bought at the (too high) price of introducing the nakedly Sabellian *homoousios* into the Nicene creed.<sup>296</sup> Eustathius was clearly, after Ossius, the most authoritative figure at this synod; it would have been a good opportunity to introduce *homoousios* or some such formula, had he been itching to do so. Alexander’s creed was indeed changed at Antioch, and changed in a Eustathian direction: all possible ways of describing the Son as mutable (Eustathius’ bugbear) are closed off, while the ἀπαράλλακτος (non-scriptural and Origenist, never used by Eustathius) is dropped from εἰκόν. The strict meaning of γεννητός is insisted on: Eustathius argues elsewhere εἰ γὰρ κτιστός, οὐκ ἄρα γεννητός; εἰ δὲ γεννητός, οὐ κτιστός.<sup>297</sup> But these changes are so moderate that they have never even, to my knowledge, been remarked on. Οὐσία and its compounds, I have argued above, were not in Eustathius’ normal vocabulary for describing the relations between

---

<sup>294</sup> *Urk* 18.13 (p. 39.17-18).

<sup>295</sup> *Urk* 18.13 (p. 39.18 - p. 40.1).

<sup>296</sup> For example, Hanson, *Search*, pp. 171-172.

<sup>297</sup> Fr. 57 Spanneut (p. 111).

Father and Son, any more than they were in Alexander's;<sup>298</sup> they are not used here. Nor does Eustathius take the opportunity to specify one hypostasis of Father and Son. Rather, Alexander's language is largely kept to throughout, a little precision is added to his thought in one or two places, and the defensiveness of the formula is removed; otherwise, Eustathius seems quite happy to let Alexander's faith be his. Marcellus might not have been so mild; but then Marcellus (pace Alastair Logan)<sup>299</sup> was almost certainly not there.

### **b. The Synod of Nicaea.**

There is no point in speculating on Marcellus' feelings when the long-awaited (second) Synod of Ancyra was transferred to Nicaea, but they are unlikely to have been positive. Apart from the loss of prestige to his own see, he clearly had a strong dislike for the whole Eusebian party and an even stronger dislike for their theology, and it must have been clear (especially after his earlier letter) that Constantine's move to control the synod himself did not bode well for the plans which had been laid by Alexander's party.

As might be expected, Constantine did have things largely his own way. Peace, or an ostentatious display of peace-making, proved the order of the day. Eustathius' feelings were made clear in a writing, possibly a sermon, on Proverbs 8.22 which he produced not long afterwards:

What then do we say? That is the reason a great Council comes to the city of Nicaea. Two hundred and, I suppose, seventy assembled together: I cannot record the size of the crowd clearly since I did not take the trouble to track it down.<sup>300</sup>

---

<sup>298</sup> This synod's insistence that the Son is image, not of the will nor of anything else but the Father's hypostasis, clearly shows the sense in which fr. 44, cited above, is to be taken.

<sup>299</sup> Logan, 'Councils', pp. 434-5.

<sup>300</sup> On the number present at the Council, and the number believed to have been present, see E. Honigmann, 'La liste originale des pères de Nicée', *Byzantion* 14 (1939), pp. 17-76. Honigmann argues that within the amplified lists of Nicene names (including the lists edited by Gelzer et al. in *Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina*) a shorter list of some 194 names, represented by the Latin list A V, can be isolated, a list which corresponds more closely than any other to the original list of members of the Council. And yet in a sense Honigmann proves too much. His

Now when there was debate as to what the faith is, a plain refutation adduced the text of the blasphemy<sup>301</sup> of Eusebius. It was read in the presence of all, and at once its deviation brought ever growing misfortune on those who heard it and unbearable shame on the one who wrote it.

But when the impious document was torn up in the sight of all and the Eusebians had been caught out, some,<sup>302</sup> alleging the cause of peace, conspired to silence all those whose words are normally the best.

But the Ariomaniacs are afraid that they might be exiled after so great a Council has come together. And so they rush forward and anathematise the condemned doctrine, subscribing with their own hands to a common statement. And when with all possible deviousness they had held onto their episcopal seats -- though they should have been degraded -- at times covertly and at times openly they lobby for the rejected opinions, sabotaging various refutations. And because they want firmly to establish the tares they have planted, they fear the learned and shun witnesses. And that is why they attack the heralds of truth.

But even so we do not believe that the godless can ever gain the upper hand over the divine. For, though they should again grow strong, they will again be defeated, as the venerable voice of the prophet Isaiah said.<sup>303</sup>

---

Latin list clearly omits the names of some bishops who were there, as even Honigmann himself admits and as has been amply demonstrated in one important case by Knut Schäferdiek, 'Wulfila, vom Bischof von Gotien zum Gotenbischof', *ZKG* 90 (1979), pp. 253-292 (107-146), at pp. 287-289 (141-143). Schäferdiek also provides a useful critique of Honigmann's thesis. It would seem that, when a few obvious doublets have been removed and if handled with due caution, Gelzer's lists remain indispensable.

<sup>301</sup> This is usually taken as a sort of hendiadys for 'blasphemous writing': Sellers, for example, translates 'the statement of Eusebius' blasphemous false teaching' (R.V. Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch and His Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: University Press, 1928), p. 27), while Hanson offers 'the blasphemous document of Eusebius' (*Search*, p. 160). But Eustathius may actually be referring to a document called 'The Blasphemy of Eusebius'. Four considerations may be advanced in support – none of them conclusive, but collectively, perhaps, suggestive. (1) The extracts from Arius' *Thalia* cited in Athanasius *De Syn* 15 are introduced by the rubric 'Blasphemies of Arius', or – in MSS K,O, and R -- 'Blasphemy of Arius' (Opitz, on *De Syn* 15.3 (p. 242.8)). A similar title might have gathered together extracts from Eusebius. (2) The singular form *gramma* more naturally means 'text' or 'document' (as might be adduced in evidence) than 'writing' or 'letter'. (3) This would allow the phrase 'of the blasphemy of Eusebius' to be given full weight, rather than being treated as a sort of rhetorical flourish. (4) It would then be possible to take the verb 'torn up' literally rather than metaphorically: it is easy to imagine a bill of indictment being torn in two in a final dramatic gesture.

<sup>302</sup> Eustathius presumably means Constantine here.

<sup>303</sup> Theodoret, *HE* I.8.1-5.

‘All whose words are normally the best’ probably includes Marcellus:<sup>304</sup> he reports in his Letter to Julius that he refuted ‘some’ - the Eusebians - at Nicaea, a claim which the Roman presbyters who were there with him corroborate.<sup>305</sup> But the historical commentators Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret all agree that Constantine made great play of peace-making, taking all the petitions that either side lodged against another and destroying them without reading them. Marcellus’ refutation, though it impressed his own supporters, clearly was not allowed to have its full effect.

Constantine, of course, could not have been present at every one of Nicaea’s working parties, assuming it had such; the sources present him merely as attending the final session. But his presence there was clearly crucial; whatever he may have thought he was doing there, and however admirable his sentiments of merely wishing to ratify what the bishops decided, his initial action as described in all the sources of demanding peace and reconciliation effectively pre-empted the whole synod; and it is not to be doubted that those in danger of condemnation would appeal to him to preserve them. Even if his involvement was no greater than that which Eusebius of Caesarea describes (tearing up the accusations and counter-accusations; commending Eusebius’ own faith and saying it was what he himself believed; suggesting the word *homoousios*), that was enough entirely to determine the direction of the synod’s proceedings.

The original aim of the synod -- the deposing or at least the condemnation of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his associates -- had failed. Nevertheless, in the long run that turned out to be an advantage. A whole generation in the East, together with some crucial representatives from the West, had signed up to one faith, even if an important minority neither liked nor believed what they had signed up to. This was to prove absolutely crucial in later years in re-establishing a unity which had come to seem for most of the century like an impossible dream.

---

<sup>304</sup> Feige, ‘Markell’, p. 281 suggests this is the case.

<sup>305</sup> Letter of Julius of Rome, in Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 32.2.

### c. The Creed of Nicaea

The views of Hanson and Simonetti on this matter are likely to continue influential, especially in the English-speaking world, for a long time to come, but a couple of recent articles have begun to point out just how unlikely it is that Marcellus had anything much to do with the writing of the Nicene creed.<sup>306</sup> Gerhard Feige is apparently more interested in clearing the word *homoousios* of heretical associations than in clearing Marcellus of them, but he surveys the interpretation of *homoousios* in particular throughout the fourth century, showing that it is only with Basil of Caesarea that the word itself becomes expressly accused of having Sabellian overtones, whereas Arius himself rejected it rather on the grounds (reasonable enough, one might think) that it had disturbingly Gnostic associations<sup>307</sup> -- Eusebius of Caesarea makes the same point, and never tries to associate Marcellus with it. O. Skarsaune, meanwhile, argues that the word *homoousios* cannot be considered an indicator of authorship or part authorship of the Nicene creed because it was adopted on the orders of Constantine, but analyses all the creed's other crucial phrases -- 'from the *ousia* of the Father', 'true God from true God', 'begotten not made' and 'begotten from the Father as *monogenes*', and finds that all this points to the Nicaenum as a product of the Alexandrian party.<sup>308</sup> It should already be clear that I (largely) agree with them.

---

<sup>306</sup> The assumption, here questioned, that Marcellus *must* have championed the *homoousios* at Nicaea is made, for example, by Schwartz, *GS* IV, 17 and Wolfgang Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra, Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist, Sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie und zum Neuen Testament*, Theologischen Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte X (Halle: Akademischer Verlag, 1940), p. 8.

<sup>307</sup> Gerhard Feige, 'Markell von Ankyra und das Konzil von Nizäa (325)', in *Denkender Glaube in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Festschrift aus Anlass der Gründung der Universität Erfurt*, ed. Wilhelm Ernst and Konrad Feieries, Erfurter Theologische Studien 63 (Leipzig: Benno Verlag, 1992), pp. 277-296.

See especially *Urk* 6 (p. 13.17-20).

<sup>308</sup> O. Skarsaune, 'A Neglected Detail in the Creed of Nicaea (325)', *Vig Chr* 41 (1987), pp. 34-59.



The Nicene creed is an extraordinary creed in the circumstances, extraordinary because it is neither based on nor uses some of the most important language of the two faiths which had been signed up to already by the *Tome's* two hundred or the synod of Antioch. The phrase 'Who shall declare his generation?', although it would have been agreed to by both Alexander and Eustathius on the one hand and the Eusebii on the other, has gone, as has the language of image (which Marcellus must have been glad to see abandoned).

Instead of being a complex series of propositions about Father and Son loosely based around the Rule of Faith, as in the case of the two preceding faiths of the controversy, the Nicene creed is a simple baptismal creed with some highly technical defensive additions and some anathemata. Its very structure proclaims it a document which was chosen (or forced on the assembly) for reasons of inclusivity, and then fought over word by word, with in particular some impressive rearguard actions from the Alexandrian side.

Eusebius of Caesarea claims that the creed he put forward to the assembly (presumably by way of clearing his name) was joyfully accepted by all, and implies that it formed the basis of the Nicene creed.<sup>309</sup> This claim was placed in question by Lietzmann<sup>310</sup> and J.N.D. Kelly,<sup>311</sup> who both concluded that the Nicaenum, which has many minor as well as major differences from Eusebius', is based on a rather different creed type, the Jerusalem; more recently, however, commentators have argued that the Jerusalem creed type is a chimera, and the Nicaenum does not follow any one particular creed type particularly closely.<sup>312</sup>

---

<sup>309</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea to the church of Caesarea = *Urk* 22.7 (p. 43.26 - 44.10).

<sup>310</sup> Especially in Hans Lietzmann, 'Symbolstudien XIII', *ZNW* 24 (1925), 193-202.

<sup>311</sup> J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn (London: Longman, 1972), pp. 217-20.

<sup>312</sup> Indeed, there have been attempts to deconstruct the whole concept of 'baptismal creed'. See for example Vinzent on 'Confession' as a phenomenon of the 'Reichskirche': Markus Vinzent, 'Die Entstehung des "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnisses"', in Wolfram Kinzig, Christolf Marksches, and Markus Vinzent, *Taufragen und Bekenntnis, Studien zur sogenannten 'Traditio Apostolica', zu den 'Interrogationes de fide' und zum 'Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis'*, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 74 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), pp. 185-409, especially pp. 195-6. But this perhaps undervalues Eusebius' pained insistence on the traditional character of his creed. He presents his statement of faith 'as we received from those who were bishops before us both in our first instruction and when we received baptism' (*Urk*

To conclude therefore that Eusebius' statement is a simply misleading account of the historical process involved in composing the Nicaenum because his creed differs fairly largely from the finished product is to ignore the important information it offers.<sup>313</sup>

Eusebius presents his creed as the simple faith which he has learned 'from the bishops before us and in catechesis and when we received baptism, and as we have learned from the holy Scriptures, and as we have believed in the presbyterate and in the episcopacy itself, and have taught.' This claim is likely to have been perfectly calculated to appeal to Constantine, who thought the dispute far too technical<sup>314</sup> -- he expresses his own rule of faith (which he presumably owes in its outline to Ossius and to his mother Helena), in the letter to Alexander and Arius, as a belief in Divine Providence, obedience to the twin commands to honour and love God and love one's neighbour, faith in Christ as Light of the World, and love of truth (in other words, the account of Christianity any Christian would have given to an interested outsider).<sup>315</sup>

The baptismal character of Eusebius' creed must have been an important part of its appeal to Constantine; in any case, a baptismal type of creed thereafter became the model for the Nicene faith, rather than the rambling statements, loaded with technical terms, of the faiths of Arius, Alexander and the Antiochene synod. The first line of Eusebius' creed, 'We believe in one God, Father, ruler of all, maker of all things visible and invisible' was adopted unchanged, which is a good indication that his creed actually was the original

---

23.3). For our purposes here the salient fact is obviously the perceived connection between credal formularies and baptism, not the actual derivation of those formularies.

<sup>313</sup> Markus Vinzent, reacting against the Lietzmann--Kelly analysis, concludes, 'Die Parallelen zu Eusebius' Pistis und die Unterschiede zu der des Alexander und der der Synodalen in Antiochien machen erneut deutlich, dass kein anderes wie auch immer postuliertes östliches oder westliches Taufbekenntnis als Grundlage für Nizäa angenommen zu werden braucht, sondern dass man sich bei der Formulierung des *Credo* wohl direkt auf Eusebius stützt' ('Entstehung', p. 348).

<sup>314</sup> See his impatient remarks in Eusebius, *VC* II.69.1-2.

<sup>315</sup> T.D. Barnes (*Constantine*, p. 213) replies to accusations of technical incompetence on the part of Constantine by pointing out that Constantine's concern was above all for a united Christian laity. This is perfectly true, and Constantine's motives throughout the whole are

document out of which the Nicaenum<sup>316</sup> was forged. The second line got as far as ‘and in one Lord Jesus Christ’, before it diverged.

Marcellus would already have objected to ‘one Lord Jesus Christ’, with its suggestion of a second hypostasis, which argues that he had indeed been silenced by Constantine in the name of peace, since even the Fourth Creed of Antioch managed to dispense with calling Christ ‘one’.<sup>317</sup> ‘Word of God’ was replaced by ‘Son of God’, probably on the insistence of Eustathius of Antioch, who was the only one of Alexander’s party who seems to have preferred Son language to Logos language, as guaranteeing a real and unique generation, and the phrase γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ then added, probably also Eustathius’ phrase, further specifying the sense in which ‘Son’ was to be understood, and attempting, still with entirely biblical language (which had doubtless been a shibboleth after the three previous, ‘technical’ faiths) to rule out other possible understandings of ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς.

Athanasius reports that at this point it became clear that the Eusebians had ways of interpreting all of this in accordance with their own thought, and that some unambiguous expression had to be used.<sup>318</sup> Τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς was added to rule that out, the first time an unscriptural expression is used in this creed. I would argue that this is probably Athanasius’ own contribution, a suggestion he whispered in Alexander’s ear as a way of making sure Eusebius and his friends would be unable to sign. Alexander and Eustathius had both scrupulously avoided the term *ousia* in this sense to date, preferring the apophatic ‘Who can declare his generation?’ formula, as shown above. Athanasius, meanwhile, had used *ousia* of his own choice in *Henos somatos* (a step Alexander had retreated from in *He philarchos*) and was to

---

perfectly reasonable and intelligible -- but not, I would hold, compatible with the norms of synodal legislation as understood up to that point.

<sup>316</sup> For a full critical edition of the Creed, see Giuseppe Luigi Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea et di Constantinopoli*, Testi e Ricerche di Scienze Religiose 2 (Rome: Herder, 1967).

<sup>317</sup> See Chapter 5 below.

<sup>318</sup> See the brightly coloured account in Athanasius, *De Decr* 19-20.

continue to use it afterwards.<sup>319</sup> Athanasius has a very clear memory of how this formula came to be adopted, over twenty-five years later: personal involvement tends to sharpen one's memory for such points wonderfully.<sup>320</sup> Alexander, having tacitly rejected the formula once before, was clearly now so keen to produce a formula that Eusebius of Nicomedia would not be able to sign that he doubtless was delighted with the idea (which he himself must then have proposed); Eustathius and the rest of the anti-Eusebian majority doubtless concurred, with greater or lesser reservation, because a large majority would have been necessary for this first unscriptural phrase to be included without leaving the opportunity for the Eusebians to object.

This point gained, the assembly returned to Eusebius of Caesarea's text. 'God from God' and 'Light from light' then passed (Arius had protested against the second of these formulations in his creed,<sup>321</sup> and Marcellus would not have liked it much either, since it belongs to the language of image), and then divergence begins again. 'True God from true God' was insisted on, against Eusebius himself and all those who argued (basing themselves on 'That they may know you, the only true God') that the Son was God, but not true God.<sup>322</sup> Γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα was probably again a formulation of Eustathius', perhaps from an earlier draft: the first word is taken from the Antiochene faith, the second modelled on it, and both are characteristic of Eustathius' thought.

We come next to the notorious ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί, about which so much has been written. Skarsaune rightly complains that it has been the focus of far too much attention in considering the Nicene creed, largely due to the preoccupations of the generation of the 350s and 360s, and to the fact that *homoiousios* was so memorably coined by the group which sought to distance itself from the Sabellianism it imputed to Athanasius' party. It is clear that it

---

<sup>319</sup> Repeatedly in *C Ar I*, for example. See Hanson, *Search*, pp. 428 and 437.

<sup>320</sup> It may be noted that, of the other three commentators on Nicaea who were actually present there, both Eusebius of Caesarea and Marcellus mention only or largely their own contributions to it, while Eustathius remembers primarily what went wrong.

<sup>321</sup> In the form λύχνον ἀπὸ λύχνου (*Urk* 6.3 (p. 13.1)).

<sup>322</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea uses Jn 17.3 in this way in *Urk* 3 (p. 5.4-10).

was of far less embarrassment to Eusebius of Caesarea than the anathematising of ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν or πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν which he can only explain his signing of by pretending it applied to those who claimed Christ was not before his birth from Mary.<sup>323</sup> Its function is fairly clear: it was known that both Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia had said they could not accept it,<sup>324</sup> and the anti-Eusebians were becoming more and more keen to produce a creed which Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends could not possibly sign under any circumstances.

Zahn argued in favour of Marcellus' influence at the synod that the word was indeed meant in a 'Marcellan' sense, i.e. in the sense of numerical identity rather than generic identity.<sup>325</sup> Studer argues persuasively that this was not the case: for both Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius ὁμοφύης and ὁμογενής were synonyms for ὁμοούσιος. It was the likes of Basil of Ancyra and Basil of Caesarea in the 350s and 360s who identified the word as meaning μονοούσιος or ταυτοούσιος, as a way of crystallising their own fear of 'Sabellianism'.

Marcellus never uses the word, or indeed any compound of *ousia* (except when attacking the use of it by others) in any of his extant writings, despite the fact that the Letter to Julius would have given him ample opportunity to do so. If Eustathius defends it after Nicaea, it does not seem to be part of his own vocabulary; it is entirely absent from the Creed of Antioch. There are only two plausible candidates, it seems to me, for its authorship: Athanasius and Constantine. Athanasius liked *ousia* language, and defended that particular word with great gusto,<sup>326</sup> and would have seen that it would be a good way of trapping Eusebius of Nicomedia. But Eusebius of Caesarea's evidence should

---

<sup>323</sup> Compare the tone of *Urk* 22.12-13 with 15-16.

<sup>324</sup> For Arius see *Urk* 6.3 and 5 (p. 12.11 and p. 13.18) and the fragment from the *Thalia* cited in Athanasius, *De Syn* 15.3 (p. 242.17 Opitz). For Eusebius of Nicomedia see the fragment from Ambrose, *De Fide* printed as *Urk* 21 (p. 42).

<sup>325</sup> Theodor Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (Gotha, 1867), pp. 9-32.

<sup>326</sup> On Athanasius' use of *homoousios*, see Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), pp. 260-6.

probably be taken at its full weight:<sup>327</sup> the author of the word, despite his former preference for scriptural language, was probably indeed Constantine, whether because he had become interested in the technical side of the debate,<sup>328</sup> or because he, also, wanted to make things difficult for Eusebius of Nicomedia or at least Arius while seeming to press for peace, cannot be determined. Constantine had his sadistic side, and might well have enjoyed watching Eusebius squirm, even if he did intend (at that point) to save him from the wrath of his fellow-bishops.

This is the last of the controversial sections of the creed proper, although various other changes or additions were made to Eusebius' text which make lesser points against Arian or Eusebian theology, not points they would have had any difficulty agreeing with. 'Through whom all things came to be which are in the heavens and on earth' was added to underline the Son's active role in creation. Δι' ἡμᾶς τοῦς ἀνθρώπους was added to διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, presumably to show in what sense δι' ἡμᾶς τοῦς ἀνθρώπους ought to be used, since Arius was accused of having applied it to the creation of the Logos rather than to the incarnation.<sup>329</sup> Κατελθόντα was added before σαρκωθέντα to stress the gulf between God and the world, and ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον was replaced by ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, presumably by Eustathius, in order to stress that the Son took a whole man, body and soul -- Marcellus doubtless approved this change, but Alexander cannot have been too interested in it.

In the penultimate section, ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἕξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς becomes ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοῦς οὐρανοῦς, ἐρχόμενον. This is one section in the creed which seems, ever so slightly, to reflect the theology of Marcellus. The future participle ἕξοντα is replaced with

---

<sup>327</sup> *Urk* 22.7 (p. 44.3-4).

<sup>328</sup> Constantine (or rather the lucky imperial official who had the job of translating the Emperor's Latin into intelligible Greek (see Eusebius, *VC* IV.12)) once uses the word. It appears in the *Oration to the Saints* 13.1 (p. 172, 12-13 Heikel), where Constantine is trying to say that 'things which occur by nature do not belong to the same order of reality as do matters of moral choice'.



the (scriptural)<sup>330</sup> present participle, making Christ's coming more clearly immediate, an effect to which the change of 'ascended to the heavens' for 'ascended to the Father' and the removal of *πάλιν* also contributes. The change is also to an exact scriptural wording from one which is only approximately so.

Finally, *ἐν πνεῦμα ἅγιον* becomes *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα* (in the more usual New Testament order). Eusebius' version clearly implies the three hypostaseis; the Nicaenum removes the necessity of that interpretation. Here again, Marcellus may be influential, perhaps in discussion with his allies during a break in the proceedings, although Eustathius is also a possible source of the change.

Eusebius added to his creed (presumably originally a straightforward baptismal formula) a version of the formula we later find attached to the Dedication creed and defended by Asterius:

Each one of these [one Father, one Lord Jesus Christ, one Holy Spirit] subsists, the Father being truly Father and the Son truly Son and the Holy Spirit truly Holy Spirit, just as our Lord said when sending out his disciples to preach: 'Go forth and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.'<sup>331</sup>

Whether or not he invented the formula, this was a clever move of Eusebius': it concentrated on his opponents' potential fissure, once again the hypostaseis. Marcellus would attack precisely this phrase in the *Contra Asterium*. But Eusebius' opponents did not take the bait; they swept this section away entirely, and replaced it with a series of anathemata designed clearly to expose the unity in heresy of their opponents, anathematising first of all *ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν* and *οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι* and *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο* (the order shows that they knew which was the most important to their enemies, who had by now dropped

---

<sup>329</sup> See *Urk* 4b.9 and 14 (p. 8.6 and p. 9.12).

<sup>330</sup> Mt 24.30 and 26.64.

<sup>331</sup> *Urk* 22.5 (p. 43.15-19). The baptismal connection of this creed is underlined by the fact that Eusebius here quotes the long form of Mt 28:19. He more often (sixteen times to nine) quotes a short form, ending with 'in my name' rather than with the threefold formula found here. In fact, this is the only pre-Nicene occurrence of the long text. Of the other four uses, three occur in the anti-Marcellan works and one in the *Theophany*. See H. Benedict Green, 'Matthew 28:19, Eusebius, and the *lex orandi*', in *The Making of Orthodoxy, Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 124-41, especially p. 125 with p. 138 note 20. Compare the Dedication creed, cited in Athanasius, *De Syn* 23.5-6 and Asterius, fr. 60 Vinzent.

ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων).<sup>332</sup> A later stage of the discussion will have qualified the anathematising of ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων with further anathemata for ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας.<sup>333</sup> Hanson shows he completely misunderstands ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως by describing it as dangerously Sabellian and suggesting that its adoption was too high a price for Alexander to pay for the support of Eustathius and Marcellus;<sup>334</sup> the Eusebian party and their successors clearly had far less difficulty with ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως than with ἐξ ἑτέρας οὐσίας, since they reuse the former in the Fourth Creed of Antioch and its compounds (with the gloss ‘and not from God’),<sup>335</sup> whereas they drop the latter altogether. The anathematising of τρεπτός and ἀλλοιωτός was not a problem for the Eusebians at all, since they also denied that Christ was either of these things -- only they argued he was ἄτρεπτος and ἀναλλοίωτος<sup>336</sup> by grace, not by nature.

#### d. The aftermath.

We know from Eustathius that he and his allies were less than delighted to see Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends sign up to the creed that had been expressly been put together to make it impossible for them to sign. Arius’ allies, the Libyan bishops Secundus and Theonas, seem to have been equally horrified. Eustathius was full of foreboding, which was not misplaced, even though Constantine exiled Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis probably shortly after he gave his sermon (if that is what it is) on Proverbs 8.22.

Constantine may always have intended quietly to exile Eusebius and Theognis after Nicaea was over, or Eusebius’ support for Licinius may have begun to rankle as he turned it over in his brain, or kind friends (such as Ossius) may

<sup>332</sup> See Hanson, ‘Who Taught EX OYK ONTΩN?’

<sup>333</sup> See Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance*, pp. 233-42 for a full discussion of the three options for Christ’s origin behind these anathemata. He *is* from the Father / the Father’s substance; he is *not* from nothing or from anything else (be it *ousia* or *hypostasis*).

<sup>334</sup> See Hanson, *Search*, pp. 161-2 and 171-2.

<sup>335</sup> Cited in Athanasius, *De Syn* 25.5.

<sup>336</sup> So Arius (*Urk* 6.2 (p. 12.9)); ἀναλλοίωτος on its own is used by both Arius (*Urk* 1.4 (p. 3.3)) and Eusebius of Nicomedia (*Urk* 8.4 (p. 16.9-10)).

have pointed out to him just how closely Eusebius had been involved with the previous regime. Eusebius probably contributed to his own downfall also, thinking himself safe rather too soon in beginning negotiations for Arius' eventual restoration.

At this point, the triumph of the eternal existence of the Son, together with the party who stood for it, must have seemed fairly secure. It was the widespread opinion at this point in the East, although by no means the only one. Alexander's allies, particularly Marcellus, must have viewed Constantine's involvement in the affair with less than complete joy, and felt that, whatever the disadvantages of persecuting emperors, Constantine's attitude to the Church would not be without its difficulties either. But for the present, Alexander was safe, Eustathius' presbyters had lost their voice (and probably soon their churches, for the time being), the imperial capital was about to move from hostile Nicomedia to friendly Byzantium, and the churches could return to a state of peace. It was the last time they were to be at peace with one another for some considerable time.

## CHAPTER THREE

### From Nicaea to the Death of Constantine

In the decade or so after Nicaea, the following events are attested to have taken place: Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea were deposed and banished by Constantine;<sup>1</sup> Eustathius of Antioch and Eusebius of Caesarea held a pamphlet war;<sup>2</sup> Alexander of Alexandria died, and was replaced as bishop by his secretary, the deacon Athanasius;<sup>3</sup> Eustathius of Antioch was deposed by a synod presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea, and replaced, probably by Paulinus of Tyre;<sup>4</sup> a synod which probably met in Bithynia, encouraged by the Emperor, pardoned first Arius and Euzoius and later also Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis;<sup>5</sup> Eusebius and Theognis held a large synod at Nicomedia which supposedly deposed Alexander of Alexandria and Eustathius and issued a creed and various letters;<sup>6</sup> the Cappadocian layman Asterius the Sophist circulated a writing in defence of a letter Eusebius of Nicomedia had written to Paulinus;<sup>7</sup> a further synod at Antioch presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea deposed a number of other bishops from the diocese of Oriens and issued a number of canons;<sup>8</sup> Marcellus wrote and circulated an attack on Asterius and other Eusebians, particularly Eusebius of Caesarea;<sup>9</sup> a synod at Tyre, which was investigating the misdeeds of Athanasius with a view to deposing him, having temporarily adjourned and reconvened at Jerusalem for the consecration of a new basilica there, censured Marcellus for refusing to accept the emperor's recommendation that Arius be received into communion and formally or informally warned him over the theological content of his work

---

<sup>1</sup> Opitz, *Urk* 27 (= CPG 2055).

<sup>2</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.23.6-8; Sozomen, *HE* II.18.3-4.

<sup>3</sup> *Festal Index*, Preface (Martin-Albert, pp. 226-227).

<sup>4</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.24; Sozomen, *HE* II.19; Theodoret, *HE* I.21.

<sup>5</sup> Opitz, *Urk* 31 (= CPG 2048).

<sup>6</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* II.7 (p. 18.21 - p. 19.10 Bidez-Winkelmann).

<sup>7</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.36; Sozomen, *HE* II.33; Marcellus, *Contra Asterium*, frs P2, 3, 7 (S/V 2,9,18); Eusebius of Caesarea, *Contra Marcellum* I.4 *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> Joannou, *Synodes Particuliers*, pp. 102-26; see Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica*, pp. 145-150 for identification of these canons, which Joannou assigns to the Dedication synod of 341, with the synod in question.

<sup>9</sup> Socrates *HE* I.36; Sozomen *HE* II.33; Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum*, *passim*.

against Asterius;<sup>10</sup> Marcellus sent his work against Asterius to the Emperor, but Constantine handed the work over to a synod of bishops for trial by them;<sup>11</sup> the synod, which met at Constantinople in the presence of the Emperor, deposed Marcellus;<sup>12</sup> Arius was scheduled to be received into communion at Constantinople, but died the day before the ceremony;<sup>13</sup> Constantine died; Eusebius of Caesarea published two works against Marcellus, the *Contra Marcellum* and *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*; those bishops whom Constantine had exiled were granted an amnesty by his sons;<sup>14</sup> the same bishops were deposed a second time. In addition to these events attested from one or more ancient sources, there is one which can be deduced from a study of the documents in general: Ossius of Corduba, for so long Constantine's trusted ecclesiastical advisor and troubleshooter, left the court and returned to Spain.<sup>15</sup>

Among these various events, only a few have certain or generally agreed dates, many are uncertain as to relative order, and some are disputed altogether. The date of the death of Constantine (22 May 337) is, of course, widely attested;<sup>16</sup> the dates of the death of Alexander (17 April 328), the consecration of Athanasius (8 June 328) and the synod of Tyre (July-October 335) are known from the Festal Index.<sup>17</sup> No one, so far as I am aware, currently doubts Philostorgius' assertion that Eusebius and Theognis were deposed and exiled three months after Nicaea (although there remains the question whether Maris of Chalcedon was deposed at the same time, as Philostorgius claims), nor that there was a general amnesty after the death of Constantine for all exiled bishops (although no actual document to that effect is produced by Athanasius or any of the ancient historians).

---

<sup>10</sup> Athanasius, *De Synodis* 21; Socrates *HE* I.36.

<sup>11</sup> Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* II.4.29.

<sup>12</sup> Hilary, *Fr Hist A*. IV 1.3.1-3 (Feder p. 50.18 - p. 51.11).

<sup>13</sup> Athanasius, *De Morte Aarii*.

<sup>14</sup> Athanasius, *Hist, Ar.* 8.1.

<sup>15</sup> De Clercq, *Ossius*, pp. 282ff.

<sup>16</sup> See *PLRE* I, 'Fl. Val. Constantinus 4', p. 224.

<sup>17</sup> *Festal Index*, Preface, pp 226-227; Year 8, pp. 232-235.

No one has, so far as I am aware, suggested an alternative date and reason for Ossius' departure to De Clercq's -- who thinks Ossius left in 326 in disgust at the execution of Crispus -- but this suggestion is simply guesswork.<sup>18</sup> The pamphlet war between Eustathius and Eusebius referred to in Socrates is undatable, except as taking place between Nicaea and the deposition of the former. The date of the restoration of Eusebius and Theognis is generally placed between December 327 and December 328, following Philostorgius' claim that they were in exile 'three whole years', but the sequence of events involved and their relationship to the restoration of Arius has been much disputed. The date and cause of the deposition of Eustathius of Antioch is more problematic still. Every year between 326 and 331 has been proposed, and at least four different causes; in particular, the relative order of the deposition of Eustathius and the restoration of Eusebius is still extremely problematic. Philostorgius' synod at Nicomedia led by Eusebius and Theognis which deposed Alexander and Eustathius is generally assumed to be a garbled version of the Nicomedian synod which reinstated Eusebius and Theognis, and is sometimes even used as evidence for a 'second session of Nicaea'. Asterius' letter in defence of Eusebius of Nicomedia is dated variously to just before and just after the return of Eusebius, and variously identified or not with the work of Asterius which Athanasius cites in *Contra Arianos*. Those who think Marcellus' *Contra Asterium* was originally written to and for the Emperor (for example Barnes and Seibt) assign the writing of it to the year immediately after the synod of Tyre and in reaction to its events.<sup>19</sup> Simonetti, Hanson and Markus Vinzent, however, following the indications of Socrates, all place Marcellus' composition before that synod, and possibly as early as 330.<sup>20</sup> The date of the deposition of Marcellus, which Socrates fixes at 335/6, has in the past been set as early as 328 (Schwartz), or 330 (Bardy), although recent commentators have

---

<sup>18</sup> T.D. Barnes notes (in *Constantine*, pp. 225-6) the political importance of Ossius' departure, citing De Clercq's reason in his note as a possibility; Simonetti, following De Clercq, gives the year of his departure as 326 (M. Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 101 note 3), but makes no mention of the reason; R.P.C. Hanson, *Search*, ignores both the date of and the reason for Ossius' departure altogether.

<sup>19</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 56; Seibt, *Markell*, p.11.

<sup>20</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 131; Hanson, *Search*, p. 217; Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra: Die Fragmente und der Brief an Julius von Rom* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p. XVII.



returned to 335 (Simonetti, as Gericke had earlier argued), 336 (Barnes, Hanson) or even early 337 (Seibt, Vinzent).<sup>21</sup> The date of the death of Arius has been tied to the same synod which deposed Marcellus by e.g. Barnes and Rowan Williams, although it necessarily alters with the proposed date of that synod.<sup>22</sup> Finally, most commentators assign both Eusebius' works against Marcellus, *Contra Marcellum* and *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, to the same time, some (e.g. Simonetti, Hanson, Lienhard) to the period immediately after the synod of Constantinople<sup>23</sup>, some (Barnes, Seibt) to the period after Constantine's death,<sup>24</sup> but Vinzent has identified the *Contra Marcellum* (surely correctly) as Eusebius' expert witness from the synod of Constantinople itself.<sup>25</sup>

I propose the following understanding of these events, in the following order:

**October/November 325:** Eusebius and Theognis exiled, probably to Gaul, perhaps to Trier.<sup>26</sup>

**Autumn 325-Spring 328:** Pamphlet war between Eustathius and Eusebius of Caesarea.

**Autumn 327-May 328:** Plot to unseat Eustathius is conceived and executed, culminating in his hushed-up (at Constantine's request) deposition for fornication at the spring provincial synod of Coele Syria, to be replaced by Paulinus of Tyre. Riots in Antioch, fed by universal confusion and rumours about what has actually happened.

**17 April 328:** Death of Alexander of Alexandria.

**8 June 328:** Athanasius consecrated Bishop of Alexandria.

---

<sup>21</sup> Eduard Schwartz, 'Eusebios', *RE*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, VI (1907), 1370-1439, at 1421; Gustav Bardy, 'La politique religieuse de Constantin après le concile de Nicée', *Rev Sci Rel* 8 (1928), pp. 516-551, at p. 534; Simonetti, *Crisi*, pp. 131-2; Hanson, *Search*, p. 217; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 56; Vinzent, *Markell*, p. XVIII.. For a summary of dates suggested by earlier scholars, see Seibt, *Theologie*, pp. 241-244.

<sup>22</sup> Barnes, *Constantine*, pp. 241-2; Williams, *Arius*, p.80.

<sup>23</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 132; Hanson, *Search*, pp. 217-8; Joseph Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth Century Theology* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), p.4.

<sup>24</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p.56; Seibt, *Theologie*, p. 243.

<sup>25</sup> Vinzent, *Markell*, p. XIX.

<sup>26</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* I.10 (p. 11.6-7), II.1<sup>b</sup> (p. 12.25-26), II.7 (p. 18.21 - p. 19.1).

**May-December 328:** Constantine, horrified at Eustathius' impurity, loses his faith in the Nicene agreement, dismisses Ossius of Corduba from his court, and recalls Arius and Euzoius. They are reinstated at his instigation by an ad hoc enlarged provincial synod in Bithynia; Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis take the opportunity to write to the next scheduled Bithynian provincial synod, meeting in early October, to engineer their own pardon by Constantine. Paulinus dies and is replaced as Bishop of Antioch by Eulalius, once again with much rioting.

**Spring 329:** Following the death of Eulalius after only a few months in office, Eusebius of Caesarea presides over a synod of the Diocese of Oriens at Antioch, which deposes a number of bishops and issues canons. A large synod convenes at Nicomedia at which the Melitians are present and present their complaints about Athanasius' ordination, and which issues a creed similar or perhaps even identical to the Second Creed of Antioch, and various theological letters, including one by Asterius the Sophist, the *Pro Eusebio*, defending the theology of Eusebius of Nicomedia by means of a commentary on the creed which has just been issued.

**Spring-Summer 329:** Asterius tours Syria and elsewhere, giving readings from his *Pro Eusebio*.

**329-330:** Marcellus composes his *Contra Asterium* and circulates it to churches in Galatia and probably more widely across Central Anatolia.

**July-October 335:** Synod of Tyre, including consecration of the new basilica at Jerusalem. Preliminary condemnation of the *Contra Asterium*.

**Winter 335/6:** Marcellus sends the *Contra Asterium* to Constantine with a covering letter full of flatteries which he ignores, summoning a synod to try it for heresy.

**July 336:** Synod of Constantinople deposes Marcellus on the basis of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Contra Marcellum*, which he composes for the occasion and publishes later, supplemented by an appendix.

**Saturday 24 July 336:** Death of Arius.

**Sunday 25 July 336:** Constantine's tricennalia celebrations begin.

**22 May 337:** Constantine dies.

**June 337:** Amnesty for exiled bishops declared. Marcellus returns.

**Autumn 337 - 338:** Eusebius writes and publishes *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*.

## **1. Marcellus and the deposition of Eustathius, the return of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and related events.**

Of the above list of events, my defence of the date of the deposition of Eustathius and of the return of Eusebius of Nicomedia with their related events will be found in Appendix 3. In it I argue for the following claims: that the exoneration of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea can be assigned with some confidence to a Bithynian provincial synod of October 328; that Arius was pardoned in the summer of 328, at the instigation of Constantine, by a synod assembled for the purpose in Bithynia, whose membership was largely the same as that of the ordinary Bithynian provincial synod, but included a few token figures from nearby provinces; that the relative order of these events and the deposition of Eustathius of Antioch cannot be pinned down for certain in the present state of scholarship, particularly in the light of the Syriac evidence recently brought to bear on the question by R. W. Burgess,<sup>27</sup> but that the most economic reading of the evidence favours Eusebius' pardon as a reaction to the discrediting of Eustathius, not the cause of it; and that the synod referred to by Philostorgius which took place in Nicomedia after the return of Eusebius and Theognis, which deposed Alexander and Eustathius and issued a creed and various letters, was not the synod which exonerated these bishops and Arius, far less a second session of the Synod of Nicaea called as such by Constantine, but a synod called in the spring of 329 by Eusebius and his friends to consolidate their position among their supporters, the 'depositions' of Eustathius and Alexander being simply condemnations of their theology. In addition, I argue that it is Theodoret's account of the deposition of Eustathius which is largely

---

<sup>27</sup> R.W. Burgess, 'The Date of the Deposition of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS* ns 51 (2000), pp. 150-60.

accurate (except in concretising a putative ‘those from Thrace’ as Eusebius of Nicomedia, now translated to Constantinople, and Theognis of Nicaea), and I surmise that the coup was agreed beforehand with Constantine, and carried out on his authority (the Emperor once being convinced of Eustathius’ infamy by real or trumped-up evidence), with orders to hush the matter up as far as possible to protect the church’s reputation- a policy which went disastrously wrong.<sup>28</sup>

The consequence of all of this for Marcellus is what concerns us here. First, of course, the death of Alexander and the fall of Eustathius, quickly followed by the departure of Ossius (which I have argued in the Appendix mentioned above was likely to have been a consequence of Constantine’s disenchantment with Eustathius following his apparent exposure as a fornicator), left the remnants of the previously strong Nicene coalition, including Marcellus, increasingly isolated. The rallying synod of the Eusebians at Nicomedia, which would have taken place in the same spring as the synod at Antioch which elected Eusebius of Caesarea as bishop there to replace the short-lived Eulalius, and deposed some of the continuing supporters of Eustathius in the diocese, was also (as again argued in the Appendix 3) likely to have been the locus of the alliance of Eusebius of Nicomedia and the Melitians against Athanasius. The 329 synod at Nicomedia was doubtless a second session of Nicaea for those who attended it, in that it did its utmost to reverse what had been done there, but it would never have been so recognised by the anti-Eusebian alliance, and Constantine is unlikely to have had anything to do with it either- particularly since he was still in the West at this time.<sup>29</sup>

Despite the losses of Eustathius, Alexander and Ossius, the leading spirits of the anti-Eusebian coalition, it is likely that allegiances at this time continued, with

---

<sup>28</sup> Such a projected response from Constantine to the impurity of a bishop would be parallel to the account Theodoret gives (*HE* 1.11.5-6) of Constantine’s saying he would cover with his imperial robe a bishop he discovered in adultery: ‘for he said that the sins of priests ought not to become clear to the many, lest having taken scandal thence they should sin freely’.

<sup>29</sup> He is not attested as returning to Heraclea, in Thrace, until 3 August 329 (see Barnes, *New Empire*, p. 78).

the exception of the province of Coele Syria, as they had been at Nicaea. The bishops of Bithynia and Asia continued to be led by the Eusebian party, as did the bishops of Diospontus, Pontus Polemoniacus, Cappadocia, Phoenicia, Palestine (to some extent), and probably Cilicia. Central Asia Minor, including Galatia, Paphlagonia, Isauria, Pisidia, Pamphilia, Phrygia and Lycia, is likely to have continued anti-Eusebian, as for the most part it would continue to be (as we shall see) at the time of Tyre, of the condemnation of Marcellus at Constantinople, and of Sardica. We have no bishop-list for the 329 synod of Nicomedia, but there is one for the synod of Antioch, which was a diocese-wide synod.<sup>30</sup> About a third of the bishops from the diocese who attended Nicaea signed the canons of this synod four years later. The synodal letter speaks its delight at having representatives from every province in the diocese, but they are thin: of the seventeen bishops of Isauria who signed at Nicaea, only one appended his name to the canons of this Oriens diocesan synod. The continued absence of Isaurian bishops from the rolls of Eusebian-led synods over the next decade and a half tells its own story.

But those bishops who disagreed too noticeably with Eusebian theology and came from Oriens provinces which were led by Eusebians (Cilicia, Coele Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine)<sup>31</sup> were in trouble. Canons 9 and 14 of Antioch 329 lay down that the metropolitan bishop is in overall charge of all ordinations in the province, and has the right to call bishops from a neighbouring province to support him in case of disagreement among his own bishops on the deposition of one of them. The implication of these rulings is that any province with a Eusebian-supporting bishop is likely to have ensured that only the like-minded would be ordained in his province (as Eustathius had himself done in the case of

---

<sup>30</sup> C. H. Turner, *EOMIA* II,2, p. 231. For a proposed restoration of the sees on the basis of Nicaea, see Table 1 at the end of this chapter.

<sup>31</sup> Palestine was led by Eusebius of Caesarea throughout this period, although Macarius of Jerusalem was a good counter-weight until his death in 333; Phoenicia, until 328 in the hands of Paulinus of Tyre, also had a Eusebian supporting metropolitan, Paul, at the time of the Arsenius crisis in 334; all known bishops of Antioch after the deposition of Eustathius were Eusebian creations; it is not certain that the metropolitans of Cilicia, Theodore and Antony, were Eusebian-supporting (see chapter 2), but some significant Cilician bishops (Narcissus of Neronias, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Athanasius of Anazarbus) certainly continued to be.

Eusebian-supporting clergy),<sup>32</sup> and those others already in harness would be deposed.<sup>33</sup> Athanasius gives us a list of Nicene-supporting bishops from the above provinces who were deposed about this time: Euphration of Balanea, Cymatius of Paltus, Cymatius of Gabala and Cyrus of Beroea from Coele Syria, Hellanicus of Tripoli and Carterius of Antaradus in Phoenicia, and Asclepas of Gaza in Palestine.<sup>34</sup>

We have every indication that the years following the return of Eusebius saw another ecclesiastical cold war throughout the East, with provinces on the whole following their metropolitan in allegiance. It is important to remember this when the war becomes more heated, and to remember, in synods such as those of Tyre, Constantinople 336, Antioch 341 and Eastern Sardica, how many of the provinces represented were concentrated in the hands of Eusebian supporters. The perception current among modern scholars and in standard textbooks that a majority of the Eastern bishops, termed ‘moderates’, initially supported the Eusebians and rejected Eustathius and Marcellus as extreme and Athanasius as a thug, ignores, as we shall see, the extent to which this ‘majority’ is carefully engineered at each of the relevant synods by not inviting those from provinces not friendly to the Eusebian line.<sup>35</sup>

Philostorgius alleges that the Nicomedian synod (of 329) was attended by a πλήρωμα of two hundred and fifty.<sup>36</sup> Only a fraction of these are likely to have

---

<sup>32</sup> Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 4

<sup>33</sup> For the evidence which suggests they were wholehearted in pursuing such a policy, see chapter 5 below.

<sup>34</sup> Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 5; *De Fuga* 3.3 (see Honigman, *Patristic Studies*, p. 366 for a rationalisation of these lists).

<sup>35</sup> See Hanson, *Search*, pp. 274-6 for a denial of the view that the Eusebians targeted Eustathius, Athanasius, Marcellus et al. as their theological enemies, and J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Harlow: Longman, 1972), p. 261 for the view that ‘the great majority of bishops’, though ‘horrified by the bold statements of Arius’ supported a ‘pluralistic, mildly subordinationist Trinitarian theology’. There is no evidence for such a ‘majority’: the largest group the Eusebians ever gather in their support (the ninety-seven bishops at the Dedication synod of Antioch in 341) is less than half the size of that which met at Nicaea, even discounting representatives from the West.

<sup>36</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* II.7 (p. 18.21 - p. 19.10).



been bishops.<sup>37</sup> They presumably included the West Coast Eusebians of Bithynia and Asia, as well presumably as Theodore of Heraclea; it may or may not have included the Oriens Eusebians who met together in the same spring (Asterius' travels around Syria reading his defence of Eusebius of Nicomedia might suggest it did not). It seems virtually certain that Marcellus and the Central Anatolian bishops were not invited.

Marcellus was clearly not unaffected by the events of 328 and 329. We have evidence (though indirect) of his reactions to both the deposition of Eustathius and the war council of the Eusebians at Nicomedia in his great work which survives in fragments in its indictment by Eusebius of Caesarea, the *Contra Asterium*.

#### **a. Marcellus and the deposition of Eustathius.**

Whatever relations were between Marcellus and Eustathius (they may have been close friends or merely acquaintances conscious of one another's theological strengths), and whatever Marcellus thought in his heart of hearts about Eustathius' guilt or otherwise as an alleged fornicator, he bitterly resented the part played by Eusebius of Caesarea, who had presided over the deposition of the great Antiochene, and by Paulinus of Tyre, who replaced him. This can be seen from the fact that although Marcellus is apparently writing against a letter of Asterius' defending Eusebius of Nicomedia, he appears to be far more vitriolic in his attacks on Paulinus and the other Eusebius, if the latter's citations are at all representative. Marcellus clearly attacks Paulinus for changing sees in defiance of the Nicene canons (as can be seen from Eusebius' elaborate defence

---

<sup>37</sup> Nicetas describes them all as bishops (= Philostorgius, *HE* II.7<sup>a</sup> (p. 19.18)), but this is almost certainly merely an inference; Photius's text reflects much more closely the wording of the original, which makes no mention of the word 'bishop'. 'Πλήρωμα' rather suggests that the number includes presbyters, deacons and other lesser clergy, and perhaps even lay people: Arius in particular seems to have had a large, well-born lay following. The number 250 seems suspiciously close to the number present at Nicaea; no gathering of bishops even approaching this size is ever mentioned in connection with the Eusebian party on any other occasion, or by any more reliable source. On the number of bishops at Nicaea, see chapter 2.

of this),<sup>38</sup> and accuses Eusebius himself of believing Christ to be a mere man (a compliment Eusebius would return with interest).<sup>39</sup>

There is one passage in particular which may link Marcellus' vitriol against Eusebius and Paulinus with Eustathius' deposition:

[Saying that he (Marcellus) had learned from report that Eusebius preached some things, having been once in Laodicea, and concerning things which he did not know, as having learned from report, he writes, and adds, saying] it was necessary on the contrary [for Eusebius] to call out to the Lord with tears and grievings, 'We have sinned, we have been impious, we have been lawless, and we have done evil in your sight, and now repenting we ask to obtain clemency from you.' These things were fitting for him, these things it was advantageous to say, because of the measureless kindness and clemency of God. Although it was consequent for God, giving heed with clemency and justice, to reply, saying 'If an enemy had reproached me, I would have borne it, and if one who hated me had boasted against me, I would have hidden from him. But you, O equal-souled man, my leader and my friend; who sweetened food for me when we were together, we went in fellowship in the house of God'; for that he is with us his priests, we know from his saying, for he said 'I will be with you for all the days of your life until the end of the age.' Then consequently assuredly I suppose he would also have added to the foregoing the following words: 'Let death come upon them, and may they go down alive to Hades; because evil is in their hearts.' For the Scripture says 'Those being dead in ignorance of impiety are swallowed up by Hades'; for they were dead, though seeming to be alive.

P 77 (S/V 119, K 99)<sup>40</sup>

This is an extraordinary passage, based for the most part on LXX Psalm 54, whose application to Eusebius at first sight seems staggering in its viciousness. But there are some clues in the text as to what might have given rise to Marcellus' words.

---

<sup>38</sup> Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* I.4.2.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. Eusebius, *C Mar* II.2.44.

<sup>40</sup> Fragments of Marcellus are cited with my own numbering first, then that of Seibt published by Vinzent in *Fragmente*, then that of E. Klostermann in *Gegen Marcell, Über die Kirchliche Theologie, Die Fragmente Marcells*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. G.C. Hansen, GCS (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972).

Firstly, there is the word τάναντία ('on the contrary'). This implies that Marcellus had previously quoted what Eusebius actually did say in his sermon (or what Marcellus heard that he had said), which was quite different from the words of contrition which Marcellus sarcastically follows with. What Eusebius actually did say, in fact, or was supposed to have said, was quite possibly the words Marcellus then puts into the mouth of God: 'If an enemy had reproached me, I would have borne it, and if one who hated me had boasted against me, I would have hidden from him. But you, O equal-souled man, my leader and my friend; who sweetened food for me when we were together, we went in fellowship in the house of God.'

Words such as 'O equal-souled man, my leader and my friend' (ἄνθρωπε ἰσόψυχε, ἡγεμὼν μου καὶ γνῶστὰ μου) are somewhat unlikely ones for God to address to Eusebius of Caesarea, and they would be rather inapposite for Marcellus to have plucked out of thin air as an insult. But they would be entirely unsurprising coming from Eusebius as he shed crocodile tears over the moral downfall of Eustathius of Antioch.

If I am correct in my guess that Marcellus has simply re-ascribed to God weeping over the sins of Eusebius of Caesarea the words Eusebius used to weep over the sins of Eustathius, this sermon would have been preached in Laodicea in Syria, the seat of Theodotus of Laodicea, whose 'leader' -- i.e. metropolitan -- Eustathius had certainly been. It was Theodotus who, with Eusebius and Narcissus, had been placed under a provisional ban at the pre-Nicene Synod of Antioch -- a synod which was led by Ossius of Cordoba and Eustathius of Antioch.<sup>41</sup> Eusebius may well have been taking the opportunity to gloat at the downfall of his and Theodotus' enemy under cover of pious shock at his evil deeds. If so, it is hardly surprising that Marcellus' reaction was rage at his impudent hypocrisy. Marcellus' anger still burns from the pages of a work written at least a year after the action he describes.

---

<sup>41</sup> Opitz, *Urk* 18 (= *CPG* 8509).

**b. Marcellus, the synod at Nicomedia, and Asterius' *Pro Eusebio*.**

Philostorgius tells us, in a passage cited in both Photius and Nicetas, of a synod which met at Nicomedia after the return of Eusebius and Theognis:

After three whole years [he says that] Eusebius and Maris and Theognis, having obtained a return by the decree of the Emperor Constantine, put forth a symbol of heretical faith and everywhere sent letters for the overthrow of the synod in Nicaea; and deposed Alexander of Alexandria and excommunicated him, because reverting he had turned again to the homoousion. But also they laid a charge against Eustathius of Antioch of intercourse with a slave girl and enjoyment of shameful pleasure; the Emperor sentenced him to banishment, making him an exile to the West. And he says that the full complement of this lawless synod was two hundred and fifty, and that they made Nicomedia the workshop of their lawless deeds.

Philostorgius, *HE* 2.7 (Photius)

After three whole years he [Constantine] also decreed return to the Eusebians. And indeed, having returned from the Gauls, they assembled a synod of two hundred and fifty bishops in Nicomedia, and deposed Alexander and all those preaching the homoousios.

Philostorgius, *HE* 2.7<sup>a</sup> (Nicetas)

I have argued in Appendix 3 that Philostorgius' information here may be taken seriously: the depositions of Alexander of Alexandria and Eustathius would simply be a condemnation of their theology.

But Philostorgius, through Photius, also tells us that Eusebius' synod 'put forth a symbol of ... faith and everywhere sent letters for the overthrow of the synod in Nicaea'. This new creed is not mentioned by any other author, but it might solve a puzzle which is difficult otherwise to make sense of.

Marcellus' *Contra Asterium* was a refutation of a letter of Asterius in defence of a letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre (*Urk* 8), as we can see from the following extracts:

But I will remind you of those things which he himself [Asterius] has written, allying himself with the things written badly by Eusebius, in order that you may know that he has clearly departed from his earlier promise. For he wrote thus in these words: 'For the point of the letter is to refer to the will of the Father the begetting of the Son, and not to declare the begetting of God a passion.

P 2 (S/V 2, K 34)

With the result that Asterius, wishing to exonerate Eusebius who had written badly, having made mention of both 'the nature of the father' and 'the nature of the begotten', became himself accuser of himself. For it would have been far better to have left 'the depth of the thought of Eusebius lying in brevity' as he himself wrote, unexamined, than that he, having used such a theory, should lead the wickedness of the writing to the light.

P 3 (S/V 9, K 35)

For having wanted to defend the Eusebius who wrote the letter badly, he says 'having unfolded the dogma first in a non-teacherly way, he composed the letter, for the letter was not made for the Church or for the ignorant, but for the blessed Paulinus', calling him blessed because of this, that he holds the same opinion as Asterius.

P 7 (S/V 18, K 87).

As well as obviously being some sort of a commentary on this letter, however, Asterius' work, which I shall entitle *Pro Eusebio*, seems to be a commentary on some sort of a creed:

He has written that he 'believes in God, the Father Almighty, and in his Son the only-begotten God, our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit,' and he says that he had learned this mode of Godly piety from the Divine Scriptures. And I accept heartily the things that are said whenever he should say this, for this mode of Godly piety is common to all of us, to believe in the Father

and the Son and the Holy Spirit. But whenever he should say, having guessed at the power of the divine, more humanly for us, through a certain clever analysis, 'the Father is Father and the Son Son,' it is no longer safe to praise such an analysis. For through such an analysis it comes about that the heresy currently thought up by them increases, which clearly, I think, is easy to demonstrate from his writings. For he said that 'it was necessary to acknowledge the Father to be truly Father and the Son truly Son and the Holy Spirit likewise.'

P 1 S/V1 (Re 59, K 65)

The affinities of the *Pro Eusebio* with the Second Creed of Antioch have, in fact, long been recognised.<sup>42</sup> This creed, which Athanasius claims was written at the 341 synod of Antioch,<sup>43</sup> but which Sozomen tells us was alleged to have been written by the martyr Lucian of Antioch,<sup>44</sup> is as follows (significant agreements with the *Pro Eusebio* are underlined and in bold type):

Πιστεύομεν ἀκολουθῶς τῇ εὐαγγελικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ παραδόσει εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν τε καὶ ποιητὴν καὶ προνοητὴν· ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα·

καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, θεόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου, μόνον ἐκ μόνου, τέλειον ἐκ τελείου, βασιλέα ἐκ βασιλέως, κύριον ἀπὸ κυρίου, λόγον ζῶντα, σοφίαν ζῶντα, φῶς ἀληθινόν, ὁδόν, ἀλήθειαν, ἀνάστασιν, ποιμένα, θύραν, ἄτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοιώτον, τῆς θεότητος οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα, τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, τὸν ὄντα ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, θεὸν λόγον, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκε, τὸν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἄνωθεν καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ παρθένου, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον, μεσίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπόστολόν τε τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς, ὡς φησὶν ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με· τὸν παθόντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς οὐρανοῦς,

<sup>42</sup> For a summary of scholarly views on the affinities between the two, see M. Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien: Die theologischen Fragmente* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 164-166.

<sup>43</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 23.



καὶ καθεσθέντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ εἰς παράκλησιν καὶ ἁγιασμὸν καὶ τελείωσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσι διδόμενον, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς διετάξατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, λέγων· πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος· δηλονότι πατρὸς ἀληθῶς πατρὸς ὄντος, υἱοῦ δὲ ἀληθῶς υἱοῦ ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἀληθῶς ἁγίου πνεύματος ὄντος, τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐχ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ ἄργῶς κειμένων, ἀλλὰ σημαιόντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν οἰκείαν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ὑπόστασιν τε καὶ τάξιν καὶ δόξαν· ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν.<sup>45</sup>

Fragments of the *Pro Eusebio* which parallel this creed (besides fragment 1, listed above) are as follows:

So he seems consequently to have said that it says 'he was begotten before the ages'; for the one who came forth becomes offspring of the Father who brought forth. But the other is no longer received by him either healthily or piously. For saying that the one which came forth

---

<sup>44</sup> Sozomen, *HE* 3.5.

<sup>45</sup> Text from Athanasius, *De Syn* 23.2-6 (p. 249.11-33 Opitz); punctuation slightly altered. (Newman's translation: We believe, conformably to the evangelical and apostolical tradition, in One God, the Father Almighty, the framer and maker and preserver of the Universe, from whom are all things; and in One Lord Jesus Christ, His Only-Begotten Son, God, by whom are all things, who was begotten before all ages from the Father, God from God, whole from whole, sole from sole, perfect from perfect, king from king, Lord from Lord, Living Word, Living Wisdom, true Light, Way, Truth, Resurrection, Shepherd, Door, both unalterable and unchangeable; unvarying Image of the Godhead, Substance, Will, Power, and Glory of the Father; the first born of every creature, who was in the beginning with God, God the Word, as it is written in the Gospel, 'and the Word was God'; by whom all things were made and in whom all things consist; who in the last days descended from above, and was born of a Virgin according to the Scriptures, and was made Man, Mediator between God and Man, and Apostle of our faith, and Prince of Life, as He says, 'I came down from Heaven, not to do Mine own will but the will of Him that sent Me'; who suffered for us and rose again on the third day, and ascended into Heaven, and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and is coming again with glory and power, to judge quick and dead. And in the Holy Ghost, who is given to those who believe for comfort, and sanctification and initiation, as also our Lord Jesus Christ enjoined his disciples, saying 'Go ye, teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that of Father being truly Father, and of Son being truly Son, and of the Holy Ghost being truly Holy Ghost, the names not being given without meaning or effect, but denoting accurately the peculiar subsistence, rank, and glory of each that is named, so that they are three in subsistence, and in agreement one.)

from him is not Word, but simply 'only Son', and that this is the true mode of generation, is wont to convey a certain emphasis of a human aspect to the hearers.

P 5 S/V 66 (Re 31, K 36)

For Asterius having said 'the Word came to be before the ages', the phrase itself exposes him as lying; so that he misses not only the fact, but even the text. For if Proverbs says 'He set me as a foundation before the age,' how did he say '**he was begotten before the ages**'? For it is one thing for him to have been 'set as a foundation', and another to have been 'begotten before the ages'.

P 41 S/V 36 (Re 15, K 18)

For he says 'the Father who begat from himself the **only-begotten** Word and **first-born of all creation, the One** who begat **the One, the Perfect, the Perfect, the King, the King, the Lord, the Lord, God, God, the unvarying image of both essence and will and glory and power.**'

P59 S/V 113 (Re 85, K 96)

For when he, after the assumption of the flesh, is proclaimed **Christ** and also **Jesus, Life** and also **Way** and **Day** and **Resurrection** and **Door** and **Bread** and if there be any other [thing] named by the Divine Scriptures, <not> because of this is it fitting for us to be ignorant of the first name, which is **Word**.

P 18 S/V 3 (Re 37, K 43)

So then, before the **coming down** and the **being born of the virgin** there was only **Word**. Since what else was there before that which **came down in the last days**, as he also wrote, and that which was born from the virgin assumed human flesh? There was nothing other than **Word**.

P 12 S/V 5 (Re 42, K 48)

These similarities are far too great for coincidence, and they have led to a wide range of theories. Those who accept Athanasius' claim in *De Synodis* that the Second Creed of Antioch was indeed made up at the Dedication Synod of 341 have explained the similarities by assuming that Asterius, who was apparently present at the synod, composed it then and there, basing it on his own favourite theological expressions.<sup>46</sup> Those, such as Gustave Bardy, who accept Sozomen's ascription of the creed to one Lucian of Antioch, martyred at Nicomedia under Maximin Daia, as at least probable, would have it (or a prototype) as a model for both the creed of Asterius and that offered by Eusebius of Caesarea in his own vindication at Nicaea.<sup>47</sup> Markus Vinzent argued rather that it was Asterius himself who was the author of what would later be known as the Second Creed of Antioch, probably well before Nicaea -- Vinzent sees Asterius as the main theologian and teacher of the all the Eusebians, including Arius.<sup>48</sup>

Despite the claim of Athanasius, the Second Creed of Antioch, or something very close to it, clearly existed long before that synod began. The proof of this comes from the fact that, alone among the four 'Antioch' creeds of 341, it has no deliberately anti-Marcellan clause, such as 'whose kingdom shall have no end.' In the atmosphere of that council, and given the 'anti-Sabellian' tone of this creed itself, that would be extremely surprising, unless Sozomen rather than Athanasius is right, and the creed predates not only the synod itself but even the deposition of Marcellus in 336.

Another possibility, which could be combined with either Bardy's or Vinzent's theory, is that this is the creed which was issued by the 329 synod of Nicomedia. This would explain why Asterius' letter seems to be a commentary on an already existing creed, a creed whose authority could be taken for granted, and why such a commentary should be considered an appropriate means of

---

<sup>46</sup> E.g. Hanson, *Search*, p. 289.

<sup>47</sup> G. Bardy, *Lucien*, pp. 119-32. On the other hand, Brennecke, *Homöer*, p. 221 note 265 and Löhr, p. 15 both deny any connection with Lucian and both point to Sabinus as the source of the claim.

defending Eusebius. If it was the creed which had just been issued by the Nicomedian synod, it stood, for the Eusebians, as the new standard of orthodoxy, the replacement for the creed of Nicaea.

Asterius' *Pro Eusebio* might then have been one of the synodal 'letters [sent] everywhere for the overthrow of the synod in Nicaea'. This would explain why the defence was in letter form, which is otherwise difficult to make sense of. This would be one of the synods, therefore, which Athanasius sneeringly claims Asterius attended in the hope of being made a bishop -- although the Eusebians stopped short of such a move with a known apostate, who had sacrificed during the persecutions.<sup>49</sup>

If I am correct in these surmises, that a creed was promulgated at Nicomedia which Asterius then used as a basis for his *Pro Eusebio*, then Marcellus' attack on Asterius was not simply a spat with a prominent theologian from a rival city (Caesarea in Cappadocia). It was a well-aimed blow at the heart of the whole Eusebian system: its leading bishop (Eusebius of Nicomedia), its leading theologian (Asterius) and its newly-promulgated creed. It was Marcellus' reaction to the sudden reversal of the fortunes of his friends, particularly the deposition of Eustathius, and perhaps also to the newly-formed coalition against Athanasius (if Marcellus knew of its existence at this stage). It was a brilliant and daring work, as can be seen from the surviving fragments, and a skilful exposure of the theological weaknesses of the Eusebian system. Unfortunately, it was not without theological problems of its own, which the Eusebians were able to exploit in their turn.

## 2. The writing of the *Contra Asterium*.

---

<sup>48</sup> Vinzent, *Asterius*, p. 166

<sup>49</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.36.

There are two basic schools of thought on when and for whom Marcellus composed the *Contra Asterium*, following the apparently contradictory evidence of Socrates and Sozomen on the one hand and Eusebius' *Contra Marcellum* on the other.

Socrates tells us (*HE* 1.36) 'When the bishops then convened at Jerusalem had intelligence of these things [that Marcellus, wishing to counteract the influence of Asterius, had fallen into the error of Paul of Samosata and dared to say that Christ was a mere man] ... , they insisted that Marcellus, as a priest, should give an account of the book which he had written. Finding that he entertained Paul of Samosata's sentiments, they required him to retract his opinion.' He goes on to say that Marcellus promised to burn his book, but the matter could not be settled as the synod was suddenly dissolved by the emperor's summoning of the principle parties to Constantinople to meet the complaints of Athanasius; and so the Eusebians took the matter up again in Constantinople.

This account demands that the *Contra Asterium* have been written before the synod of Tyre in 335, in direct response to the work of Asterius, and probably have been written for a general audience. Sozomen's account, drawing on what must be the synodal letter of the synod which deposed Marcellus, also implies a work which had a general circulation, at least in Galatia: he cites the letter's demand to the 'churches in that place [i.e. Galatia] to seek out and destroy the book of Marcellus, and to convert those thinking the same things, as many as they should find.'

The *Contra Marcellum*, on the other hand, tells us scathingly 'So, reasonably, these things [the faults Eusebius has pointed out in Marcellus' theology] moved the Emperor, so truly God-beloved and thrice-blessed, against the man [Marcellus], although he had flattered endlessly and gone through many

encomia of the Emperor in his composition' (Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum*, 2.4.29).<sup>50</sup>

Klaus Seibt has taken this latter designation to mean that the *Contra Asterium* was originally written to Constantine.<sup>51</sup> This interpretation is part of his elaborate theory about the friendship between Marcellus and the Emperor. He argues that the work (which he calls *Opus ad Constantinum Imperatorem*) was written directly for Constantine, after the synod of Tyre, appealing to their former friendship in an attempt to persuade him to return to his former support of the anti-Eusebian party.

There is some evidence to support Seibt's view, but there are serious objections to some parts of his theory, and the evidence is better explained in other ways. Seibt begins from Eusebius' scathing comment cited above on the flatteries and encomia addressed by Marcellus to Constantine. He takes this as evidence that Marcellus' book itself was originally written to the Emperor, and finds confirmation in the work's use of the second person singular, and in particular in the phrase 'But I will remind you (σε) of those things which he himself has written, allying himself with the things written badly by Eusebius, in order that you may know that he has clearly departed from his earlier promise.'<sup>52</sup>

But there is no trace in the surviving fragments of Marcellus' work of flatteries of the Emperor. On the contrary, there are some expressions which it is virtually impossible to imagine him directly addressing to Constantine, so brusque are they and devoid of any of the little politenesses which would simply have to accompany them in addressing the Emperor directly in this period:

For the name of 'dogma' depends on human will and judgement. And that this holds thus bears witness for us sufficiently the dogmatic skill of the doctors, and also the things that are called

---

<sup>50</sup> Εικότως ἄρα ταῦτα βασιλέα τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς θεοφιλῆ καὶ τρισμακάριον κατὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκίνει, καίτοι μυρία κολακεύσαντος καὶ πολλὰ βασιλέως ἐγκώμια αὐτοῦ ἐν συγγράμματι διελθόντος.

<sup>51</sup> Seibt, *Markell*, p. 241.

<sup>52</sup> P 2 (S/V2, K 34). On second-person addresses to the Emperor, see Corcoran, *Empire*, p. 320.



'dogmata of the philosophers' bear witness. But that also 'those things which seemed good to the senate' still, even now, are called 'dogmata of the senate', no one, I think, is ignorant.

P 6 (S/V 17, K 86)

The Senate is Constantine's own proper sphere: Marcellus cannot have referred to it as though Constantine would have no more knowledge of it than anyone else. Marcellus would have had to have made the final phrase at the very least something like 'You, O Most Illustrious Emperor, are not, I think, ignorant that ... ,' unless he wanted to be read as grossly insulting.

Rather, Eusebius' phrase should be taken as referring to a covering letter, which, if Marcellus had a good copy of his work retranscribed for the occasion, would have formed one codex (and hence one σύγγραμμα) with the *Contra Asterium* he was forwarding with it, as I will discuss below. Nor need the second person singular address imply that the work was addressed to only one recipient: Eusebius' *Contra Marcellum* also makes use of the second person singular,<sup>53</sup> despite being clearly addressed to a wide audience. Finally, the broken promise which Seibt thinks was Eusebius' is as likely, in Marcellus' context, to be a promise of Asterius' to demonstrate to his readers that there is nothing problematic about the thought of Eusebius, once properly explained, a promise Marcellus certainly would have thought could never be fulfilled.

Seibt dates the *Contra Asterium* to 335-6, which seems to depend on the notion that it is a reaction to events at Tyre. Others, such as Barnes,<sup>54</sup> have taken the same view, despite Socrates' evidence to the contrary. Their logic seems to be that the Synod of Tyre would have deposed Marcellus if the material to do so already existed, rather than wait for a further synod the following year. Barnes also reads Eusebius' comment on Marcellus' flatteries in the same way Seibt was to do.

---

<sup>53</sup> E.g. at *Contra Marcellum* I. 3.13, σκέψαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν παραθέσεων ὁδὸν τῆς ἀληθείας διήμαρτεν.

<sup>54</sup> T.D. Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 241.

Simonetti, Hanson and Vinzent, however, follow Socrates and Sozomen, whose accounts here can be made good sense of.<sup>55</sup> Socrates, in the passage cited above, has the bishops assembled at Jerusalem call Marcellus to account for his work against Asterius, find him guilty of entertaining the opinions of Paul of Samosata, and demand that he retract them. Marcellus promised to burn his book, he tells us; but before the issue could be resolved, the synod was forced to adjourn by order of the Emperor as a result of Athanasius' appeal in Constantinople. The Eusebians, arrived at Constantinople, turned again to the case of Marcellus; he refused to burn his book as he had promised, and was deposed.

Sozomen begins his account at Constantinople, using as his main source the letter the synod sent reporting the fact of Marcellus' deposition, but adds an alternative assessment from another source, favourable to Marcellus, claiming that the Eusebians had become angered with Marcellus for refusing to consent to the definitions of the Synod of Tyre and the reacceptance of Arius at Jerusalem, and therefore absenting himself from the consecration of the Great Martyrium at Jerusalem, to avoid communicating with Arius. The Eusebians thereupon wrote to the Emperor, charging Marcellus with a personal insult to Constantine, since he had ordered the construction of the new church at Jerusalem.<sup>56</sup>

Both of these stories have the ring of authenticity, and can be reasonably reconciled, with each other and with the evidence of Eusebius of Caesarea. Athanasius gives us further evidence about this reconvening of the synod of Tyre at Jerusalem in the form of a letter from ἡ ἅγια σύνοδος ἡ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις θεοῦ χάριτι συναχθεῖσα to the churches of Alexandria, and throughout Egypt, the Thebaid and Libya, and to bishops, priests and deacons

---

<sup>55</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 131; Hanson, *Seach*, p. 217; Vinzent, *Markell*, p. XVII.

<sup>56</sup> Sozomen, *HE* II.33.

throughout the world.<sup>57</sup> This letter explains that Constantine sent the synod letters demanding that Arius and his friends be received, saying that he had inquired into their orthodoxy and been satisfied, and presenting their confession of faith for the bishops to ratify, which they did. This was presumably intended to be a rubber-stamping operation. Marcellus appears to have prevented this, and forced a debate, presumably on the eve itself of the consecration, but not surprisingly he was unable to carry his point, choosing instead to absent himself from the consecration ceremony rather than be part of the undoing of Nicaea. The appearance of Marcellus' book late on the agenda at Tyre, after he had committed the *faux pas* of refusing to attend the great ceremony at Jerusalem, would make sense: he had given his enemies the rope they needed to hang him. Constantine's letter effectively setting aside the decisions of the synod of Tyre (Socrates, *HE* I.34) would then have arrived early enough to prevent a final decision on Marcellus. A debate had begun, however, and Marcellus could see that he was to be the Eusebians' next target. His promise to burn his book is undoubtedly a pro-Eusebian fabrication: Eusebius of Caesarea makes no mention of any such promise, and Marcellus is extremely unlikely to have made it.

Instead, in a last desperate attempt to outmanoeuvre the Eusebians, Marcellus sent the disputed book to the Emperor with a flattering covering note, presumably recalling the Emperor's mind to the agreed orthodoxy of Nicaea, and defending his writing in that light. The Eusebians' strategy of suggesting to Constantine that Marcellus had personally slighted him was successful, however, and the Emperor turned Marcellus' book over to the Eusebians, including the flattering covering letter of which Eusebius of Caesarea was so scornful, for them to sit in judgement over.

This scenario assumes that Marcellus wrote the *Contra Asterium* exactly when he might have been expected to: soon after the great synod of Nicomedia in

---

<sup>57</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 21.2.

spring 329, when, according to my surmise, Asterius' *Pro Eusebio* was first unleashed on the world.

The request of the synodal letter to the churches *αὐτόθι* (the referent is 'the παροικία of Galatia') to 'seek out the book and destroy it' suggests that Marcellus circulated his work throughout his own province.<sup>58</sup> Whether he disseminated it beyond is unknown, but it seems likely that he did. But it should not surprise us that, even if the Eusebians came to know of its existence in the year 330 or so, they were unable to move against Marcellus for a further five years. Marcellus was a bishop of long standing and a respected figure. He was also metropolitan of his own province, and as far as we can tell supported by most of the neighbouring provinces. In the cases of Eustathius and Athanasius, those who deposed them had matter for deposition (the sexual wrongdoing, or what could be made to look like it, of the one, and the violence of the other), as well as disgruntled local figures who could be counted on to bring or support complaints to the Emperor. There is no evidence that either of these could be found in the case of Marcellus. The charge of 'heresy' with which Marcellus was eventually indicted was only sustained, as we shall see, by the anger of the Emperor, stirred up on entirely different grounds, however sincere the Eusebians were in branding his views as beyond the pale.

Instead, the Eusebians concentrated their fire on Athanasius, who eluded their best efforts to depose him for five years. In the event, the carefully planned engineering of his downfall was to deliver Marcellus, too, into their hands.

### **3. The synod of Tyre.**

By the winter of 331, Athanasius was defending himself before the Emperor on charges of uncanonical election as bishop, extortion, bribery and sacrilege. Having heard both sides of the case, Constantine dismissed the charges. In the

spring of 334, a synod was called at Palestinian Caesarea by Constantine to investigate the same charges against Athanasius of sacrilege (breaking the chalice of Ischyryus), plus charges of murdering Arsenius, bishop of Hypsele. Arsenius, however, was found and produced alive, and the charges dismissed. The followers of Melitius, Colluthus and Arius wrote to Constantine in a body, nevertheless, with new charges of violence and intimidation, and Constantine called the Synod of Tyre, threatening anyone summoned who failed to attend with immediate deposition.<sup>59</sup> The synod, according to Eusebius of Caesarea's account (which may well reflect Constantine's rhetoric here) was to resolve the current ecclesiastical dispute so that all might then worship at the newly built shrine of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem as of one mind and heart.<sup>60</sup> At some point, Constantine also sent letters asking that Arius be received as orthodox at the consecration there.<sup>61</sup>

It should be noted that the Synod of Tyre was intended from the beginning to bring about Marcellus' downfall, as well as Athanasius'.<sup>62</sup> The first point to note is that Marcellus' presence at Tyre would not have been his own choice; Constantine had chosen the list of those who were to attend, who were to be informed of the fact by the imperial agent Dionysius,<sup>63</sup> and Marcellus was as

---

<sup>58</sup> Sozomen, *HE* II.33.1.

<sup>59</sup> For this threat, see Eusebius, *VC* IV.42.4. For the above events in Athanasius' career, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 21-2.

<sup>60</sup> Eusebius, *VC* IV.41.2-3.

<sup>61</sup> These letters are referred to in the synodal letter of the bishops at Jerusalem given in Athanasius, *De Syn* 21.

<sup>62</sup> Klaus M. Girardet, *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht, Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites (313-315) und zum Prozess des Athanasius von Alexandrien* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1975), pp. 66-74 discusses the legal model underlying the proceedings at Tyre. He argues that there is an 'ambivalence' in the process since the bishops present were filling two quite distinct roles at the same time. On the one hand, they were acting as ecclesiastical *iudices* in pronouncing the sentence of excommunication on Athanasius. But on the other hand, they were acting as non-magistrate *consilarii* of a secular *iudex*, in examining the civil or criminal guilt of their colleague on charges such as *iniuriae* or *violentia* (p. 72). 'The *iudex* in this process is Constantine' – not Dionysius, who was there to keep order; 'the bishops are summoned as his *consilium* (pp. 67-8). In arriving at a ψήφισμα urging the exile of Athanasius on the Emperor, Girardet claims, they undoubtedly – from the point of view of earlier synodal ideas – overreached their competence (p. 72). This is, he thinks, a consequence of the idea of the *Reichssynode*, but it remained an anomaly. 'After Tyre, as far as one can see, no *Reichssynode* again delivered a formal ψήφισμα concerning the punishment of a (former) bishop through the organs of justice of the state' (p. 74).

<sup>63</sup> For his career, see *PLRE* I, 'Flavius Dionysius 11', pp. 259-260.

subject to the threat of deposition for non-attendance as anyone else.<sup>64</sup> Marcellus' book is unlikely to have been originally on the agenda: the synod had been called by Constantine to discuss political problems (i.e. the unrest in Alexandria), not theological ones. But Marcellus played into the hands of the Eusebians by taking a stand at Jerusalem against the Emperor's letters in support of Arius, and by refusing to enter into communion with Arius by attending the consecration liturgies there. It was a cleft stick: to have done so would have been to accept the undoing of Nicaea by the Eusebians.

The Eusebians must have arranged for Marcellus to be on Constantine's list in the knowledge, or at least the hope, that he would find himself unable to communicate with Arius, and so would be forced to offend the Emperor by absenting himself from Constantine's planned great occasion. They probably began proceedings against him immediately after his absence from the great liturgy at Jerusalem, presumably as soon as the synod reconvened at Tyre. They need not have had a copy of Marcellus' book to hand to do so. Its contents must have been read and noted long before as deeply inimical to Eusebian theology, and as offering some notable hostages to fortune in the form of several outrageous passages, if fortune should ever leave Marcellus vulnerable enough to have them come to trial.

Six of the leading Eusebians, however, the two Eusebii, Theognis of Nicaea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Ursacius and Valens, had already departed to Constantinople in pursuit of Athanasius, who had fled to the Emperor to appeal against the conduct of the synod's leaders. Their absence must have slowed proceedings somewhat, as well as robbing them of some of their force: before the case of Marcellus had been fully dealt with, if indeed the synod intended to do more than intimidate him at this stage, word came that the Emperor had listened to Athanasius and was effectively disallowing the synod's decrees.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> For Constantine's letter, see Eusebius, *VC* IV.42.3-4. Barnes somewhat harshly calls Marcellus' attendance at the synod 'an error of judgement which rapidly led to his downfall and exile' (Barnes, *Eusebius*, p. 241).

<sup>65</sup> The letter is given in Socrates, *HE* I.34 and Sozomen, *HE* II.28.



It can be clearly demonstrated that Marcellus' invitation to Tyre was a hostile one. We have no full list of bishops who attended the synod of Tyre, but Socrates does give us a number for them – sixty -- and we also have Eusebius' list of the provinces they came from (at least those who then went on to Jerusalem), as well as many references to individuals who attended in various of Athanasius' documents.<sup>66</sup> From these, and from comparison with the episcopal lists of Nicaea and of the Eastern synod of Sardica, we can name a third of the bishops at Tyre with certainty, and assign provinces to the rest with some confidence.<sup>67</sup> Eusebius tries to make out that Tyre was a second, and greater, Nicaea (calling it 'the greatest [synod] of those we know'<sup>68</sup>), but it is clear from the list of provinces that it was basically a synod of the diocese of Oriens, with about twenty bishops from the Egyptian diocese (mainly Arian supporters and Melitians) and a few others present as special advisors: no bishops from Asia Minor are mentioned at all except for those of Cilicia (itself belonging to the Diocese of Oriens), Cappadocia and Bithynia (Galatia is not included in Eusebius' list, since Marcellus did not attend the consecration at Jerusalem). The bishops of Oriens came in number (Eusebius speaks of 'All Syria and Mesopotamia' being present, which could have been as many as twelve, from the representation at Eastern Sardica, and the comprehensiveness of the adjective may extend to the other provinces of the Oriens); those from the other provinces Eusebius mentions were hand-picked, undoubtedly by the Eusebians (as Constantine's letter makes clear).<sup>69</sup> The 'fair blossoms of God's younger generation' sent by the Pannonians and Moesians are Ursacius and Valens, and there is no reason to imagine they were sent as representatives by their provinces at all, merely that they were chosen by Eusebius of Nicomedia as being already staunch supporters of his party. The 'metropolitan of Macedonia'

---

<sup>66</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.28.2; Eusebius, *VC* IV.43.2-4. Eusebius' habitual careful accuracy in his lists of provinces represented at episcopal synods can be seen by comparing his list of the bishops at Nicaea (*VC* III.7.1-2) with the established lists (H. Gelzer et al., *Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1898), pp. LX- LXIV, allowing for his following the Lukan appellations of the provinces of Asia Minor, cf. Acts 2:9-11).

<sup>67</sup> See Table 2 at the end of this chapter..

<sup>68</sup> Eusebius, *VC* IV.47.

<sup>69</sup> Eusebius, *VC* IV.42.3.

is a more interesting case: Alexander of Thessalonica had attended Nicaea and signed against Arius. (He was probably not the recipient of *He philarchos* and the synodal letter of Antioch 325, as Opitz suggests;<sup>70</sup> Alexander of Byzantium is a much better candidate.) Athanasius tells us both that the Eusebians counted him as one of their own, and that he wrote to the *comes* Dionysius at Tyre to defend Athanasius against what he saw as dubious in the unfolding of judicial proceedings there.<sup>71</sup> From 'Thrace' (the diocese rather than the province, in Eusebius' usage)<sup>72</sup> came Theodore of Heraclea, who was chosen, with Ursacius, Valens, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicaea and Macedonius of Mopsuestia, for the investigative commission to the Mareotis to examine the story of the smashing of Ischyryus' chalice. The Bithynians, who were presumably present as court bishops or special advisors, consisted of Eusebius of Nicomedia himself, Theognis of Nicaea and Maris of Chalcedon. The Cappadocians might have included Pancratius of Parnassus, who attended Sardica, and presumably Dianius of Caesarea, as well as the layman Asterius, who would not have been included in the bishop-count, but could be the figure Eusebius means when he says 'the leading Cappadocians also excelled among the rest for their scholarly learning'.

Athanasius may sound hysterical when he says, in the *Apology Against the Arians*, 'What kind of a Council of bishops was then held? Was it an assembly which aimed at truth? Who of the majority among them was not our enemy?',<sup>73</sup> but he is absolutely right, on the evidence of who actually attended it. The three bishops from Bithynia, the two (if it was two bishops) from Cappadocia, and Marcellus, metropolitan of Galatia, can in no way be considered representative of Asia Minor: the whole of the Asiana Diocese was unrepresented (even, apparently, by the Eusebian Menophantus of Ephesus), as was most of Pontica (the provinces of Honorias, Paphlagonia, Diospontus, Pontus Polemoniacus and Armenia), and even the province of Isauria, which belonged to the Diocese of

---

<sup>70</sup> Opitz, 'Zeitfolge', p. 150.

<sup>71</sup> Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar* 16; 80

<sup>72</sup> Eusebius, *VC* III.7.1, cf. Gelzer, *PNN* end map.

<sup>73</sup> Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar* 8.2

Oriens. The natural support of Marcellus and the Nicene formula (and hence, presumably, Athanasius) in Central Anatolia was excluded. Marcellus himself, however, who could easily have been excluded also, was summoned. This was a risk on the part of the Eusebians: as a probable vote, and potentially a powerful speaker, for Athanasius, Marcellus was a dangerous presence. His invitation must therefore have been arranged with a view to injuring him in some way (even if not yet by a charge of heresy), or at least humiliating him by forcing him to enter once more into communion with Arius.

Once the six who had set out in pursuit of Athanasius arrived in Constantinople, they were swiftly successful in having Athanasius banished on a new charge, that of treasonously threatening to prevent the Alexandrian grainships sailing to Constantinople. Athanasius departed into exile on 7 November 335.<sup>74</sup> Constantine himself may have spent most of the following spring campaigning on the Danube;<sup>75</sup> the next synod, however, this time summoned directly against Marcellus, he attended himself.

#### **4. The synod of Constantinople.**

Whatever Marcellus had thought of Athanasius prior to the synod of Tyre, whether or not they had been friends or even acquaintances, whether or not the *Contra Asterium* was in some sense meant as a blow on behalf of the beleaguered young bishop of Alexandria as well as the disgraced former bishop of Antioch, the bishop of Ancyra would have known after the synod of Tyre and the banishing of Athanasius that his turn was undoubtedly next. He made one last move to prevent his own downfall, as Athanasius had done: he appealed to the Emperor, sending him the disputed *Contra Asterium* with an eloquent covering letter.

---

<sup>74</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 24.

<sup>75</sup> Barnes, *New Empire*, p.80.

It is unlikely that, had Marcellus not done so, he would never have been deposed.<sup>76</sup> Socrates' account shows that the Eusebians were already onto Marcellus at the synod of Tyre, once they knew they had leverage with Constantine against him. His deposition was only a matter of time. With Athanasius gone, there were now only two prominent anti-Eusebians left to deal with: Alexander of Byzantium, now Constantinople, and Marcellus. The Eusebians immediately moved on both of them.<sup>77</sup>

The occasion to do so was the celebration of Constantine's tricennalia, which may well have been the occasion of his first return to Constantinople after a campaign on the Danube. Marcellus' letter to him had no effect whatever: he may not even have read it. Instead, he handed the work over to the Eusebians to be tried for heresy, but mindful no doubt of the débâcle of Tyre, he resolved to be present at the trial himself.<sup>78</sup>

Barnes fixed the date of the synod which deposed Marcellus as July 336, shortly before the celebrations on the 24th,<sup>79</sup> and this still remains the most plausible date for a number of reasons, despite the fact that Seibt and Vinzent have both since argued for 337.<sup>80</sup> It is likely that the Eusebians would have moved as quickly as possible after his non-appearance at Jerusalem to have Marcellus condemned, otherwise Constantine's wrath might have evaporated. The violence which greeted Marcellus' return in the amnesty of 337 suggests that Basil, Marcellus' successor, had had time to establish himself as a presence in the see. The Eusebians' attempted move against Alexander of Constantinople required the same tactics -- the cleft stick of acceptance of Arius or deposition -- which had worked successfully against Marcellus, but those tactics would be

---

<sup>76</sup> In Barnes' *Athanasius*, p. 56, it is Marcellus' presenting of the *Contra Marcellum* to Constantine that is his great mistake, but this view depends on the work's having been originally written for Constantine and not already known otherwise.

<sup>77</sup> Alexander of Constantinople may also have been one of the targets of Tyre; if so, he managed to escape its trap by sending his presbyter Paul instead, presumably with the express permission of Constantine.

<sup>78</sup> Hilary, *Fr Hist A* .IV.1.3.1 (Feder p. 50.19-21).

<sup>79</sup> T.D. Barnes, 'Emperor and Bishops, AD 324-344: Some Problems', *AJAH* 3 (1978), pp. 53-75, at pp. 64-5.

<sup>80</sup> Seibt, *Markell*, p. 243; Vinzent, *Markell*, p. XVIII

more effective if Marcellus had already been made an example of. Seibt and Vinzent both believe that the *Contra Marcellum* was published after Constantine's death, which must then have occurred shortly after his deposition, but Barnes also believes this,<sup>81</sup> and thinks the ten months which elapsed between the trial and Constantine's death do not preclude other bishops' wanting documentation on Marcellus' heretical teachings after that period, particularly since Marcellus then returned from exile and his teaching might be considered more of a threat.

It is likely that, just as the gathering of bishops for the consecration of the new basilica at Jerusalem in September 335 was called, doubtless on the advice of Eusebius of Nicomedia, as an occasion when the bishops of Oriens and those of Egypt should meet together in communion as one, necessitating a settling of their differences, the tricennalia celebrations in July 336 called for a similar display of unity among the bishops of Asia Minor, Thrace, and the regions beyond. This would be the reason why none of the Eusebians from Oriens and Egypt other than himself are attested by Eusebius as being present at the synod which deposed Marcellus: the bishops of these provinces were not invited to the tricennalia festivities, having already taken part in one show of support for Constantine at Jerusalem, and being unnecessary to the Eusebians' plans. It would also be the reason for the apparent duplication of Arius' readmission to communion, this time in Constantinople. In fact, Arius might have been much more incidental to these proceedings, at least to outward appearance. His mere presence would have been enough to produce a crisis of conscience for a supporter of Nicaea, who would have to see communicating with him (i.e. communicating at an assembly at which he was present) as a betrayal and a turning back on all Nicaea stood for. A second liturgical gathering with mandatory attendance, at which Arius once again happened to be present, would be Eusebius' chance to make the other half of the Eastern bishops, those of Thrace, Dacia and Asia Minor, accept Arius or be deposed: and principally, Alexander of Constantinople.

---

<sup>81</sup> Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 263.

It would also provide a jury for the Marcellus trial. Once again, it appears that the bishops attending this were hand-picked, and invited to come well prior to the Tricennalia celebrations, before the arrival of the main body of bishops, who included Marcellus' main supporters. Eusebius, once again, gives us a good idea which bishops did attend the trial, and once again, they exclude Marcellus' natural supporters.

Eusebius tells us that 'they came together as a holy synod in the basilica from the different provinces of Pontus and Cappadocia, Asia and Phrygia and Bithynia, Thrace and the parts beyond to condemn the man because of his writing'.<sup>82</sup> This list is interesting for several reasons. Eusebius consistently uses the older division of the provinces of Asia Minor in use in the mid-late third century: Bithynia, Pontus and Galatia, Cappadocia and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia.<sup>83</sup> In his list of those provinces represented at the synod of Constantinople which condemned Marcellus, two of these are conspicuously missing: Pamphylia and Galatia, the two provinces which, together with Isauria (not represented either, presumably being classed with Cilicia as part of the Oriens), made up most of central Asia Minor. These provinces had been abundantly represented at Nicaea (forty bishops signed from these regions under their more modern divisions), as well as at the synod of Ancyra of 314 (more than a third of the bishops there). Bishops from these same provinces would also write in support of Athanasius and likely also Marcellus before the Synod of Sardica.

His use of the older, larger provincial names allows Eusebius to present the bishops of the Constantinople synod as widely representative, but they need not, in fact, have been more than the usual Eusebian gang, who had mostly been present at Tyre and would be present again at Eastern Sardica seven years later. From Cappadocia would doubtless have come Dianius of Caesarea, and

---

<sup>82</sup> Eusebius, *C Mar* II.4.29.

<sup>83</sup> Eusebius, *VC* II.7.1.



possibly also Pancratius of Parnassus (and doubtless Asterius). From Asia the likely representative is its metropolitan Menophantus of Ephesus, who had attended Nicaea and would also attend Eastern Sardica; there were four other 'Asian' bishops (in Eusebius of Caesarea's parlance) at Eastern Sardica who might also have attended this synod, Eusebius of Pergamum, Eusebius of Magnesia, Leucadas of Illium and Niconias of Troas. From Bithynia were surely present once again Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea and Maris of Chalcedon. From Thrace would have come Theodore of Heraclea (assuming by 'Thrace' Eusebius here again means the diocese rather than merely the province), and from 'the parts beyond' it, presumably Ursacius and Valens from Singidunum in Moesia and Mursa in Pannonia. Protogenes of Sardica and Cyriacus of Naissus, both in Dacia, who are described by the Easterners' Letter from Sardica as having subscribed a list condemning various unacceptable propositions of Marcellus, were presumably present also; ill-informed about the history of the controversy, they would have taken the proceedings at face value.<sup>84</sup>

There are no 'famous names' from the Eusebian side from Pontus or Phrygia at this period, but Amaseia and probably Zela had been Eusebian-supporting sees around the time of Nicaea and before: Basil of Amaseia, who attended the 314 synods of Ancyra and Caesarea, is mentioned by Philostorgius as 'Arian-minded',<sup>85</sup> and his suffragan Heraclius of Zela, who attended both synods also, as well as Nicaea, may have been similarly inclined. At Sardica there are bishops from both sees attending the Eastern synod. Phrygia is less clearly linked with the Eusebian side; the metropolitan of the province was not present at Sardica, which was represented only by Antonius of Docimeum and Eusebius of Doryleum, who may well also have been the representatives Eusebius refers to here. All in all, the deposition of Marcellus is quite likely to have achieved by about twenty bishops, who certainly did not exclude those from his own province or most of those adjoining it.

---

<sup>84</sup> Hilary, *FH* A IV.1.3.4 (Feder p. 51.15-25).

<sup>85</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* 1.8, 1.8a (p. 9.4-5 and 19).

Eusebius of Caesarea had been asked, as he tells us himself, to prepare a case against Marcellus.<sup>86</sup> Markus Vinzent has recognised that Eusebius' *Contra Marcellum* represents precisely this 'expert witness'.<sup>87</sup> It has all the immediacy of a case against someone who still has to be treated with caution: Eusebius largely restricts himself to citing Marcellus' own words, adding a minimum of gratuitous abuse, in contrast to his *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, which flings around accusations of Sabellianism in the comfortable knowledge that he is no longer required even to seem to be fair. Eusebius added an epilogue (*CM* II.4.29-31) to the speech he had given at the trial, briefly describing Marcellus' condemnation, and published it. Ironically, Marcellus owes whatever chance he has of being vindicated by modern scholars of the opinions he was deposed by this synod for holding to Eusebius' meticulous working over of the text of the *Contra Asterium*, which uses all the skills of documentation and classification, the categorisation of a text into short passages and the arranging of them under broad headings for easy reference, and above all, the citing of them at great length, which he had developed in writing the *Demonstratio Evangelica* and inventing the first ecclesiastical history.

Eusebius attacked the *Contra Asterium* on four grounds: it misquoted and misunderstood various passages of Scripture; it maliciously and unfairly attacked various bishops, including the saintly Paulinus of Tyre; it emptied the Son of separate existence, by insisting on calling him only Logos before the Incarnation, and making the Logos a mere faculty of God without a separate subsistence; and it devalued the incarnate Son also, by assuming a time after the Last Judgement when the Logos would not need the flesh any more, and would abandon it.<sup>88</sup> These last two charges, which came to be those the Eusebians/Acacians would continually return to, were later characterised as deriving from the theologies of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata respectively,

---

<sup>86</sup> Eusebius, *C Mar* II.4.29.

<sup>87</sup> Vinzent, *Markell*, p. XIX.

<sup>88</sup> Eusebius, *C Mar* I.2; I.4; II.2; II.3-4.

with Montanus (who was also accused of modalism, even less plausibly than Marcellus) sometimes added for good measure.<sup>89</sup>

Although Marcellus' views were to be enshrined in subsequent literature as ridiculous caricatures of his original thoughts, Eusebius certainly identified parts of Marcellus' theological thinking that were problematic, as Marcellus himself, probably with the help of Athanasius, was to come to realise. It is difficult to judge on the information we have how fair Marcellus' trial actually was. That those who attended it were carefully chosen to exclude Marcellus' natural supporters seems clear from the information Eusebius and Sozomen give us.<sup>90</sup> That Eusebius was attacking Marcellus' one-hypostasis theology from the perspective of a 'two Gods' theology which was equally problematic, and had itself been previously judged heretical (at Antioch 325), is even clearer. But it is not impossible that Marcellus was given some chance to put his own case, and was unable or unwilling at this stage to modify even the most problematic elements of his book. The fact that it would have been luminously clear to him that the motivation for his deposition was itself malicious, part of a long line of such depositions of the Eusebian opponents, is hardly likely either to have improved his temper or to have increased his ability to persuade an audience known to be largely hostile of his innocence. But it is quite possible that neutral observers such as (presumably) Protogenes of Sardica and Cyriacus of Naissus were perfectly persuaded, at the time, that justice had been done.

The synod of Constantinople appears to have produced a list of condemned statements of Marcellus', according to the letter of the Easterners at Sardica.<sup>91</sup> The one which was to stick, and even to be enshrined in the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan creed, was a statement which Marcellus himself never made as such: that Christ's kingdom would have an end. What Marcellus did say, though perhaps, as he was later to argue, only speculatively, was that the Logos

---

<sup>89</sup> E.g. Hilary, *FH A IV.1.2.4* 9Feder p. 50.10-17).

<sup>90</sup> See discussion above. Sozomen's account of the synod's letter to the local Galatian churches also shows they were not represented at the synod itself.

<sup>91</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV.1.3.4* (Feder p. 51.11-16); Sozomen, *HE II.33.2*.

would be separated from the man Jesus, who, he hinted, might nevertheless continue to exist, now separately from the Logos.<sup>92</sup> Marcellus certainly hedged this proposition with caveats, but he could be argued at this point to be the only true Nestorian of the ancient world.

With Eustathius, Ossius, Alexander of Alexandria, Macarius of Jerusalem, Athanasius and Marcellus all either dead or disposed of, the final anti-Eusebian with a major position in the East left in place was Alexander of Constantinople. If I am right in my interpretation of the circumstances that led Alexander to be forced into a choice between communicating with Arius and deposition, Eusebius of Nicomedia was trying a repeat of the tactics which had worked so well at Jerusalem: Constantine's tricennalia celebrations were to be the occasion for another great show of episcopal unity and solidarity with the emperor, absence from which would once again provoke immediate repercussions. This may have been a less formal threat than at Tyre and Jerusalem, despite the starkness of the choice Alexander faces in Socrates' and Sozomen's accounts -- the story ultimately derives only from Athanasius, who knows how to heighten the drama.<sup>93</sup> But the Eusebians' *modus operandi* was clear enough, and there is nothing surprising in Alexander's fear of deposition if he absented himself from liturgies of major political significance in his own see, or refused to communicate because Arius would also be communicating.

For once, luck returned to the anti-Eusebians. The day before the tricennalia celebrations were due to begin,<sup>94</sup> Arius died a sudden and shameful death

---

<sup>92</sup> See P 123 (S/V 104, K 116); P 125 (S 105, V 106, K117); P 128 (S/V 109, K 121).

<sup>93</sup> Athanasius, *De Morte Arii* was written to show that Arius was never received back into communion. Hanson, *Search*, p.265, following Opitz, dismisses the account as largely fictional; Williams (*Arius*, p. 81) allows Arius' death may have been 'embarrassingly sudden', but doubts whether it occurred in quite the manner or with the timing Athanasius suggests. If it is assumed that Athanasius is deliberately playing up this story to distract attention from the fact that Arius was received into communion by a good many bishops long before this event, however, it need not be seen as so inherently implausible -- the venue in question is not an unusual one for a sudden death, and the constant battle for acceptance, including public rejection by high-profile bishops such as Alexander, who could no doubt count on mob support for his views, must have been extremely stressful for Arius.

<sup>94</sup> Athanasius, *De Morte Arii* 2-3. July 24<sup>th</sup> 336, the day before Constantine's celebrations began (Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 253), was indeed a Saturday, as Athanasius' account claims.

(expiring in a public lavatory, quite possibly of a heart attack), which carried overtones of divine disfavour, and definitively excused Alexander from having to communicate with him. Constantine was clearly not so unnerved by this circumstance as to make any change in his ecclesiastical policy (Athanasius stayed in exile, as did Marcellus), but it definitively put an end to the device of using communion with Arius as a shibboleth for the anti-Eusebians, giving them a choice between a humiliating acceptance of the Bithynian modification of Nicaea or deposition. The dead Arius now moved from being a weapon in the hands of the Eusebians to being a weapon in the hands of their opponents, and one which they used so successfully as to damn the Eusebians for most of history by association with him.

## **5. Conclusion**

The decade of 328-338 saw a complete reversal of fortunes for the Eusebians and their enemies. Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends returned to an influence they were never to lose in his lifetime. For whatever reason, whether through fear, charisma, powerful connections, ancient camaraderie or sheer force of personality, Eusebius of Nicomedia was extraordinarily successful at mobilising and uniting his friends, as well as marginalising and discrediting his enemies. The theology of the Eusebians may not have been uniform, but their theological positions had more in common than those of their enemies. Above all, they were successful in exploiting their strongholds in Western Anatolia and the diocese of Oriens in a pincer movement against Central Asia Minor, joining also with dissident elements in Egypt to keep up the pressure there.

The anti-Eusebian party suffered from not being a party at all in the same sense as the Eusebians: the original coalition leaders, Alexander, Eustathius and Ossius, quickly disappeared, leaving two oases of anti-Eusebianism in Egypt and Central Anatolia, considerably isolated from one another both in geography and in theological tradition. Athanasius was successful in mobilising support in

Egypt, although not, at this stage, successful enough to combat the Eusebian party machinery; we have little record of what political moves Marcellus made at this period. His main attack was theological. For a man who could successfully gather together the leaders of all Anatolia two decades earlier, Marcellus seems oddly at this period to have been politically though not theologically caught on the back foot. The height of his political achievement in this decade is his lone stand at Jerusalem: his refusal to condemn Athanasius, and his refusal to turn his back on Nicaea and accept Arius back into communion, even at the Emperor's behest, and even at the cost of his own see.

Part of the reason for the inability of the anti-Eusebian party to resist the manoeuvres of their opponents is that there were no ecclesiastical rules governing the deposition of metropolitan bishops: the Eusebians were therefore able to make them up as they went. There was no legal precedent for the removal of a metropolitan other than the case of Paul of Samosata, who was ultimately evicted only with the help of the emperor Aurelian and the agreement of the bishop of Rome. In practice, therefore, it is impossible to say who should have constituted the original court hearing the charges against Athanasius and Marcellus, far less who might constitute an appeal court. The sharp practice of the Eusebians is easy to establish; what rules they were breaking much more difficult.

The *Contra Asterium* is a monumental work on the intellectual plane, though not without its hostages to fortune, but it is also full of the angry bitterness of one who knows his side's victory is inexplicably slipping away. In the years between its publication and the Synod of Tyre, Marcellus seems to have given up the struggle, perhaps because he was older and more tired than Athanasius—he would have been over fifty at the time of his deposition, and is described as an 'old man' at this point by both Athanasius and Eusebius (who was older than he was). But his deposition galvanised him to some extent, together, perhaps, with his deeper acquaintance with Athanasius. His theology, as old-fashioned in its way as Eusebius of Caesarea's, was due to receive a challenge from someone



whose views he could not dismiss. Meanwhile, he once more took up the fight to bring the Eusebians their comeuppance, or at least to subject both their theology and their politics to the censure of a wider world.

**Table 1: The Bishops at Antioch 329<sup>95</sup>**

(*ital.* = known Eusebian supporters)

**Palestine** (19 at Nicaea):

*Eusebius of Caesarea*  
Antiochus of Capitolias  
Maximus of Eleutheropolis  
Peter of Aila  
*Patrophilus of Scythopolis (for*  
*Patricius?)*  
*Aetius of Lydda (for Aetherius?)*

**Syria** (22 at Nicaea):

Siricius of Cyrus  
Archelaus of Doliche  
Eustathius of Arethusa  
Manichaeus of Epiphaneia  
Peter of Gindarus  
Bassus of Zeugma  
*Theodotus of Laodicea*  
*Alphaeus of Apameia*

**Arabia** (6 at Nicaea)

Cirion of Philadelphia

**Mesopotamia** (5 at Nicaea)

James of Nisibius

**Cilicia** (10 at Nicaea)

Hesychius of Alexandria minor  
*Macedonius of Mopsuestia*  
Tarcondimantus of Aegeae  
Nicetas of Flavia  
Moses of Castabala  
Theodore of Tarsus  
*Narcissus of Neronias/Irenopolis*  
Paulinus of Adana  
*Amphion of Epiphaneia*

**Isauria** (17 at Nicaea)

Agapius of Seleucia

**Phoenicia** (10 at Nicaea)

Anatolius of Emesa  
Thadonius of Alassus  
Magnus of Damascus  
Aeneas of Ptolomais  
Theodore of Sidon

**plus 2 unidentified**

(Alexander & Agapius 2)

---

<sup>95</sup> The names are given in Turner, *EOMIA* II,2, pp. 231, 312-315; the provinces they represent are given on p. 231. The individual sees can be supplied from comparison of the names with those from the same provinces who attended Nicaea, with a very high degree of correspondence.

**Table 2: The Bishops at Tyre 335**<sup>96</sup>

(**Bold**=known by name as present, *ital.*=Mareotis commission, underline=group who pursued Athanasius to Constantinople)

**Pannonia:** *Valens of Myrsa*

**Moesia:** *Ursacius of Singidunum*

**Macedonia:** Alexander of Thessalonica

**Thrace (diocese of):** *Theodore of Heraclea*

**Bithynia:** Eusebius of Nicomedia, *Theognis of Nicaea*, *Maris of Chalcedon*

**Galatia:** Marcellus of Ancyra

**Cappadocia:** Dianius of Caesarea plus at least one (Pancratius of Parnassus?)

**Persia:** one 'man very learned in the divine oracles'

**Cilicia:** *Macedonius of Mopuestia*, **Narcissus of Neronias** and possibly others, including the current bishop of Tarsus (Theodore?) (5 attended at Sardica)

**Syria:** **Flacillus of Antioch** plus up to eleven others (Eusebius says 'All Syria', and 12 attended at Sardica)

**Mesopotamia:** up to five (five attended at Nicaea, none at Sardica, but Eusebius' 'all' seems to include this province as well as Syria)

**Phoenicia:** Paul? of Tyre plus others (two attended Sardica, but this was on the spot)

**Arabia:** Antonius of Bosra? (the sole Arabian at Sardica)

**Palestine:** Eusebius of Caesarea, Maximus of Jerusalem, Patrophilus of Scythopolis

**Egypt:** **Athanasius of Alexandria**, **Callinicus of Pelusium (Melitian)**, **Euplus**, **Pachomius**, **Isaac**, **Achilleus** and **Hermaeon (Melitian bishops)**, an unknown number of Egyptian bishops accompanying Athanasius

**Libya:** probably Secundus and other pro-Arius bishops

**Thebaid:** at least one bishop (two attended Sardica)

---

<sup>96</sup> Known names are supplied from Athanasius' works; provinces are from Eusebius, *VC* IV.43.

## CHAPTER FOUR

# From the Exiles' Return to the Dedication Synod of Antioch

### 1. The Exiles' Return.

#### a. Marcellus' exile.

It is possible to establish something of a pattern in the places to which Constantine exiled ecclesiastical transgressors of the East. He seems to have had two policies: the most important figures, the ones who had the most capacity to make political trouble, were exiled to Trier, Constantine's former capital, where their correspondence with their home-bases would be considerably slowed, and where the large imperial machinery could keep an eye on them. Athanasius' exile certainly comes into this category, and as we have seen, so probably did that of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis: they were exiled to Gaul, and 'as far away as possible', a combination which would certainly fit Trier.<sup>1</sup>

Figures deemed to be less problematic, such as Arius, Eudoxius and Eustathius, were exiled to 'Illyricum', which in the usage of Theodoret and Philostorgius, the two historians who provide this information, means not the west coast of Macedonia but the diocese, sometimes the prefecture, of Illyricum.<sup>2</sup> (Jerome's claim in *De Viris Illustribus* that the place of exile of Eustathius was Traianopolis in the diocese of Thrace, where he was still living in 394, may

---

<sup>1</sup> See chapter 3.

<sup>2</sup> Arius' exile: Philostorgius, *HE* I.9c (p. 11, line 15); Eustathius' exile: Theodoret, *HE* I.22.1. The diocese of Illyricum: Philostorgius, *HE* XII.13 (p. 149,7); *Cod. Angelicus* a (p.179,11); 3.24 (p. 50,17); XII.2 (141,2). The prefecture of Illyricum: Theodoret, *HE* II.4.6; V.23.10; V.17.1; V.34.10; Philostorgius, *HE* III.1a (p. 29,16); III.5a (p. 73,10); IX.8 (p. 119,8). Either diocese or prefecture (but not the west coast of Macedonia): Theodoret, *HE* I.22.1; IV.7.6; IV.8.1; IV.9.1; II.22.1; II.22.2; V.14.1; Philostorgius, *HE* IV.3a (p. 59,25); VI.6a (p. 74, 17); IX.3 (p. 116.11); I.9c (p. 11.15), V.1 (p. 66.7); III.5a (p. 73.11).

safely be ignored.)<sup>3</sup> Theodoret tells us that Eustathius was ‘conveyed through [the diocese of] Thrace to an Illyrian city’.<sup>4</sup> Several candidates for this city present themselves: the most likely are Sardica (one of Constantine’s capitals before 324 and a city which was just over the border from Thrace into the next prefecture), Naissus (a strategically important city which may have been Licinius’ capital at one point and was to be Dalmatius’ capital in 335 and Constans’ in 337), and Sirmium (an imperial capital since the time of Diocletian and a city specifically called ‘of the Illyrians’ by Philostorgius).<sup>5</sup> Arius and Eudoxius were also probably sent to one of these (which would have had the same advantage as Trier of being a centre of imperial agents ready to report on any untoward activities), though not necessarily the same one. Sirmium would be an attractive city for us to place them in, situated as it is between Singidunum and Mursa, whose bishops Ursacius and Valens became such firm converts, theologically as well as politically, to the Eusebian party.

It seems likely that Illyricum, and one of these three cities in particular, was the destination for Marcellus also. There are several reasons for thinking so. As we shall see, the Western synod of Sardica in 343 was heavily influenced by Marcellus.<sup>6</sup> Now, the so-called Western synod was in fact largely composed of bishops from the dioceses of Macedonia, Dacia and Illyricum: 35 of the 56 bishops other than Athanasius, Marcellus and Asclepas whose signatures we possess, over sixty per cent, were from these areas or the nearby province of Thracia.<sup>7</sup> We will see also that Marcellus probably went and campaigned in these areas after the abortive synod of Rome in March 341.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, Sirmium, the metropolis of Pannonia, at some point (possibly after the synod of Sardica, since he is not listed as being present there) chose Photinus,

---

<sup>3</sup> Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* 85.

<sup>4</sup> Theodoret, *HE* 1.22.1.

<sup>5</sup> For these three cities as imperial residences used at some point by Constantine, see Barnes, *New Empire*, pp. 49, 69, 74, 80, 86-87.

<sup>6</sup> See chapter 5.

<sup>7</sup> See the list of bishops at the Eastern synod of Sardica given in Hilary, *FH B II* 4 (Feder pp. 132-139).

<sup>8</sup> See chapter 5.

Marcellus' pupil and former deacon, as its bishop, in the teeth of what must have been considerable opposition from Valens of Mursa in the same province and Ursacius of Singidum in Moesia, a mere forty miles east. Valens may have attempted to move to another see (Aquilea) on the strength of this.<sup>9</sup> Marcellus was condemned at some point (perhaps, at the request of Constantine, when he first arrived in the diocese) by the bishops of both Sardica and Naissus (Protogenes and Cyriacus, the former allegedly four times), although they subsequently both supported him, Protogenes quite strongly, at the Sardican synod.<sup>10</sup> Any one of these three cities could well therefore have played host to him in 336-7.

If Marcellus did sow the seeds of his later ringing endorsement by the bishops of the prefecture of Illyricum while in exile there from July 336 until June or July 337, he at least equalled the feats of Athanasius in attracting in his year and a half in Trier the support of its bishop, Maximinus, and the young Caesar Constantine II, who had been stationed in that city since 328.<sup>11</sup> These contacts and the support of these regions were to stand Marcellus and Athanasius in good stead for years to come.

#### **b. The decree of return.**

Constantine died on 17<sup>th</sup> May 337, leaving three sons under twenty-one and a nephew to succeed him. These four had been appointed to the rank of Caesar during Constantine's lifetime, and on the appointment in 335 of Dalmatius, the last of the four to be named, the empire's territories had been notionally divided between them, although Constantine himself still held the reins of power.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Hilary, *FH B II* 2.4.1 (Feder p. 129.7-15).

<sup>10</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.3.4 (Feder p. 51.11-25).

<sup>11</sup> Barnes, *New Empire*, p. 84

<sup>12</sup> Barnes, *Constantine*, pp. 251-252



It is likely that Constantine, having imprudently executed his only adult son eight years earlier, was by this means attempting to provide the stablest possible succession, at least until his remaining sons were old enough to have had some experience of government. Dalmatius' age is not known, but it is likely that he was ten to twenty years older than his cousins, and that this was the reason for his appointment.<sup>13</sup> It may have been understood by Constantine's close advisors that Dalmatius was to be quietly disposed of when Constantine's sons reached a more suitable age for government.

The Caesars were also to be aided by Praetorian Prefects. Barnes has argued, on the basis of a North African inscription, that there were five of these according to the 335 settlement, besides Evagrius, Constantine's own praetorian prefect: one over each of the four Caesars, with one additional prefect for the diocese of Africa.<sup>14</sup> Constantius' was one Flavius Ablabius.<sup>15</sup>

Ablabius may well be the key to one of the many puzzles of the Arian controversy: why Marcellus and the other exiles were allowed to return to Constantius' territory after the death of Constantine, when Constantius so quickly afterwards sanctioned their further banishment. Athanasius claims (*Hist. Ar.* 8.1) that 'the three brothers, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans, caused us all after the death of their father to return to our own country and church', but the letter he gives is a private letter from Constantine II to the church in Alexandria, whose arguments have force only in his own case: Athanasius was exiled to Trier (in Constantine's territory) for his own safety, and Constantine II is fulfilling his father's wishes in returning him to Alexandria. More than one modern commentator has doubted whether Constantius, at least, had any part in ordering the return of the bishops exiled by his father;<sup>16</sup> Barnes concludes that Athanasius won Constantine II's friendship

---

<sup>13</sup> *PLRE*, I, 241, 'Fl. Iulius Dalmatius 7'. He was the son of the eldest of Constantine's half-brothers. His assignation to the portion of the empire which bordered the Sarmatians shows that he was thought to be a safe pair of hands for a potentially troublesome region.

<sup>14</sup> Barnes, *New Empire*, pp. 134-136; *AE* 1925.72 = *ILT* 814.

<sup>15</sup> *PLRE* I, 3-4, 'Fl. Ablabius 4'.

<sup>16</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, pp. 137-8; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 34.

and support for his return, and trusted himself to conciliate Constantius on his journey East before he actually entered the latter's territory.<sup>17</sup> But this leaves a problem: as I have already argued, we have no reason to assume that Marcellus or the other exiles were in Constantine's territory (Britain, the Gauls and the Spains), which was as far removed as it could be from Constantius', but rather good reason to think that Marcellus was in what was then either Dalmatius' territory or Constans'. Moreover, even if Athanasius thought he could count on talking Constantius round after the fact, Marcellus and Asclepas are unlikely to have been able to count on doing the same.

Simonetti makes a virtue of this fact, and claims that the violence caused by the returns of all the exiles other than Athanasius was due to their having no official leave to repossess their sees.<sup>18</sup> This is impossible, however: they would never have achieved repossession of their churches at all with no official mandate, and would have been extremely unwise to try.

If Ablabius' name were on the original document licensing the exiles' return, however, as the addressee of a rescript, perhaps, Athanasius would have been unable to cite it, since Ablabius had been executed for treason the following year. The same would apply to any letter which Ablabius had sent to the churches in Alexandria. Now, Ablabius is mentioned in Athanasius' Festal Letter 4 (for 332) as 'Ablabius, who fears God in truth', and as helping Athanasius send the letter from court, where he has just been acquitted after being tried on various charges, including that of breaking Ischyrus' chalice.<sup>19</sup> Ablabius was prepared, in other words, to take the risk of being openly friendly with a man who had powerful enemies at court, a risk which must reflect some friendship, kinship or shared theological position with Athanasius or one of his close supporters, or at the very least, shared enemies. He seems the likeliest candidate for the missing pro-Nicene link at Constantius' court in the early summer of 337, whose influence lasted just long enough to see the exiles safely

---

<sup>17</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 34.

<sup>18</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 138.

home, before he was dismissed by Constantius as a prelude to being executed the following year.

Dalmatius, Constantius and Constans may have spent some of June and July campaigning together against the Sarmatians, in an attempt to win Constantine's younger sons their Victory titles (Constantine II was already *Alamannicus*), during which period Athanasius met at least Constantius, and conceivably one or both of the others, in Viminacium.<sup>20</sup> Dalmatius was killed, possibly in the context of this campaign (although certainly by pre-arrangement), some time between August 2<sup>nd</sup> and September 9<sup>th</sup>, and his territory divided between Constans and Constantius. One probable victim of this territorial re-adjustment was Paul, newly elected bishop of Constantinople shortly after Constantine's death.<sup>21</sup> Paul's election must have been accepted by Dalmatius; Athanasius is unlikely to have passed through Constantinople, where he saw Paul, as late as the 9<sup>th</sup> of September.<sup>22</sup> When the city was transferred to the territory of Constantius, he deposed his late predecessor's major episcopal appointment as he deposed important civil appointments of his predecessors, including Ablabius (although the latter lasted long enough after Dalmatius' death for an inscription which erases the name of Dalmatius' prefect still to contain Ablabius' name),<sup>23</sup> and even the pro-Eusebian Egyptian prefect Philagrius, though he re-appointed him a year later.<sup>24</sup> We can have no clue as to who suggested Eusebius of Nicomedia as a replacement for Paul, but his appointment marks the beginning of a firm policy in favour of the Eusebian party at Constantius' court.

---

<sup>19</sup> Athanasius, *Festal Letters* 4.5.

<sup>20</sup> Barnes (*Athanasius*, pp. 34-6, 41) demonstrates the meeting at Viminacium this summer; Constantius must have been fighting the Sarmatians at the behest of either Dalmatius or Constans, since he was out of his own territory -- he and Constans are both *Sarmaticus* by 340 (*CIL* 3.12483).

<sup>21</sup> For the date of summer 337 for Paul's election, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 212-13; see further below.

<sup>22</sup> Constantinople was more or less exactly halfway between Trier and Alexandria, on the route Athanasius is likely to have taken (see below). Since Athanasius took 128 days for his journey, the chronological halfway point would have been 20<sup>th</sup> August. However, since there was presumably little politicking for him to do before Sirmium, the first 1800 miles of journey must have passed relatively quickly and uneventfully, leaving him in Constantinople proportionally somewhat earlier.

<sup>23</sup> See note above.

<sup>24</sup> *PLRE* I, 694, 'Fl. Philagrius 5'.

### **c. Athanasius' return.**

Athanasius is the only exile whose precise whereabouts, path of return and length of time in his see before being removed again are known with certainty. His path and manner of return in particular are extremely interesting and suggestive.

Athanasius and Marcellus are likely to have corresponded during their time in exile: as we have seen, both were pursuing a policy of building up as much support as possible in areas outside the Eusebian-led provinces, whether they were doing this independently or as part of an agreed strategic campaign. It seems to have become clear to both bishops that the anti-Eusebians, if they were to survive further attacks from their enemies, had to enlist as much and as widespread support as they could.

Athanasius' return journey to Alexandria presented a perfect opportunity for building up support. It took him just over five months to return from Trier to Alexandria, from the date of Constantine II's letter to the churches in Alexandria (17<sup>th</sup> June 337) to the date given in the Festal Index for his re-entry of the city (23<sup>rd</sup> November).<sup>25</sup> The Easterners at Sardica raged over his activities at this point: 'Throughout the course of his journey back he was subverting the churches: some condemned bishops he restored, to some he held out the hope of a return to episcopal office, some pagans he ordained bishop although there were bishops who had stayed sound and whole throughout the murderous attacks of the gentiles; heedless of the laws, he set all his store by foolhardiness.'<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> *Festal Index* [X] (= A. Martin and M. Albert, eds, *Histoire 'acéphale' et index syriaque des lettres festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, SCh 317 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1985), p. 236, with p. 286, n. 30)

<sup>26</sup> Hilary, *FH A* IV 1.8.2 (Feder p. 54.28 - p. 55.4).

It seems clear from this that Athanasius took the overland route, passing through the Balkans, Constantinople, Asia Minor, Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine: from Trier, this route would have taken two months even by imperial courier, and so five months would represent a reasonable leisurely journey with a stop for several days at major centres.<sup>27</sup> The interesting question is at which major centres he stopped for the activities the Easterners so objected to.

As we have seen, Athanasius stopped at Viminacium in Moesia Prima to meet with Constantius (and perhaps Ablabius). He may also have spent some time at this period with the bishops of the major cities of Illyricum and Dacia, and perhaps even Macedonia (which would have been several days' journey out of his way) who were to take the anti-Eusebian part so firmly at Sardica (perhaps on the recommendation of Marcellus). Much seems to have taken place in these dioceses of which we know very little, between the synods of Nicaea and Sardica: the Eusebians recruited Ursacius and Valens, Alexander of Thessalonica aligned himself with the Eusebians, distanced himself from them and then realigned himself with them again,<sup>28</sup> and a number of bishops were deposed and reinstated, as we learn from the sneers of the Easterners' letter at Sardica.<sup>29</sup> Athanasius also probably attracted a fair amount of support in the diocese of Thrace, where Eustathius's friend Eutropius of Adrianople<sup>30</sup> 'had often convicted Eusebius, and had advised them who came that way not to comply with his impious dictates,<sup>31</sup> to which Lucius of Adrianople was

---

<sup>27</sup> Journey times based on a figure of 50 miles per day by imperial courier, 25-35 miles for an ordinary traveller (as given in L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1974), pp. 185, 188). Distances are based on the most likely routes, as witnessed by that of the Bordeaux pilgrim in 333 (Cuntz, *Itineraria Romana*, pp. 86-102), supplemented as necessary by the Antonine Itinerary (Cuntz, *Itineraria Romana*, end map) and the Peutinger Table (K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana: Römische Reisewege am der Hand der Tabula Peutingeriana* (Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder, 1916)), measured against the same roads as marked on the *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ed. R.J.A. Talbert (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

<sup>28</sup> Alexander, invited to Tyre presumably in expectation of his support for the Eusebian side, writes to the comes Dionysius in support of Athanasius (Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 80); by 339 Athanasius is claiming that the Eusebians again 'indeed reckon him to be one of themselves, and account him a partner in their designs, but they only prove thereby the violence they have exercised towards him' (Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 16.1).

<sup>29</sup> Hilary, *FH A* IV 1.20 (Feder p. 61.9-30).

<sup>30</sup> Eutropius was the dedicatee of Eustathius's *De Pythonissa*.

<sup>31</sup> Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 5.1

returning, and whence several bishops were exiled in the years that followed;<sup>32</sup> he certainly spent some time with Paul in Constantinople.

Barnes convincingly assigns Paul's election to this summer (against Schwartz, Opitz, Klein, Hanson and others) by correlating the internal information in Socrates' account with Constantius' known whereabouts in the period 337-340.<sup>33</sup> Barnes' suggestion that Athanasius played an active role in Paul's consecration is perhaps unlikely (it would be odd that involvement in a premature consecration, which would nicely recall the dubious circumstances of his own ordination, is never made one of the charges against Athanasius by his enemies), but at the very least, Athanasius is likely to have courted Paul on his way through Constantinople shortly after the latter's installation, convinced him of his own innocence if he still needed convincing, and secured his support for the future.<sup>34</sup>

It may well have been specifically on this journey, as Barnes argues, that Athanasius caused the ructions in Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine which Theodoret has Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends Theognis and Theodore of Heraclea use as an argument for persuading Constantius to exile Athanasius a second time.<sup>35</sup> These may have included attempts, successful or otherwise, to re-instate some or all of those anti-Eusebian bishops previously deposed in these provinces: Euphration of Balanea, Cymatius of Paltus, Cymatius of Gabala and Cyrus of Beroea in Syria, Hellanicus of Tripoli and Carterius of Antaradus in Phoenicia, and Asclepas of Gaza in Palestine.<sup>36</sup> He may well also have visited the Eustathian churches at Antioch, as well as other bishops who had never been specifically involved on either side.

---

<sup>32</sup> Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 19.1

<sup>33</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 213; Schwartz, *GS* III, p. 274; Opitz, *Athanasius' Werke* II, p. 186, line 11, note; Klein, *Constantius* (1977); Hanson, *Search*, p. 265; F. Winkelmann, 'Die Bischöfe Metrophanes und Alexander von Byzanz', *BZ* 59 (1966), pp. 47-71, at p. 61; W. Telfer, 'Paul of Constantinople,' *HTR* 43 (1950), pp. 30-92, at p. 55.

<sup>34</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 36 & 212-213.

<sup>35</sup> Theodoret, *HE* II.3.8; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 36.

<sup>36</sup> See above chapter 3.



But although allies in these provinces would have been useful, as provinces led by Eusebian metropolitans, their usefulness, to a man attempting to recruit political support equal to or greater than the forces which had been ranged against him at Tyre, would ultimately have been limited. Athanasius needed to attract the support of whole provinces, certainly of metropolitans, if he was to be proof against a repeat of the Eusebians' formerly successful tactics. The provinces whose support it made most sense for him to seek, besides those of Dalmatius' former territories, were those of central Asia Minor, the friends of Marcellus of Ancyra.

Athanasius would have been virtually certain to stop in Ancyra, on his journey from Constantinople to Antioch, even if he and Marcellus had had no contact since Tyre: apart from Ancyra's prime place as the major city on the main road between those two capitals,<sup>37</sup> Marcellus was the one bishop (other, perhaps, than Alexander of Constantinople) who had proved himself rock-solid in his opposition to the undoing of Nicaea by readmitting Arius to communion, and in his support of Athanasius, even against Constantine, even at the peril of the see he had governed for over twenty years. Even if they kept anti-Eusebian plotting to a minimum (and it would be surprising if they did, given that such seems to have been the whole point of Athanasius' journey over the long land-route), Marcellus would have been good for traditional episcopal hospitality and perhaps for a late night or two telling jokes (both he and Athanasius had an acerbic sense of humour often bordering on the outrageous)<sup>38</sup> and cursing Eusebius and all his works.

But Marcellus is also likely to have been able to give Athanasius a number of names of potential supporters, including, probably, those from Isauria, Pamphylia and Lycia whom Athanasius claims as signatories to the Sardican documents in his (and Marcellus') favour.<sup>39</sup> These may be the same as the

---

<sup>37</sup> See the discussion of Ancyra's importance in this regard in Clive Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara', *DOP* 31 (1977), pp. 27-87..

<sup>38</sup> For Marcellus, see for example P85 / SV75 (Re 65, K 74) and, for Athanasius, *De Morte Aarii*.

<sup>39</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 1.2.

'nearly sixty-three' (ἑγγύς ξγ -- an odd phrase) out of Asia, Phrygia and Isauria who Athanasius claims wrote in his support prior to the synod of Sardica.<sup>40</sup> These in turn may be the same people whose written support, the Easterners at Sardica complain bitterly, Athanasius enlisted before going to Rome to pursue his case there, as we shall shortly see.

#### **d. Marcellus' return.**

If Marcellus was indeed banished to a city of Illyricum, he could have been home in Ancyra in three to four weeks, even before Paul's election in Constantinople.<sup>41</sup> Since the only civic disturbance Marcellus is accused of causing took place in Ancyra itself, we can assume that he was not part of a long triumphalist returning tour like that of Athanasius, but that he returned home as quickly as possible. As mentioned above, he, like the other exiles, must have had, along with Athanasius, imperial documents granting leave to return to his see, and hence the right to request support from the provincial governor in so doing. Unlike Athanasius, however, whose see was empty and waiting for him,<sup>42</sup> Marcellus and the other returning exiles had to worry about ejecting their successors.

The letter of the Easterners at Sardica, which accuses Athanasius of a campaign of violence over many years, also charges Marcellus, Paul of Constantinople, Asclepas of Gaza and Lucius of Adrianopole specifically with causing violence on their returns from exile. The following is the account it gives of violence in Ancyra:

For indeed there were also in Ancyra of the province of Galatia after the return of the heretic Marcellus burnings of houses and various sorts of pitched battle. Presbyters were dragged naked to the forum by him, and (which is to be mentioned with tears and lamentations) the

---

<sup>40</sup> Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar* 50.4.

<sup>41</sup> Sardica was about 650 miles from Ancyra, Naissus about 100 miles further, Sirmium about 220 miles further again.

consecrated body of the Lord, hung at the necks of priests, he publicly and openly profaned, and most holy virgins dedicated to God and Christ, their clothes having been dragged off, with foulness to be abhorred he denuded publicly in the forum and in the centre of the city, the people coming together.<sup>43</sup>

Marcellus and his friends countered these charges by accusing the Eusebian party of being the ones who actually stirred up the violence:

We have heard also from others, what is confirmed by the testimony of the bishop Marcellus, that a number of outrages similar to those which were committed at Alexandria have occurred also at Ancyra in Galatia.<sup>44</sup>

These events are often understood in rather simplistic terms;<sup>45</sup> it is worth examining them in some detail to see what we can make of the charges the Easterners' letter makes against Marcellus, both general and specific. The specific charges are three: that he dragged presbyters naked to the forum, that he profaned the consecrated host by having it suspended at the necks of priests in public, and that he stripped consecrated virgins in the forum, or brought them there having stripped them already. In addition, the letter imputes to Marcellus by implication ('after the return of the heretic Marcellus') a general riot, which included arson attacks.

The 'house-burnings and various sorts of pitched battle' described by the Easterners' Letter fit into a clear pattern of violent behaviour in cities of the East throughout the fourth century and beyond, which has been convincingly

---

<sup>42</sup> Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar* 29.3.

<sup>43</sup> 'Fuere namque et in Anqira provinciae Galatiae post reditum Marcelli haeretici domorum incendia et genera diversa bellorum. Nudi ab ipso ad forum trahebantur presbyteri et, quod cum lacrimis luctuque dicendum est, consecratum domini corpus ad sacerdotum colla suspensum palam publiceque profanabat virginesque sanctissimas deo Christoque dicatas publice in foro mediaque in civitate concurrentibus populis abstractis vestibus horrenda foeditate nudabat.' (Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.9.1 (Feder p. 55.10-19)).

<sup>44</sup> Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar* 33.3.

<sup>45</sup> For example (from a most distinguished scholar): 'The population of Ankara had grown fond of their new bishop, and it was only after considerable rioting that Basil was ejected and Marcellus restored' (Foss, 'Ankara', p. 37).

analysed by Timothy E. Gregory.<sup>46</sup> The underpoliced cities of the Empire in late antiquity were subject to constant riots, sparked off initially by religious controversy, sporting rivalries, political demands or the fear of famine, but quickly becoming indiscriminate rampages against whatever property or people caught the mob's eye. *Agents provocateurs* could be involved, stirring up the crowd for the benefit of one party or another, or simply to cause trouble, but often the riot simply took on its own momentum and continued for days, completely losing sight of its initial impetus.

There were riots throughout the fourth century to which ecclesiastical causes were assigned in such cities as Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople, as well as many lesser ones; these cities also rioted for other reasons, most famously Antioch in the Riot of the Statues in 387, where an uncontrollable mob attacked and ill-treated imperial statues, and it looked for a time as though the city would be razed in punishment. The number of fatalities was often high, including sometimes the lynching of important officials or even bishops (as in the cases of the *comes* Hermogenes in Constantinople in 342, or Bishop George in Alexandria in 361).<sup>47</sup>

The forces at hand to put down such riots were small, given the imperial policy of starving prefects and governors of troops.<sup>48</sup> Some riots were left to burn themselves out.<sup>49</sup> In the most serious cases, such as in Antioch at the time of Eustathius' deposition, or at the lynching of Hermogenes in Constantinople, imperial troops were sent in, and the city as a whole was punished.<sup>50</sup> But the normal means of dealing with more small-scale outbreaks of unrest must have been the sending in of a small group from the Prefect's or other responsible official's personal force to target a few individuals marked out as ringleaders or

---

<sup>46</sup> Timothy E. Gregory, 'Urban Violence in Late Antiquity', in R.T. Marchese, ed., *Aspects of Graeco-Roman Urbanism* (Oxford: BAR, 1983), pp. 138-161.

<sup>47</sup> Hermogenes: Ammianus, XIV.10. 2; Socrates, *HE* II.13.1-4. George: *Hist. Aceph.*, 2.8-10; Socrates, *HE* III.2-3, esp. III.2.10; Sozomen, *HE* V.7; Ammianus, XXII.11.1-11, esp. 8-10.

<sup>48</sup> See Ramsay McMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 163-166.

<sup>49</sup> Gregory, 'Urban Violence', p. 155.

<sup>50</sup> Eusebius, *VC* III.59.2-3; see also n. 50.

scapegoats, extract them, and have them made an example of.<sup>51</sup> When we hear (as we frequently do, particularly in the writings of Athanasius) of beatings (with rods) and floggings (with a flagellum, often fatal) of monks, presbyters and virgins, this is generally likely to be a punishment for disturbance of the peace, and those involved are likely to be lower-class *humiliores*.<sup>52</sup> Virgins especially might also be the victims of crowd aggression, but their frequent mention in catalogues of this nature suggests that, like the monks, they might well have been tough nuts not averse to joining in a fray in defence of a revered bishop. Certainly they seem to have been out and about and on the scene to a surprising degree, suggesting that many of them were the reverse of well-born.<sup>53</sup>

We hear nothing, however, of such punishments in Ancyra, a silence which is probably not insignificant given the frequency with which such accusations were made both by and against Athanasius. Marcellus (unlike his successor Basil) is never accused in the surviving literature of pursuing his enemies with clubs, whips, chains, dungeon, fire or sword. The case of the stripping of the

---

<sup>51</sup> An example of this sort of tactic is described by Ammianus Marcellinus (XV.7.1-10), where Leontius, prefect of Rome 355-356, abandoned by his subordinates, rode his own carriage into the middle of an angry crowd and picked out a 'ringleader' and had him arrested and flogged there and then. The crowd dispersed immediately. The same prefect used *apparitores* (police agents) to extract and punish possibly random members of the crowd on another occasion (Ammianus, XV.7.2).

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Athanasius, *Ep. Enc.* 4.3.

<sup>53</sup> Consecrated virgins may have been directly involved in the riots in Ancyra, as either perpetrators or victims of crowd violence, but it is also possible that lower-class muscular virgins were largely a feature of Egyptian Christianity, or perhaps of the two or three largest cities of the East. In Alexandria, presbyters (one thinks of Athanasius' lieutenant Macarius) could also be involved in strong-arm tactics, but such may not have been the case in the church of Ancyra. If Marcellus did have a supporting rabble anything like Athanasius', the riots might indeed be at least partly attributable to them, in which case the treatment of the presbyters and virgins in the forum (of which more anon) might also have been a form of judicial punishment, and rather a mild one for the time. It would be interesting to know what sort of numbers of virgins in general were to be found in Ancyra and its dependent regions, as well as how far Marcellus and Basil had been responsible for increasing their numbers and from what sort of classes they came. The synod of Ancyra of 314 already mentions virgins, although the provision of only the penance of the twice married for those virgins who give up the state and marry (canon 19) shows that professional virginity was not then yet heavily sacralised. Palladius, writing at the beginning of the fifth century, singles out Ancyra for praise for its large number of (well-born) virgins, but these may or may not reflect a similarly flourishing situation in Marcellus' time (Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, 67: 'In this city, Ancyra, there are many other illustrious virgins, about two thousand or more, chaste and noteworthy women'). Basil certainly had a known interest in the state of consecrated virginity (one of his few surviving works is a *De Virginitate*), but if he introduced bands of virgins loyal to him in any numbers in Ancyra between July 336 and July 337, he was doing well.

presbyters and the virgins with which Marcellus was charged may not be all it appears to be, either. If the Greek words behind ‘nudi’ and ‘nudabat’ are γυμνοί and ἐγύμνου, the charge concerning the presbyters and holy virgins may not imply stripping completely naked (though a hostile mob or even group of guards would have been capable of that), but perhaps stripping off the outer layer of sober clerical wear in the case of the presbyters (leaving them in their nightshirts),<sup>54</sup> and their veils in the case of the virgins (as Athanasius complains was done to virgins in Alexandria).<sup>55</sup> Even if something nearer complete stripping is envisaged, it is worth recognising that if this was a judicial act, though unpleasant and humiliating, it was actually rather mild by the standards of the day, if we assume that any consequent outrages to the persons concerned would certainly have been reported by Basil at Sardica and be included in the list of charges against Marcellus.

The two actions with which we are here concerned, the stripping of the presbyters and the stripping of the virgins, may have been carried out by a mob, whether prompted by Marcellus or his associates or not. It is also possible that these specific actions and the riots generally were perpetrated *against* Marcellus or his friends, later in the day, after the guards had departed, by an anti-Christian mob or by troublemakers loyal to Basil.<sup>56</sup> But in the case of the specific actions it is more likely, particularly since no further outrages on the victims seem to have followed, that they were carried out by the guards sent by the civil authorities to install Marcellus (as similar actions were perpetrated by the guards installing Gregory in place of Athanasius),<sup>57</sup> either because Basil’s company resisted them, or out of a desire to do the pleasant job of expelling a senior figure and his associates as thoroughly as possible. Marcellus might have

---

<sup>54</sup> See the references collected in Joseph Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church*, book VI, chapter 4, sections 18-20, esp. Socrates, *HE* VI.22.5-7.

<sup>55</sup> Athanasius, *Encyclical Letter* 4.3

<sup>56</sup> Basil of Ancyra was himself to be deposed for various deeds of violence and for perjury, albeit probably to some extent on trumped-up charges, twenty years later (Sozomen, *HE* IV.24; see also T.D. Barnes, ‘The Crimes of Basil of Ancyra’, *JTS* ns 47 (1996), 550-4, who points out the similarity between these and other such charges used to depose one’s enemy bishops).

<sup>57</sup> Athanasius, *Ep. Enc.* 4.3.



cheered them on, or stood by indifferent or appalled, or even tried to restrain the guards; it is unlikely he could have prevented them.

As for the third charge, it can be seen on close examination that the writer of the Easterners' Letter does not actually believe that Marcellus was guilty of the kind of sacrilege implied by violently suspending a consecrated host from the neck of a priest. Such charges against Marcellus are entirely absent elsewhere in the letter, which concentrates rather on the violence and sacrilege of Athanasius, branding Marcellus simply with heresy. Athanasius was haunted for over two decades by the charge that one of his presbyters (not even he himself) had merely smashed a sacred chalice when it was empty. Marcellus' alleged action would have been far more serious, had it been established with anything like credibility.

Instead, this particular incident, which probably did not take place during the Mass itself (which would surely have been reported as an aggravating circumstance), must also either have been a particularly aggressive act on the part of the authorities or have been perpetrated by a mob. Eastern hosts were leavened: it is unlikely (though not impossible) that the host itself was pierced in order to suspend it, an action which would have been logistically difficult and which would have involved deliberate sacrilege of the worst possible kind. Instead, the likelihood is that it was already in a vessel of some sort, either ready to be taken off and protected by an indignant Basil, or in the process of being taken to the housebound: in the latter case, it may have been in a pyx whose own strings were used to tie it round the presbyter's neck. This is the sort of action one could well imagine a mob undertaking (even a 'Christian' mob, perhaps, if they were using the host to shame a churchman deemed to have polluted it by his heretical theology); it is hard to imagine either bishop, or the close followers of either, being involved.

We have only the Easterners' letter (which presumably had Basil as its source, but may have embroidered freely) against Marcellus' word (or Julius'

description of it) to go on in according blame, in other words, if indeed they are describing the same incidents.<sup>58</sup> Marcellus, or Basil, or their associates, or Eusebian *agents provocateurs*, or the actions of the authorities may have struck the spark that ignited the crowd, who may have been pro-Marcellan, anti-Marcellan, anti-Christian or merely a group of men spoiling for violence on a hot summer's day or night. What seems secure is that the actions discussed are likely to have been either considerably less shocking or considerably less closely linked to Marcellus than the Easterners' letter would have us believe. If the three specific events mentioned (the denuding of virgins, the denuding of presbyters and the suspension of the host) did not begin as part of a campaign of mob violence (whether or not it was provoked by interested parties, which Marcellus obviously thought it was), they quickly gave way to one. Socrates may reasonably be left with the last word on the subject of a mob's proclivities:

No one of any experience can be ignorant of the fact that such fatal accidents are for the most part concomitants of the factious movements of the populace. It is vain, therefore, for calumniators to attribute the blame.<sup>59</sup>

#### **e. The correspondence between the Eusebians and Rome prior to 338.**

It had been common practice since at least the second century for synods which condemned a theologian or movement within the church to send out a circular letter informing the wider church of the resolution, and warning bishops not to enter into communion with the individual or to give room to the movement. The letter circulated after Paul of Samosata's deposition in 268, partly preserved in Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, is a clear example of the form, addressing itself 'To Dionysius [of Rome] and Maximus [of Alexandria] and to all our fellow-ministers throughout the world, bishops, presbyters and deacons, and to

---

<sup>58</sup> The certainty and strength of language of the writer of the Easterners' letter is no guarantee of his veracity. The same writer claims that Athanasius smashed the chalice of Ischyryus 'with his own hands' ('*propriis manibus*', Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.6.1 (Feder p. 53.14)), when the official charge had only ever been that his presbyter Macarius had done so.

<sup>59</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.15.7-8.

the whole Catholic Church under Heaven ...' [HE VII.30.2]. In practice, Paul's deposition was only achieved with the written consent of the see of Rome.<sup>60</sup>

The struggle for the see of Rome between Cornelius and Novatian in 251 was attended by a flood of letters across the Empire, actively involving the bishops of Carthage, Alexandria, Antioch, Palestinian Caesarea and Cappadocian Caesarea, who held synods and wrote to one another in support of their own candidate and against the other. This sort of correspondence was a natural extension of the normal custom of a bishop's exchanging letters of friendship with other prelates of his own rank on coming to a major episcopal office, so that especially at the level of the greatest sees all one's opposite numbers would be known and recognised. Any changes in the holders of the major sees would be swiftly known and taken into account by colleagues, as Eusebius' description of Dionysius of Alexandria's voluminous correspondence amply demonstrates (HE VI. 44-46).

It would be interesting to know, therefore, at what point Rome was appraised of the depositions of Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis, Eustathius, Asclepas, Eutropius, Hellenicus, Euphration, Cyrus, Cymatius, Carterius, Lucius, Marcellus and Paul, and at what point its bishop began to feel it was time to stop burying bodies and time to start looking upstream for the cause of their deaths. 'Rome' at this period means Silvester, bishop from 31<sup>st</sup> January 314 until 31<sup>st</sup> December 335; the short-lived Marcus in 336; and Julius from 6<sup>th</sup> February 337 until 12<sup>th</sup> April 352.<sup>61</sup>

The depositions of Eusebius and Theognis cannot have caused more than a flicker of surprise: whatever part Ossius played in their downfall, they had been marked men at Nicaea itself, as Eustathius makes clear,<sup>62</sup> and only the emperor's apparent graciousness had saved them. Eustathius' fall must have saddened and

---

<sup>60</sup> See chapter 1 for a fuller account of the deposition of Paul of Samosata.

<sup>61</sup> Agostino Amore, 'Silvestro I', *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* XI (1968), cols 1077-1079; Gian Domenico Gordini, 'Marco', *BS* VIII (1967), cols 699-700; Agostino Amore, 'Giulio I', *BS* VI (1966), cols 1234-1235.

astonished Silvester, if he felt any personal involvement in the Nicene proceedings, but in the face of such decisive activity on the part of Constantine, and a cause so explicably human, the Roman leader is perhaps unlikely to have questioned the matter further. The restoration of Eusebius and Theognis might have been a cause for raised eyebrows, but clemency and repentance were after all in the nature of both Christianity and imperial politics. The departures of Asclepas of Gaza, Cyrus of Beroea, Euphration of Balaneae, Cymatius of Paltus, Cymatius of Gabala, Caterius of Antaradus and Hellenicus of Tripolis -- all local depositions -- need not even have been reported to Rome at the time, and are certainly unlikely to have caused much alarm by themselves. The time and circumstances of the depositions of the two metropolitans of Adrianople, Eutropius and Lucius, are unknown to us, and may have seemed or even been plausible enough. But unless he was by then too ill to receive it, Silvester can only have heard the news of the deposition of the bishop of Alexandria, the Church's most prestigious prelate other than himself, with considerable disquiet.

One question which we cannot answer is whether Silvester heard the news from the synod of Tyre itself. There is no synodal letter from Tyre extant, but the letter from the allied synod of Jerusalem, which Athanasius gives in *De Synodis*,<sup>63</sup> is significantly addressed 'To the Church of God which is in Alexandria, and to all throughout Egypt, Thebais, Libya and Pentapolis, also to the Bishops, Priests and Deacons throughout the world, health in the Lord.' No mention is made of Rome; and although Silvester might well have received a letter in his own name, it seems not unlikely that, Constantine or no Constantine, the group around Eusebius was less than keen to spell out to Rome that they had just undone the work of Nicaea with no reference to Rome whatever.

They might have argued, reasonably enough if one ignores the international context of the controversy, that the reinstatement of Arius, an Alexandrian

---

<sup>62</sup> See chapter 2.

<sup>63</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 21.2-7.

presbyter, was really a local Alexandrian affair. The deposition of the bishop of Alexandria himself cannot have been considered such. The difficulty here is that the bishops leading the Synod of Tyre may well have been awaiting the agreement of Constantine to their decisions before they issued their synodal letter, an agreement which they never got. Instead, they got an anomaly: banishment of Athanasius, but no imperial permission to appoint a successor to him.<sup>64</sup> The Eusebian group could pretend, or, indeed, persuade themselves, easily enough after Constantine's death that Athanasius' exile was simply a ratification of the decision of Tyre, just as Athanasius could go along with the fiction that he had been sent away for his own safety, but it is difficult to see what letter could have been sent out at the time when there was no replacement bishop to be announced.

To add to the difficulty of relations between the Eusebian group and Rome in this period, scarcely more than a month (and that in the non-sailing season) elapsed between Athanasius' banishment on November 7<sup>th</sup> 335 and Silvester's death on December 31<sup>st</sup>. Silvester's successor, Marcus, of whom we know nothing, was consecrated on 18<sup>th</sup> January 336, and might or might not have written for further details on the fate of the bishop of Alexandria before he died on 7<sup>th</sup> October of the same year, doubtless after hearing something of the closing celebrations of the emperor's thirtieth regnal year, the news of the deposition of a heretic, Marcellus of Ancyra (whom his presbyters may have pointed out to him as a great defender of orthodoxy at Nicaea), and rumours at least of the strange and disturbing death of Arius in a public lavatory. Whoever else he heard from, one bishop who was likely to have primed Rome on a different side to all of this was Alexander, bishop of Constantinople.

When Julius took over as bishop of Rome on 6<sup>th</sup> February 337, therefore, he would have known from the first that all in the East was far from well, and since

---

<sup>64</sup> T.D. Barnes takes this to be the case (*Athanasius*, p. 25), and must surely be correct. Pistus, whom Julius would refuse to accept on the grounds of his ordination by Secundus after the latter's deposition at Nicaea, may have been elected at Tyre to replace Athanasius (see below),

his first task on consecration would involve exchanging letters with the principal sees of the East, including the absent bishop of Alexandria, he is likely to have begun his enquiries early. The death of Constantine on May 17<sup>th</sup> and the amnesty which followed shortly afterwards can only have confused the Western outlook further. Julius is likely already to have written to the church at Alexandria once, if not twice, before Athanasius even arrived there on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, asking who on earth he was supposed to address as its bishop.

## 2. The Events of 337-341

If I am correct in my conjecture that it was Constantius' Praetorian Prefect Flavius Ablabius who championed the exiles and secured their return, his dismissal from office by Constantius soon after the latter's proclamation as Augustus on 9<sup>th</sup> September left the forces opposing Eusebius and his friends in a horribly exposed position. The Eusebian group seem to have begun to move against them almost immediately, before Athanasius even re-entered Alexandria.

The sequence of events during these four years, 337 to 341, has been carefully worked on among others by Eduard Schwartz and W. Schneemelcher, but there remain some points which need to be clarified.<sup>65</sup> I propose the following timetable of events, some of which must remain conjectural, which will be argued for below.

**Autumn/winter 337:** Eusebius of Constantinople, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea, Theognis of Nicaea, Menophantus of Ephesus and Ursacius and Valens assemble at Constantinople at the request of Constantius, presumably with some others, in order to depose Paul. They replace him with

---

but never received the necessary imperial backing to install and keep him in the see- Athanasius found it empty on his return in 337 (*Ap c Ar* 29.3).



Eusebius.<sup>66</sup> Constantius ratifies their decision and leaves; the seven Eusebians (plus Stephen, later of Antioch) remain. They write to Julius of Rome and probably other bishops against Athanasius, Marcellus and Asclepas of Gaza.<sup>67</sup> It may be at this stage that they compile the book of condemned Marcellan propositions to which the Eastern Synod of Sardica refers.<sup>68</sup> They may at this stage send a presbyter and two deacons, Macarius, Martyrius and Hesychius, to Rome with the letter attacking both Athanasius and Marcellus and asking Julius to accept Pistus as bishop of Alexandria;<sup>69</sup> if so, the messengers do not make the full journey until the early spring.

**Spring 338:** The Eusebians send letters to the three Augusti against Athanasius and possibly also Marcellus.<sup>70</sup> Athanasius gets wind of these moves and arranges a synod of Egyptian and Libyan bishops to write in his defence (or rather, issue a letter he has composed) to Constantine II and Constans and to send presbyters to head off Macarius and his companions at Rome.<sup>71</sup> Athanasius, meanwhile, departs for Cappadocia to defend himself before Constantius, and possibly to have another meeting with Marcellus.<sup>72</sup> He also arranges a visit in his defence to Alexandria by the popular hermit Antony.<sup>73</sup>

**Late spring:** Julius, increasingly worried by events in the East, and more and more convinced that the Eusebian party are up to no good, listens to the Alexandrian presbyters' version of events and goads the Eusebian envoys into

---

<sup>65</sup> Schwartz, *GS* III, pp. 265-334; W. Schneemelcher, 'Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien 341', in *Bonner Festgabe Johannes Straub zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Adolf Lippold and Nikolaus Himmelmann (Bonn: Rheinland-Verlag, 1977), pp. 319-346.

<sup>66</sup> Names: Hilary, *FH* B II 1.2.1 (Feder p. 106.2-3 and 9-10); Theodoret, *HE* II.8.6; *EOMIA*, I.2.4, p. 645, lines 33-35. Deposition of Paul: Socrates, *HE* II.7.2; Sozomen, *HE* III.4.3; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 212.

<sup>67</sup> Hilary, *FH* B II 1.2.1 (Feder p. 106.2 - p. 107.1); Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 19.3, 5; 42.5; Theodoret, *HE* II.8.6; *EOMIA* I,2,iv, p. 645, lines 36-41.

<sup>68</sup> Hilary, *FH* A IV 1.3.4 (Feder p. 51.11-16).

<sup>69</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 22.3; 24.1.

<sup>70</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3.5-7; *Hist Ar* 9.1 mentions only Constantius and Constans- even in treasonable mode, Athanasius followed the official *damnatio memoriae* of Constantine II.

<sup>71</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3-19; 22.3-4, 24.1-3.

<sup>72</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp.41-2.

<sup>73</sup> Athanasius, *Festal Index* 10 (= Martin-Albert, p. 236); *Vita Antonii* 69-71. See Martin-Albert, pp. 75-76 and Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 45 for the date.

boasting that they can make good all their accusations at a Roman synod.<sup>74</sup> He writes to the Eusebians, agreeing to this ‘proposal’, as well as to Athanasius (and presumably Marcellus), proposing the same.<sup>75</sup> Julius is quite sincere and definite in this request, although he does not set a definite date.<sup>76</sup>

**Autumn 338:** Athanasius and Marcellus, who dare not leave their sees for so long, presumably write friendly letters to Julius, agreeing in principle to a new synod, but do not commit to a date. The Eusebians either do not write, or write putting Julius off.<sup>77</sup>

**Winter 338/9:** A group of Eusebian-supporting bishops, including a number of Arians and probably some Melitians and other victims of Athanasius’ violent tactics in Alexandria,<sup>78</sup> assembles in Antioch and petitions the emperor against Athanasius, Marcellus and the rest, this time successfully, presumably all on the same grounds: that they re-took possession of their sees unlawfully, without permission of an episcopal synod; that there were riots when each returned to his church; that they had punished those who supported their depositions by denouncing them to magistrates; and that they had committed whatever crimes they were originally deposed for.<sup>79</sup> Constantius issues letters to the relevant magistrates, requesting Philagrius, newly re-appointed Prefect of Egypt (who had already been Egyptian Prefect until 337), to install his countryman Gregory as bishop of Alexandria (Pistus had proved too much of a liability) and deal with Athanasius.

---

<sup>74</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 22.3.

<sup>75</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 9.1; *Ap c Ar* 22.3; 22.4; 29.2; 30.1.

<sup>76</sup> Schwartz, *GS* III, p. 285.

<sup>77</sup> All of this is surmise based on the political realities and on Julius’ subsequent attitude to the parties in question.

<sup>78</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 9.3; *Ep Enc* 6.1.

<sup>79</sup> Socrates (*HE* II.8) gives these as the charges which toppled Athanasius, but they sound like part of a job lot of charges intended to cover all the exiles, since they are applicable to all of them, with modifications.

**Spring 339:** The bishops who returned from exile in 337 are all redeposed, the magistrates using their usual strong-arm tactics.<sup>80</sup> Athanasius also writes to his former protector, Constantine II.<sup>81</sup>

**August 339:** Athanasius arrives in Rome, after a circuitous journey to avoid being apprehended. Julius writes again to the Eusebians, pressing them to name a date for a Roman synod to retry Athanasius' and Marcellus' cases.

**December 339:** Marcellus arrives in Rome after unknown activities elsewhere (Barnes' suggestion that he went to Illyricum is attractive).<sup>82</sup> Constantine II or Constans may even have been persuaded to write to Constantius with vague suggestions of a synod in Rome as early as this.

**First half of 340:** Constantine II invades the territory of his brother Constans and is killed.<sup>83</sup> Constans pays a visit to Rome, meets and is petitioned by Athanasius and Marcellus there and takes up their cause, writing to his brother on their behalf.<sup>84</sup> Julius also writes to the Eusebians an extremely irritable letter by two presbyters, Philoxenos and Elpidius, giving them an ultimatum to come to a synod in Rome before the following March.<sup>85</sup> Constantius, anxious to ensure he is indeed pursuing a policy that is defensible to the wider church, though not prepared to allow interference from either his brother Constans or ecclesiastical powers outside his own territory, determines to use the occasion of the dedication of the newly built Hagia Homonoia church the following winter to hold a large and representative synod and ensure that the Eusebian policies have widespread support.

**Summer 340:** Constantius sends invitations for the dedication of the church of Holy Concord the following winter to bishops throughout his half of the empire.

---

<sup>80</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 33.1-3, 35.2, 6; *Hist Ar* 12.2.

<sup>81</sup> Barnes deduces this letter in a neat piece of exegesis of the *Apologia ad Constantium* (Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 50-2).

<sup>82</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 57.

<sup>83</sup> *PLRE* I, 223-4, 'Fl. Val. Constantinus IV'; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 218.

<sup>84</sup> See chapter 5 below.

Philoxenus and Elpidius arrive in Antioch with their request, which (not entirely unreasonably) enrages the Eusebians. They maliciously detain the presbyters, ‘inviting’ them to attend the synod which will take place in Antioch instead of allowing them to carry out their task of escorting the Easterners to Rome.<sup>86</sup>

**November 340:** Bishops from Constantius’ territories on the wrong side of the Cilician Gates (those from the dioceses of Thracia, Asia and Pontica) begin to assemble in Antioch before the winter sets in.

**Late December 340:** Ninety-seven bishops attend the Dedication synod at Antioch, which will end in the dedication itself on 6<sup>th</sup> January 341. (The synodal letter is dated the year of the consuls Marcellinus and Probus, or 341, but this will have been written at the end of the synod; the synod will have to have started in December, in order to be finished by January 6<sup>th</sup>.)<sup>87</sup>

**March 341:** The presbyters arrive back in Rome and make their report to Julius. Marcellus hears it and decides to leave without waiting any longer for the Easterners. He leaves a written statement of faith and indictment of his opponents for the synod, whether it happens with or without Eusebian representatives.<sup>88</sup> Julius waits a little longer to see if the Eusebians still might come, and then holds the synod without them in the church of the presbyter Vito, who had been one of the two presbyters sent to represent Silvester at the synod of Nicaea sixteen years before.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 20.1; 21.2; 22.1; 22.6; 25.1.

<sup>86</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.3. Julius, in expecting the Eusebians to travel two thousand miles during winter, and the Eusebians, in forcing the Roman presbyters to do so, were being at the very least extremely inconsiderate, as both make clear in their reactions. Winter travel by road over mountain passes (the Cilician Gates and the Julian Alps were both involved) was not impossible, except in periods of exceptionally heavy snowfall (Casson, *Travel*, p.176) but was more difficult and much more uncomfortable than at other times (cf. Libanius, *Or* 59.96, on Constantius’ winter journey to Constantinople in early 342), as well as more dangerous (roads were more deserted and robbers and wild animals hungrier, besides the dangers the weather presented).

<sup>87</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.8.5; Athanasius, *De Syn*, 25.1.

<sup>88</sup> Marcellus, *Letter to Julius*.

<sup>89</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 20.3. See chapter 5 below for discussion of these events.

From this proposed summary of events, my views on various points at issue will be clear. Firstly, I will argue that while there was no ‘home synod’ as such at Antioch in the years when Constantius held court there, neither were there two ‘large and representative’ synods meeting there in the winters of 337/338 and 338/339; rather, the actions usually ascribed to a synod in Antioch in early 338 probably took place partly in Constantinople, and those which did take place at Antioch may not have involved a formal synod at all. The synod which did meet there in early 339, which appointed Gregory and sent him to Alexandria, was not particularly ‘large and representative’, except of Athanasius’ enemies in Egypt and Libya and elsewhere.

Secondly, Julius must have written at least twice to the Eusebians and received unsatisfactory answers or no answer at all, before he sent his final ultimatum. That ultimatum must have been to appear within a certain length of time, rather than on a certain day, to make sense of what seems otherwise to be a completely unreasonable proposal for a synod two thousand miles from Antioch right at the end of the non-travelling season. The unreasonably short amount of time Julius gave the Easterners to come to Rome must have been a gaffe produced by his irritation at the Eusebians’ treatment of him and his desire to tie them down. Constantius must have been involved in the planning of the alternative synod, the Dedication Synod, and it must to some extent be his answer to criticism from the West, possibly from his brother Constans, possibly the bishop of Rome, possibly even both.

Finally, the Dedication synod must have been in December/January 340-341, ending on January 6<sup>th</sup>, and must have taken place before the synod at Rome. Julius’ letter to the Easterners given by Athanasius, which was written after the synod at Rome, must have been written in response to letters from the Dedication synod, and not to the assembling synod itself.

#### **a. The second depositions of Marcellus and Athanasius**

The notion of a ‘home synod’ at Antioch along the lines of the *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* of fifth-century Constantinople was first suggested by Schwartz;<sup>90</sup> it seemed to him to be the best solution to the problem of the constant flow of ecclesiastical-juridical action which seems to have taken place in Antioch during Constantius’ residence there, including Julius’ letter addressing various of the Easterners as a body who were from fairly widely scattered sees. Opitz and Hanson followed him in this path.<sup>91</sup> As a solution to the problems mentioned, however, its virtues are more apparent than real, as W. Schneemelcher made clear.<sup>92</sup> Once the relative dates of the Dedication synod and the Roman synod are reversed, Julius need not be seen as writing to a synod he knows in advance will be assembling in the Eastern capital. In addition, it is far from clear, as I will attempt to show, that all the juridical actions perpetrated by Eastern bishops during these years took place in Antioch; their weight and degree of imperial sanction also varied largely.

Schneemelcher counselled despair: ‘Wir können nichts darüber [the status of the synods held by the Eusebians] aussagen, wie denn der Kreis um Eusebius, mit dem man von Rom aus in diesen Jahren verhandelte, sich zusammensetzte, wann und wie oft er zusammentrat und welche Kompetenzen er hatte.’<sup>93</sup> Barnes tidied the events of 337-339, as witnessed by the Alexandrian synodal letter, the Encyclical Letter and Julius’ letter, into two Antiochene synods in the winter of 337/8 and 338/9.<sup>94</sup> I will now propose a slightly different reading of the evidence.

Athanasius quotes in the *Apologia contra Arianos* a letter from a synod of Egyptian and Libyan bishops held in Alexandria in 338 (a letter which, as Barnes neatly demonstrates, he had composed himself).<sup>95</sup> This letter complains

---

<sup>90</sup> Schwartz, *GS* III, p. 279

<sup>91</sup> Opitz, *Athanasius’ Werke* II, p. 89, line 18 note; Hanson, *Search*, p. 266.

<sup>92</sup> W. Schneemelcher, ‘Kirchweihsynode’, p. 330.

<sup>93</sup> Schneemelcher, ‘Kirchweihsynode’, p. 331.

<sup>94</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 36-7, 45-6.

<sup>95</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3-19; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 37.



about the activities of οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον against him since his return from exile: they have written to the three Augusti and to various bishops, charging him with murder, abrogating an imperial donation of corn to the widows of Egypt and a campaign of violence against his enemies in Alexandria and Egypt since his return from Trier, being hated by his congregation, and the old charges of the smashed chalice of Ischyros and improper election to the episcopacy (a point which, as Athanasius indicates, it ill becomes the newly-transferred bishop of Constantinople to make).<sup>96</sup>

At this same period (i.e. between the exiles' decree of return and the winter or spring of 339, when the Eusebians decided to drop Pistus as their candidate for the episcopacy of Alexandria, and adopt Gregory instead), an embassy of a presbyter and two deacons was sent to Rome to persuade Julius to accept Pistus as bishop of Alexandria, where they were soon joined by presbyters sent from Athanasius, probably from the Alexandrian synod of spring 338. Julius refers to the incident in his letter to the Dedication synod, describing the embassy as sent from 'you, the Eusebians'.<sup>97</sup>

Schwartz was adamant that this embassy was not sent from a synod proper as such, and the letter of the bishops of Egypt and Libya bears out his view.<sup>98</sup> All its references are to the letters the Eusebians are writing, not to any synods they are holding: it several times implies that the synod of Tyre is the only synod they have so far held, and makes the point that since from this time the Eusebians have made their assertions without even bothering to hold a synod or a trial, how can they expect the proceedings of the trial and the synod they did have (the synod of Tyre) to be believed?<sup>99</sup> Instead, it seems that the Eusebians

---

<sup>96</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3.7; 5.1-3; 6.4-5; 6.6; 7.1; 7.4; 14.3; 18.1-4; 19.3,5.

<sup>97</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 24.1.

<sup>98</sup> 'Eine Synode im strengen Wortsinne war es nicht' -- Schwartz, *GS* III, p. 279.

<sup>99</sup> 'Since they now raise a cry against certain things that were never done either by him or for him...let them inform us from what synod they obtained their knowledge of them, from what proofs, and in the course of what investigation? But if they have no such evidence to bring forward, and nothing but their own mere assertion, we leave it to you to consider as regards their former charges also, how the things took place' (Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 5.5). 'They frequently threatened him with synods, and at last (τέλος) assembled at Tyre; and to this day they do not cease to write against him' (*Ap c Ar* 6.3-4). 'What weight can be attached to that

have written at least two rounds of letters, one to the Augusti and one to the bishops throughout the world, since Athanasius' return.<sup>100</sup>

One synod around this time which we know did happen in Constantinople, however, is the synod which deposed Paul of Constantinople and installed Eusebius of Nicomedia; this is convincingly argued by Barnes on the basis of Constantius' movements to have taken place in the autumn of 337.<sup>101</sup> We would expect this synod to have begun to attempt to counteract the decree of return for the exiles almost immediately, particularly since Flavius Ablabius, if he was responsible for the return, had probably already been dismissed by this point. We would expect this synod to have included the Eusebians from the areas around Constantinople, such as Eusebius himself, Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea and perhaps Ursacius and Valens. And this is exactly the group whom the Westerners at Sardica claim wrote to Julius against Athanasius and Marcellus, and who were refuted by bishops who 'wrote from other places in order to testify to the innocence of Athanasius our fellow bishop, and that those things created by Eusebius were full of nothing other than lies and falseness,'<sup>102</sup> a fair description of the contents of the synodal letter of Alexandria.

If there was a second condemnation of Marcellus at Constantinople (perhaps a solemn anathematising of a book of condemned propositions of his, presumably

---

synod or trial [Tyre] of which they make their boast? Since they presume thus to controvert the circumstances of a case which they did not witness, which they have not examined, and for which they did not meet [Athanasius' election], and to write as though they were assured of the truth of their statements, how can they claim credit respecting those matters for the consideration of which they say they did meet together? Will it not rather be believed that both in the one case and the other they have acted out of enmity for us?' (*Ap c Ar.* 1.8).

<sup>100</sup> 'Although they plainly confess in their letter [presumably that to the Emperors, which Athanasius is refuting point by point] that the Prefect of Egypt passed sentence upon certain persons [while Athanasius was still on his journey back from Tyre], they now are not ashamed to impute this sentence to Athanasius' (Athanasius, *Ap c Ar.* 5.4).

<sup>101</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.8; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 213.

<sup>102</sup> 'Scripserunt et ex aliis locis episcopi ut testificarentur innocentiam Athanasii coepiscopi nostri; quae autem ab Eusebio facta sunt, nihil aliud quam falsitatis et mendacii fuisse plena.' (Hilary, *FH* B II 1.2.1 (Feder p. 106.5 - p. 107.1)).

in his absence), this was presumably the occasion on which it occurred.<sup>103</sup> If the letter to Julius against Athanasius and Marcellus referred to by the Westerners at Sardica is the same as the one brought by Macarius, Martyrius and Hesychius to Rome, it may well have been brought not from Antioch but from Constantinople.<sup>104</sup>

If these events did take place at Constantinople, however, they need not (other than the deposition of Paul) have been the formal acts of a synod as such, which Athanasius' comments seem to preclude. Constantius, who had assembled the 'Arian' synod to depose Paul and elect a successor to him,<sup>105</sup> did not formally ratify the replacement of Athanasius by Pistus, but left the former in office for over a year. Instead, it would seem likely that the group of 'Arians' Constantius had assembled (or some of them) remained in Constantinople together after Constantius had ratified the acts of the synod (which would therefore have been

---

<sup>103</sup> The account given in the Easterners' letter at Sardica ('Sed haec quidem secundum impietatem Marcelli haeretici prima fuerunt; peiora sunt deinde subsequuta. Nam quis fidelium credat aut patiator ea, quae ab ipso male geste atque conscripta sunt quaeque digne anathematizata sunt iam cum ipso Marcello a parentibus nostris in Constantinopoli civitate?' (Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.3.4 = Feder p. 51.11-15)) is confused: several scholars (e.g. Zahn (*Markellus*), Gericke, (*Marcell* p. 13) and Hanson (*Search*, p. 218)) interpret it as meaning that Marcellus was condemned a second time at Constantinople. While I would argue there cannot have been a second formal deposition of Marcellus, because it would imply that the authority of the first no longer stood, there must be some way of making sense of the four occasions on which Protogenes of Sardica is supposed to have condemned Marcellus (Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.14.3). A formal condemnation of a book of propositions of his, mentioned in the Easterners' letter (*FH A IV* 1.3.4 (Feder p. 51.12-16)), would make sense as a way of driving home his heretical status: it might have been taken around cities including Sardica and Naissus for signature by Ursacius and Valens, and signed by Protogenes on the grounds that he had condemned Marcellus twice already.

<sup>104</sup> If so, they are still unlikely to have reached Rome before the spring of 338, the timing we would expect from the fact that Athanasius' presbyters found them there about then. If Constantius arrived in Constantinople in late September 337, he is unlikely to have been able to organise a synod before the middle of October (unless Ursacius and Valens, the furthest-flung attenders, were already in the area or travelling with Constantius' court). If Constantius left in late October or early November, and the informal meeting carried on for a week or two into November, it would already have been too late for Macarius and his companions to make the full trip to Rome before the snows would render their passage through the Julian Alps discouragingly uncomfortable and dangerous: they most likely wintered in Mursa (with Valens), Poetovio or some other suitable place on the Illyrian side of the Alps, and resumed the journey in early March, about the time when Athanasius' presbyters would also have been able to set sail from Alexandria (although they would have arrived in Rome a good month later than Macarius: see Appendix to Chapter 12, 'The Alexandria-Rome sailing schedule' in L. Casson, *Ships and Seamananship in the Ancient World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), pp. 297-299).

<sup>105</sup> For Constantius' assembly of an 'Arian' synod to condemn Paul, see Socrates, *HE* II.8.

formally closed) and left the city on his way to the East. They might have reconvened in so small a group (the Westerners' letter mentions only six) that Athanasius felt he was safe in denying their actions synod status, or not formally convened themselves as a synod at all, but presented themselves merely as the defenders of the acts of the synod of Tyre.

The other Eusebian activity the Alexandrian synodal letter mentions, besides the writing of letters 'to various bishops,' is the writing of letters against Athanasius (the other returned exiles may well have been included) to the three Augusti.<sup>106</sup> These cannot have been sent until December 337 at the very earliest: the charges they made included accusations about Athanasius' conduct in his see since his return on November 23<sup>rd</sup>. Athanasius has clearly by the time of the Alexandrian synod seen a copy of a letter sent to at least one of the three (given his specific knowledge of the charges involved), and knows also that the Eusebians have written to Rome.<sup>107</sup> Eusebius of Nicomedia is probably by this stage at the court at Antioch, petitioning Constantius against Athanasius in person,<sup>108</sup> and putting forward claims that Athanasius is appropriating imperial corn supplies meant for Egyptian widows. Athanasius has already received a warning letter on the subject from Constantius by the time of the synod of Alexandria.<sup>109</sup>

It is worth considering at this point T.D Barnes' alternative timetable for these events (the letter and envoy to Julius; the letters to the Augusti; the petitioning of Constantius) and also for the election of Pistus. Barnes assigns them to one synod in Antioch in the winter of 337/8, which would seem indeed to be the most economical theory.<sup>110</sup> There are two reasons (besides the suggestive list discussed above of those who originally wrote to Julius), however, why this is unlikely.

---

<sup>106</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3.5-7.

<sup>107</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 4.1; 5.4; 6.4; 19.3.

<sup>108</sup> Athanasius' claim that the Eusebians shrink from no journey, however long, to take their charges to the most solemn tribunals on earth (Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3.7) probably implies that Eusebius went to Antioch in person to pursue charges against Athanasius.

<sup>109</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 18.2-3.

<sup>110</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 36-7.

Firstly, there is the evidence of Athanasius. Barnes argues that, as the letter of the Alexandrian synod makes no complaints about the composition of the synod which replaced him by Pistus, it must have been 'a large and representative conclave of bishops from throughout the eastern provinces.'<sup>111</sup> If so, it would be the first such synod since the time of Licinius to be called with no involvement from an emperor, and it would be extraordinary that the sources were all silent on the subject.<sup>112</sup> A rather more satisfactory reason for Athanasius' silence on the composition of this synod may be that there was no synod as such at all. As mentioned above, Athanasius polemicises against Tyre by arguing that the Eusebians are now making new accusations without bothering to have a synod at all.

Secondly, Constantius' attitude to the synod would be extremely peculiar if it was as official as Barnes assumes. If it took place in Antioch in winter, it would have taken place under his very nose; he would have had to ratify it or nullify it. If the synod had elected Pistus without the emperor's agreement and written to Julius on the subject, it would have been impudent in the extreme; if they did have the emperor's agreement, on the other hand, it is hard to imagine why he took so long to move against Athanasius, at a period when every day in office was strengthening Athanasius' hand.

If Pistus was not elected at this stage, however, who elected him and when? Hanson is probably right in his suggestion that this was done during the lifetime of Constantine.<sup>113</sup> He suggests a unilateral action by Secundus of Ptolemais; Schwartz suggests that Pistus was made bishop of the Mareotis rather than of Alexandria.<sup>114</sup> Neither of these suggestions is very convincing, despite the

---

<sup>111</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 36.

<sup>112</sup> Sabinus clearly makes no mention of it, since this synod is not picked up by either Socrates or Sozomen; the letters of both Eastern and Western synods at Sardica are silent on the subject, as is the homoiousian synod of Ancyra of 358 (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73.2.1-11.11), which mentions the 336 synod which first deposed Marcellus and the Dedication synod in a list of canonical synods and creeds recognised by the party (*Panarion*, 73.2.2,10).

<sup>113</sup> Hanson, *Search*, p. 263.

<sup>114</sup> Schwartz, *GS* III, 164 and 278.

superficial support of Athanasius' accusation that the Eusebians established Pistus 'over the Arians (τοῖς Ἀριανοῖς)' in Alexandria.<sup>115</sup> The Eusebians were too clever to have espoused a unilateral action with no basis, even an apparent one, in imperial or synodal legislation, and it is clear that Julius was being asked to recognise him as Bishop of Alexandria in place of Athanasius.

What seems most likely is that Pistus was indeed elected at Tyre, but the election was never ratified by Constantine.<sup>116</sup> The action of the six Constantinopolitan Eusebians in writing to Julius was an attempt to profit from the ambiguity of the situation. Julius had only been Bishop of Rome since the previous February; he must have been, to say the least, confused about the exact situation in Alexandria, and to whom precisely he should send letters of friendship as its bishop. The Eusebians could pretend Tyre had been ratified by Constantine, and that Athanasius' exile showed as much;<sup>117</sup> Pistus must therefore be the true bishop of Alexandria. If Julius would agree to write to Pistus (not elected under Constantius, and therefore not an insult to his authority as such), the Eusebians would then have an extremely strong case for petitioning the emperor to recognise him according to the precedent of Aurelian's recognition of Paul of Samosata's successor on his being written to by the Bishop of Rome.

Julius was not fooled; Athanasius' presbyters arrived, and made mincemeat of their opponents. Julius wrote to all parties, calling for a synod at Rome. The Eusebians must have ignored him, or replied in self-righteous dudgeon as they were to continue to do.

The other prong of the Eusebians' attack was rather more successful, although by proceeding on two different fronts with two different arguments, they were giving hostages to fortune which would prove impossible to ransom.

---

<sup>115</sup> Athanasius, *Ep Enc* 6.2.

<sup>116</sup> See above.



Constantine II supported Athanasius (Constantine's reaction to the Eusebian letters and Athanasius' embassy refuting them is not known); Athanasius successfully defended himself before Constantius in the short term.<sup>118</sup> But by the following winter, Constantius had had enough of Athanasius and agreed to expel him (and presumably also the other exiles).

Although Constantius could have expelled the former exiles purely on the basis of the synods which had originally deposed them, there must have been some sort of a synod at this point to elect Gregory, and it was probably this synod which formally petitioned Constantius for the former exiles' removal also (quite possibly on his direction, as in the case of the deposition of Paul).<sup>119</sup> Julius may even have petitioned Constantius himself, calling for a synod to review the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus, and pronouncing Pistus beyond the pale. If so, Constantius answered the letter of this petition, not the spirit. The synod reviewing the cases of the exiles was clearly a strictly Eastern, presumably Eusebian affair, and the discredited Pistus was simply replaced by someone else.

The make-up of this synod is unknown, although it is likely to have been much smaller than the Dedication Synod would be, since it made no real impression on the sources (Sabinus cannot have recorded it except as a prelude to the Dedication Synod, and Basil of Ancyra makes no mention of it).<sup>120</sup> Flacillus of Antioch presumably presided, Eusebius of Constantinople would not have been absent, and there are likely to have been as many dissident bishops of Egypt,

---

<sup>117</sup> Julius' counter-argument, that Athanasius found his see empty on his return (*Ap c Ar* 29.3), which shows that he had not really been deposed by Constantine, indicates that the Eusebians had used the argument from exile to deposition.

<sup>118</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. also Constantius' reinstatement of Philagrius as Praetorian Prefect of Egypt on the basis of an Egyptian petition (*Hist Ar* 9.3).

<sup>120</sup> Socrates' account, while it confuses the Dedication Synod with the synod of 338/9 at this point, shows that his source made a distinction between the two: the Eusebian party 'previously designed to calumniate Athanasius', bringing various charges against him (Socrates, *HE* II.8.6-7), which were probably referred to in the Acta of the Dedication Synod as having already taken place. Basil (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73.2.2,10) lists the synods recognised by the homoiousian party: he includes the first synod which deposed Marcellus, and the Dedication synod, but says nothing of any synod in between. See also above.

Libya and the Thebaid as could be procured,<sup>121</sup> besides the usual suspects from the diocese of Oriens: the bishop of Caesarea (Eusebius, or Acacius if Eusebius was already dead), Narcissus of Neronias, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, George of Laodicea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis. If Eusebius of Caesarea was still alive, this may have been the occasion for which he composed *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, which he dedicated to Flacillus.<sup>122</sup> If so, he had been preparing it for such an occasion for some time: it has none of the hastiness of the *Contra Marcellum*, but is a long, laboriously written and carefully shaped work, deliberately written in three books for the three hypostases, against Marcellus' one book making known the one God.

It is, however, emphatically not the case that Athanasius was deposed and Gregory appointed by 'a council of bishops convened and conducted according to due form,'<sup>123</sup> any more than the synod of Tyre had been convened and conducted according to due form. The bishop of Alexandria, by power as well as precedent, was one of the three great prelates of the Church.<sup>124</sup> The succession of the other two great sees, Rome and Antioch, had been disputed in the course of the third century.<sup>125</sup> In the first case, that of the Novatian schism, Antioch supported Novatian, but was unable to prevail against the combined authority of Alexandria, Carthage and other important sees of the West. In the second, the deposition of Paul of Samosata, the judgement of a number of major Oriental bishops (not including Dionysius of Alexandria, who declined to get involved) was insufficient to depose the bishop of Antioch without the agreement of Rome. There was no precedent at all for the removal of a bishop

---

<sup>121</sup> Athanasius (*Ep Enc* 6.1) tells us that the Arians in Alexandria had petitioned for Gregory.

<sup>122</sup> Barnes (*Athanasius*, p. 56), Seibt (*Markell*, p. 243) and Vinzent are probably right in dating *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* to the period after Marcellus' return to Ancyra; the fact that it is dedicated to Flacillus indicates an Antiochene provenance rather than a Constantinopolitan one, which would suggest it was not part of a second condemnation of Marcellus at Constantinople (if there was one), but rather composed as general ammunition to be used against him at any fitting opportunity. The opportunity may have come in Antioch in the winter of 338/9.

<sup>123</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 50.

<sup>124</sup> Nicaea, Canon 6.

<sup>125</sup> See chapter 1.

of Athanasius' status without reference to one, and that the most prestigious, of the other two major sees, and certainly not against its will.<sup>126</sup>

The 339 synod was on firmer ground with Asclepas of Gaza (just as Julius and the Western synod of Sardica were on shaky ground in attempting to re-instate him), if indeed Asclepas' enemies waited this long to depose him once more. According to canon 14 of the 329 synod of Antioch, a disputed local deposition should be taken to a synod composed of the metropolitan of the province, other bishops of the province and the bishops of neighbouring provinces. Most of these may have been present at this synod: Gaza was in the province of Palestine, and Caesarea was its metropolitan see. It might even be argued that this synod had the right to depose Marcellus, if (and it is a very big if) a majority of the bishops of his province and of the civil diocese, including the metropolitan of the capital of the civil diocese, were present and agreed to his deposition (not that a canon exists to this effect, but by analogy with the role of the provincial metropolitan and his synod).<sup>127</sup> But the bishops of the great sees in the third century as well as those in the fifth and beyond would have agreed that the bishop of Alexandria could not be deposed without the agreement of Rome as well as Antioch, just as Antioch alone could not make Novatian bishop of Rome.

---

<sup>126</sup> The oft-repeated claim of the 'Easterners' that the West was interfering in their affairs (Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.1, cf. Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.26.1-2 (Feder p. 65.7-19)) was a three-card trick: no ecclesiastical distinction between 'East' and 'West' existed at this point, as the legal and hortatory correspondence cited in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* between sees in each region makes abundantly clear. Instead, advantage is simply being taken of a very temporary civil administrative arrangement. It could be argued that the ratification of the emperor provided a *de facto* higher court than the ecclesiastical, but there was no provision in canon law at this stage for him to do so.

<sup>127</sup> It is not impossible that these putative requirements were fulfilled by the 339 synod: the regions of Central Asia Minor whose bishops supported Athanasius and presumably Marcellus (Isauria, Pamphilia, Lycia, Asia and Phrygia -- see above) were all in the dioceses of Asiana or Oriens, while the diocese of Pontica, in which Galatia was situated, had Dianius of Caesarea as the bishop of its capital and included the provinces of Bithynia, Cappadocia, Diospontus and Pontus Polemoniacus, all of which had had 'Ariophrone' or anti-Marcellan metropolitans in the recent past (although the diocese as a whole only sent ten bishops, including Basil, to Sardica). However, this seems unlikely. The synod at Constantinople which originally deposed Marcellus had no representatives from Galatia; of the four Galatian sees besides Ancyra which signed at Nicaea (the only cities in Galatia), only one (Iuliopolis, whose bishop attended at Sardica) is known to have been involved on the Eusebian-Acacian side; in addition, as

Athanasius left Alexandria on April 16<sup>th</sup> 339 for Rome. As soon as he arrived there, Julius must surely have immediately sent another request, and an urgent one, for a synod to take place at Rome.<sup>128</sup> Athanasius would have known how little chance there was of this happening, but needed above all to be seen to do things according to the ecclesiastical canons; he must have busied himself in the meantime with writing and sending envoys to his various friends in both East and West. Marcellus, if he was simply banished again to Constans' regions (rather than facing the somewhat harsher penalties Athanasius was convinced awaited him if he were taken) may have been one of the recipients of Athanasius' correspondence, which would explain his appearance in Rome three months after Athanasius'.<sup>129</sup>

At some point, Constantius must have been persuaded, either by petitions from supporters of the exiles in his own territory, by pressure from the churches in the West or by requests from one or both of his brothers (before they went to war with one another early in 340) that he had to hold a more convincing, more representative synod.<sup>130</sup> The completion of the new great church begun by Constantine, Hagia Homonoia, provided a suitable occasion, and the invitations must have been issued by the latest in the late summer of 340.<sup>131</sup> It would appear that they went only to bishops in his own realm.

---

mentioned above, we have no reason to believe that the 339 synod, which is never even mentioned in the sources in relation to Marcellus, was as comprehensive as this would entail.

<sup>128</sup> This would be the letter summarised in Sozomen, *HE* III.8.3, and mentioned briefly at *Ap c Ar* 20.1.

<sup>129</sup> Marcellus himself says that he waited 'a year and three full months' for his enemies to come (Letter to Julius, lines 12-14), and had to leave Rome before the synod itself, in the end. Athanasius, in the Alexandrian synodal letter, claims to believe his opponents were seeking the death penalty for him (Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3.5; 3.7; 4.1; 5.3; 18.1), and had some chance of success.

<sup>130</sup> See chapter 5 for the suggestion it was pressure from Constans in spring 340 which was most successful in this.

<sup>131</sup> On the church's name and the date being assumed for the synod, see below. The shortest time attested between the convoking and the assembling of a large imperial-summoned synod at this period is the Council of Chalcedon's three and a half months between 17<sup>th</sup> May 451 and 1<sup>st</sup> September; other synods where the interval is known (e.g. Ephesus) attest as much as six and a half months.

## **b. Julius and the call for a synod**

Julius, meanwhile, was clearly losing patience after another year of hearing nothing satisfactory from the Eusebian party. Goaded by their insolence, he gave them a deadline (προθεσμία) to come for a synod in Rome, and despatched two presbyters to try and make them keep it.

The question of what exactly that deadline was is an important and difficult one. Julius tells us that Athanasius waited ‘a year and six months’, and Marcellus that he himself has waited ‘a year and three months’ for the Eusebians to appear in Rome for a synod.<sup>132</sup> Those to whom Julius is replying in the letter given in Athanasius’ *Apologia contra Arianos* have implied that Julius has not given them enough time to make the journey; Julius seems to concede that they have a point.<sup>133</sup> How do we square these two different pieces of information?

It would seem to make sense if we assume that Athanasius’ eighteen months may be either from his arrival in Rome or from Julius’ first writing with an urgent proposal (as opposed to the somewhat vague proposal he had sent earlier) shortly afterwards. Marcellus’ fifteen months will be from his arrival, either three months after Athanasius’ or three months after Julius’ letter. Athanasius insists he went directly to Rome from Alexandria, without going to the courts of either of the other two Augusti;<sup>134</sup> if he took a direct sailing he could have been there by mid-May, but he is more likely to have taken a more circuitous route to avoid imperial apprehension.

At the other end of the time-line, Julius complains bitterly that his presbyters were kept as late as January; they still did have time, however, to return to Rome before or only very shortly after the last day of the appointed term.<sup>135</sup> If

---

<sup>132</sup> See above.

<sup>133</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.3.

<sup>134</sup> Athanasius, *Ap ad Const* 4.1

<sup>135</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.3; 21.2,4 (see also chapter 5).

they managed to leave Antioch on 7<sup>th</sup> January, they would just have been able to make the 2000 mile land journey to Rome (sailing would have been impossible) by about 14<sup>th</sup> March, if they had been lucky with the weather, and the Cilician Gates and the Julian Alps were not blocked by snow, although keeping up the necessary thirty miles per day would have been most unpleasant in winter.<sup>136</sup>

We may therefore posit that the period Julius appointed, which the presbyters made it back for with so much difficulty, was about the Ides of March. This would make Athanasius' eighteen months of waiting commence in mid-September 339, and Marcellus' fifteen in mid-December. This is not impossible timing. The trip from Alexandria to Rome was against the trade winds, and had been known to take well over 70 days.<sup>137</sup> Athanasius' enemies at Sardica claim that he 'De civitate occulte profugiit';<sup>138</sup> presumably the ports were watched. He may have worked his way around the coast overland or in a light craft as far as Tripolitania, safely in Constans' territory, before he made the major crossing, and not have arrived in Rome before August; if Julius was out of the city in the mountains or in Campania, it could well have been September before they were able to do their business and Julius was able to write to Eusebius and his friends.

To make sense of the combination of Athanasius' eighteen months' wait and the deadline that was too soon for the Eusebians, we have to assume that the deadline was not given at this point, but in a third irate letter perhaps six months later, when Julius' patience was really wearing thin, and after he had had the promise of support for his request from Constans.<sup>139</sup> It was at this stage, we may assume, that Julius proffered the deadline of which he speaks. Προθεσμία can mean an appointed length of time as well as an appointed day.<sup>140</sup> That would

---

<sup>136</sup> The date of January 7<sup>th</sup> assumes that the Dedication Synod (which the presbyters certainly attended, since they reported on its content (Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 21.4), ended on January 6<sup>th</sup>, as will be argued below, and that the presbyters were then immediately released.

<sup>137</sup> Lucian of Samosata records a voyage (possibly fictional) in which a grain ship attempting to cross from Alexandria to Rome is hit by bad weather and blown off course, landing at Piraeus after seventy days (*Nav.* 9).

<sup>138</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.8.3 (Feder p. 55.8-9).

<sup>139</sup> See chapter 5 below.

<sup>140</sup> Julius calls the προθεσμία 'στενήν' (narrow) and also speaks of the 'interval' (διάστημα) of the προθεσμία as being 'narrow' (25.3), both of which seem to suggest that it is a length of



seem more likely here: March, so near Easter, would have been an extremely peculiar time to deliberately choose for a synod involving bishops from so far away. If Julius had given a time-limit of a year, however, when he sent Elpidius and Philoxenus to the East, it might have seemed ample to him (particularly after the Eusebians had dragged their heels for so long already). It would not in fact have given them so very much time once the presbyters had made their voyage East, with perhaps only two months of the sailing season left. If Julius's request to the Easterners was in any way unreasonable, they amply took their revenge on his poor presbyters, who had over two months of hard travelling in winter conditions to return with the news that the Easterners were not coming by the time appointed.

### c. The date of the Dedication Synod

The case for January 6<sup>th</sup> as the date of the Dedication synod has been most cogently put by W. Eltester (although some scholars continue to follow the sequence proposed by Schwartz, which places the Dedication Synod after the synod of Rome, in the summer of 341).<sup>141</sup> January 6<sup>th</sup> is probably correct, for the following reasons:

The date of the synod is given as the feast of Epiphany in the 8<sup>th</sup>-century *Liber Calipharum*, argued by Bidez to be here dependent on Philostorgius.<sup>142</sup> Even if, as Vinzent claims, the *Liber Calipharum* (like most eighth-century chronicles)

---

time rather than a date for assembly which he has given the Easterners; in other words, although the end of that time came to be itself a deadline, the Eastern bishops were not directly being asked by Julius to travel during the winter.

<sup>141</sup> Walther Eltester, 'Die Kirchen Antiochias im 4. Jahrhundert', ZNT 36 (1937), 251-86, at pp. 254-5, followed by Schneemelcher, 'Kirchweihsynode', p. 330, Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 57, and Seibt, *Markell*, p.12; Schwartz, *GS* III, pp. 301 and 310-311, followed by Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 146-160, Hanson, *Search*, pp. 270, 284-285, and Vinzent, 'Die Entstehung des "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnisses"' in W. Kinzig et al., *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis: Studien zur sogenannten "Traditio Apostolica" zu den "Interrogationes de fide" und zum "Romischen Glaubensbekenntnis"* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1999), pp. 185-409, at pp. 202-206.

<sup>142</sup> Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn 1981), p. 212

can be heavily unreliable,<sup>143</sup> the feast of Epiphany is liturgically extremely plausible: since Hagia Homonoia, the pagan-friendly name of the new church which was dedicated at the time of the synod,<sup>144</sup> would not have a corresponding Christian feast-day, the Epiphany, the feast of Christ as *Lumen Gentium*, the second major feast after Easter in the Eastern calendar, would have been eminently appropriate.

Secondly, there is the evidence of Julius' letter. This is demonstrably replying to a letter sent from a synod in Antioch which is summarised by Sozomen (*HE* III.8). Sozomen describes the letter as 'beautifully expressed and composed with great legal skill, yet filled with considerable irony and indulging in the strongest threats'; Julius says 'If the author of it wrote with an ambition of exhibiting his power of language, such a practice surely is more suitable for other subjects: in ecclesiastical matters, it is not a display of eloquence that is needed, but the observance of apostolic canons.'<sup>145</sup> Sozomen says 'They confessed in this epistle that the Church of Rome was entitled to universal honour, because it was the school of the apostles ... they added that the second place in point of honour ought not to be assigned to them, because they did not have the advantage of size or number in their churches'; Julius complains 'Now if you really believe that all bishops have the same and equal authority, and you do not, as you assert, account of them according to the magnitude of their cities, he that is entrusted with a small city ought to abide in the place committed to him, and not from disdain at his trust to remove to one that has never been put under him' (a palpable hit on Eusebius of Nicomedia).<sup>146</sup> 'They called Julius to account for having admitted the followers of Athanasius into communion', Sozomen tells us, 'and expressed their indignation against him for having insulted their synod and abrogated their decrees, and they assailed his transactions as unjust and discordant with ecclesiastical right'; 'Who are the parties who dishonour synods?', replies Julius, 'Are not they who have set at nought the votes of the

---

<sup>143</sup> Vinzent, 'Entstehung', pp. 204-5.

<sup>144</sup> For the name see Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), pp. 345-346.

<sup>145</sup> Sozomen, *HE*, 3.8.4; Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 21.5.

Three Hundred, and have preferred impiety to godliness?<sup>147</sup> Sozomen's letter cannot simply be an extrapolation from Julius', however, because it gives some additional information, such as the final sneer that there was no point in the Easterners trying to defend themselves, because everything they did was wrong (a taunt more suited to the lips of teenagers than of bishops, one would have imagined). The conclusion that Julius really is replying to the letter Socrates is summarising seems inescapable.

Sozomen (following Socrates) sets this letter in a different synod from the Dedication, but his order here is impossible: Eusebius, one of the dedicatees of Julius' letter, is already dead by the time this synod to which Julius is replying supposedly takes place.<sup>148</sup> There is every reason to believe the synod involved is actually the Dedication Synod, despite the fact that Sozomen separates the two: it is large enough to claim to represent more than the Eusebians, it included the farther-flung bishops of Constantius' territory, Maris of Chalcedon and Theodore of Heraclea, as well as the ubiquitous Eusebius of Constantinople, and it must have taken place in January of 341.<sup>149</sup> Sozomen must at this point be using a source (presumably Sabinus) which does not fully name and date all its documents; the source-compiler may not himself have realised that the three or more letters to Julius which he had before him were all from the same synod. If the two synods are indeed identical and the date of January correct, then since Julius' letter declares itself to be written following the synod of Rome which exonerated Athanasius and Marcellus, which itself took place shortly after the return of the presbyters from Antioch, the synod of Rome must have taken place

---

<sup>146</sup> Sozomen, *HE* 3.8.5; Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.2.

<sup>147</sup> Sozomen, *HE* 3.8.6; Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 23.2.

<sup>148</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 21.1; Socrates, *HE* II.12.1; Sozomen, *HE* III.7.3. The chronology of this entire section in both Socrates and Sozomen is a mess, due to their using Athanasius' tendentious and selective *Historia Arianorum* (supplemented in all likelihood by Sabinus' probably equally tendentious and selective *De Synodis*) as a base narrative into which to slot known dates and documents from other sources.

<sup>149</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 26.1; 21.1; 341 is *the terminus post quem* because of the eighteen months since Athanasius arrived in Rome, and the *terminus ante quem* because Eusebius was dead by the winter of 341/2 (Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 201); Julius refers to the date of January for the release of the presbyters who brought the synodal letter to which Julius is replying (*Ap c Ar* 25.3).

after the Dedication synod, and not vice versa as Schwartz, Hanson and Vinzent claim.

### 3. The Dedication Synod of Antioch

The Dedication Synod, or at least one or more of the creeds it issued, is often considered as the voice of the majority of moderate Easterners.<sup>150</sup> This is an illusion: its ninety-seven members were neither moderate, politically or theologically (as their letter to Julius as well as the creeds they issued amply demonstrate), nor a majority (even assuming they all came from Constantius' regions, they constitute less than half the number of those from the same regions at Nicaea).<sup>151</sup> They look to be representative: they include the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Palestinian Caesarea, Cappadocian Caesarea and Ancyra. But the very occupants of these sees tell us that the synod was still heavily dominated by the Eusebians and people who owed their positions to them, as can be seen from the sixteen names of participants (one a layman and so not part of the episcopal count) that are given by or can be deduced from the sources.<sup>152</sup> One important Palestinian bishop, Maximus of Jerusalem, we are specifically told by Socrates, did not attend.<sup>153</sup>

However, other than the Egyptian synod which exonerated Athanasius in 338, it was by far the largest episcopal gathering since Nicaea, and seems to have been a breath of fresh air on the Eastern scene. Having won their struggle against their previous opponents, at least for the time being, the Eusebian leaders could turn to real theological debate amongst themselves and those who were

---

<sup>150</sup> E.g. 'The doctrine they [the creeds of the Dedication synod] taught or implied was a faithful replica of the average theology of the Eastern Church': J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn, Harlow: Longman, 1972), p. 274; 'It [the Second Creed] represents the nearest approach we can make to discovering the views of the ordinary educated Eastern bishop...the Second Creed shows us how the hitherto silent majority wished to modify this [the 'true blue' Arianism of the First Creed]': Hanson, *Search*, pp. 290-291.

<sup>151</sup> See Sozomen, *HE*, IV.22.22 and Hilary, *De Syn* 28 for the number present; Gelzer, *Nomina*, pp. LX- LXIV, nos. 2-92, 94-204, for the number present at Nicaea from the same regions.

<sup>152</sup> See below..

reasonably like-minded, and so discussion of the theological issues seems to have moved on to the front foot again for the first time in a decade and a half. Since the bishops who came from the wrong side of the Cilician gates (including Basil of Ancyra) would quite likely have assembled in good time, to ensure they avoided the heavy snows, there would probably have been a preliminary group with some leisure to discuss theological and political issues. The debate on the theological level is likely to have been quite fruitful, even if there was clearly no room for manoeuvre (whether or not anyone wanted it) on the ecclesiastical-political side. Both Basil of Ancyra and Hilary, who gloss over or condemn the synod of Tyre, consider this synod as authoritative: Basil, in particular, singles out the full proceedings of this synod for acceptance, whereas he mentions only the authority of the creeds of the synods which followed it.<sup>154</sup>

Thirteen names of episcopal participants can be gleaned from Socrates, Sozomen and Julius, a fourteenth (probably) from the Third Creed, and a fifteenth from his own later writings.<sup>155</sup> Flacillus of Antioch seems to have presided.<sup>156</sup> The other figures mentioned by the sources are the Eusebius of Constantinople, Gregory of Alexandria, Dianius of Cappadocian Caesarea, Acacius of Palestinian Caesarea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Eudoxius of Germanicia, Theodore of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias, Maris of Chalcedon and Macedonius of Mopsuestia, the embryonic homoiousians Basil of Ancyra, Eusebius of Emesa and George of Laodicea, and presumably the rather pro-Marcellan Theophronius of Tyana, as well as the layman Asterius the Sophist.

---

<sup>153</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.8.3.

<sup>154</sup> Hilary, *De Syn* 33; Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 73.2.10.

<sup>155</sup> Dianius, Flacillus, Narcissus, Eusebius, Maris, Macedonius and Theodore are the addressees of Julius' letter (*Athanasius, Ap c Ar* 21.1); Sozomen (*HE* III.5.10) lists Eusebius of Constantinople, Acacius of Caesarea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theodore of Heraclea, Eudoxius of Germanicia, Gregory of Alexandria, Dianius of Caesarea and George of Laodicea. According to *Liber Synodicus*, Asterius was also there: this is an attractive proposition, though not a necessary one. Both Socrates (*HE* II.10.1) and Sozomen (*HE* III.6.3-5) also list Eusebius of Emesa elsewhere. Basil of Ancyra, in the synodal letter of the 358 synod of Ancyra, speaks of the Dedication Synod as though he had been present at it. Theophronius need not actually have been present to clear his name with the Third Creed, but it would have been normal practice for him to be so.

<sup>156</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.8.5.

That there were some diverse shades of opinion at the synod can be seen from the three creeds (which will be discussed below), and from a remark which was evidently made in the synodal letter to the bishop of Rome, to which Julius refers in bewilderment in his reply: 'I wonder how you could ever have written that part of your letter in which you say that I alone wrote, and not to all of you, but to the Eusebians only ... Either then the Eusebians ought not alone to have written, apart from you all, or else you, to whom I did not write, ought not to be offended that I wrote to them who had written to me.'<sup>157</sup> Through this complaint comes the voice of the likes of Basil, straining to be recognised as more than merely an adjunct to the Eusebian gang, using the letter to Julius, perhaps, as a way to make a point to those nearer home.

There was clearly unity at the synod, however, of two sorts, as we shall see. One was agreement in taking offence at Julius' demands. The second was in condemning the doctrines ascribed to Marcellus of Ancyra. Whatever the theological differences of the group, those who had a voice at all clearly felt Marcellus to be beyond the pale. We may imagine that even by this stage some of those not in the immediate Eusebian circle felt uncomfortable about the treatment of the bishop of Alexandria, and squirmed at Julius' imputation of Arianism to the whole East: condemnations of extreme Arian statements by the East become marked in the years that follow. But the case of Marcellus was clear; all those committed to the three hypostaseis of Origen (presumably nearly all of those at this synod, although not necessarily the majority of Eastern bishops in general, given the widespread support of one-hypostasis theology in Antioch, central Asia minor, the Balkan peninsula and Egypt) found his apparent identification of the Son with the Father as shocking as he found their apparent doctrine of the Father and his obedient created instrument with whom he lived in 'συνφωνία in all things.'<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> *Apol c Ar* 26.1.

<sup>158</sup> See Marcellus, fragments P 84 and 85 (S/V 74 and 75).



The universal opprobrium cast on Marcellus concealed, to some extent, the differences that were already present in the group that met at the Dedication synod: it would take nearly two more decades before the fissures became gaping cracks and then split the dominant Eastern party asunder. But as long as they could revel in orgies of hate against one extreme enemy and indulge in self-satisfied baiting of the hapless Julius for his unreasonable request to attend a synod well over two thousand miles of road-journey away in the middle of winter, the mass of those Easterners who attended the synod could continue conveniently to forget that their ascendancy was founded on the brilliant and cunning machinations of a small group of people over the previous twelve years, who had in that time expelled bishops from all three major Eastern sees, flouted the major Western see and left such a trail of depositions of other bishops of metropolitan and lesser sees as ought to have given them, as it did Julius, pause.

**a. The reply to Julius.**

The most immediate business of the synod was the reply to Julius' ultimatum that the Eusebians attend a synod in Rome by a definite date, probably mid-March. As has been noted, Julius' proposal was unrealistic, and the synod took full advantage of that fact. The main points of the letter, reconstructed from Julius' letter, Athanasius' extract in *De Synodis* and Sozomen's summary,<sup>159</sup> are as follows.

1. Rome's claims to honour on the grounds of the antiquity of its apostolic tradition and the teaching there of Peter and Paul do not give it precedence over the sees of the East, since the apostles came from and first taught in the East.<sup>160</sup>
2. All bishops are of equal honour, regardless of the size of their cities or the number of churches there, since it is the office which gives the dignity.<sup>161</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 22; *Ap c Ar* 21-35; Sozomen, *HE* III.8.4-8.

<sup>160</sup> Sozomen, *HE* III.8.5.

3. Julius, in receiving Athanasius and Marcellus as bishops and communicating with them, and not writing letters of friendship to Pistus, has dishonoured the synods which deposed them, 'lighted up the flame of discord', acted contrary to the canons and to church tradition and preferred communion with criminals to communion with the bishops of the East. According to the tradition set by the cases of Novatian and Paul of Samosta, the East and the West do not interfere with one another's canonical decisions, but merely ratify them. The acts of a synod, once passed, are sacrosanct and cannot be revoked.<sup>162</sup>

4. Julius wrote by himself alone, without support from other bishops in the West, and only addressed the friends of Eusebius, not the rest of the Easterners.<sup>163</sup>

5. Julius' attempt to dragoon the Easterners into going to Rome for a synod by sending presbyters is outrageous. His proposal of a synod is unnecessary, since the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus are already closed, and in any case he has given the Easterners too little notice, and is completely unreasonable in suggesting they should desert their flocks and travel a very long way in the middle of winter in time of war.<sup>164</sup>

6. The Easterners will not come to the synod, and unless Julius accepts the decisions of the synods they have already held and excommunicates Athanasius and Marcellus, they will not send him letters of peace and accord.<sup>165</sup>

7. The Eastern bishops are not followers of Arius, nor could they be, since he was a presbyter and they are bishops, but they tried him and found him to be

---

<sup>161</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.2.

<sup>162</sup> Sozomen, *HE* III.8.6; Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.1-2.

<sup>163</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 26.1.

<sup>164</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.1,4.

<sup>165</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.4; Sozomen, *HE* III.8.7.

orthodox. They supply a creed which describes their faith, and is compatible with Arius'.<sup>166</sup>

A word or two about Julius' reply to this letter may be made here. He addresses it to 'Dianius, Flacillus, Narcissus, Eusebius, Maris, Macedonius, Theodore and their friends who have written to me from Antioch.' These must be the first seven signatories of the letter, rather than the salutants (the letter must be written from 'the holy synod at Antioch,' since its authors make the point that they are more than merely 'the Eusebians.')

In addressing his reply to these by name, rather than to the synod, Julius is refusing to recognise the synod's validity.

He answers point 2. with the sneer 'If all bishops have equal authority, why do you keep moving to larger sees?' To answer the third point, he reminds them that Nicaea allowed that the decisions of synods to depose bishops are revisable, so that proceedings should always be carried out with an eye to the judgement of future synods. Most commentators point out that the canons of Nicaea as they stand do not, in fact, include this resolution.<sup>167</sup> However, this is the practice which Nicaea itself adopted with regard to Eusebius of Caesarea, Narcissus of Neronias and Theodotus of Laodicea, who had been provisionally condemned by the synod at Antioch a few months before Nicaea, which, however, itself looked forward to a review of the case at Ancyra (where the upcoming 'great and holy synod' was then expected to be). Julius does not make the point that the case of Novatian pleads against the Eusebians, since Fabius of Antioch did not accept the West's preference of Cornelius, but he could have. The Easterners' point that Julius has preferred the communion of Athanasius and Marcellus to that of themselves is of course correct, but he had, when they came to Rome, to make a decision one way or the other, and had already reason to be deeply suspicious of the group which had claimed to depose them.

---

<sup>166</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 22.

As already mentioned, Julius more or less concedes that the Easterners were correct to say that they were not given enough time to come to the synod, and was clearly so embarrassed at their pointing out how unreasonable the journey would have been in the middle of winter in time of war that he concealed their letter for a time from the bishops who had assembled for the synod he called.<sup>168</sup>

We do not know who composed the letter to Julius- it may be a composite- but there are four individuals any one of whom would fit the bill of a very bright, very rhetorically skilled and very sarcastic author: Eusebius of Nicomedia, Basil of Ancyra (who might have been responsible for the claim that there were more than merely the Eusebians to be reckoned with in the East), Acacius of Caesarea and Asterius the Sophist.

#### **b. Acacius of Caesarea's *Contra Marcellum*.**

It is possible that the Dedication Synod not only enshrined anti-Marcellan phrases in the anathemata of its creeds (as we shall see), but also had a set-piece address against him by Acacius of Caesarea. Five fragments of a *Contra Marcellum* by Acacius survive from his early days as a theologian (in latter years he would deny that the Son was the image of the Father in the sense in which he affirms it here),<sup>169</sup> and since they attack Marcellus' work against Asterius, and Asterius is thought to have been present at the Dedication synod, it is usually and attractively assumed the piece was read there.<sup>170</sup>

---

<sup>167</sup> E.g. Schwartz, *GS* III, p. 302, n. 2; Opitz, *Athanasius' Werke* II, p.103, line 24 note; Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 59, with p. 257 note 24.

<sup>168</sup> See above.

<sup>169</sup> Acacius' anhomioianism is refuted from his own earlier works at Seleucia in 359 (Socrates, *HE* II.40.33; Sozomen *HE* IV.22.21); he replies that he should not be judged from his own works.

<sup>170</sup> The fragments are to be found in Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 72.6-10. For a thorough examination of the theology of Acacius' *Contra Marcellum*, as well as a brief discussion of its probable setting at the Dedication Synod, see Joseph T. Lienhard, 'Acacius of Caesarea: *Contra Marcellum*. Historical and Theological Considerations,' *Cr St* 10 (1989), 1-22.

Acacius' work, as we have it, is clever, though often unscrupulously so. It defends Asterius' exegesis of one phrase, or part of a phrase, of the Dedication Creed, in the light of Marcellus' criticism of it.

Asterius wrote ἄλλος μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ γεννήσας ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ λόγον καὶ πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, μόνος μόνον, τέλειος τέλειον, βασιλεὺς βασιλέα, κύριος κύριον, θεὸς θεόν, οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα; ἄλλος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθείς, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου ('For the Father who begot from himself the only-begotten Son and First-born of all creation is the one, one having begotten one, complete having begotten complete, a King a king, a Lord a lord, God one divine, an unvarying image of substance and will and glory and power; and the one born from him, who is the image of the invisible God, is the other').<sup>171</sup> This phrase is closely paralleled in the second article of the Second Creed of the Dedication Synod with the Son as subject (though in the accusative after Πιστεύομεν εἰς): τὸν γεννηθέντα ... ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου, μόνον ἐκ μόνου, τέλειον ἐκ τελείου, βασιλέα ἐκ βασιλέως, κύριον ἀπὸ κυρίου, ... τῆς θεότητος οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα.<sup>172</sup>

Marcellus dealt with Asterius' exegesis of this phrase at length, in at least two stages. 'Asterius makes mention of the "image of the invisible God" because of this,' Marcellus says, 'so that he might teach "God differs from the Logos so much, as much as even a human being seems to differ from his own image."' This is the key to Marcellus' opposition. He first of all gives his own understanding of how 'image' is to be taken, in everyday and consequently in theological language (how far he is drawing on a non-theological use of the term by Asterius is unclear), and then seeks to show that Asterius' own exegesis goes considerably beyond the language of the Lucianic creed, and is both nonsensical (in terms of the meaning of the word 'image') and theologically dangerous.

---

<sup>171</sup> Asterius, fr. 11 and 12 Vinzent.

<sup>172</sup> Hahn and Hahn, pp. 184-185.

An image is an image not of itself but of some other thing, Marcellus tells us (P 60); images are there to point to those things of which they are images even when they are absent (P 55; this may originally have been Asterius' description).<sup>173</sup> Like the emperor's statue, the 'image of the invisible God' of Colossians 1.15 cannot therefore itself be invisible (P 54), which would make no sense. The Logos therefore becomes 'image of the invisible God' only after having assumed the form which is 'according to the image and likeness of God' (P 53), i.e. human flesh. Indeed, it becomes clear that human beings are described as being made in the 'image and likeness of God' precisely because human flesh would shortly become the image of the Logos who assumed it. (P 57)

For Marcellus, the Logos made human made the unseen God visible and tangible as God's true εἰκών, and any theology of a pre-incarnate Logos as image (a language both Alexander and Athanasius were quite happy to use)<sup>174</sup> was both otiose and pernicious. This is an enormously rich theology, arguably Marcellus' greatest contribution to patristic thought, largely because it sidesteps the middle and neo-Platonic understanding of image in cosmic terms which so dogged most commentators in the third and fourth centuries and beyond. For this very reason, it inevitably infuriated those who were wedded to that understanding.

'These words clearly expose his base opinion concerning θεότητος,' Marcellus points out (P 59). 'So he wishes him to be none of those things of which he spoke before; for he says that he is the image of all these. So then, if he is the image of essence, he is no longer able to be essence itself; and if he is the image of will, he is no longer to be will itself, and if the image of power, no longer power, and if the image of glory, no longer glory' (note that Marcellus here follows the order of the Second Creed). By moving θεὸς θεόν from its place at the beginning of the list to the end of it, Asterius has made 'an unvarying image

---

<sup>173</sup> Vinzent makes this Asterius' fragment 13 (Vinzent, *Asterius*, p. 88 (13)).



of substance and will and glory and power' an elucidation of what exactly he means by θεόν. Well might Marcellus argue that Asterius does not really believe in the true Godhead of the Son, and that (by implication) he does not even go so far as to see the Son as representing Origen's *epinoiai* (αὐτοδύναμις was used by Origen;<sup>175</sup> αὐτοουσία, αὐτοβουλή and αὐτοδόξα are clearly modelled on it), far less seeing him as Lord and God.

Marcellus must have had some particular arguments also about the adjectives μόνος, τέλειος and βασιλεύς, because Acacius refers to such (*Panarion* 72.7.1-2). Μόνος is possibly dealt with around fr. P 68-71, in the discussion of μονάς and τριάς and the three hypostases. In any event, Acacius deals colourfully and brusquely with Marcellus' arguments, showing a great deal more panache than his predecessor ever did. Because the extracts given in Epiphanius are in fact from an anti-Acacian context, it is impossible to know how long Acacius' original speech was, or whether image theology was quite so central to it as the surviving extracts suggest, since it was precisely the Son's exact likeness to the Father that was later in dispute. What does appear clearly is that Acacius has a sure enough grasp of the theological issues between Marcellus and Asterius to flit from gross travesty of Marcellus' reasoning to real refutation of it and back again, sometimes turning Marcellus' words against Asterius back on their author, larding his own account with scriptural insults and apostrophising his absent antagonist with gross threats whose real mark was presumably a delighted gallery.

Acacius argues that because Marcellus claims (probably following Asterius) that an image is not itself what it is an image of (the image of God is not God), then in Marcellus' eyes the scriptural 'image of the invisible God' must be lifeless and without θεότης, being neither Lord, God, essence, will, power or glory.<sup>176</sup> Acacius here is obviously deliberately ignoring the nature of Marcellus'

---

<sup>174</sup> E.g. Alexander, *He philarchos* (= *Urk.* 14), 38 and 47; Athanasius, *C Ar* 2.27 and 2.36. (See chapter 2 above.)

<sup>175</sup> Origen, *Comm in Jn* 1.38 (p. 43.9 Preuschen).

<sup>176</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72.7.1.

argument: it is Asterius who extends the term ‘image of the invisible God’, for which Marcellus had a perfectly reasonable exegesis, to make Christ the image of essence, will, power and glory: the Lucianic creed had made Christ the image of the essence, will, glory and power of the Father (and therefore not the Father, according to Marcellus’ understanding of image).

Acacius is also taking issue with positions Marcellus really holds, however. One who is complete begets one who is complete, separate and distinct, having a separate subsistence (hypostasis), Acacius argues, against Marcellus’ position that the Logos remains one with the Father and is not a separate entity. Acacius and his party (he uses the first person plural) believe the image of an *ousia* is another *ousia*, the image of a will is another will and the image of power and glory are another power and glory. Acacius cites for the first two the scriptural precedent of John 5.26, ‘For as the Father has life ἐν ἑαυτῷ, so he has given to the Son to have life ἐν ἑαυτῷ’ and 5.21 ‘For just as the Father raises the dead and gives life, so also the Son gives life to those whom he wills.’<sup>177</sup> Marcellus hated this theology of two wills of the Father and Son in perfect harmony: he would have said the Logos is the Father’s will, just as he is the Father’s wisdom and the Father’s δύναμις, and that it is Christ who has a second will, qua human being.

Acacius turns Marcellus’ slur on Asterius (‘These words clearly reveal his base opinion concerning the Godhead’) back on Marcellus (72.7.1), as Marcellus had done Eusebius of Caesarea’s against the Ancyrans, and probably against Eustathius of Antioch. He calls down scriptural condemnation on Marcellus (‘Hear the word of the Lord: Write of this man, “A man rejected”’(72.7.10)), and apostrophises him with threats (‘You ought to have your tongue cut out for impiety’ (72.7.2)).

Acacius was the heir to Eusebius’ see of Palestinian Caesarea -- and, of course, Origen’s library -- and so was a fitting man to take up his predecessor’s role as

---

<sup>177</sup> *Panarion* 72.9.8.

Marcellus-basher. Like Eusebius he has unwittingly left us some of the best clues we have as to the content of Marcellus' controversial work. From Acacius, we have important clues as to what Marcellus was actually trying to do in the *Contra Asterium*, and as to why he developed some of the ideas that were to cost him so dear. Marcellus was trying to refute Asterius out of his own mouth, and from his own scriptural texts and his own creed. He was arguing against the notion of the pre-incarnate Christ as a pale carbon copy of the Father, and for the notion of the incarnate Christ as revealing and life-giving *eikon* of God, by the somewhat daring method of applying all the scriptural or scripture-based titles of Christ in the Lucianic creed (only-begotten Son, First-born of all creation, King, Lord, God [probably]) to the Christ of the Incarnation, rejecting Μόνος and Τέλειος as unscriptural, along with οὐσία, and applying any difference of glory and will to the incarnation also, leaving Δύναμις as one of the titles of the Pre-incarnate, along with Wisdom and, of course, Logos. It was Marcellus' application of the second title of King to Christ's earthly rule in the flesh which brought about his lasting reputation as the man who taught that Christ's kingdom would have an end.

Acacius may have alienated a small group at the synod who would go on to be responsible for the pseudonymous Fourth Oration against the Arians, which takes what really can reasonably be described as a middle ground between the Eusebians and Marcellus: the taunt that Marcellus' enemies believe that Christ has a beginning but his kingdom does not seems to pick up a comment of Acacius' in these extracts.<sup>178</sup> But it is likely that, for the most part, he was greeted with resounding cheers and ecstatic applause, not least from the part of the room occupied by the surviving targets of Marcellus' original work, Eusebius of Constantinople, Narcissus of Neronias and Asterius.

### **c. The creeds of the synod.**

---

<sup>178</sup> *Panarion* 72. 7.7; *C Ar* IV 8.1.

The Dedication Synod issued three creeds, apparently (according to *De Synodis* 22-24, where they are given) in separate letters. This suggests that they had three separate functions within the synod, perhaps one in the letter to Julius, one in the main synodal letter (which has not survived in any form), and one in a letter dealing specifically with the case of Theophronius of Tyana (which has not survived either).<sup>179</sup> The first creed seems, from the snippet of text given by Athanasius, to have been part of the sneering letter sent to Julius:

We have not been followers of Arius- how could bishops, such as we, follow a presbyter?- and nor did we receive any other faith beside that which has been handed down from the beginning. But after taking on ourselves to examine and to verify his faith, we have admitted him rather than followed him; and you will know from the things being said: for we have been taught from the first to believe in one God, the God of the universe, the Framer and Preserver of all things both intellectual and sensible; and in one Son of God, Only-begotten, existing before all ages, and being with the Father who begat him, by whom all things were made, both visible and invisible, who in the last days according to the good pleasure of the Father came down and took flesh of the Virgin, and fulfilled all his Father's will; and suffered and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the Father, and comes again to judge the living and the dead, and remains King and God to all the ages. And we believe also in the Holy Spirit; and if it be necessary to add, we believe concerning the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting.

#### First Creed of Antioch<sup>180</sup>

J.N.D. Kelly is quite wrong when he argues that this creed represents a *via media* between Arius and Marcellus.<sup>181</sup> Hanson is much nearer the mark when he calls it the product of 'Arians of *sang pur*'.<sup>182</sup> There is nothing that Arius had not already agreed to in it, and much that he would have been positively enthusiastic about. Kelly thinks that 'Arianism in the proper sense of the word is deliberately ruled out by the affirmation that the Son "existed before all ages and coexisted with the Father who begat him."' But Arius was quite happy to

---

<sup>179</sup> The practice of issuing several different letters from a large synod, often covering much of the same ground, can be seen in the documents from both Nicaea and Sardica, for example.

<sup>180</sup> Text Hahn and Hahn, pp. 183-184 (Athanasius, *De Syn* 22.5-7; Socrates, *HE* II.10-18).

<sup>181</sup> 'By thus excluding the extremes represented by Arius and Marcellus, the creed was choosing the middle way preferred by most conservative churchmen' (Kelly, *Creeds*, p. 266).

use the phrase *πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων* to describe the son's existing, and does so on at least two occasions:<sup>183</sup> he agrees that the Father made all the ages *through* the Son, and so he necessarily existed before them. What Arius *would* have said was 'There was when he was not,' a statement anathematised at Nicaea about which Antioch is entirely silent. As for the phrase *συνόντα τῷ γεγεννηκότι αὐτὸν πατρί*, Arius had already assented to and voluntarily used the verb *γεννάω* of the Son in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia in the very first document of the controversy.<sup>184</sup> The stress on the 'good pleasure' and 'will' (*εὐδοκία* and *βουλή*) of the Father, meanwhile, would have been meat and drink to Arius, since his whole soteriological system was fired by the idea that it is the Son's obedience to the will of the Father which brings about our salvation.<sup>185</sup>

Kelly is, however, absolutely right when he says that there is nothing to show that this creed was formulated as an official confession of the synod at all, and that it was in fact simply an extract from the apologetic letter which the council prepared as an answer to Pope Julius.<sup>186</sup> The interesting -- and unanswerable -- question is where the synod obtained this creed, and why they included it. It is possible that it represented the local creed of some or other of the synod's members. But it is also possible that the letter presents the creed to Julius as the one which Arius signed at Jerusalem to demonstrate that he was orthodox (as distinct from the one given in Socrates and Sozomen, which he presumably signed before his return in 338).<sup>187</sup> If so, the writers of the synodal letter still made the creed their own to the extent of adding one last sneer in transcribing the last line (since presumably Arius had had more diplomacy than to address the remark to Constantine).

---

<sup>182</sup> Hanson, *Search*, p. 291.

<sup>183</sup> *Letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia* = *Urk 1* (p. 3.2); *Letter of Arius and Euzoius to Constantine* = *Urk. 30* (p. 64.6-7).

<sup>184</sup> *Letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia* = *Urk 1* (p. 3.3).

<sup>185</sup> See Robert C. Gregg and Dennis E. Groh, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (London: SCM Press, 1981), esp. pp. 77-129.

<sup>186</sup> Kelly, *Creeeds*, p. 265

<sup>187</sup> See chapter 3.

One final point to be noted about this creed is that, like so many of the Eastern creeds of the last two thirds of the fourth century, it has an anti-Marcellan clause: ‘remains King and God to all the ages.’ This need not rule out this creed’s having been used by Arius, even before Marcellus’ condemnation, since Marcellus’ *Contra Asterium* and its theology was doubtless a hissing and a by-word among the Eusebians from the moment they first saw it, long before they created a chance to try him for heresy.

The second creed, which has already been discussed in chapter 3, was probably the main creed issued by the synod. If the theory I have outlined there is correct, that it was issued in 329 at a synod in Nicomedia, and commented on by Asterius in connection with the theology of Eusebius of Nicomedia, then its reiteration here was the last triumphant, undefeated rallying cry for the Eusebians proper. Eusebius of Caesarea was dead, Paulinus of Tyre was dead, Arius was dead, and Eusebius of Constantinople, Theognis of Nicaea and probably also Asterius were all to die in the next couple of years.<sup>188</sup> There was an ambitious younger generation ready to take over from them -- Acacius of Caesarea, Eudoxius of Germanicia, Ursacius and Valens -- but they had little of Eusebius’ gift for uniting a party behind them. Acacius himself, who defended Asterius and his theology so stoutly here, would in latter years disown both the theology he here defends and the Dedication Creed itself, while others would claim that creed as a bastion of orthodoxy.

If the creed itself, including its anathemata, is not explicitly anti-Marcellan, because it sparked rather than replied to his theological broadside, yet its adoption as the creed of this synod can be considered entirely of a piece with the anti-Marcellan nature of the synod as a whole. Marcellus attacked all of Eusebian theology on the basis of this creed, and tore Asterius’ commentary of it to shreds; to reiterate it, unshaken and unchanged, as Acacius taunted the work that had attacked it and the synod as a whole wrote to Julius to refuse to

---

<sup>188</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 172, note 26, on the basis of Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.18 Theognis may already have been dead by the Dedication synod since he is not mentioned as being present there.



allow Marcellus to be re-tried, was an act of triumphant defiance, a fitting revenge for every insult Marcellus had landed.

The third creed, the creed of Theophronius of Tyana, is extremely interesting. It runs as follows (including Athanasius' introduction):

And one Theophronius, Bishop of Tyana, put forth before them all the following statement of his personal faith. And they subscribed it, accepting the faith of this man.

'God knows, whom I call as witness over my soul, that thus I believe:

εἰς θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ὅλων κτίστην καὶ ποιητὴν, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα,

καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν λόγον, δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων,

θεὸν τέλειον ἐκ θεοῦ τελείου, καὶ ὄντα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,

παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθεσθέντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ μένοντα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ θεὸς ἐκχεῖν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπηγγείλατο πέμψαι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς, ὃ καὶ ἐπεμψεν, ὡς αἱ πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων μαρτυροῦσιν.

εἰ δὲ τις παρὰ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν διδάσκει ἢ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

καὶ Μαρκέλλου τοῦ Ἀγκύρας, ἢ Σαβελλίου, ἢ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως ... ἀνάθεμα ἔστω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ πάντες οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ.<sup>189</sup>

It has been considered probable that Theophronius was suspected of being a follower of Marcellus, above all because he has obviously been forced to anathematise Marcellus and the two stock heretics held to be his predecessors,

---

<sup>189</sup> Text: Hahn and Hahn, pp. 186-187 (Athanasius, *De Syn* 24.2-5).

Sabellius and Paul of Samosata.<sup>190</sup> Hilary speaks, in his very brief account of the Dedication synod, of a creed that was composed ‘cum in suspicionem venisset unus ex episcopis quod prava sentiret’ (*De Syn* 29). The creed he gives is the Second creed, but the circumstances seem to match the third.

In fact, a careful examination of Theophronius’ creed shows it to be a rather pro-Marcellan account of the faith, to which Theophronius has presumably been forced to add three phrases and two anathemata intended to be anti-Marcellan, but which he has managed to add in such a way as to keep his views intact. His desperate desire to do so shines clearly out of the creed’s introductory phrase.

Firstly, Theophronius declares his faith in ‘God the Father almighty’, not in ‘one God the Father’ as creeds of the period (e.g. Arius’ second creed, Eusebius of Caesarea’s creed, the creed of Nicaea and the First, Second and Fourth creeds of Antioch) standardly do, usually following this with belief in ‘one Lord Jesus Christ’ (except in the Fourth Creed of Antioch). This refusal to list Father and Son as one and one, lest they make two, is absolutely characteristic of Marcellus’ thought.

In the second article, Theophronius declares the Son to be only-begotten divine Word, Power and Wisdom. The Marcellus of at least some parts of the *Contra Asterium* would have reserved the word Son, and probably also μονογενής, for after the incarnation, but Marcellus was presenting a creed to Julius at almost exactly this time which declared his belief in God’s μονογενής υἱὸς λόγος, ὁ ἀεὶ συνυπάρχων τῷ πατρὶ καὶ μηδεπώποτε ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι ἐσχηκώς, showing that he himself had abandoned that particular idiosyncrasy. Λόγος, Δύναμις and Σοφία were Marcellus’ characteristic words for the Pre-incarnate. The list υἱόν, λόγον, δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν was also one that formed part of the formula of refutation of the Eusebians agreed between Marcellus and

---

<sup>190</sup> See M. Tetz, ‘Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien (341) und Marcellus von Ancyra: zu den Glaubenserklärung des Theophronius von Tyana und ihren Folgen’ in *Oecumenica et Patristica: Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag* (Geneva: 1989), pp. 199-218.

Athanasius the previous year:<sup>191</sup> it also arises in the Letter to Julius. Marcellus at this stage would have wanted to add a phrase like ἴδιος καὶ ἀληθῆς τοῦ θεοῦ to λόγος, δύναμις and σοφία, as he does in the letter to Julius, to distinguish his understanding of the terms from the Eusebian doctrine that the Son was the exact image of the Father's Word, Power and Wisdom (Asterius' theology), i.e. a second Word, Power and Wisdom, but doubtless this would not have been received at the Dedication synod with very much warmth.

Theophronius has probably been forced to add the next three phrases, or at least the latter two. The phrase τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, which is straight out of the First Creed of Antioch, would not have appealed to Marcellus, who did not like using birth language before the Incarnation; the aorist, connected with πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, would have been particularly unattractive to him. However, this was the word and the tense used at Nicaea, in the phrase τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, and it did represent the theology, if one reads πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων as eternal generation, of his fellow-traveller Eustathius.<sup>192</sup>

Θεὸν τέλειον ἐκ θεοῦ τελείου would have been a real stumbling-block for Marcellus. We have seen that Acacius claims that Marcellus rejected τέλειος ἐκ τελείου; adding the 'God from God' formula only reinforces the difficulty, and makes it very difficult to understand the phrase in anything other than a Eusebian sense, as meaning two separate Gods. 'God from God' had been used at Nicaea, however Marcellus made sense of it: he might have interpreted τέλειος to himself here as a synonym for ἀληθῆς, and thought of the phrase as against Eusebius of Caesarea's 'God but not true God', as Nicaea's 'true God from true God' had been.

Ὦντα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει was obviously meant, as far as the Eusebians were concerned, to signify clearly and unambiguously that the Son

---

<sup>191</sup> See chapter 5.

<sup>192</sup> Hahn and Hahn, p. 160

was a second hypostasis. Theophronius' phrase, however, is not unambiguous. It leaves room for the hypostasis in question to be the Father's -- unlike the phrase ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν, for example, which is used in the Second Creed.

The phrase καὶ μένοντα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας looks as though it is meant to be anti-Marcellan, but it would not in fact exclude even the position Marcellus is popularly, though erroneously, held to have maintained, since Christ's kingdom would only have an end after the end of the aeons, when the material world passed away.

The treatment of the Spirit is interesting, and gives the lie to the notion that the role of the Spirit was not a live issue at this time. It largely matches the few tantalising remarks of Marcellus' on the role of the Spirit which survive in the *Contra Asterium* fragments, but most closely matches the pronouncement on the Spirit of the Western Creed of Sardica: πιστεύομεν καὶ παραλαμβάνομεν τὸν παράκλητον τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὅπερ ἡμῖν αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἐπηγγείλατο καὶ ἔπεμψεν. καὶ τοῦτο πιστεύομεν πεμφθέν.<sup>193</sup>

The anathema condemning Marcellus is also interesting, because it looks as though even here Theophronius avoided fulfilling the Eusebians' requirements, although we cannot tell exactly how. The text as it stands does not construe (Marcellus, Sabellius and Paul are in the genitive, with no subject), and there is presumably some kind of lacuna. This is probably not accidental. It is impossible for us now to know what filled the lacuna, if anything,<sup>194</sup> but

---

<sup>193</sup> Hahn and Hahn, p. 189. I have here cited the text of Tetz (*ZNW* 76 (1985), p. 253) save in the last clause where I have retained the reading of Theodoret, *HE* II.8.48 (p. 117.5 Parmentier-Scheidweiler). For full references and discussion of the textual problem of the Western Creed, see chapter 5 below.

<sup>194</sup> Tetz points out that most translators ignore the problem, while Opitz inserts an entirely random κατὰ (Tetz, 'Kirchweihsynode', pp. 199-201). Tetz himself suggests the absolutely brilliant emendation of εἰ δὲ τις παρὰ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν διδάσκει ἢ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἄ<μ>αθ<η>μα ἔστ<ι> καὶ Μαρκέλλου τοῦ Ἀγκύρας ... (If anyone teaches [anything] beyond this faith or holds in himself the things which are also teachings of Marcellus of Ancyra)' for εἰ δὲ τις ... ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω καὶ Μαρκέλλου τοῦ Ἀγκύρας, ἢ Σαβελλίου, ἢ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ πάντες οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ

Theophronius certainly seems to have maintained saving ambiguity to the end. Since the text is transmitted through Athanasius, he may have taken some trouble to preserve the ink-blot, parablepsis or whatever it originally was which secured Marcellus from condemnation by his friend.<sup>195</sup> Theophronius' mental filling of the blank might well have been καὶ < ὁ Εὐσέβιος ὁ ἐχθρὸς > Μαρκέλλου τοῦ Ἀγκύρας, ἢ Σαβελλίου, ἢ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως ... ἀνάθεμα ἔστω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ πάντες οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ.<sup>196</sup>

This text has one final interesting possibility, allied to that which has just been mentioned. It is transmitted by Athanasius. Athanasius may have known Theophronius, and seen that he had been remarkably successful in defending himself and leaving his faith intact. Athanasius may have had more than a little smile at the thought of all the Eusebians tripping up and signing (as he says they did), in the teeth of their own intentions, the genuine and heartfelt expression of faith of a disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra.

Theophronius seems successfully to have held on to his see: we hear of him no longer, and no bishop of Tyana attended at Sardica. If so, he presumably had Constantius (who was present at the Dedication synod) to thank for his opportunity to 'repent' of his Marcellan opinions. His reprieve meant that there was still at least one bishop friendly to the anti-Eusebian party in one of the major cities on the main road from Constantinople to Antioch.

The Dedication of the church of Hagia Homonoia was celebrated at the end of the synod; presumably Flacillus preached. Elpidius and Philoxenus made their

---

(Tetz, 'Kirchweihsynode', p. 201), which has the one drawback of being a sentence no Greek-speaker would ever have written.

<sup>195</sup> It is an extraordinary fact that in the whole of the rich ms. tradition of Athanasius' *De Synodis*, no scribe ever 'corrected' the phrase, supplying, for example, καὶ <εἰ τις διδάσκει ἢ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ> Μαρκέλλου or καὶ <δὲ τὰ> Μαρκέλλου (understanding εἰ τις διδάσκει ἢ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, a more likely scribal emendation -- if a harsher construction -- as it involves less tinkering with the holy writer's words). The surprising difficulty of finding a smooth and concise emendation (a difficulty intended by the author?) has almost certainly contributed to the preservation of the *lectio difficilis*.

<sup>196</sup> Text: Hahn and Hahn, pp. 186-187 (Athanasius, *De Syn* 24.2-5).

escape and set out on the long journey back to Rome, in order to let Julius and the Italian bishops know that an ecumenical synod would not now take place.

#### **4. Conclusion.**

The Dedication Synod of 341 marks a major shift in the Eastern landscape. This was the last stand of the old Eusebian group, the leader of which died shortly afterwards. The charge of Arianism would now really begin to hit home with some of the Eastern bishops, who long sought the means to repel the caricature of their theology that had been (as we shall see) so comprehensively sold to the West. Meanwhile, the most successful defence was offence, and an equally unfair but effective caricature of the theology of Marcellus of Ancyra became the point around which the fragmenting forces of the East could unite -- that and their unreasonable treatment by Julius.

Over the next few years, various of these themes would begin to play themselves out- most cacophonically at the abortive synod of Sardica in 343. But we must now turn to the evolution of the myth of Arianism itself, the counter-attack from the exiles in Rome which was to be so very successful in the medium and long term.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### Rome and Sardica

Arianism may have been perfected by Athanasius and Marcellus on a rainy Tuesday in Rome in 340, as I will argue in this chapter, but it was not invented there.<sup>1</sup> As early as the summer of 325, Eustathius can be found using the word Ἀριομάνιτης;<sup>2</sup> Athanasius uses the word in his Festal Letters for 338 and 339,<sup>3</sup> and he is already in the latter talking about ‘those around Eusebius’ in a way which may be making them equivalent to the Ἀριομάνιται.<sup>4</sup> In his *Encyclical Letter* of that summer, Athanasius calls his replacement bishop Gregory an Arian, although his defence still mainly rests on the claim that the replacement is simply uncanonical.<sup>5</sup> Marcellus was in no doubt at the time of writing the *Contra Asterium* that Asterius and his friends were peddling a full-blown heresy.<sup>6</sup> But it took the mixture of Marcellus’ brooding sense of the widespread evil of the Asterian/Eusebian system, Athanasius’ disgust at Arius’ old enormities as condemned by Alexander, both their experiences of the surprisingly systematic and well-organised vendetta carried on against them by the Eusebians, and the irritation and sheer incomprehension of a West that had believed the whole matter wrapped up fifteen years before, to ignite the full, well-rounded myth of Arianism that with slightly varying nuances was to endure as far as the twentieth century. It was this myth itself, however, by the very sense of unfairness it evoked in some of the Easterners who were accused of being part of it, which was to cause the break-up of the old Eusebian party and make possible some of the more nuanced statements of their position.

---

<sup>1</sup> I borrow the conceit from Perry’s account of the invention of the ancient novel: Ben Edwin Perry, *The Ancient Romances, A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Sather Classical Lectures 37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> Theodoret, *HE* I.8.3; see chapter 2 for discussion of this fragment.

<sup>3</sup> Athanasius, *Festal Letters*, 10.9 and 11.10, 12. For the dating of the Festal Letters, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 183-91.

<sup>4</sup> Athanasius, *Festal Letters*, 11.12

<sup>5</sup> Athanasius, *Encyclical Letter* 2.2

<sup>6</sup> Marcellus, *Contra Asterium*, fr. P 1 (S/V 1, K 65)

## 1. Marcellus and Athanasius in Rome.

Joseph Lienhard has said that ‘the known history of Marcellus after 340 is principally the history of his relationship with Athanasius.’<sup>7</sup> This, if not absolutely true (Marcellus’ important relationship with Photinus after this date can be gauged in at least one particular), contains more than a grain of truth. Even about the relationship with Athanasius, however, we know much less than we would like.

The one period we know them to have been in close proximity is the year 340, when both were in Rome awaiting the Eusebians’ answer to Julius’ call for a synod. In that period, Athanasius is widely agreed to have begun the first volume of his major theological treatise *Contra Arianos*;<sup>8</sup> in the same period, Marcellus penned his short *Epistle to Julius*, the only work ascribed to him from antiquity to have come down to us complete. I will argue that Marcellus also at this period drafted (though he may not have completed) an anti-Arian work, possibly entitled *Against Theodore [of Heraclea?] on the Holy Church*, which is known to us in much abridged form as Pseudo-Anthimus of Nicomedia’s *De Sancta Ecclesia*.

These three works, together with the encyclical letter and creed of the so-called Western Synod of Sardica and later indications in Hilary and Epiphanius, offer the most tantalising hints of a relationship whose measure we yet cannot entirely take. As I will show, we can see evidence of Marcellus and Athanasius working closely together, and yet in less than perfect theological agreement: each continues to use expressions the other explicitly condemns. Their causes were

---

<sup>7</sup> Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, p. 5

<sup>8</sup> On the date, see Charles Kannengiesser, *Athanase d’Alexandrie, Évêque et Écrivain, Une Lecture des Traités Contre les Ariens*, *Théologie Historique* 70 Paris: Beauchesne, 1983), pp. 374-403, especially pp 398-403; Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 54-55; and Karin Metzler with Kyriakos Savvidis, eds, *Athanasius Werke*, I *Die Dogmatischen Schriften*, 2. *Orationes I et II Contra Arianos* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), p. 109 note. Metzler concludes that ‘Athanasius verfasste *OrrArian I.II* ca. 340 in Rom’.

closely associated by their defenders, and they both needed one another as evidence of the generality of the 'Arian' plot against the orthodox, yet Marcellus' sudden departure from Rome in early 341, their separate places of abode, one in Rome and Milan, the other in Illyricum, in 341-2, and the less than perfect accord among the Western party there seems to have been at Sardica are suggestive, as is the apparent rift between them over Photinus in c. 345 reported by Hilary.

On the other hand, Athanasius can also be found silently disagreeing with his mentor and predecessor Alexander in *Contra Arianos* I on one point, while still upholding him as bastion of orthodoxy in the work as a whole.<sup>9</sup> As far as Marcellus is concerned, Athanasius is still prepared to speak enthusiastically about him in the late 350s, in the *Historia Arianorum*,<sup>10</sup> and to accept his communion in 371.<sup>11</sup> Marcellus had lost his own see partly in defence of Athanasius, and it is one of the most attractive aspects of Athanasius' character that he never forgets his friends' suffering on his behalf.<sup>12</sup> Above all, it should be noted that in that most crucial area of theology, the doctrine of salvation, Marcellus and Athanasius thought very much alike: there may be differences in the terms they are prepared to use to describe the immanent relations of the Trinity, but they are trying to protect the same two truths, which they both share with Irenaeus, namely that it is one proper to the true God and indissolubly and eternally linked to the same, sharing all the same properties but the name of Father, who became incarnate, and that humanity is saved by the fact of the Incarnation itself, by the ontological reality of the joining of human flesh to one who is also all that is God.

---

<sup>9</sup> Alexander, in *He philarchos*, angrily rejected the imputation that he taught 'two ἀγέννητα' in any sense (*Urk* 14.44-45 (p. 26.22-29)); Athanasius is more nuanced in *Contra Arianos* I. He is clear that the Son is not γεννητός, but that means that the sense in which he is γεννητός needs to be qualified. See the discussion in *C Ar* I.56.

<sup>10</sup> *Hist Ar* 6.1-2.

<sup>11</sup> Joseph T. Lienhard, 'Did Athanasius Reject Marcellus?', in *Arianism after Arius, Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, ed. Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), pp. 65-80, at p. 77.

<sup>12</sup> Athanasius' Letter to the Churches of Alexandria from Sardica (Turner, EOMIA I.2,iv, p. 654-656) is a good example of his real sympathy with his supporters in their distresses.

### a. Marcellus' Letter to Julius

Although the Letter to Julius<sup>13</sup> postdates at least the conception of Athanasius' *Contra Arianos*, as well, I will argue, as the draft from which *De Sancta Ecclesia* is taken, it is the yardstick by which Marcellus' theological development at this period must be measured, and so must be examined before comparison with the one or hypothetical reconstruction of the other.<sup>14</sup>

The shift in Marcellus' theology from the *Contra Asterium* fragments to this letter has often been noticed and commented upon.<sup>15</sup> Marcellus is now prepared to equate the Son and the Logos, and to state quite unequivocally that the Son is eternal and is the one through whom all created things are made,<sup>16</sup> not merely a title accorded to the Logos after the Incarnation. He also confesses οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος,<sup>17</sup> but of the eternal Son and Logos reigning τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ rather than explicitly of Christ: in fact his doctrine does not seem, on close inspection, to have greatly changed on this point since the earlier work, which asserted that after the final judgement the Logos will no longer need his partial kingdom, but be king of all things generally, reigning together with the God and Father.<sup>18</sup> But these two points cover much of the substance of the criticisms that continue to be made of him, by writers such as Eusebius of Emesa and Cyril of Jerusalem as well as in successive creeds.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> The Letter is here cited from the text of Vinzent = no. 129 Klostermann (pp. 214-5).

<sup>14</sup> For a rather different reading of the significance of the Letter to Julius from that which is offered here, see M. Vinzent, 'Die Gegner im Schreiben Markells von Ankyra an Julius von Rom', *ZKG* 105 (1994), 285-328.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Maurice J. Dowling, 'Marcellus of Ancyra: Problems of Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity', Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, pp. 143-4.

<sup>16</sup> 'πιστεύω δὲ ... ὅτι εἰς θεὸς καὶ ὁ τούτου μονογενῆς υἱὸς λόγος, ὁ αἰεὶ συνυπάρχων τῷ πατρὶ καὶ μηδεπώποτε ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι ἐσχηκώς ... Οὗτος υἱὸς ... ἀδιάρητος δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα τὰ γινόμενα γέγονε (Vinzent, *Marcellus*, p. 126, lines 8-15).

<sup>17</sup> Vinzent, p. 126, lines 11-12.

<sup>18</sup> Fr. P 125 (S 105, V 106, K 117), Vinzent, *Marcellus*, p. 98, lines 3-5.

<sup>19</sup> Eusebius of Emesa, *Sermon* 3, 24 Buytaert; Cyril of Jerusalem *Cat. Lect.* 15, 27; Eastern Creed of Sardica, anathemata 5-7; Makrostichos Creed; First Creed of Sirmium.

A number of critics have accused Marcellus of dissembling, 'trimming' or downright lying in this creed,<sup>20</sup> often on the basis of *De Sancta Ecclesia*, which seems to return to Marcellus' earlier views. It is true that, for reasons I will discuss shortly, Marcellus makes no mention here of other views of his which became increasingly problematic in the East as the century progressed, and which are revisited in *De Sancta Ecclesia*: his insistence on one hypostasis and prosopon, as well as one nature, for example. But it is equally clear that on the two points mentioned above Marcellus had clarified his thought by the time of this work, without actually moving particularly far from his earlier expression of it. Even in the *Contra Asterium*, Marcellus could describe the Logos as τὸν ἀληθῶς υἱὸν, in contrast to 'τὸ κατὰ σάρκα', which was Son out of κοινωνία with the Word.<sup>21</sup> There seems to be no real reason to assume that he was dissembling on either this point or his belief that the Son Logos would reign eternally: he and his disciples repeatedly signed statements to this effect.<sup>22</sup>

On the one article of Marcellus' faith as presented in the *Contra Asterium* which really was heretical, if he persisted in it, his belief that the Logos would withdraw from the man Jesus after the Last Judgement, the Letter to Julius is silent, and unless one takes the perilous path of accepting the attribution of various diphysite pseudo-Athanasian pieces to Marcellus' latter years,<sup>23</sup> every other document is also silent. We have no means of knowing how dear this idea was to Marcellus, or whether kind friends were able to talk him out of it (Athanasius can be found trying to reconcile monophysite and diphysite pro-Nicenes towards the end of his life).<sup>24</sup> What does seem clear is that of all

---

<sup>20</sup> L.W. Barnard, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Eusebians', p. 64: Marcellus was an 'arch-trimmer adept at facing both ways'; M. Richard, 'Un opuscule méconnu de Marcel évêque d'Ancyra', *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 6 (1949), 5-24, at p. 23, reprinted in Richard, *Opera Minora* II, ed. E. Dekkers et al. (Turnhout: Brepols / Leuven University Press, 1977), no. 33; Reinhard Hübner, 'Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankyra', in *Ecriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nyse*, ed. Marguérite Harl, pp. 199-229 at p. 214.

<sup>21</sup> Fr. P 43 (S/V 38, K 20).

<sup>22</sup> For example, the so-called Western Creed of Sardica, the Profession of Faith of the deacon Eugenius of Ancyra.

<sup>23</sup> Especially the pseudo-Athanasian *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos*. See Martin Tetz, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I. Eine Markellische Schrift "De incarnatione et contra Arianos"', *ZKG* 75 (1964), 217-70.

<sup>24</sup> Athanasius, *Ad Epictetum* 2 = PG 26, 1052C - 1053C sets out the rival positions.

Marcellus' theological ideas which came under attack, the one he was keenest to defend is what Joseph Lienhard has called his 'miahypostatic theology', his belief in one hypostasis of Father and Son and Spirit.<sup>25</sup> Whichever views he was prepared to modify or abandon, he continued to hold fast to this.

The Letter to Julius is not merely interesting for what it omits, however, but above all for the expressions it does use. In comparing it with the opening chapters of Athanasius' *Contra Arianos* I, two observations may be made. Firstly, Athanasius and Marcellus are drawing broadly upon the same agreed list of propositions, both propositions to be ascribed to opponents and condemned, and propositions to be upheld. Secondly, the list of condemned propositions is substantially the same as the list of condemned propositions cited in Alexander's encyclical letter before the synod of Nicaea, *Henos somatos*. I will treat the second observation first.

The parallels between *Henos somatos* and *Contra Arianos* I have been noted and schematised by Rudolph Lorenz,<sup>26</sup> though his schematisation is not particularly helpful for noting further parallels with Marcellus and will not be used here. They include the following.

#### Slogans and pronouncements attributed to Arius

1. Οὐκ ἀεὶ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ἦν.<sup>27</sup>
2. Οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γέγονεν.<sup>28</sup>
3. Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν.<sup>29</sup>
4. The Son is a κτίσμα and a ποίημα.<sup>30</sup>
5. The Son is not ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν to the Father,<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Joseph Lienhard, 'The "Arian" Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered', *Theological Studies* 48 (1987), pp. 415-37; Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, pp. 38, 42-43.

<sup>26</sup> Rudolf Lorenz, 'Die Christusseele im arianischen Streit. Nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Quellenkritik des Arius und zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Athanasius', *ZKG* 94 (1983), 1-51, at pp. 8-10.

<sup>27</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.19).

<sup>28</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.9-10)

<sup>29</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.11).

<sup>30</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.11).



6. nor ἀληθινὸς καὶ φύσει τοῦ πατρὸς λόγος,<sup>32</sup>  
 7. nor ἀληθινὴ σοφία αὐτοῦ.<sup>33</sup>  
 8. The Son is only called λόγος and σοφία καταχρηστικῶς.<sup>34</sup>  
 9. The Son was made (γενόμενος) τῷ ἰδίῳ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ἐν τῷ θεῷ σοφίᾳ, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τὰ πάντα καὶ αὐτὸν πεποίηκεν ὁ θεός.<sup>35</sup>  
 10. The λόγος is ξένος and ἀλλότριος from the οὐσία of God.<sup>36</sup>

#### General observation against Arius

11. The views of Arius are an apostasy which is so great it must be the forerunner of the Antichrist.<sup>37</sup>

In *Contra Arianos* I, Athanasius ascribes pronouncements 1, 2 (in the form ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γέγονε), 3, 5, 8, 9 and 10 to Arius. In opposition to pronouncements 4, 6 and 7, he provides positive statements from his own side: the Son is not a κτίσμα or a ποίημα (4), he is υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς φύσει καὶ γνήσιος τοῦ πατρὸς, σοφία μονογενῆς and λόγος ἀληθινὸς καὶ μόνος τοῦ πατρὸς (6 and 7).

Marcellus uses a ‘they say’ ‘we say’ formula in the Letter to Julius,<sup>38</sup> without mentioning Arius by name. ‘They say’ ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν (3), the Son is a κτίσμα and a ποίημα (4), the Son is not the ἴδιος and ἀληθινὸς λόγος of the Almighty God (6), nor ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, but God’s ἕτερος λόγος and ἕτερα σοφία καὶ δύναμις (7). He is only *called* λόγος and σοφία and

<sup>31</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.11-12)

<sup>32</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.12).

<sup>33</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.12-13).

<sup>34</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 7.13 - p. 14.1).

<sup>35</sup> *Urk* 4b.7 (p. 8.1-2).

<sup>36</sup> *Urk* 4b.8 (p. 8.3-4).

<sup>37</sup> *Urk* 4b.3 (p. 7.1-2).

<sup>38</sup> Marcellus’ presentation of the views of his opponents is analysed in Markus Vinzent, ‘Die Gegner im Schreiben Markells von Ankyra an Julius von Rom’, *ZKG* 105 (1994), 285-328. The text is presented schematically on p. 293. Vinzent concludes that the opponent in view throughout is Asterius. Vinzent’s analysis may, however, be over-refined. It presupposes a complexity of structure and a coherence of argument which a collection of condemned propositions need not necessarily possess.

δύναμις (8), and is made (γενόμενον) (9). The Son is ἄλλη ὑπόστασις διεστῶσα τοῦ πατρὸς (10). Marcellus says that those who believe these things are ἀλλοτρίους τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας', the exact words used by *Henos Somatos* against Arius.

Beyond the statements ascribed to 'those whom I refuted at Nicaea', Marcellus makes some statements which do not appear as such in *Henos somatos*, but are used in similar form in *Contra Arianos* I. These include the pairing ἴδιος καὶ ἀληθινός (Athanasius uses the two words in apposition rather than as a pair, the second as part of the phrase ἴδιος τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ), the quartet υἱός, δύναμις, σοφία, λόγος as parallel epithets (Athanasius also uses them all as such within a line or two of one another, though separately), and the affirmation that the Son Logos never had an ἀρχή (Athanasius ascribes to Arius the view that the Logos did have an ἀρχή). In addition, both accuse Arius / the opponents of believing in a ἕτερος λόγος.

Neither Marcellus nor Athanasius seems to be straightforwardly borrowing from the other in these expressions, which draw on *Henos somatos* but move beyond its condemned propositions to positive doctrinal assertions. Marcellus is using a tighter text ('This one is Son, this one is Power, this one is Wisdom, this one is proper and true Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ'), which he has rhetorically made his own and is unlikely to be copying from Athanasius' rather loose and diffuse collection of propositions, but *Henos somatos* is so much more Athanasius' provenance than Marcellus', being probably originally written by him,<sup>39</sup> that it seems impossible that Marcellus would take that letter as the basis of a newly precise and thought-out theology quite far removed from the expressions of the *Contra Asterium* as we have them, without any prompting at all from the bishop of Alexandria. The conclusion is inescapable that Marcellus and Athanasius are using an agreed list of propositions, both propositions to be denied which are ascribed to Arius and his friends (which have conveniently already been condemned at Alexandria, and to some extent at Nicaea), and

---

<sup>39</sup> See the discussion in ch. 2, above.

propositions which may be safely affirmed as orthodox. These agreed statements are probably part of a wider package of anti-Arian rhetoric, as I will argue shortly. But first it may be worth noting where Marcellus and Athanasius differ in their use of the agreed formulae.

The main point of difference is in *ousia* language. Although neither yet makes much use of *homoousios*,<sup>40</sup> Athanasius accuses Arius of teaching that the Son is alien to the Father κατ' οὐσίαν. Marcellus, as we have seen, uses an equivalent form with 'hypostasis': the Son is ἄλλη ὑπόστασις διεστῶσα τοῦ πατρός. His equivalent of the Nicene ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός is ἄληθῶς (υἱὸς) ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: he accuses his opponents of believing ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in the same sense as the created order (τὰ πάντα) is ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. Athanasius also uses the phrase ἴδιος τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, where Marcellus would use the absolute form ἴδιος λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. Marcellus never uses *ousia* language except in describing the views of his opponents. Athanasius, on the other hand, shies away from Marcellus' use of hypostasis language, preferring the scriptural χαρακτήρ τῆς (τοῦ πατρός) ὑποστάσεως,<sup>41</sup> which rather tells against Marcellus' usage. He will also use a phrase such as εἰκὼν τῆς τοῦ πατρός οὐσίας, which Marcellus would never use, and which betrays a residual Origenism on Athanasius' part which leaves some of his theological expressions in fact closer to Asterius' thought than to that of Marcellus.<sup>42</sup>

## **b. *De Sancta Ecclesia***

Of all the anonymous or pseudonymous works of the fourth century attributed to Marcellus in the twentieth, the only one which has commanded widespread support is the attribution to him of Anthimus of Nicomedia's *De Sancta*

---

<sup>40</sup> The word appears only once in the first two *Orationes* – at *C Ar* I.9.2.

<sup>41</sup> Heb 1:3.

<sup>42</sup> For a recent study of Athanasius which emphasises what might be called the contemplative / Platonic side of his thought, see Nathan Kwok-kit Ng, *The Spirituality of Athanasius, A Key for Proper Understanding of this Important Church Father*, European University Studies XXIII. 733 (Bern: Peter Lang, 2001).

*Ecclesia*. This short anti-heretical piece, surviving among a selection of heresiological material in two manuscripts, was published under the title *Anthimi Nicomediensis episcopi et martyris de sancta ecclesia* by Cardinal Mercati in the *Studi e testi* series in 1905: the editor noted that the piece must either be pseudonymous or interpolated, since it dealt chiefly with a heresy (that of the ‘Ariomaniacs’) which flourished well after Anthimus’ death in 302, but made no suggestions as to the real author or interpolator. Marcel Richard proposed Marcellan authorship in an article first published in 1949 (an article which set the fashion for a number of less convincing attributions of pseudonymous works to Marcellus).<sup>43</sup> His thesis has been accepted by most major commentators on Marcellus (Manlio Simonetti, Martin Tetz, Maurice Dowling, Alexandra Reibe, Alastair Logan and Klaus Seibt -- Markus Vinzent and Joseph Lienhard have been more circumspect). The sole dissenting voice, R.P.C. Hanson<sup>44</sup> (less credible on this occasion for not having read Richard’s original article) has been thoroughly refuted by Alastair Logan, who has emerged as the main commentator in English on the work, re-editing it with commentary and English translation for the *Journal of Theological Studies* in 2000.<sup>45</sup>

Logan, who originally dated the work to ‘the 340s’,<sup>46</sup> breaking with the tradition begun by Richard and followed by Simonetti of dating the work to the third quarter of the fourth century, has more recently proposed a date more precisely in the middle of that decade, in the couple of years following the synod of Sardica.<sup>47</sup> I will accept Logan’s arguments (echoed by Seibt, with some additional points)<sup>48</sup> against a date in the 360s or so: the work’s ascription of the

---

<sup>43</sup> Richard, ‘Un opuscule méconnu de Marcel évêque d’Ancyra’, *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 6 (1949), 5-24, reprinted in Richard, *Opera Minora* II, ed. E. Dekkers et al. (Turnhout: Brepols / Leuven University Press, 1977), no. 33

<sup>44</sup> Richard Hanson, ‘The Date and Authorship of Pseudo-Anthimus De Sancta Ecclesia’, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 83 (1983), 251-4.

<sup>45</sup> Alastair H.B. Logan, ‘Marcellus of Ancyra (Pseudo-Anthimus), ‘On the Holy Church’: Text, Translation and Commentary’, *JTS* ns 51 (2000), 81-112. The text is cited here by the section numbers of Logan’s edition (pp. 89-93).

<sup>46</sup> Alastair H.B. Logan, ‘Marcellus of Ancyra and anti-Arian Polemic’, *StP* XIX (1989), 189-97.

<sup>47</sup> Logan, ‘On the Holy Church’, pp. 87-8.

<sup>48</sup> Seibt, *Markell*, pp. 64-6.

words δοῦλος and ὑπηρέτης to Arian language about the spirit is broadly foreshadowed by the language of Eusebius' *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*; ascription of the Son's generation to the will of the Father is not merely a 'neo-Arian' doctrine, since it appears in the fragments of Asterius quoted by Marcellus in the *Contra Asterium*; the names used (Asterius and Eusebius of Caesarea) are those of characters from the earlier part of the controversy. However, I would now like to make a case for 340 as the date of the work (a date which Seibt's analysis would certainly favour), which can only be done by a thorough examination of its structure and content.

Firstly, although the work's unity was convincingly demonstrated by Richard, no one has so far proposed a plausible context for the original writing of the work. Richard, following Harnack and Bardenhewer, thought it was more likely to have been a letter than a tract, the same sort of letter as Basil of Caesarea would later send to Amphilochius of Iconium on canon law. Logan agrees, citing the addressee of the title (Ἀνθίμου ἐπισκόπου Νικομηδίας καὶ μάρτυρος ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Θεόδωρον περὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας) and the use of the second person (ἵν' εἰδέναι ἔχοις ὅτι, 'in order that you may know that').<sup>49</sup> But πρὸς Θεόδωρον could as easily mean 'against Theodore' as 'to Theodore,'<sup>50</sup> and the second person singular was characteristic of Marcellus' style: he uses a similar phrase, ἵνα γνῶς ὅτι, in one of the fragments of the *Contra Asterium* (P 2 (V2, K 34).

Rather, the work is so lapidary that it must be either an abbreviation of a longer work, or the plan for one. The work as it stands does not make an enormous amount of sense. Sentences such as 'Because of this Eusebius of Caesarea also wrote "unbegotten"' (12), with no further explanation, must surely be notes intended for expansion, or abbreviations of an argument whose general lines the

---

<sup>49</sup> *De S Eccl* 8.

<sup>50</sup> Little of the work of Theodore of Heraclea survives, but Jerome tells us (*De Viris Illustribus* 90) that he wrote during the reign of Constantius, besides the commentaries on Matthew and John that are attested in the catenae, a commentary on the Pauline epistles. It is something of a wild conjecture, but not an impossible one, that *De Sancta Ecclesia* is written in reaction to an exegesis by Theodore of Heraclea of Ephesians 4:5

abbreviator was confident of being able to reconstruct without difficulty. Two circumstances which support the view that the work is less than complete are the tendency of even the two manuscripts that have come down to us to abridge the text still further (though they clearly derive from a common ancestor, both omit items from lists the other gives more fully), and the title ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Θεόδωρον, which demonstrates that the work was not thought to be complete when the title was originally appended to it..

On the other hand, the overall shape of the work is clear, and developed with some artistry. The technique of *inclusio* is used several times. Μία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία in the first sentence (1) is balanced by the work's final words ἁγίας καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας (19). A reference to heretics bringing other heretics down 'to the pit of ruin' (εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀπολείας βάραθρον) in 4 is balanced by a reference in 18 to their having been 'drowned in the pit of atheism' (εἰς τὸν τῆς ἀθεας βυθὸν ἀπεπνίγησαν). And the reference to Sadducees in 5 as the first heretics is picked up by the accusation in 18 that the 'Ariomaniacs' derive their doctrine of the servility of the Spirit from Dositheus, heresiarch of the Sadducees, tying them once and for all into the well-worn heresiological taxonomy at the earliest possible point.<sup>51</sup>

The piece therefore hangs on the following broad frame, which might be called a parabola with an introduction (phrases in bold type build the upward and downward trajectories, while those in italics form the introduction and its echoes in the main text). The credal formula of '*one God and one Son of God and one Holy Spirit*', which was presumably used by Marcellus' opponents (it is difficult to imagine Marcellus employing such an expression unprompted) is diffused of the significance of the three 'one's by following it with two other, more banal uses of 'one', 'one human being created by God' in the beginning, and 'one cosmos' (1). The focus is then shifted to what Marcellus sees as his

---

<sup>51</sup> For a convenient survey of heresiological taxonomy, see Rebecca Lyman, 'A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism', in *Arianism after Arius, Essays in the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, ed. Michele R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), pp. 45-62.



own safe ground -- the **one catholic and apostolic Church**, called catholic because it is spread over the whole world, and apostolic because it ‘received the faith from the apostles and keeps it to the present’ (2). This is presented as an exegesis of Eph 4:5, ‘one God [sic], one Faith, one baptism’:<sup>52</sup> the faith is the apostolic element, the baptism guarantees the Catholicity, and God is the unity guaranteeing the oneness of the Church.

**Heresies**, on the other hand, neither receive their faith from the apostles nor exist throughout the whole world, which is why their churches are also **not called ‘catholic’** (3).

Therefore it must be set down whence and from whom the heretics received their starting-points, ‘**and were brought down by [other] heretics to the pit of ruin**’ (4).

The following heresies and heresiarchs and their origins are then briefly discussed:

the **Sadducees**, Cerinthus and the Ebionites (5),

Simon Magus, the gnostics, **Marcion** and the Manichees (6),

**Hermes, Plato and Aristotle** (7).

So, the author continues, the origins of the heresy of the Ariomaniacs should be given (8).

*Three hypostases* are from Valentinus, who derived them from Hermes and Plato (9).

---

<sup>52</sup> There appears to be no support within the Greek MS tradition for the reading Θεός in place of Κύριος in Eph 4:5, but there is some evidence in citations. For Latin evidence, see the apparatus to *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*, ed. John Wordsworth and Henry Julian White, II, *Epistulae Paulinae* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), at p. 434. In Greek, the reading occurs twice in the Long Ignatius, at *Philippians* 1 and *Ephesians* 6. In view of the undoubtedly ‘Arian’ provenance of the Long Ignatius, the exegesis attached to the former (*Phil* 2) is particularly relevant.

The phrase *Second God* is from Hermes, the expressions ‘ingenerate’ and ‘generate’ are from Plato, and the notion of the Logos’ subsisting by the will of God is likewise from Hermes (10-15).

So the Ariomaniacs are disciples of **Hermes, Plato and Aristotle** rather than of Christ and the apostles (16).

Their doctrine of the Son as Second Cause is from **Marcion’s** pupil Apelles (and also, though the text does not spell this out, echoes **Aristotle**; 17).

The *Holy Spirit* is blasphemed by the Ariomaniacs as a δοῦλος and ὑπηρέτης, a doctrine which they derive from Dositheus, heresiarch of the **Sadducees**.

So they are **drowned in an abyss of atheism** (18).

When certain people withdrew in revolt against the Church and the apostolic preaching, at that very moment they harvested the name of heresiarch and **lost the name of the holy catholic and apostolic Church** (19).

From the above schematisation, it can be seen that even the middle section matches the introductory ‘One God and one Son of God and one Holy Spirit’, showing the sense in which Marcellus understands the phrase by refuting the ‘Ariomaniac’ interpretation of it. ‘One God’, which Marcellus believes in fervently, is contrasted with the three hypostases of Marcellus’ enemies, which travesty it. ‘One Son of God’ is not to be considered a second God, generate in the sense in which all things are, subsisting only by the will of the Father and not by a divine nature shared with God, a secondary cause through which the first cause works rather than being one with the first in causing all that is. ‘One Holy Spirit’ is not to be considered inferior to and divided in nature from Father and Son.

If I am right in arguing that the work as it stands is abridged (and the ease with which I have abridged it further while retaining its structure is not insignificant), it must still, given its tight and coherent structure, represent a plan for a whole work or major section of a work, if not an abridgement of one. It must also be a

work of reasonably restricted length, to retain any sense of that structure. And yet what sort of work? Why would it have been written? A clue may lie in the final paragraph, which should be examined in full.

Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἅμα τῷ ἀναχωρῆσαί τινας στασιάσαντας πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸ ἀποστολικὸν κήρυγμα, εὐθέως οἱ πρὸς αὐτῶν πλανηθέντες καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀποσχισάντος αἰρεσιάρχου ἐκαπώσαντο, ἀπολέσαντες τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ἀναθρεψαμένης αὐτοὺς ἀγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.<sup>53</sup>

Logan takes the ‘withdrawing’ of this passage to refer to the walkout of the Eastern party from the abortive synod at Sardica, and this interpretation has a certain plausibility: ἀποχωρεῖν is used by Socrates to describe this action in his account of the incident a century later.<sup>54</sup> But who, then, would be the heresiarch whose name those who had been led astray straightway harvested, and why would the harvesting be at that moment in particular, given the dastardly deeds of this party on previous occasions? An occasion which fits this scenario better is the Synod of Tyre/Jerusalem. The ‘act of rebellion against the Church and the apostolic preaching’ referred to would be the accepting of Arius back into communion, in defiance of the decision of the Great and Holy Synod of Nicaea, and perhaps also the deposing of Athanasius from his ‘apostolic’ see of Alexandria. Various texts of Paul might be considered to forbid one or both of these acts, and they were certainly against the will of the Church as expressed at Nicaea.

On this reading, the ‘withdrawing’ would be the metaphorical withdrawing from the Church which Tyre/Jerusalem represented in Marcellus’ eyes. At that very moment, Marcellus asserts, those who had erred bore as fruit the name of the severed heresiarch and lost the name of the one who had nurtured them, the holy

---

<sup>53</sup> Logan’s translation: ‘One should also be aware of this, that at the same time as certain people withdrew, who were in revolt against the Church and the apostolic preaching, at that very moment those of their party who had been led astray also harvested the name of the schismatic heresiarch and lost the name of her who had nurtured them, the holy Catholic and apostolic Church.’

<sup>54</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.20.8.

catholic and apostolic Church. His point would be that by receiving Arius in defiance of the statutes of Nicaea, instead of making him Catholic they simply made themselves Arians.

These arguments sound close to those used by Athanasius at the beginning of *Contra Arianos* I, though he begins where Marcellus ends, and could be considered to be slightly reacting against Marcellus' picture as well as fleshing it out. Arianism is worse than all the other heresies because it has the cunning to clothe itself in Scripture, and try to force its way back into the Church fold thereby. But to argue there is nothing wrong with Arianism is to call Caiaphas a Christian and reckon Judas still among the band of apostles. The Arians, having left the Church in the time of Alexander, exchanged the name of Christ for that of Arius, and those who follow after them inherit the same name, while those who communicate with Athanasius are Christians just as those who communicated with his predecessor were.<sup>55</sup> Athanasius' concern here would be to move the Arians' condemnation further back in time from the slightly dangerous question of who was or was not guilty at Tyre, to the firm ground of Alexander's vindication and Arius' condemnation at Nicaea: the guilt of anyone who associates with Arius (and the innocence of those who communicate with both Alexander and Athanasius himself) is of long standing and clear. For Athanasius, the real and proven villain is Arius with his Egyptian and Libyan associates; the Eusebians can be assimilated to this group because they are now still standing by them. For Marcellus, on the other hand, the dangerous party, theologically as well as politically, are the Eusebians: assimilating them to the condemned Arius is a bold move which requires a decisive moment at which the charge becomes applicable. This specificity would also reflect Marcellus' precise legal mind.

Both Marcellus and Athanasius use the term 'Ariomaniacs' in this discussion. Athanasius, too, has a heresiological taxonomy, though a more popular and less

---

<sup>55</sup> Athanasius, *C Ar* I.1-3. Athanasius begins this little set piece with an allusion to 1 Jn 2:19: the Arians have 'gone out [ἐχέλαθεν] from us' (*C Ar* I.1.1).

detailed one than Marcellus': it begins with Marcion and includes Valentinus, Basilides, Manichaeus, Simon Magus, the Cataphrygians and the Novatians (the latter two of which groups, most interestingly, are entirely absent from Marcellus' list).<sup>56</sup> Both are attempting to account for the fact that a rather large group is involved with the Arians, or seems to be.

If I am right in my suggested date for *De Sancta Ecclesia* and my interpretation of the final paragraph, the work reflects and is the first expression of the perfection of the myth of Arianism by Marcellus and Athanasius during their year together in Rome. The myth, like the agreed series of anti-Arian and orthodox propositions referred to above, would represent a compromise between the two theologians: both had their own nuances, and each disagreed slightly with some of the other's expressions of it. But if I am right in interpreting *De Sancta Ecclesia*, it was clearly in its broad lines the work of both. It was to endure largely unquestioned for nearly fifteen hundred years.

Both Marcellus and Athanasius are now quite sure, in a much clearer way than either has been before, that 'Ariomania' is a package with very specific contents. Firstly, it has a heresiarch, something Marcellus has never before adverted to. Secondly, the Eusebian party may be called 'Arians' tout court, rather than 'supporters of the Arians', as Athanasius called them in his encyclical letter of 338, and their theology, particularly that of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Asterius, may be attacked as 'Arian' also, something Athanasius had not previously done. Thirdly, their heretical opinions are the cause of their enmity towards and political activity against Marcellus and Athanasius and all the 'orthodox.' One final touch which seldom appears in the literature, no doubt due to its disreputable nature, is likely to have been an important part of the myth when discussed orally. God had passed clear judgement on the heresy's heresiarch by bringing about his death the day before he was due to be received

---

<sup>56</sup> Athanasius' catalogue of heretics is in *C Ar* I.3.1-2. The inference that they are 'Ariomaniacs' rather than Christians is drawn in I.4.1.

back into the Church (if the reception at Tyre/Jerusalem were written off as a travesty) in the most striking and shameful manner.<sup>57</sup>

T.D. Barnes sees the myth of Arianism as adopted by Athanasius in *Contra Arianos* I as a clever but cynical move to disguise a political struggle as a theological one, and thereby win support for his cause from other ecclesiastical quarters.<sup>58</sup> Barnes is not alone in this: the very brilliance of the myth has elicited the greater disgust from those twentieth-century commentators who prided themselves on having seen through it<sup>59</sup> (though the greater admiration from those, like Barnes, who have approached Athanasius out of a historical-political interest rather than a theological one). It should be asked, therefore, whether Marcellus and Athanasius (who I have shown to be co-authors of the myth) are likely actually to have believed the picture they themselves created.

I suspect its creation was something nearer to a temptation they found themselves unable to resist. Who could bring themselves to be generous to their persecutors in such circumstances, to keep the complex theological and political nuances of the controversy distinct, and give due weight to the vacillations of Constantine, the ties of class and friendship, and the other non-theological factors which even in the ancient world ought to have been recognisable as having some influence on the actions of the 'Arians'? The myth of Arianism as it appears in *De Sancta Ecclesia*, is referred to (albeit not by name) in the Letter to Julius (and indeed in Julius' own letter to the Eusebians), and is expounded in virtually all of Athanasius' subsequent works, is a myth with a seductive power which has scarcely been bettered by that of any other heresy (Maurice Wiles has called it the 'archetypal heresy').<sup>60</sup> It was so

---

<sup>57</sup> For discussion, see above.

<sup>58</sup> See Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 53, 55.

<sup>59</sup> Tetz observed (not totally disapprovingly) that Schwartz had drawn his picture of Athanasius 'nach dem Muster eines "machiavelistisch" gesinnten, reinen Hierarchen' (Martin Tetz, 'Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien', *ZKG* 90 (1979), 304-338, at p. 164). That is very much the view of Athanasius which helps determine the narrative of Richard Klein, *Constantius II. und die christliche Kirche*, *Impulse der Forschung* 26 (Darmstadt, 1977).

<sup>60</sup> M.F. Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy, Arianism Through the Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).



plausible. What better way for Athanasius and Marcellus to explain to themselves and everyone else the murderous hatred of the Eusebian party, than to see it as the war of heterodoxy against orthodoxy? What better way to make sense of the alliance of Marcellus' theological enemies with Athanasius' political ones, than to see them all as part of the same heresy? Marcellus could provide the explanation as to why his enemies were technically 'Arians', and in the process associate them inextricably with the party and opinions condemned by the whole Christian world at Nicaea; Athanasius could indulge in the pleasure of seeing all his political enemies as theological pariahs, rather than merely the Alexandrian ones. The two bishops knew their enemies well enough to know that there were considerable theological and personal differences between them, just as there were between themselves. But why should they bother to distinguish them, when their enemies made no effort to distinguish themselves, but acted continually in political concert? If Marcellus and Athanasius can be convicted of less than perfect charity and generosity towards those who meant them harm, it could also be argued that the Eusebians deserved their fifteen hundred years as 'Arians', if not for their theological views, then at least for their political choices.

Marcellus himself probably developed a great deal theologically in this period, at least in seeing some of the problems of his own more exuberant speculations, and modified his thinking in a least one vital way, by agreeing to speak of the Logos as Son before the incarnation. Much of the Roman world recognised his continuing merits: Marcellus continued to have substantial support across three quarters of the Empire. Unfortunately for him, however, power in the East was now definitively in the hands of those who had no sense of his merits at all, and would remain so for a very long time to come.

## **2. The Synod of Rome.**

In late March or very early April of 341, more than fifty bishops assembled in Rome, at the church presided over by the presbyter Vito, in the expectation of meeting with the Easterners to try the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus.<sup>61</sup> The Easterners, of course, had no intention of joining them. Julius, who had summoned the synod, was clearly deeply embarrassed by the letter the Easterners had sent with his presbyters in reply to his invitation. Having been assured by the protagonists that the proceedings against Athanasius and Marcellus had been carried out by a small partisan group,<sup>62</sup> he was faced with a large group claiming to be representative of the East in general, and accusing him of fomenting schism by accepting Athanasius and Marcellus in defiance of the synods which had deposed them, and of acting high-handedly by calling for an unnecessary new synod thousands of miles from the area where the relevant events had taken place. Furthermore, this large group clearly had the backing of the Eastern emperor, who was present at the Dedication synod. Either the Dedication synod's letter to Julius made a great deal of this, or conceivably Constantius or one of his officials sent a letter to Julius on the emperor's own account, accusing him of interfering in affairs beyond his jurisdiction.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> The date can be narrowed down as follows. Easter was April 19<sup>th</sup> in 341. Julius says that the Italian bishops arrived 'for the appointed time-limit' (τῆ ὀρισθείσῃ προθεσμίᾳ, Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 26.3) given to the Easterners to come to Rome for a synod. Because a time-limit for the Easterners of late April or early May would make nonsense of Julius' complaint that his presbyters were kept until as late as January (Julius' letter, in Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 25.3), the limit must have been before Easter. The Italian bishops would have had to be back at home by the 17<sup>th</sup> at the latest; assuming they were all within a week's journey of home (there were certainly fifty bishops within that distance of Rome by the fourth century, and some of the fifty were in any case probably not Italian bishops but the friends of Athanasius who had converged on Rome in the previous year), the synod must have been over by April 10<sup>th</sup>. It is unlikely that less than a week, at the very least, would have been allowed for the proceedings, which makes April 3<sup>rd</sup> the *terminus ante*. On the other hand, as we have seen, Julius' presbyters are unlikely to have made the 2000 mile winter journey from Antioch in much less than two months. Julius' letter seems to imply (*Ap c Ar* 21.4) that the presbyters arrived shortly before the Italian bishops assembled (which is plausible, since the arrival of the presbyters with the Eastern letters could scarcely have been concealed for a time if they had arrived after the Italian bishops had already assembled) and that Julius kept the latter waiting a little in the hopes that the Easterners would arrive despite the refusal their letter gave. If so, the end of the προθεσμία must have been about the Ides of March (as already proposed), the presbyters must have arrived a couple of days earlier, and Julius cannot have kept the Italian bishops waiting for longer than a fortnight, or three weeks at the very most. For the number of bishops and for Vito, see *Ap c Ar* 20.3.

<sup>62</sup> *Ap c Ar* 34.2 (in Julius' letter).

<sup>63</sup> Some such action on Constantius' part or the part of one of his officials is strongly suggested by the surprisingly defensive nature of the reply Julius sent, and from its reluctance to pronounce any actual penalties on the Eastern bishops, even those who had replaced Athanasius and Marcellus in their sees. The letter he did send (text in Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 21-35), despite

At this point, Marcellus left, knowing that the Easterners were not coming, before the synod could meet without them.<sup>64</sup> He may never really have expected the Easterners to come; in any case, it seems likely that he left in anger and frustration, knowing that any synod which could now be held would be entirely incapable of reinstating him and Athanasius. Probably at Julius' request, he did leave a statement of his own faith so that the synod which did meet could pronounce him orthodox, for what that judgement was worth; in addition, he

---

some hard-hitting observations, is in fact self-exculpatory rather than accusatory, though it gives way to accusation at one or two points. After complaining of the Easterners' tone, he defends himself on the two major points at issue, his acceptance of Athanasius and Marcellus as brother bishops, including accepting them into communion, and his calling of the Eusebians to a synod. On the latter point, he argues that the Eusebians' envoys themselves first asked for the synod; reviewing previous synods is perfectly lawful and was allowed for by Nicaea; and the Eusebians have in any case themselves revised the decisions of previous synods, both Nicaea and (he hints) the synod which deposed Eusebius and Theognis. On the former point, he argues that the Eusebians' evidence against Athanasius and Marcellus is countermanded by evidence he has received in their favour from a wide variety of people. In addition, Athanasius can show from the documented proceedings at Tyre that the event was a conspiracy, he was not in any case convicted of anything, and Constantine did not ratify his deposition, since he was not replaced; Marcellus can clearly demonstrate his orthodoxy when questioned, an orthodoxy which is also attested by delegates from the West who were at Nicaea. The rule of the Church demands that bishops with letters of recommendation should be received, Julius argues. The evidence of those who have gathered in Rome from the East, as well as much circumstantial evidence, including the self-contradictory nature of the Eusebians' letters, suggests a conspiracy carried on by a few people; the fact that the wider church was never properly informed of or invited to the trials of Marcellus and especially Athanasius in the first place is a final reason for suspecting them.

What Julius' letter does not do may easily be seen from a comparison of it with the so-called Westerners' Letter of Sardica. Julius excommunicates no-one, accuses no-one directly of Arianism or Ariomania, and makes no attempt to restore Athanasius and Marcellus to their sees. Instead, he begs that 'such things may no longer be', reminds the recipients that they must give an account of their actions before God on the day of judgement, and feebly asks them one more time to come to Rome for a synod if they still believe they can prove anything against Marcellus and Athanasius.

<sup>64</sup> Vinzent argues that Marcellus knew when he wrote his letter to Julius of the refusal of the Easterners to come to the Roman synod. But he rather oddly combines that with the belief that (a) the Roman synod was already over when Marcellus wrote but (b) Marcellus knew nothing of the Dedication creed (Vinzent, 'Gegner', pp. 291 note 25, 296 note 44, 324-5). His reasons for (a) are that (1) Marcellus' letter is addressed directly to Julius rather than to a synod and (2) his departure is only intelligible if his case has already reached a positive outcome (p. 324). But (1) would seem to make as much sense before a synod as after it – especially one Marcellus could see would be emasculated by the refusal of the Easterners to come – and (2) ignores the anger and frustration I suggest Marcellus must have felt. Vinzent's main reason for (b) is that Marcellus' condemnation of the proposition that the Logos is a creature and a work would have been senseless had he known that the Dedication creed condemned the proposition that the Son is a 'creature as one of the creatures' (p. 293). But for Marcellus those two propositions are obviously not equivalent, and Vinzent would seem to have committed himself on the basis of

asked that it should be sent with Julius' reply to the Easterners so that anyone who had merely accepted the Eusebians' account of his theology without knowing either him or them would have the opportunity to know better.

Julius put off showing the letter from the Dedication synod to the Italian bishops (Marcellus had clearly, from his letter, seen it already before he left) for as long as possible, hoping against hope that the Easterners would still appear, but was forced in the end to bring it forward for general inspection.<sup>65</sup> He need not have been afraid of loss of face: the Italian bishops were indeed furious, but their wrath was aimed not at a man whose somewhat unrealistic proposals had assembled them on a fool's errand (as Julius must have feared), but at the insolence of the letter's authors.<sup>66</sup>

We now come to two important questions: what the Italian bishops who did appear for the synod made of their task, now that so many essential parties had failed to come, and what formal decisions they took. Both of these questions are partly unanswerable, but insofar as they are answerable, their answers may be rather different from what they are generally assumed to be.

The second question is easier to address. The evidence available to us on the point derives from three sources: the documents of Sardica (mostly negative evidence and evidence from silence), Julius' letter to the Easterners, and Athanasius' description of the synod in *Historia Arianorum* (to which the two mentions in the main narrative of the *Apologia contra Arianos* add nothing, as we shall see). Debates over Rome's authority past and present have somewhat clouded this issue: commentators both for and against a wider authority for the bishop of Rome than simply in the affairs of his own see have used this synod as evidence for its being claimed at the time.<sup>67</sup> In this they rather over-estimate the

---

that argument to the view that Marcellus could not have condemned Arius of being an Arian either, since the phrase is found in *Urk* 6.2.

<sup>65</sup> *Ap c Ar* 21.4.

<sup>66</sup> *Ap c Ar* 21.4-5.

<sup>67</sup> Du Clercq commends the letter for its 'quiet dignity and authoritative wisdom' (p. 303). Hanson, *Search*, pp. 272-3 laments the fact that 'a new and unpleasant aspect' had been placed

weight of this synod's actions. In fact, it may have done nothing new in legal terms at all, beyond refusing to recognise the Dedication synod's letter as valid evidence, and requesting Julius to write in reply to it from his own persona, which he did in terms which were far from being the extraordinary claim of Roman supremacy which they have sometimes been thought to be. It merely ratified practical decisions with regard to Athanasius and Marcellus which Julius had already made more than a year previously. If the synod of Rome did more than this, legally speaking, Julius was at some pains to conceal the fact from the Easterners.

Despite the fact that Athanasius himself, in characteristically wool-pulling manner, attempts to dress the synod's actions up as a full and final judgement on his case,<sup>68</sup> his own writings (for Athanasius never actually lies, however much he may suppress or twist information against his own interests) show how local was the scope of the synod's ruling, as Julius' letter shows how provisional it was. Athanasius speaks of the synod of Rome three times; twice in the *Apologia contra Arianos*,<sup>69</sup> and once in *Historia Arianorum*.<sup>70</sup> For once, the *Historia Arianorum* account is the best. The synod at Rome, he says there, τοὺς μὲν περὶ Εὐσεβίου, ὡς ὑπόπτους καὶ φοβηθέντας ἐλθεῖν, οὐκ ἀπεδέξαντο,

---

on the controversy by 'the opportunism of Julius of Rome'. For a legal and political analysis of the letter, see Klaus M. Girardet, *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht, Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites (313-315) und zum Prozess des Athanasius von Alexandrien*, Antiquitas, Reihe 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte 21 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1975), pp. 87-95.

<sup>68</sup> At the beginning of the *Apologia contra Arianos*, Athanasius expresses his astonishment that his case needs to be judged *again*, since it has already been judged many times: κέκριται γὰρ οὐχ ἅπαξ, οὐ δεύτερον ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις. πρῶτον μὲν <ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ τῇ> ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ χώρᾳ συναγομένη ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων ἑγγύς ἑκατόν, δεύτερον δὲ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ γράψαντος Εὐσεβίου καὶ κληθέντων αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ συναχθέντων ἐπισκόπων κάκει πλέον πενήκοντα, καὶ τρίτον ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Σαρδικῇ συναχθείσῃ κατὰ πρόσταξιν τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων βασιλέων Κωνσταντίου καὶ Κώνσταντος (*Ap c Ar* 1.2). This is sleight of hand. Although everything Athanasius says here is individually strictly true, several of his observations combine to give an overall impression which is false. An unwary reader, who balked at reading Athanasius' large dossier in detail, would assume the Eusebians, having been summoned to Rome with Athanasius, were actually present among the fifty bishops who judged his case there. The mention of Constantius' part in bringing about the synod of Sardica conceals the fact that he never ratified the decisions to which Athanasius refers. And most importantly, the use of the verb κρίνω for all three occasions mentioned subtly suggests that each judgement is of the same weight, a full trial, rather than the local and provisional one which I will argue that the synod of Rome was.

<sup>69</sup> *Ap c Ar* 1.2 and 20.3.

<sup>70</sup> *Hist Ar* 15.1.



ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ γραφέντα παρ' αὐτῶν ἠκύρωσαν, ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀπεδέξαντο καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοινωνίαν ἠγάπησαν.

What it might have meant for the synod not to receive 'the Eusebians', who were not present, is deliberately left unclear by Athanasius, but it was hardly a legal condemnation: οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον were not a legal body, and in any case, Julius could hardly have written to them by name as bishops if he had just taken part in their formal condemnation. The legally valuable part of Athanasius' information is twofold: he (along with Marcellus, as Julius tells us) was 'received' and his communion lovingly shared; the writings of the Eusebians (presumably the Dedication synod's letter to Julius) were set aside by the synod as inadmissible evidence. The reasons for this last action and the implications of it will be considered presently; first of all, it is important to note the scope of the synod of Rome's reception of the two bishops.

Church practice was for all Christians to be accepted into local communion in foreign churches if they had the appropriate letters testifying to their being in good standing, and for bishops abroad to be given hospitality in accordance with their status if they bore letters of recommendation from their metropolitan bishops: in the case of the metropolitans themselves, which both Athanasius and Marcellus were, presumably initial letters of friendship from other bishops on their taking up office would normally have served. If those bishops were deposed, other important bishops were to be informed of the fact immediately by letter; in Athanasius' case at least, this had not happened at the time, because the Eusebians had had to await Constantine's death before they could interpret his banishing of Athanasius to Trier as confirmation of the decisions of Tyre without fear of contradiction. The later notice sent to Julius of Athanasius' deposition was rendered invalid in Julius' eyes by the facts that it attempted to replace Athanasius with a man, Pistus, who had been ordained presbyter by a heretic,<sup>71</sup> and that it was contradicted by a delegation from another synod,

---

<sup>71</sup> Julius refers to Pistus' ordination in Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 24.2 and 4.



Alexandria,<sup>72</sup> which had at least as much canonical right to judge Athanasius' case, arguing against the legitimacy of Tyre's decision. Athanasius and Marcellus in addition both have a large number of letters of recommendation from friends, although Julius does not say who or how many they are.<sup>73</sup>

Julius and the synod of Rome are not 'interfering in the affairs of the East' at this point, therefore, but addressing the very practical, immediate question of whether to receive the Bishop of Alexandria during his stay in Rome with the proper ecclesiastical welcome befitting his station, or whether to perform the extremely serious action of turning him away. Julius argues that the case against Athanasius put forward by a handful of bishops<sup>74</sup> from around Constantinople was so doubtful that he could not consider it proven, and so had to offer appropriate hospitality to the man who was still Bishop of Alexandria until better proof was furnished of a successful case against him. The Dedication Synod's letter has not offered any better proof: although he does not dwell on the point, Julius intimates that he does not accept the synod's validity by addressing his reply to named individuals instead of 'To the Holy Synod at Antioch'. Only the presence of Athanasius' and Marcellus' accusers themselves will be deemed a satisfactory means of offering testimony, since they are themselves also accused.<sup>75</sup> The previous situation is therefore unchanged. The Bishop of Rome will continue to receive Athanasius (and Marcellus) with the status of bishop, and to communicate with them, until a satisfactory case against them is brought.

Julius' letter, however, shows that he does not consider the synod at Rome to have made the final ruling on the matter, or to have condemned those who condemned Athanasius and Marcellus: he writes to them as his 'dearly beloved brothers', and once again asks them to assemble at Rome to try Athanasius' and

---

<sup>72</sup> For the delegation bringing the letter of the Alexandrian synod, see *Ap c Ar* 27.1, 28.3 and 33.2.

<sup>73</sup> See *Ap c Ar* 23.3-4.

<sup>74</sup> Julius refers to the destructive activities of a 'few' in *Ap c Ar* 25.1, 34.2 and 5, while according to 27.1 'those around Eusebius wrote formerly' against Athanasius. See also the letter of the Westerners at Sardica.

Marcellus' cases, if they will. He has not been involved in making decisions, in other words, which cover areas outside his jurisdiction. The legal decision of the synod of Rome is merely to accept Athanasius and Marcellus as bishops for the purposes of Roman communion and hospitality.

What the synod of Rome does not do is very clear from a cursory comparison with the rulings of the Western synod of Sardica. It does not proclaim Athanasius and Marcellus to be officially restored to their sees, or anathematise their successors, or excommunicate their accusers. It merely denies, for the purposes of communion with the local Roman and Italian churches, that they have yet been validly condemned, without ruling out the possibility that they may be proved to be so at a later date. (It may be noted that all the evidence Julius produces concerning Tyre is procedural, concerning the validity of the trial proceedings; he does not discuss the charges themselves.)<sup>76</sup>

This is all that Athanasius himself, in his more exact moments, claims that the synod did: received him as a bishop, and admitted him to communion and episcopal *agape*.<sup>77</sup> It 'judged' the case against him to be doubtful enough to need a further trial; it did not pretend, in the absence of the Easterners, to supply that trial. It certainly made no attempt to restore him as bishop in Alexandria, or to anathematise Gregory, at least that Julius is prepared to admit to.

The synod's actions in the case of Athanasius, therefore, are entirely clear. The need to receive so great a prelate with proper hospitality or else insult him grossly pushed the synod to make some preliminary decision on his case: it concluded, as Julius already had, that, without prejudice to any more convincing case against him which might be brought, there was currently insufficient evidence that he had been validly and conclusively deposed with due legal form, and so he should continue to be treated as bishop in the meantime.

---

<sup>75</sup> *Ap c Ar* 33.3-4.

<sup>76</sup> See *Ap c Ar* 27.3 - 28.7, 31.

<sup>77</sup> *Ap c Ar* 20.2; *Hist Ar* 15.1.

Why the evidence against Marcellus was also dismissed and the synod which deposed him ruled to be invalid (Julius says of Marcellus as well as Athanasius ‘We acted agreeably to the canon, and not unjustly, in holding communion with them’ and ‘It is neither holy nor just to reject those who have never been condemned’)<sup>78</sup> is not entirely clear. Unless Athanasius has omitted some of Julius’ letter, Julius himself makes no attempt to explain this move to his correspondents.

It is Marcellus who is the key to the first of our questions above, what the Italian bishops who appeared for the synod made of their task once they realised that the full-scale synod to try Athanasius and Marcellus they had envisaged could not now take place. All the signs are that the synod at large, if not Julius himself, swallowed the Marcellan-Athanasian myth of ‘Ariomania’ hook, line and sinker; and that if they knew they had no competence to restore the two bishops to their sees by themselves, they nonetheless had few doubts about the rights and wrongs of the question, or about who was responsible.

There are four reasons in favour of this view. Firstly, there is the unexplained invalidation of the synod which condemned Marcellus in Constantinople. There are various ways this synod could have been argued to be invalid on procedural grounds. There were no Galatian bishops there, so far as we know from Eusebius, which was certainly irregular. Many of the bishops from nearby provinces who were (presumably) friends with Marcellus (the authors of the letters written in his support, for example) were not present, and presumably, as at Tyre, were not invited. Marcellus was given no chance to clear himself on any later occasion: even Paul of Samosata was tried three times before he was condemned. His doctrines were misrepresented to the Emperor, and things which he had written speculatively were taken as actual assertions.

---

<sup>78</sup> *Ap c Ar* 34.4 and 5.

Julius could have made any of these points; they would have been no more hard-hitting than the points he makes about Athanasius' case. At least two of them were made elsewhere, before and during Sardica.<sup>79</sup> His failure to do so suggests what other evidence confirms: that the case against Marcellus was not thrown out by the synod of Rome on procedural grounds, as Athanasius' was, but for other reasons, which could not diplomatically be dwelt on in Julius' letter. These reasons are likely to include a conviction on the Roman synod's part that Marcellus had been condemned purely because he had earlier exposed his accusers' own heresy, refusing to communicate with the heretic Arius.

Secondly, there is the synod's failure even to consider the *Contra Asterium*, on the basis of which Marcellus was condemned, as evidence against him that ought to be examined. This is clear from Julius' account, which merely mentions testimonies, oral and written, in his favour, and a further inquiry into his current beliefs, which he confirmed in writing and asserted that he had held for his whole life.<sup>80</sup> Some criticism of this method of demonstrating Marcellus' orthodoxy clearly reached the main players in the West, because the Western Synod of Sardica went out of its way to examine the content of the *Contra Asterium* itself. But at Rome, the testimony in Marcellus' favour had clearly been strong enough to persuade the relevant parties that he had no case on the subject of the antilogion to argue.

Thirdly, there is the testimony on Marcellus' behalf to which Julius refers. Vito and Vincentius were obviously prepared to testify strongly to Marcellus' orthodoxy at the time of Nicaea.<sup>81</sup> The synod of Rome took place in Vito's own church; it is clear that his voice had some weight at the synod, presbyter though

---

<sup>79</sup> The Easterners at Sardica seem to be replying to such a defence when they state 'Namque post unam et secundam multasque correptiones cum nihil proficere potuissent -- perdurabat enim et contradicebat rectae fidei et contentione maligna ecclesiae catholicae resistebat -- ... omnes ... actis eum ecclesiasticis damnaverunt' (Hilary, *FH A IV.1.3.3*; Feder p. 51.1-7). This hardly squares with the facts as even the Easterners' letter itself gives them, that Marcellus was deposed after one single trial at Constantinople. The Westerners at Sardica, meanwhile, complain precisely that Marcellus was condemned out of context on the basis of speculative views misrepresented as his teaching.

<sup>80</sup> See Julius' letter at *Ap c Ar* 23.3 and 32.2 with Marcellus letter to Julius, p. 124.2019 Vinzent.

<sup>81</sup> *Ap c Ar* 32.2.

he was. Vito and Vincentius could look back on the very beginning (so far as the West was concerned) of the controversy, sixteen years previously, and see the now beleaguered Marcellus as a bastion of orthodoxy at the height of his powers, while Athanasius was still a young deacon acting as secretary to Alexander. It is not difficult to imagine that they would have found his conspiracy theory entirely believable as an explanation for his deposition, especially after the depositions of so many other key players at Nicaea.

Finally, there is the fact that Marcellus himself makes the proven (at Nicaea) heresy of his accusers and his own refutation of them the central plank of his defence in his written statement of belief. As we have seen, he ascribes the statements condemned as Arius' in *Henos Somatos* to his enemies currently living, a tactic aimed at reinforcing their position as already ecumenically condemned in the Roman synod's eyes.<sup>82</sup> This would dovetail neatly with the evidence of Vito and Vincentius, and probably also of those who had written in his favour from Asia Minor, and with the suspicious insolence of the Dedication synod's letter and the Easterners' failure to appear. Marcellus' case for his own defence was probably as neatly sewn up, with all the supporting documents and testimonies in his own defence, as Athanasius'. Like Athanasius' case, it was probably largely irresistible, in the absence of his opponents. And we know from the *Orationes Contra Arianos* that Athanasius was prepared to back Marcellus' theological story to the hilt, despite the fact that he had at the time a perfectly good case of his own without it.

The presence at the Roman synod of a number of other deposed bishops -- at least four, probably including Lucius of Adrianople and Asclepas of Gaza,<sup>83</sup> besides various presbyters from Alexandria and elsewhere - can only have added to the plausibility of the Arian conspiracy theory in the eyes of the Italian bishops, as in Julius'. The synod took no decision at all concerning the

---

<sup>82</sup> On Tetz identification of Marcellus' opponents with Asterius, see note 37 above.

<sup>83</sup> Athanasius, at *Ap c Ar* 33.1, names four provinces from which bishops came. See Opitz note to p. 111.11 for identifications.

episcopal status of these other figures, it seems, at least that Julius is prepared to admit to. But their tales of woe clearly added to the general feelings of outrage.

In the light of all of this, Julius' letter is enormously restrained, although this fact is not usually noticed. He makes no accusations against the Eusebians which he cannot substantiate. He makes only the barest mention of Arianism, and that in the most oblique terms. He defends his own actions in calling the Easterners to a synod and in receiving Athanasius and Marcellus in the first place at great length and with great care. And finally, as mentioned, although he implicitly denies the validity of the Dedication synod, he writes to Eusebius and his friends as brothers, indicating in other words that he is still in communion with them. He leaves their conduct to God on judgement day (always a sign of ecclesiastical bottling-out), and makes one more futile plea for them to come to Rome for a proper synod. The probability that he was expecting his letter to be read by Constantius or one of his officers is high.

Finally, it is worth considering, despite the fact that the question is ultimately unanswerable, whether Julius was quite as convinced by Marcellus as he was by Athanasius, and as the bulk of the Roman synod seems to have been. L.W. Bernard has pointed out (rightly, despite his unjustified slurs on Marcellus' integrity) that Julius is rather lukewarm in his defence of Marcellus,<sup>84</sup> compared with his ready defence of Athanasius, and compared with the strong support Marcellus seems to have received from the Roman synod in general. His conclusion, that Julius was not entirely of one mind with the Roman synod in the case of Marcellus at least, cannot therefore be dismissed out of hand. At the very least, it seems that Julius was a cautious and balanced man, whereas caution and balance were to be very much absent from the debate over the next few years. It may well be also that Julius was shaken by the strength of the feeling against Marcellus in the letters which arrived from the Dedication synod, and felt that he had rather engaged with forces beyond his strength. Marcellus'



premature departure also did little to make Julius' task of holding the synod without the Easterners easier, a fact the latter may not have been entirely delighted with.

Whatever Julius' fears or annoyances, it is probable that they were not shared by the majority of the members of the synod on whose behalf he was writing, and even that it was for that very reason that he had reserved the writing of the letter to the Easterners to himself. By the time of Sardica, those Westerners who were present, including eleven from the Italian provinces, were so fervently behind Marcellus as well as Athanasius that many of them were prepared to adopt his theology to clarify their theological position, in spite of Julius' prior request to them not to go beyond the theological formula approved at Nicaea.<sup>85</sup> Julius on that occasion remained in Rome. The embattled, defensive writer of the letter to the East two years earlier had clearly had enough. Though impressively self-possessed and in control of his arguments at that point, he had probably already had far more than he had bargained for.

### **3. The Road to Sardica**

#### **a. The involvement of Constans and the case of Paul of Constantinople.**

We have now to consider an important question, although one that can probably only receive a speculative answer on the current evidence: how Constans, now sole emperor of the West, came to be so interested in the ongoing Eastern ecclesiastical controversy that he was prepared to threaten his brother with war on behalf of two of the exiled bishops.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> L.W. Barnard, 'Pope Julius, Marcellus of Ancyra and the Council of Sardica, A Reconsideration', *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 78 (1971), 69-79, at pp. 71-2.

<sup>85</sup> See below.

<sup>86</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.22.3-5; Sozomen, *HE* III.20.1; Theodoret, *HE* II.8.54-56; Philostorgius, *HE* III.12 (p. 43.1-7).

The threat of war on his brother which Constans was prepared to make in 345 is so serious a political event that several commentators have doubted whether it actually happened: 'It is difficult to believe,' Hanson says, 'that Constans would have been ready to plunge the Empire into civil war ... for the sake of the restoration of a few bishops.'<sup>87</sup> Hanson is right: it is far easier to believe, on the previous record of the house of Constantine, that Constans was ready to demand the restoration of a few bishops for the sake of plunging the empire into civil war; or rather, for the opportunity to lay claim to some of his brother's territory. Constantine, when still part of an imperial college, had used the wrongs of the Christian populace as an excuse to annex the remainder of the empire piece by piece;<sup>88</sup> it would hardly be surprising if his son saw an opportunity to use the wrongs of Christian bishops to annex at least part of his brother's territory. Constans had gained the whole territory of his elder brother Constantine II after their civil war of 340; he may well have been hoping to provoke Constantius into a similar war. Constantius, held down in Antioch by his campaigns against the Persians, was wise enough not to be drawn in: he eventually reinstated the bishops rather than risk that war, but he viewed the bishops concerned with lasting resentment, and took his revenge on them when he had the opportunity.

The two bishops over whose reinstatement Constans was eventually prepared to threaten war were, significantly, Paul of Constantinople and Athanasius, the bishops of the two major cities just beyond the bounds of Constans' territory,<sup>89</sup> both of whom were powerful local political figures with a great deal of popular support. Magnentius, Constans' usurping successor, approached both in 350 (to Athanasius' embarrassment and Paul's downfall), obviously intending to continue Constans' policy by similarly engaging support in the two 'buffer zones' of Egypt and Thracia.<sup>90</sup> Constans may have had some desultory interest

---

<sup>87</sup> Hanson, *Search*, p. 307; see also Schwartz, *GS* IV, 13 note1; Opitz' note to *Hist Ar* 20.2 (p. 193.14).

<sup>88</sup> See Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 70.

<sup>89</sup> Klein, following a suggestion of Seeck, thinks that Constantinople belonged to Constans rather than Constantius till it was ceded in the winter of 339-340 (p. 76). But this goes against the evidence of Philostorgius, *HE* III.1<sup>a</sup> (p. 29.15-16).

<sup>90</sup> See Athanasius' laboured defence in *Ap ad Const* 6-12 and *Historia Acephala* 1.3. See also Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 102-4 and 214-17.

in the capacity of Marcellus and the other bishops who were eventually cleared by (Western) Sardica to weaken Christian support for Constantius, but it was Athanasius and Paul who were at the heart of his policy of Eastern interference at last and probably also at first. Any waning of the support of the West for Marcellus after Sardica (if there was such) is likely to have been of as scant interest to Constans as Marcellus' earlier centrality to Western 'anti-Arian' opposition.

Constans may well have visited Rome in 340 after his defeat of Constantine II.<sup>91</sup> There he would have found Athanasius and Marcellus celebrating the sacred mysteries along with Julius, and been told of their plight. He probably knew of it already: he had by that stage already received letters against Athanasius and Marcellus from the Eusebians three years earlier, and an envoy from at least Athanasius refuting their charges; he had shown Athanasius favour at that point by requesting copies of the holy scriptures from him.<sup>92</sup>

The most economical explanation of the ecclesiastical events of 340-341 is that Constans, largely for his own political reasons, at this point wrote to his brother to request a large synod of bishops from both East and West to retry the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus, in conjunction with Julius' similar request to the Eusebians. He could plausibly have argued that their amnesty and return after Constantine's death had been granted by all three brothers together, and so Constantius should not rescind it by himself (the Eusebians' writing to Constans and Constantine II against the exiles had tacitly admitted this interest of the other two emperors). Athanasius and Marcellus had been deposed again after their return, it could be argued, by small, unrepresentative, partisan synods. Their cases should be examined by a much larger number of both Eastern and Western bishops, particularly since the Eusebians were also suspect and had charges, including charges of heresy, to answer. Constans may also have been thinking of emulating Constantine's great ecumenical ecclesiastical gathering at

---

<sup>91</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 225 with p. 315 note 47.

<sup>92</sup> Athanasius, *Ap ad Const* 4.

Nicaea, further striking home his youngest son's resemblance to his all-conquering father.

Constans' involvement at this stage would explain why Julius and the other Italian bishops were so sure the Easterners would come to the March 341 synod, even though Julius had been unsuccessfully inviting them to a Roman synod for the past three years. It would also explain why Constantius suddenly decided to call a very large Eastern synod in the winter of 340-341, when he had been content to have the exiles expelled by much smaller gatherings two years earlier; he was not prepared to accede to his brother's request for an ecumenical synod (yet), but holding a large synod of his own would be a fitting snub to Constans' pretensions -- a charge that earlier synods had been unrepresentative had probably also struck home, and the advantage of emulating the splendour of their father's great ecclesiastical gatherings was presumably not lost on Constantius either. The timing works out perfectly: if Constans wrote to Constantius in mid-March or April 340, Constantius would have received the letter in May or June, in nice time to convoke a rival synod for the following December.<sup>93</sup>

The insolent letter of the Dedication synod to Julius refusing a Western synod and complaining of Western interference provided Constantius' coded response to his brother. Constans, however, was not prepared to let the matter rest. The next dramatic Eastern ecclesiastical event after the abortive synod of Rome was the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, followed by the attempt of Paul of Constantinople to return to his former see. Here, too, Constans' hand can probably be detected.

Eusebius died in November or December of 341, but he must have been known to be mortally ill for some time, because Paul, exiled to Pontus at the time, was able to consult Maximinus of Trier about the advisability of attempting to claim

---

<sup>93</sup> See Chapter 4.

the see on Eusebius' death.<sup>94</sup> Paul's case does not seem to have been taken up by the Roman party, despite the fact that he had been the first bishop of those who were eventually supported at Sardica to be deposed by Constantius, as early as the autumn of 337. He is nowhere mentioned by name in Julius' letter, as Athanasius and Marcellus constantly are, and it would seem extraordinary that he should be merely one of the bishops from Thracia mentioned in passing in Julius' last paragraph<sup>95</sup> (given that the stigma of causing Hermogenes' death still lay in the future). In any case, if he was one of these, Julius and the Roman synod conspicuously failed to espouse his cause: Julius addresses Eusebius of Constantinople as bishop. It seems more likely that he was confined to Pontus by the terms of his exile, and unable to travel freely in the West,<sup>96</sup> or else that Julius did not wish to tackle Paul's successor, Eusebius, as directly as a request to the Easterners to restore Paul would have required.

The Easterners at Sardica, who dredge up every connection they can between their various enemies in order to discredit their communion with one another, do not link Paul directly to Julius or the Roman party, except by saying that Paul at one point condemned Athanasius (probably when still a presbyter).<sup>97</sup> Instead, they accuse two bishops only of supporting him before his disastrous return to Constantinople in late 341: Maximinus of Trier and Asclepas of Gaza. Maximinus in particular is accused of being the real cause of the huge slaughter in Constantinople, because he encouraged Paul to return there and claim the see.<sup>98</sup> But why should Maximinus take it upon himself to encourage Paul to make such a hazardous move in the face of Constantius' known wishes? And why should Paul do so with no greater support than that of the bishop of a city over a thousand miles away in another emperor's territory?

Constans is very likely to have been operating out of Trier in the late autumn of 341 as he campaigned against the Franks. He presumably reached it by around

---

<sup>94</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV.1.27.7* (Feder p. 66.30 - p. 67.7).

<sup>95</sup> In *Ap c Ar* 33.1.

<sup>96</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 7.3.

<sup>97</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV.1.13.1* (Feder p. 57.20-23).

mid-September, since he can be found at Lauriacum, halfway along the journey from the Balkans, on 24<sup>th</sup> June.<sup>99</sup> He would have had plenty of opportunity before Eusebius' death to hear of Eusebius' illness and press Maximinus to encourage Paul to return to Constantinople, whether or not Paul was already touting for support, and whether or not he would ordinarily have been likely to look for it from the bishop of Trier.

We know very little about Paul's background, but it is likely to have been aristocratic, perhaps as aristocratic as Eusebius' own. He is described by Socrates as διδασκαλικός, and as 'young in age but advanced in understanding';<sup>100</sup> to have been elected bishop of the New Rome at that age, he is likely to have been well-connected as well as highly educated. Despite the little time he had previously held the see, he had wide enough support to hold the main church against Eusebius' followers, and even against the *comes* Hermogenes for a short time;<sup>101</sup> since he had scarcely had time to build up a large popular following on his own in the three months or so he previously held the see, this support is likely to have been based on powerful connections among the local citizens. His earlier exile to Pontus may have been to estates he owned there; his life there was presumably a comfortable one, since he made no attempt to seek the hospitality of Rome, so far as we can tell, either when he was first banished from the see in 337 or after Athanasius and the others made their way there in 339-340. But most importantly, he managed to escape capital punishment on two occasions when he had, from Constantius' point of view, usurped an extremely important office, including in one case being the cause of major civil unrest leading to the death of Constantius' own ambassador. These were extremely serious offences; Athanasius fears the death penalty for lesser ones alleged against him by the Eusebians.<sup>102</sup> When Paul is finally executed in 350, the two methods used are classic methods of executing the aristocracy:

---

<sup>98</sup> Hilary, *FH A* IV.1.27.7 (Feder p. 66.30 - p. 67.7).

<sup>99</sup> See Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 225. This timing is based on Constantius' five to six months to make the similar journey from Rome to Sirmium in 357 (Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 222)..

<sup>100</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.6.3.

<sup>101</sup> See Socrates, *HE* II.13.2-3; Sozomen, *HE* III.7.6.

<sup>102</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 3.5-7.



starvation and strangling, both of which avoid shedding blood. As we know from Athanasius, even bishops of lower rank had theirs shed in abundance;<sup>103</sup> it is Paul's rank, not his sacerdotal status, which sets him apart in this regard.

If Paul had the support both of at least some of the local aristocracy and their clients and of the Western emperor in returning to the see at Constantinople, his action begins to look slightly less foolish; with Eusebius' influence gone and his friends presumably in disarray, Paul must have imagined he could successfully present his election as a *fait accompli*, and persuade Constantius to bow to the inevitable. Constantius might have thought he could follow up Paul's move with military backing if necessary; unfortunately, he was then pinned down on the Rhine just as completely as Constantius was hemmed in at Antioch (indeed more so, since Constantius was himself eventually to be the one who expelled Paul from Constantinople), and considerably further away.

On Eusebius' death, events moved very quickly. Paul would have had to have been hiding near the city by that stage, ready to step in before Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea and their friends could definitively install a successor of their choosing. Paul was installed by 'the people' in the main church; Eusebius' old friends elected Macedonius, Paul's original rival, and installed him in the church of St Paul.<sup>104</sup> As soon as the news came to Constantius in Antioch (fifteen days later, at normal post speed; the message may have been expedited due to its political seriousness, but the messenger would also have had to cross the Cilician Gates in winter conditions), he ordered the *magister equitum* Hermogenes, already on his way to Thracia with an armed force, to deal with the situation. Depending on where Constantius' messenger caught up with Hermogenes, he will have taken from one and a half to five weeks to arrive at Constantinople, where he set out to expel Paul by force.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 12.1-2 and (less luridly) *Ap c Ar* 33.2.

<sup>104</sup> Socrates, *HE* 2.12.2.

<sup>105</sup> This figure is based on a sustainable daily marching distance of twenty miles for Hermogenes' troops, and an expedited messenger speed of up to 100 miles per day, though faster speeds were possible in really urgent cases (see Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), especially p. 188).

After a stand-off which is unlikely to have lasted long, Hermogenes made a violent move on Paul, a riot started, he was lynched and huge numbers were killed; this took place in what was by now the consular year of 342. The news was not slow in coming to Constantius (an expedited message, relayed day and night, might have reached him in less than a week). He made a famously speedy winter journey himself to save the situation; he expelled Paul successfully and fined the city half its free bread ration.<sup>106</sup>

On Paul's expulsion by Constantius, he immediately headed for Trier himself, where Constans still was. There Maximinus was 'the first to communicate with him'.<sup>107</sup> And there he may well have stayed until after the synod of Sardica, at which he was not present.<sup>108</sup> Whatever the Western synod of Sardica thought of Paul's attempt to return to his see, however, and the fact that he is never mentioned by name in its documents speaks volumes, they reinstated him with the others, probably using his friend Asclepas' name as a kind of shorthand for 'Asclepas and Paul with whom he is in communion'. Again, Constans' support for Paul may have been important in achieving this; the Westerners were evidently not proud of this connection, which they carefully concealed in their encyclical letter, while the Easterners gleefully trumpeted it in theirs.

Paul attempted another return in late 344, being outwitted at that point by the praetorian prefect Philippus, who kidnapped him through the back door of an imperial bath-house and put him on a ship for Thessalonica before his supporters could wake up to what was happening.<sup>109</sup> Constans reacted swiftly; in spring 345 he threatened war on Paul's behalf, and successfully achieved his reinstatement. Paul was now finally able to occupy the see for more than a few months, remaining there until Constans' grip on his own regions faltered in 349.

---

<sup>106</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.13.2-5; Libanius, *Or* 59.96-97 Foerster; Ammianus Marcellinus XIV.10.2 (a back reference rather than an account of the event).

<sup>107</sup> Hilary, *FH* A IV.1.27.7 (Feder p. 67.2-3). For Constans presence, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 225.

<sup>108</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 71 suggests that he was. But at Sardica Asclepas communicates with Paul by letter: see below.

<sup>109</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.16 and Sozomen, *HE* III.9. On the date, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 214-5..

Paul was once again deposed and arrested, and soon after Constans' death was himself executed.

All of this suggests that it was Constans who was Paul's chief supporter, and, conversely, that Paul was the bishop in whom Constans was most interested, and that for reasons rather more political than theological. Athanasius was prepared to bring him forward in a list of wronged anti-Arian heroes, but only much later in a work for an audience largely ignorant of the intricacies of the earlier part of the controversy, *Historia Arianorum*, carefully suppressing everything about his case other than his initial condemnation on the accusation of a man who later communicated with him, Eusebius' contra-canonical usurpation of his see, and the harshness of the judicial punishments eventually meted out to him.<sup>110</sup> Marcellus may have been responsible for the recovery of Paul's body after execution, since he was buried in Ancyra,<sup>111</sup> but we have no record of their relations during Paul's lifetime. Other than Maximinus of Trier (who is likely to have been governed largely by the emperor's wishes in his dealings with Paul, since they all took place while the emperor was at Trier), Paul's main ecclesiastical champion seems to have been Asclepas of Gaza, who may conceivably have been well-connected but had been long deposed from a see which was in any case of little prestige. It was surely Paul's political clout, first and last, which rendered him a figure of such importance in the 340s and secured his memory as a bastion of orthodoxy, rather than his real importance to the developing theological struggle.

#### **b. The Eastern delegation to Trier**

Around this same period, Constantius and the Eastern party made an attempt to mollify Constans by sending a delegation of four bishops 'as if from a synod' to his court in Trier, bearing a creed designed to clear the Easterners of the charge

---

<sup>110</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 7.1-6.

<sup>111</sup> Socrates, *HE* V.9.1.

of Arianism, the so-called Fourth Creed of Antioch.<sup>112</sup> Athanasius tells us that this took place ‘a few months’ after the Dedication synod, which must mean at least seven or eight months, assuming that Constans was not in Trier but somewhere in the Balkans for the first half of 341,<sup>113</sup> and could mean as much as a year and a half later.

Athanasius tells us that ‘a report of the synod of Rome came to Constans’,<sup>114</sup> hardly surprisingly, if he had been closely involved in encouraging Eastern attendance at it. It is likely that a fierce letter of Constans to his brother, dismissing the Dedication synod as led by Arians, was the result, because the deputation to which Athanasius refers has two characteristics: it was a deputation to Constans, rather than to the church leaders of the West, and the creed it brought addressed many (though by no means all) of the traditional criticisms of ‘Arian’ theology.

No doubt encouraged by Constans, Maximinus refused to welcome the four bishops -- Narcissus of Neronias, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea and Mark of Arethusa -- who made up the envoy,<sup>115</sup> a move which went well beyond what Julius had been prepared to do. The Easterners at Sardica bitterly resented this action, not surprisingly: it was the first rejection of any of the Eastern bishops, as opposed to their theology, by the West.<sup>116</sup>

Two interlocking questions present themselves: did this embassy take place before or after Paul’s attempted return to Constantinople, and who was present at the court at Trier? On the one hand, a diplomatic overture from Constantius to Constans on the East-West ecclesiastical question might seem rather more likely before Paul’s disastrous action than afterwards, particularly if Constans was harbouring Paul at court and treating him with the honours due to the

---

<sup>112</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 25.1.

<sup>113</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 225.

<sup>114</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 15.2.

<sup>115</sup> Named by Athanasius in *De Syn* 25.1.

legitimate bishop of Constantinople. On the other, there seems to have been a group of bishops gathered at Trier, since Athanasius speaks of the Fourth Creed's being presented to 'Constans and all who were there';<sup>117</sup> this might well suggest that Paul and various others (presumably Asclepas and perhaps Ossius) were already at the court. In addition, despite the fact that at least three of the ambassadors were staunch supporters of Eusebius, the Fourth Creed is surprisingly conciliatory; we might expect this in the aftermath of Eusebius' death, when various powerful figures were jockeying for position in the East, including more some more moderate figures such as Basil of Ancyra.

It appears from Athanasius' account that the creed was drawn up by another synod, presumably also at Antioch. If so, a synod of a few important Eastern bishops who desired to take stock of their position now that Eusebius was dead seems likely; we have no notice of another synod on the scale of the Dedication, and matters needed to move quickly.<sup>118</sup> Basil, for one, would have benefited from the position of Ancyra on the main road through Asia, just as Marcellus had; he would have seen the emperor passing through in both directions, and had the latest news of events in Constantinople. Maris of Chalcedon and Theodore of Heraclea were near enough to Constantinople to be apprised of events there in any case. All of these are likely to have returned in Constantius' wake, knowing that it was vital that the Easterners regroup as quickly as possible, and probably in Basil's case (and possibly also in Maris', as we shall see) looking to change the direction of Eastern ecclesiastical politics somewhat. Narcissus and Acacius are also likely to have joined them, together with whichever of Flacillus or Stephen was currently the bishop of Antioch,<sup>119</sup> and presumably some others of a rather more moderate persuasion. If they had not

---

<sup>116</sup> The Easterners at Sardica singled Maximinus of Trier out for special condemnation, for this offence and for his dealings with Paul of Constantinople (Hilary, *FH A IV.1.27.7* (Feder p. 66 - p. 67.7)).

<sup>117</sup> Athanasius, *De Syn* 25.1.

<sup>118</sup> Schwartz, *GS III*, 322 and Girardet, p. 110 assume that the synod which produced the Fourth Creed was the Dedication, which Girardet (with some understatement) calls a 'Dauersynode'. Brennecke, *Hilarius*, p. 21 with note 18 argues (surely correctly) that it was an otherwise unknown synod.

<sup>119</sup> On the date of Stephen's election, see Burgess, p. 240.

originally assembled at the request of Constantius, he made use of them for his reply to his brother's complaint concerning the Dedication synod, and as we shall see, effectively neutralised the power of the more moderate elements, who seem to have had an important part in drawing up the creed itself.

The authors of the Fourth Creed did not anathematise the teachings of Arius by name, significantly, but they did produce a creed which was far less Arian in feel than the First Creed of Antioch, as well as less Origenist than the Second.<sup>120</sup> They confess τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, rather than ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (and certainly rather than merely ἓνα υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ μονογενῆ), not insisting on the three hypostases. Only scriptural titles are used for Christ, Word, Wisdom, Power, Life and True Light, not the Second Creed's ὅλος, τέλειος and μόνος, and the First Creed's Will language is likewise absent for the time being. The Son is not called the Father's image -- the 'God of God, Light of Light' formula, already enshrined by Nicaea, is the least problematic of such formulae for a one-hypostasis theologian, since neither demands a hard separation of two distinct beings with boundaries, unlike the Second Creed's 'King from King, Lord from Lord'. The Holy Spirit is described in terms very similar to those of both the Third Creed and the Western Creed of Sardica: both ἅγια πνεῦμα and the alternative name παράκλητος are given, and the Spirit is described as being both promised and sent.

Two scriptural phrases not in any of the previous test-of-orthodoxy creeds are the confession of the Father as the one 'from whom the whole of fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named' (a dig at Constans' pretensions?) and that the Son will 'render to everyone according to their works' (another dig?). The only anti-heretical clause (other than the anathemata, which are all derived from the Nicene anathemata) is the insistence that the Son's kingdom, being endless, remains 'to unending ages, for he sits at the right hand of the Father not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.' This is the stock anti-Marcellan

---

<sup>120</sup> The text of the creed is given by Athanasius, *De Syn* 25.2-5 and Socrates, *HE* II.18.3-6. I cite from the text given by Opitz (p. 251).



clause that virtually every Eastern test-of-orthodoxy creed would employ a form of thereafter, including those signed by Marcellus and his followers; even by this time, it was no more than an empty jibe.

Although this creed was reused on a number of occasions during the next twenty years, all the concessions made by it mentioned above were withdrawn in a series of additional anathemata, beginning with those of the ‘long-winded’ creed of three years later. At this point, nevertheless, this was a creed that even Marcellus could probably have signed, if without much enthusiasm.<sup>121</sup> It was also, however, a creed that Arius could have signed. Its repetitions of what look like three of the Nicene anathemata have slight but significant variations: τοῦς δὲ λέγοντας ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὸν υἱὸν ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως καὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ‘ἦν ποτε χρόνος ὅτε οὐκ ἦν’ ἀλλοτρίους οἶδεν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Nicaea had ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο and ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας, shutting off possibilities which the authors of the Fourth Creed retain, as well as ruling out the words κτιστός, τρεπτός and ἀλλοιωτός, about which the Fourth Creed is significantly silent.

But there is a tacit admission in this creed that, if Arius’ theology was acceptable, one-hypostasis theology was also within the bounds of reasonable Christian discourse. This concession cannot have been aimed at Marcellus; the delegation can hardly have been prepared to readmit him to his see after all that had taken place over the past seven years. It is rather a recognition that one-hypostasis theology was common (indeed, normal) in the West; in the abstract, the Easterners claim they can live with such a theology.<sup>122</sup> This was a considerable concession for a group which included the triousian Narcissus of Neronias.

---

<sup>121</sup> The phrase Marcellus would most have disliked was τὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα: see Chapter 4, above.

<sup>122</sup> For an excellent analysis of one-hypostasis and three-hypostasis theology at this period, see Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, pp. 35-46.

The choice of messengers was hardly conciliatory, meanwhile: Theodore and Maris had both been members of the Mareotis commission, and Narcissus was a long-standing enemy of both Athanasius and Marcellus. This suggests an embassy intended to be theologically acceptable but politically tough, which would address the charges of Arianism brought against those who had deposed Athanasius and Marcellus which had been so successful in winning over Western bishops, clearing the Eastern leaders of heresy and thereby showing that there was no need to retry the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus. This time, however, it was the Easterners' turn to suffer a rebuff. Constans was determined to press for a full joint synod of West and East. Constantius, still under threat from Persia, was forced to give in to his brother's request for the time being, and resort to rather more subtle means to thwart his political plans.

## 4. Sardica and After

### a. The Date of the Synod of Sardica

There has come to be virtually an absolute divide between German scholars and French, Italian and English-speaking scholars on the date of the synod of Sardica, to the extent that authors on the one side or the other will frequently give their camp's date, 342 or 343 respectively, without even indicating that it is in dispute.<sup>123</sup> This is largely owing to the positions on the debate taken up by the leading historians of the period in each language: Schwartz first proposed

---

<sup>123</sup> See, for example, on the one side Seibt, *Markell*, p. 13 and Vinzent, *Markell*, p. xxii; on the other, Manlio Simonetti, 'Sardica II. Council', *EEC* II, 757 and Michael P. McHugh, 'Sardica' in *Encyclopaedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998), 1034-5. A striking example is provided by Schneemelcher. Loofs held to the date 343 (see below). Wilhelm Schneemelcher nails his colours firmly to the mast in the title of his article 'Serdika 342, Ein Beitrag zum Problem Ost und West in der Alten Kirche', in *Evangelische Theologie*, Sonderheft: *Ecclesia semper reformanda (Theologische Aufsätze, Ernst Wolf zum 50. Geburtstag)*, ed. W. Schneemelcher and K.G. Steck (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1952), pp. 83-104, reprinted in Wilhelm Schneemelcher, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur Patristik*, ed. W. Bienert and K. Schäferdiek, *Analecta Vlatadon* (Thessalonica: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1974), pp. 338-64. Schneemelcher nowhere adverts to the problem of the date, and when on p. 99 he comes to quote Loofs,

342, and was followed by Opitz, Lietzmann and Schneemelcher; Bardy, Simonetti, Hanson and Barnes all prefer 343. German scholars may rightly claim that the combined weight of Schwartz, Opitz, Lietzmann and Schneemelcher cannot be lightly put aside, but it should be noted that Schwartz' case was disputed from the very beginning by F. Loofs and O. Seeck, and the opposing case has since been compellingly made from a number of different angles in a number of different countries on a number of different occasions.

A brief history of the dispute is as follows. Socrates and Sozomen both date the synod of Sardica to the consular year 347, a dating generally followed (with one or two exceptions, for example the Ballerini brothers) until the nineteenth century.<sup>124</sup> The publication for the first time in 1848 of the Athanasian Festal Letters, whose index gives the consular date of 343 for the synod, a date backed up by the three Festal Letters sent from abroad between the synod and Athanasius' return to Alexandria in October 346, caused this date to be generally accepted thereafter until Schwartz argued in 1904 and 1911 that it should be 342.<sup>125</sup>

Schwartz' case was mainly argued on the basis of Verona Codex LX (58),<sup>126</sup> which has among the collection of documents ascribed to Theodosius the Deacon a note of the synod of Sardica reading 'Tunc temporis ingerebantur molestiae imperatoribus synodum convocare, ut insidiarentur Paulo episcopo Constantinopolitano per suggestionem Eusebii Acacii Theodori Valentis Stephani et sociorum ipsorum, et congregata est synodus consolat. Constantini et Constantini apud Sardicam.' Schwartz emended the impossible 'Constantini et Constantini', like the Ballerini brothers, to 'Constantii et Constantis', but whereas the Ballerini had read 'Constantii IV et Constantis III', or 346,<sup>127</sup> Schwartz read 'Constantii III et Constantis II', or 342. To make sense of the

---

'Glaubensbekenntnis', p. 37, he adds magisterially in brackets after Loofs' 343 '(gemeint ist 342)'.

<sup>124</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.20.4; Sozomen, *HE* III.12.7.

<sup>125</sup> Schwartz, 'Zur Geschichte des Athanasius I' = *GS* III, 11 and 'Zur Geschichte des Athanasius IX' = *GS* III, 325-7.

<sup>126</sup> Published in Turner, *EOMIA* I.2.iv, p. 637.

Festal Index, he argued that the Index had behind its chronology two different calendars at different times, that of the consular year, beginning January 1<sup>st</sup>, and that of the Egyptian year, beginning on 29<sup>th</sup> August, and at this point was using the Egyptian year;<sup>128</sup> since Sardica was generally agreed to have met in the autumn, this would place it just within the new Egyptian year, which would then be taken to correspond to the consular year 343.<sup>129</sup>

It is true that this may be made to fit the main parameters of the other events that determine the timing of the synod. Athanasius tells Constantius that Constans wrote to him ‘when three years had passed away, in the fourth year’ commanding him to come to the court, then at Milan.<sup>130</sup> When he arrived there, Constans told him he had written to Constantius asking for an ecumenical synod, and afterwards summoned him to Gaul to meet Ossius and go to Sardica. In the context, the starting point of the three-years-and-then-some should be after Athanasius first arrived in Rome, i.e. Constans’ first summons should have taken place between August 342 and July 343, but if Athanasius means three plus years after the date of his leaving Alexandria (19<sup>th</sup> March),<sup>131</sup> this would place Constans’ summons at some point between 20<sup>th</sup> March 342 and 19<sup>th</sup> March 343. If we assume this summons took place sometime before 1<sup>st</sup> May 342, Athanasius would have been able to have arrived in Milan before the middle of May; we then have to assume that Constantius’ letter agreeing to the synod was received almost immediately, and the synod formally convoked by the beginning of June: allowing the same minimum three and a half months that was allowed between the convoking of and the date set for the synod of Chalcedon in 451, the shortest known time-frame for an ecumenical synod in our period,<sup>132</sup> the synod could have been called for the middle of September 342, about the latest date it could reasonably have been expected to start and still allow the bishops to return home before winter. We would also have to accept

---

<sup>127</sup> See *PL* 56, 146.

<sup>128</sup> Schwartz, *GS* III, 7-14 and 327-33.

<sup>129</sup> ‘Es bleibt also dabei,’ Schwartz concludes magisterially, ‘die Synode von Sardica ist im Jahr 342 berufen und zusammengetreten’ (*GS* III, 334).

<sup>130</sup> Athanasius, *Ap ad Const* 4.

<sup>131</sup> *Festal Index* [XI] (Martin-Albert, pp. 236-7).

that the Easterners were prepared, however reluctantly, to accept this extremely tight timetable.

In the years between Schwartz' original studies and 1950, he had the powerful support of Opitz (1935), Lietzmann (1938),<sup>133</sup> Chadwick (1948)<sup>134</sup> and Telfer (1950)<sup>135</sup>. However, Loofs<sup>136</sup> and Seeck, as mentioned, challenged the basis of Schwartz' redating of the Festal Index information at the time, and the French scholars Zeiller (1918)<sup>137</sup> and Bardy (1936)<sup>138</sup> also preferred the original date. After 1950, Schwartz' theory was powerfully assailed by V. C. De Clercq (1954)<sup>139</sup> and Hamilton Hess (1958),<sup>140</sup> both of whom argued convincingly that the timetable of events outlined above was simply not plausible, and that there are other problems also to be taken into consideration: why the delegation from the Western Synod only reached Constantius at Easter 344, as it is known to have done,<sup>141</sup> for example, and why the Index mentions only three Easters

---

<sup>132</sup> See Chapter 4, above.

<sup>133</sup> Hans Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church*, III, *From Constantine to Julian*, tr. Bertram Lee Wolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950 [German edn 1938]), pp. 199-200.

<sup>134</sup> Henry Chadwick, 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS* 49 (1948), 27-35.

<sup>135</sup> W. Telfer, 'Paul of Constantinople', *Harvard Theological Review* 43 (1950), 30-92, at pp. 77-80, 91-2.

<sup>136</sup> See F. Loofs, 'Zur Synode von Sardica', *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 82 (1909), 279-97 (reprinted in Loofs, *Patristica*, pp. 173-88), at pp. 294-5.

<sup>137</sup> J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 112 (1918), pp. 228-31

<sup>138</sup> Gustave Bardy, 'Sardique', *DTC*.

<sup>139</sup> Victor C. De Clercq, *Ossius of Cordova, A Contribution to the History of the Constantinian Period*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity 13 (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954), pp. 313-24.

<sup>140</sup> Hamilton Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica A.D. 343, A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), pp. 140-4.

<sup>141</sup> Like everything to do with the dating of the Council of Sardica, the matter is somewhat complicated. Athanasius tells in *Hist Ar* 20 of the arrival of the Western envoys, Vincentius of Capua and Euphrates of Agrippina, in Antioch and of the plot of Stephan of Antioch against them. The plot misfired, leading to Stephan's deposition. Now, the plot was executed 'in the very days of the most holy Pasch' (20.3). Shortly afterwards (ὀλίγον τι), Athanasius continues, Constantius, filled with contrition over the plot against Euphrates, stopped persecuting the followers of Athanasius (21.1). About ten months after that Gregory (of Alexandria) died (21.2). The date of Gregory's death is fixed to 26 June 345 by *Festal Index* [XVIII] (Martin-Albert, pp. 244-7, with p. 76 and p. 293 note 56). That would seem to support Easter 344 as the date of the arrival of the Western envoys. Those who accept 342 as the date of Sardica must, therefore, either put the arrival of the envoys and the deposition of Stephan back to Easter 343, which means that Athanasius' ὀλίγον τι must be explained away, or bite the bullet and accept the fact that the Western letter took an uncomfortably long time to arrive. The former course is adopted by Schwartz, *GS* IV, 13-14; Opitz, note to *Hist Ar* 20.2 (p. 193.10); Lietzmann, *Constantine to Julian*, 207; Telfer, 'Paul', p. 92; and Marcel Richard, 'Le comput paschal par

between Sardica and Athanasius' return to Alexandria on 21 October 346. M. Richard, in 1974, used evidence based on a series of paschal cycles in favour of 342,<sup>142</sup> but Annik Martin pointed out that this rests on a misinterpretation of a call to meet Constans in Trier as a sending from the court in Milan to (Cisalpine) Gaul.<sup>143</sup> Simonetti argued in 1975 that even if the emendation of the Verona Codex text suggested by Schwartz is correct, it could well be based on a source which mentioned the synod as convoked in that year (which most modern commentators agree it was) rather than held then.<sup>144</sup> T.D. Barnes showed in 1978 that 343 much better fits Constans' known movements for the two years, and that Rome still celebrated Easter 343 on a different date from the one given by Athanasius' festal letter, extraordinary if the synod which among other decisions agreed a common date for Easter between the two cities had already taken place.<sup>145</sup> Martin, reiterating in 1985 the previous arguments in favour of 343, demonstrated in addition that the Verona Codex account is part of a late fourth-century partial and ill-informed attempt, whose chronology is deeply unreliable, to show that the true incumbents of the sees of Constantinople and Antioch survived Arian persecution without ever being condemned by a real synod just as Athanasius did (hence the garbled account of Paul's role in the synod of Sardica), '[tout] ce qui devrait', as she says, 'mettre un point final a cette longue discussion'.<sup>146</sup>

---

octaétéris', *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), 307-39, at p. 322; the latter by Klein, p. 80 note 115; Brennecke, *Hilarius*, p. 47 with note 137; Löhr, p. 26; and Jörg Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*, PTS 39 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), p. 43. Burgess, *Chronography*, p. 240 affirms 344 as the year of the plot and of the deposition of Stephan.

<sup>142</sup> Richard, 'Le comput paschal', pp. 318-27.

<sup>143</sup> Martin and Albert, p. 289 note 42.

<sup>144</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, p. 167 note 12. A brief summary of the argument to date and a vote for 343 is found in Charles Pietri, *Roma Christiana, Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 224, 2 vols (Rome: Écoles françaises de Rome, 1976), I, 212 with pp. 212-3 note 3.

<sup>145</sup> T.D. Barnes, 'Emperors and Bishops', pp. 67-9.

<sup>146</sup> Martin and Albert, p. 289, note 42.



Alas, it has not done so. L.W. Barnard in 1983 recapitulated all the arguments to date in favour of 343;<sup>147</sup> H.C. Brennecke, meanwhile, in his important work *Hilarius von Poitiers* (1984) summarised (argued is too strong a word) in favour of 342, reiterating Schwartz's arguments, discounting Loofs', noting Richard's, and ignoring, but for a brief bibliographical reference, everyone else's.<sup>148</sup> This treatment was enough to convince Seibt (1994). In the same year Ulrich replied to Barnard at length, claiming sadly and wrongly that 342 had till then been gaining the upper hand.<sup>149</sup> Vinzent (1997) accepts the date 342 without even noting it as problematic.<sup>150</sup> One can only hope that the upcoming relevant volume of the *Theologisches Reallexikon* will redress the balance and remind the next generation of German scholars that the issue is far from having been settled in Schwartz's favour.

#### **b. The convoking of the synod.**

Constans evidently sent the Eastern delegation back from Trier to his brother in Antioch with the stern reply that nothing short of a full ecumenical synod would satisfy him, presumably suggesting Sardica as a suitable venue for it. The ad hoc synod which had sent them is likely to have assembled in late February or early March, shortly after Constantius had settled the situation at Constantinople, to allow the bishops time to return home before Easter. The journey from Antioch to Trier was over two months each way. If Theodore and the others set out some time in March 342 (about as early as they are likely to have done, assuming the embassy was indeed made after the death of Eusebius of Constantinople), they would have arrived in Trier in May; if they waited until after Easter (which that year took place on the 11<sup>th</sup> April),<sup>151</sup> they would have

---

<sup>147</sup> Leslie W. Barnard, *The Council of Serdica 343 A.D.* (Sofia: Synodal Publishing House, 1983), pp. 49-55.

<sup>148</sup> Brennecke, *Hilarius*, pp. 25-29.

<sup>149</sup> Ulrich, pp. 39-49. His lament is on p. 39.

<sup>150</sup> See above.

<sup>151</sup> See the table in Martin and Albert, p. 310.

arrived in late June. They cannot have returned to Antioch much before the beginning of August, and possibly as late as the end of September.

In any case, Constans seems to have been fairly confident that his brother would not this time refuse his request. By this time he had removed to Milan; he summoned Athanasius there from Rome.<sup>152</sup> It will here be taken that Athanasius' three plus years began with his arrival in Rome in August 339, and so Constans called him to Milan some time between August and December 342, after which he departed for Bononia (Boulogne), where he was on January 25<sup>th</sup> 343, and a winter crossing to Britain.<sup>153</sup> Athanasius carefully conceals the aim of this meeting from Constantius by dwelling on Constans' letter to his brother demanding a synod, but in fact it must have been to interview Athanasius about his case, possibly with a view to attempting to reinstate him by force if Constantius did not acquiesce in his brother's desire for an ecumenical synod. Athanasius was not stupid enough to be drawn in to such talk, as he makes very clear to Constantius, although he must have been equivocal enough not to alienate Constans for the time being.

Socrates' claim that a year and a half elapsed between the time of the summoning of the synod of Sardica and its assembly is surely a misunderstanding of Julius' 341 letter to the Easterners, since he adds that some of the Easterners complained of the shortness of the time allowed and blamed Julius of Rome for it, during which period Athanasius was awaiting the assembly of the synod in Rome.<sup>154</sup> The synod is in fact likely to have been convoked either in the autumn of 342 or the early spring of 343, depending on when exactly Constantius brought himself to agree formally to his brother's demand; it seems to have been called for the autumn of 343, to judge by the fact that the Western synod's deputies carrying its letter to Constantius only arrived at court at Easter 344.

---

<sup>152</sup> Athanasius, *Ap ad Const* 4.

<sup>153</sup> See Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 225.

<sup>154</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.20.6. Note Socrates' use of the word προθεσμία used by Julius.

One of the letters which Constans sent Constantius urging him to allow a synod to be held, probably the last (I have postulated that he sent at least three between 340 and 343) is partially summarised for us by Theodoret, who claims that Athanasius provided the stimulus for its main argument: ‘Athanasius having gone to Constans (for Constantine the eldest had died in battle), he complained of the plots of the Arian phalanx and of the battle waged against the apostolic faith, and he reminded (him) of his father and of the great synod which he had assembled, and how the things written by those of the fellowship of the synod he had confirmed by law. These things about which he had been entreated raised the emperor to his father’s zeal. For immediately having heard all these things he sent to his brother, exhorting him to keep the clarity of his father’s piety unsullied; for also he, having seized the empire with piety destroyed the tyrants of Rome and subjugated the barbarians round about.’<sup>155</sup>

This letter may well have provided part of the charge of treason against which Athanasius is attempting to defend himself in the *Apologia ad Constantium*; he is precisely concerned to claim that Constans wrote to Constantius *before* Athanasius ever met him in person, and that it was others who had requested a synod from Constans, not Athanasius.<sup>156</sup> In any case, it gives us a crucial insight into the mind of Constans, particularly the final sentence. The parallel between Constans’ father’s ‘seizing the empire with piety’, taking Rome from the tyrants, and Constans’ own subjugation of West, is clear, and the threat to take the East from his brother because of that brother’s impiety, just as Constantine took the East from Licinius, is patent. Constans offers his brother two options: to help gather an ecumenical synod, and enshrine its decisions in law, as Constantine did, or to prove himself the enemy of true Christianity, like Licinius, and have his regions, too, piously seized by Constantine’s most worthy son.

---

<sup>155</sup> Theodoret, *HE* II.4.4-5.

<sup>156</sup> Athanasius, *Ap ad Const* 4 (*PG* 25, 600D - 601A)..

Constantius agreed to the synod, but took steps to render it entirely inefficacious. A military escort was sent for the Easterners, who were to travel as a party and assemble at Philippopolis, on Constantine's side of the border, for a final pre-synod synod to prepare their approach. Once in Sardica, they were to be kept in the imperial palace under virtual house arrest. There was to be no breaking ranks.<sup>157</sup>

The Westerners fought harder to be free of the bondage of the imperial will,<sup>158</sup> and succeeded in being allowed to leave any military escorts behind. Constans' support had been bought at a price, however, a price that more than one member of the 'Western' party would come to find embarrassingly high.

### c. The Eastern Party at Sardica

Seventy-six bishops are generally agreed to have been in the Eastern party at Sardica, all but two of whom are known by name,<sup>159</sup> besides the military *comes* Strategius Musonianus, the *castrensis* Hesychius and Athanasius' old sparring-partner Philagrius, formerly prefect of Egypt and future vicar of Pontica.<sup>160</sup> Two more jumped ship and joined the Western party despite the careful guard they were under,<sup>161</sup> and one, Diodorus from the island of Tenedos off the coast of Troas, seems to have joined the Westerners from the start.<sup>162</sup> Although ten signatories did not provide the name of a see (these are presumably

---

<sup>157</sup> See especially Hilary, *FH B II.1.7.3-5* (Feder p. 119.5 - p. 121.9) and Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 15.4. There is a narrative of these events in Barnard, *Council*, pp. 64-66 and a rather more brightly coloured one in De Clercq, pp. 336-342.

<sup>158</sup> See Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 15.3.

<sup>159</sup> The Easterners' Letter has 72 names (Hilary, *FH A IV.3* (Feder pp. 74-78)), one of which (Eusebius of Pergamum) is a doublet; it does not include Ursacius of Singidunum or Maris of Chalcedon, both of whom are known to have been present ('Thelaphius of Chalcedon' is probably a haplography, concealing Maris' name and the actual name of Thelaphius' see). For the members of the Eastern synod, see A.L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers II*, *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse* 166 (1910).5, pp. 70-100, and for the presence of Ursacius and Maris in particular, see p. 93. Diodorus of Tenedos is Feder's no. 25 (p. 35).

<sup>160</sup> See *PLRE I*, 'Strategius Musonianus' (pp. 611-12); Hesychius 1 (p. 429), about whom nothing else is known; 'Fl. Philagrius 5' (p. 694).

<sup>161</sup> Arius of Palestine and Asterius of Arabia: Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 46.3; *Hist Ar* 15.4, 18.3.

χωρεπίσκοποι), and in some cases it is difficult to tell which of two or more cities of the same name is meant, we have nonetheless a good picture of the representation of the different dioceses and provinces in the party.

The Easterners themselves claimed to represent twenty-eight provinces: the Thebaid, Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria Coele, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Paphlagonia, Galatia, Bithynia, Hellespontus, Asia, the two Phrygiae, Pisidia, the Isles, Pamphilia, Caria, Lydia, Europa, Thracia, Haemimontus, Mysia and the two Pannoniae.<sup>163</sup> The majority of these provinces sent one or two bishops to the synod, or three at most. Egypt sent four bishops, including two Melitians and Ischyryus who had been victims of Athanasius' violence, but not including Gregory; Galatia also sent four, including Basil of Ancyra. Not surprisingly, most bishops came from the diocese of Oriens -- between eighteen and twenty-two, or a third of the named sees, including at least eight bishops from Syria and the metropolitans of Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine and Arabia. Among the Oriens bishops were Stephen, the new incumbent of Antioch, Mark of Arethusa, one of the unsuccessful delegation to Trier, Eudoxius of Germanicia, a rising star who would be one of the key players in the latter half of the controversy, Acacius of Caesarea, Macedonius of Mopsuestia (of the Mareotis commission) and Narcissus of Neronias. Other notable figures were Dianius of Cappadocian Caesarea, Maris of Chalcedon, Menophantus of Ephesus, Theodore of Heraclea and two bishops from Western sees, the ubiquitous Ursacius and Valens.

It is worth noting that, out of a possible two hundred and one sees from the regions governed by Constantius which had been represented at Nicaea, forty-one were represented at the Eastern synod of Sardica (the corresponding figure

---

<sup>162</sup> For Diodorus of Tenedos, see Feder, *Studien* II, 35 (no. 25).

<sup>163</sup> This list, the one Hilary gives in his *De Synodis*, accords better with the names of sees in the list of signatories he gives in *Fragmenta Historica* than with the list the Encyclical letter itself gives (*FH A IV 1* (Feder p. 49.1-7), which gives twenty-four provinces (Egypt, Mysia and the Pannoniae are missing, and Phrygia is singular), and which includes, against all available evidence, Isauria. The *De Synodis* list still has its irregularities: none of the sees in the list of signatories seems to correspond to Mesopotamia, for example (a bishop from Mesopotamia may be one of the two missing names).

for the West is five out of fourteen); twenty-three of the sixty-four named sees, or more than a third, had not been involved in the previous attempt at an ecumenical synod. Of these forty-one sees that were represented at both synods, five still had the same incumbents at the time of Sardica (Florentius of Ancyra Sidera in Lydia, Narcissus of Neronias, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Menophantus of Ephesus and Maris of Chalcedon).<sup>164</sup> Four of these were staunch members of the Eusebian party. (Two out of five, Ossius of Corduba and Protogenes of Sardica, survived to return on the Western side.) Eight of the forty-one sees had been occupied at Nicaea by known Eusebian supporters or ‘Ariophrones’.<sup>165</sup> In other words, the percentage of those from the Eusebian/Arian phalanx who survived in their sees alive and well from Nicaea to Sardica and attended both synods, according to these statistics, is 50 percent. The percentage of Westerners who survived is 40 percent. The percentage of those who survived in the East who were not known to be Ariophrone is three percent.<sup>166</sup> These are devastating statistics for those who would argue that there was no systematic weeding-out of their opponents by the Eusebians between Nicaea and Sardica, especially for those who also want to argue that the Eastern party at Sardica was representative of the East as a whole.

---

<sup>164</sup> It is possible that Kurion of Philadelphia in Arabia in the Nicene list and Quirius of Philadelphia in the Sardican one are the same person, or that Nonnius of Laodicea is the Nicene Nunechius of Phrygian Laodicea (although this would deprive us of the only plausible Pisidian representative at Sardica). If one of these identifications were correct, the percentage of surviving non-Eusebians rises to 6%; if both were, it would still be only 9%.

<sup>165</sup> Palestinian Caesarea (Eusebius), Tyre (Paulinus), Mopsuestia (Macedonius), Neronias/Irenopolis (Narcissus), Neocaesarea (Longinus), Cappadocian Caesarea (Leontius), Ephesus (Menophantus), Chalcedon (Maris) (see Chapter 2).

<sup>166</sup> It might be objected that the occupants of some sees whose representatives attended Nicaea are known at the time of Sardica, even though they did not attend that synod. This is true: in the East, Patrophilus, who had attended at Nicaea, was still bishop of Scythopolis, and the incumbents of Alexandria, Byzantium/Constantinople, Nicomedia, Nicaea and Jerusalem at the time of Sardica are also known. But only Patrophilus, once again a confirmed Eusebian, had survived the eighteen years, altering the statistics of surviving Eusebians to five out of eleven survivors (Nicomedia and Nicaea having Ariophrone bishops at Nicaea who were dead by the time of Sardica), or 45.5%, while the percentage of survivors not known to be Eusebian-friendly or Ariophrone now becomes one out of thirty-six, or 2.8 %. In the West, meanwhile, it is reasonably probable from Athanasius’ lists of bishops of Gaul and Cyprus in *Ap c Ar* 49.1 and 50.2 that Gelasius of Salamine in Cyprus and Nichesius of Douias in Gaul were still in their sees eighteen years after Nicaea (see Opitz’ notes to p. 127 no. 96 and p. 131 no. 260, while Cyril of Paphos was not. This alters the Western survival statistics to four out of eight, or 50%.



Constantius presumably required two bishops from each province, since nearly all sent that number or more. We can probably tell to some extent which provinces were committed to the enterprise by noting which ones sent their metropolitan, or an above average number of bishops. These turn out to be precisely the provinces which had been Eusebian-led for some time, even since before Nicaea in most cases: Palestine (excepting Jerusalem), Phoenicia, Syria, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Diospontus and Asia (Bithynia was less well-represented than usual on this occasion, and Galatia was of course now thoroughly in the hands of Marcellus' enemies). Of those provinces which had been unrepresented at the synods of Tyre and Constantinople which condemned Athanasius and Marcellus, on the other hand (other than Galatia itself, naturally), most did not send their metropolitan, Isauria sent no bishops, Paphlagonia, Pisidia and Caria sent one, and Lydia sent two. The two Phrygias (who had sent at least one representative to Constantinople) sent no metropolitan either, and only three bishops between them, while other bishops sent letters of support to Rome on behalf of Marcellus and Athanasius.<sup>167</sup> Even Pamphilia, which sent Sisinnius of Perge and Eugeius of Licinia, also contained at least one bishop who ratified the Westerners' documents. Apart from Galatia, central Anatolia continued largely to keep its distance from the Eusebian party and its successors.

It is not too difficult to determine who led the Eastern party. The Westerners condemned eight Eastern bishops (besides the three who had replaced Marcellus, Athanasius and Asclepas in their sees), describing them as *auctores*, *primates* or ἑξάρχου since the deaths of the two Eusebii.<sup>168</sup> One, George of Laodicea, was not even present, so their condemnation is not simply a function of their roles at Sardica, but it seems likely that among them can be found the leader or leaders of the Eastern Sardican party. Of the remaining seven, Ursacius and Valens had been at the forefront of the assault on Athanasius at Tyre, and were singled out for particular condemnation, both theologically and

---

<sup>167</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 50.4.

politically, by the Westerners, probably because their sees were in Constans' territories and they were the only members of the Eastern party whom the Westerners could hope to take successful sanctions against. Theodore of Heraclea had been on the Mareotis commission, and was one of the group's leading theologians; Narcissus of Neronias was the only surviving member (assuming Asterius was by now dead) of the group whose theology Marcellus had originally attacked. The presence of Menophantus of Ephesus on the list is rather more surprising; although he had been at Nicaea, this is the first we hear of him as a front-rank Eusebian.<sup>169</sup> It is not the last, however: he can be found plotting the downfall of Paul of Constantinople (and probably also Athanasius) in 349, together with Theodore, Narcissus, Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Eugenius of Nicaea.<sup>170</sup>

It is Acacius of Caesarea and Stephen of Antioch, however, who are most likely to have led the Easterners' party at Sardica. Stephen's career in the see of Antioch, at this point capital of the East, was short, but he proved himself more than willing to act against the Western church leaders by fair means or foul.<sup>171</sup> Acacius had already shown himself a leading light of the Dedication synod, and would continue to be one of the most powerful, as well as the most divisive, bishops in the Eastern church for a long time to come. One of these two must have composed the Easterners' encyclical Letter, and it was probably Acacius.

We know this for the following reason. The writer of that letter did not take part in the original condemnations of either Marcellus or Athanasius: 'Magna autem fuit parentibus nostris atque majoribus sollicitudo de supradicta praedicatione sacrilega [that of Marcellus]. Conditur namque in Constantinopolim civitatem

---

<sup>168</sup> *Auctores* and *primates* in the Western letter = Hilary, *FH B* II.1.7.3 (Feder p. 119.6 and 15; ἑξάρχου in Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 46.1.

<sup>169</sup> Unless we read the Verona Codex list of those who wrote to Julius against Athanasius and Marcellus (and, here, Asclepas), which includes Menophantus of Ephesus and Stephen, not yet of Antioch See the comparative edition in Feder, p. 106.

<sup>170</sup> Sozomen, *HE* IV.8.3-4.

<sup>171</sup> Stephen was to be deposed a year later for a plot to discredit the Western delegates to Constantius involving, as usual, a prostitute. See Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 20.3-5 and the circumstantial account in Theodoret, *HE* II.9.3-10.1.

sub praesentia beatissimae memoriae Constantini imperatoris concilium episcoporum';<sup>172</sup> 'una nobiscum audirent ea, quae a nostris patribus contra ipsos [Athanasius and Marcellus] in praeteritum fuerant iudicata.'<sup>173</sup> This is true of Acacius and Stephanus and none of the other condemned bishops: the others either are known to have attended the synod of Tyre or were at least bishops themselves at the time it took place. If 'parentes' and 'patres' are to be taken strictly, Acacius must be the author, since his predecessor Eusebius attended both the synod of Tyre and that of Constantinople, while Stephanus' predecessor Flacillus was only at the former.

The other reason for thinking the author of the Easterners' Letter to be Acacius is the terms in which Marcellus' heresy is described. Marcellus' understanding that Christ was made 'image of the invisible God' by the conception of his body is picked out together with the charge of believing Christ's kingdom would have an end as the crux of his heresy; the same is true of Acacius' antilogion at the Dedication synod.<sup>174</sup>

It is likely that the Eastern leaders, both ecclesiastical and civil, had prepared a series of spoiling tactics before they arrived, to ensure that the synod as such would never sit, or at least that it would never come to a conclusion. As it happens, their very first tack -- refusing to come to the synod while the disputed bishops were allowed to celebrate communion -- was successful. The Western party could not be brought to exclude Marcellus, Athanasius and the others while their cases were deliberated on, since taking their cue from Julius, they had (so far as we can tell) all already accepted them into communion.

It may be said that, despite the fact that the depositions of at least Athanasius and Marcellus had been rigged, and that the courts which had deposed them had had no jurisdiction over them derived from any canon law known to us, it was not entirely unreasonable of the Eastern party to object to the pre-empting of the

---

<sup>172</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.3.1 (Feder p. 50.18-21).

<sup>173</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.15.1 (Feder p. 58.17-19).

whole synod they had come to before it even started. On the other hand, the Westerners' position also makes logical sense, even if it proved unwise. Each bishop in the West in whose city one of the exiles had stayed had had to make the decision whether or not to communicate with him. Following the example of Julius, each (so far as we know) had decided to do so. The churches at Sardica were under the headship of Protogenes; it could be argued that it was he who had the right to determine who might celebrate there.

In addition, even if the Easterners had some reason on their side in the abstract, it is not very likely that they would have gone ahead with the synod even if the Westerners had acceded to their request and excluded the exiles for the time being. On a later occasion, when Acacius tried the same trick, the synod of Seleucia agreed to expel all bishops whose status was in doubt, so as to be able to continue with the proceedings.<sup>175</sup> He merely found other means of side-stepping the decisions of the majority, much to the irritation of some of his former comrades. It is very likely that the same tactics were planned here. The Eastern leaders did reveal two more ruses with which they had come prepared: the proposal that the former Mareotis commission should revisit the site of Athanasius' alleged crime with an equal number of Westerners,<sup>176</sup> and the need to depart for the East and congratulate Constantius as soon as he should report a victory over the Persians.<sup>177</sup> The Mareotis proposal, had it been acceded to, would have prevented any progress for a good six months, and the Eastern leaders would almost certainly have found reasons to leave Sardica in the meantime. News of a victory over the Persians, meanwhile, could presumably have been had by the *comites* at any point required.

This was undoubtedly Constantius' policy; forced into an ecumenical synod he did not want by the politicking of a power-hungry younger brother, he had given

---

<sup>174</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.2.2 (Feder p. 49.27 - p. 50.3); Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 72.6-10.

<sup>175</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.40.3; Sozomen, *HE* IV.22.11-12. See Hanns Christof Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer, Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Beiträge zur historische Theologie 72 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988), p. 46.

<sup>176</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.18 (Feder p. 60.1-15).

<sup>177</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 16.2.

his officials the task of making sure it never took place. At least one Eastern bishop was all too happy to carry out their arrangements.

#### **d. The Western Party at Sardica**

Most modern commentators set the number of the Western party at between ninety and a hundred bishops, although only eighty-six names are known, besides Julius' presbyters.<sup>178</sup> The evidence for these names (as indeed for the actions of Western synod in general) is both complex and tantalisingly incomplete.

There are five extant lists of bishops who signed documents issued by the Western synod. The longest of these, given in Athanasius' *Apologia Contra Arianos*, which purports to be a list of those who signed the main Encyclical Letter, contains seventy-five names (plus Julius' three representatives), unfortunately (and probably deliberately) with no sees attached.<sup>179</sup> Hilary gives a list of those who signed the synod's letter to Julius of Rome, fifty-nine or sixty in all.<sup>180</sup> Verona Codex LX (58), the collection of Theodosius the Deacon, gives two more documents with names attached, the Letter of the Synod of Sardica to the churches of the Mareotis, with 26 names (hereafter list A), and a letter from Athanasius at Sardica to the same, with 60 (hereafter list B).<sup>181</sup> At least the second list of signatures is not likely to belong to the letter to which it is appended, since it does not include Athanasius' own name (which the more general letter does), and on closer inspection is really two different lists (B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup>), since the first 18 names do not have sees whereas the others do, and several of the first 18 names reoccur later in the list. Most names appear in no more than one of these three lists, A, B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup>; together, they cover all of the names in

---

<sup>178</sup> Zeiller: ninety-eight (p. 233); De Clercq: 'from ninety to ninety-five' (pp. 327-8); Ulrich: 'something less than ninety'. See Feder, *Studien* II, 12-70.

<sup>179</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 48.2.

<sup>180</sup> Hilary, *FH B* II.4 (Feder pp. 132-139). Fifty-nine or sixty because numbers 59 and 60 are probably the same person: see Feder, *Studien* II, 47 and Ulrich, p. 91 note 404 and p. 93 note 415.

Hilary's list but eight, and all of the names in Athanasius' list but twelve, and themselves contain seven names which are not in either of the other two lists. 50 names appear in all three large lists, Athanasius, Hilary and AB (=A+B<sup>1</sup>+B<sup>2</sup>), 55 in Athanasius and Hilary, 63 in Athanasius and AB, and 52 in Hilary and AB; seven appear only in Athanasius, seven only in AB, and two only in Hilary.

Various different lists of the provinces the Western party claimed to represent can be found. The Verona codex<sup>182</sup> gives Rome, the Spains, the Gauls, Italia, Campania, Calabria, Africa, Sardinia, Pannoniae, Moesia, Dacia, Dardania, the other Dacia, Macedonia, Thessalia, Achaia, Epirus, Thracia, Europa, Palestine, Arabia. Athanasius gives a list in front not of the encyclical letter but of the synod's letter to the church at Alexandria,<sup>183</sup> with the provinces Rome, the Spains, the Gauls, Italia, Campania, Calabria, Apulia, Africa, Sardinia, Pannonia, Moesia, Dacia, Noricum, Siscia (= probably Savia), Dardania, the other Dacia, Macedonia, Thessalia, Achaia, Epirus, Thracia, Rhodope, Palestine, Arabia, Crete and Egypt. Theodoret,<sup>184</sup> for reasons that are rather difficult to determine, gives us first Rome, the Spains, the Gauls, Italia, Campania, Calabria, Africa, Sardinia, Pannonia, Moesia, Dacia, Dardania, the other Dacia, Macedonia, Thessalia, Achaia, Epirus, Thracia and Rhodope, much like the Verona codex, but then continues Asia, Caria, Bithynia, Hellespontus, Phrygia, Pisidia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Cilicia, the other Phrygia, Pamphilia, Lydia, the Cyclades islands, Egypt, the Thebaid, Libya, Galatia, Palestine, Arabia. Hilary gives no list of provinces as such: on the basis of the sees and provinces included in his list of signatories to the synod's letter to Rome,<sup>185</sup> he has the Spains, the Gauls, Italia, Tuscia, Campania, Apulia, the Pannoniae, Dacia, Savia, Dardania, the other Dacia, Macedonia, Thessalia, Achaia, Epirus, Thracia, Asia, Galatia, Palestine, Arabia, Egypt. The sees mentioned in list B<sup>2</sup> would add Scythia Minor.

---

<sup>181</sup> *EOMIA* I,2,iv, pp. 658 and 660-2, respectively.

<sup>182</sup> *EOMIA* I,2,iv, p. 645.2-8.

<sup>183</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 37.1.

<sup>184</sup> Theodoret, *HE* II.8.1.

<sup>185</sup> Hilary, *HF* B II (feder, pp. 132-139).



It is striking how close the Verona list in particular is to the list of the Western provinces represented at Nicaea. The extant canonical lists give Rome (sometimes under the heading Italia), the Spains, the Gauls, Calabria, Africa, the Pannoniae, Moesia, Dacia, Dardania, Macedonia, Thessalia, Achaia, Europa; Eusebius of Caesarea<sup>186</sup> adds (whether accurately or not is unimportant) Thracia and Epirus. The bishops of 'Italia' (North Italy, in practice)<sup>187</sup> and Campania presumably could not be excluded from the Sardican synod in any case, having been closely involved in the controversy since the synod of Rome. Only the inclusion of Sardinia remains a mystery on more than one count: none of its sees can actually be identified as being represented at Sardica, any more than at Nicaea.

If the lists of provinces resemble those of Nicaea, however, the same is obviously not the case with the numbers who attended from those provinces; more than six times as many attended at Sardica, for the obvious reason that the West could not risk being outvoted by the East. The ones and twos of Nicaea are replaced by six each from the Spains and North Italy, and twenty-six from the diocese of Macedonia, together with smaller numbers from other provinces. At least forty-seven were from Greek-speaking cities or had Greek names;<sup>188</sup> at least thirty-three were from Latin-speaking parts. It is possible that a number of those from the dioceses of Dacia, Thracia and even Illyricum were bilingual, as Photinus of Sirmium, Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa clearly were.

The order of names in Athanasius' list, and more importantly those who head lists A, B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup>, strongly suggests that the leaders of the Western party were

---

<sup>186</sup> Eusebius, *VC* III.7.1.

<sup>187</sup> A.H.M. Jones, *LRE* I, p. 373, argues that in practice Italy, although nominally one diocese and the city of Rome, was at this time divided in two, with the prefect of Rome governing the southern half of the peninsula and the islands.

<sup>188</sup> De Clercq (without giving the basis for his calculation) concludes that 'the number of the Latin-speaking members should be put at about forty, that of the Greek-speaking at from fifty to fifty-five' (p. 330 note 177). Ulrich reckons the number from Greek-speaking areas was sixty (p. 95).

Ossius, Julius' presbyters and deacon, Protogenes of Sardica and Gaudentius of Naissus. These are all singled out for particular disapprobation in the Easterners' encyclical, together with Maximinus of Trier who was not present. All but Protogenes were from Latin-speaking regions, but as we can see from the lists of their associates, they must either have been bilingual or been happy dealing with interpreters.<sup>189</sup> Certainly the Western party does not seem to have divided on linguistic grounds at any point we know of.

One fact which is not always appreciated, however, is the more general lack of unity of the Western party at Sardica. Julius of Rome had originally welcomed Athanasius, and soon afterwards Marcellus, as victims of the conspiracy of a small group of people. The Dedication synod's letter taught him that the group prepared to back their actions was alarmingly large. The Synod of Rome in the spring of 341 saw a number of other figures flock to Rome in the hopes of having their sentences, too, overturned. The synod seems, as far as we can gauge from Julius' letter, to have listened sympathetically to these but not to have pronounced on their status, although they probably did at least accept them into communion, whether or not they were allowed to celebrate as clergy.

Paul, Asclepas and Lucius of Adrianople were touring other regions while Athanasius and Marcellus were in Rome, the Easterners tell us: 'Sed et iudic<ibus><sup>190</sup> qui illum digne sentiaverunt credere noluerunt ideo, quia et alii quique in praeteritum pro suis facinoribus detecti sunt, nunc cum Marcello et Athanasio conjuncti sunt -- dicimus autem Asclepan ... deinde Paulum et Lucium et quotquot talibus conjuncti sunt -- circumeuntes simul exteras regiones persuadebant iudicibus non esse credendum illis, qui in eos digne sententiam protulerunt, ut hoc genere commercii sibi quondam ad episcopatus reditum procurarent' ('But also they [Julius and the Italian presbyters] did not wish to believe the judges who rightly sentenced him [Athanasius] because of

---

<sup>189</sup> On the role of translators at the council, see Hess, pp. 45-8 and, more generally, E. Schwartz, 'Zweisprachigkeit in den Konzilakten', *Philologus* 88 (1933), 245-53.

<sup>190</sup> An emendation of the text's 'iudices' is essential to make sense of this passage, which goes on to say that the judges are nearly all dead.

this, that some others, detected also in the past for their crimes, who are now joined with Marcellus and Athanasius -- i.e. Asclepas ... and moreover Paul and Lucius and as many as are joined with such people -- going around foreign regions at the same period [as Athanasius was in Rome], were persuading [people] that those judges were not to be believed who rightly brought sentence against them, so that by this sort of commerce they might procure for themselves at some point a return to their episcopacies') (Hilary, *FH* A IV 1.11.1 (Feder p. 56.16-24)). Lucius and Asclepas may have been among the crowd of deposed bishops who made their way to Rome in 341 for the abortive synod there in the hope of being reinstated.<sup>191</sup> Paul, as indicated above, was presumably still in exile in Pontus at this time. Even after his disastrous attempt to return to Constantinople in late 341, Paul probably did not go to Rome, but rather to the court at Trier, and there is no evidence that he made any contact with Julius other than through Constans, Maximus or Asclepas. Asclepas may well have joined Paul in Trier after his arrival there in the spring of 342.

Athanasius, by his own account, remained in Rome until he was called to Milan, and thence to meet Ossius in Trier. Marcellus had left Rome immediately before the pared down synod there; it has already been suggested that he went somewhere in the prefecture of Illyricum, possibly Sirmium (particularly if his deacon Photinus was installed there by this time). Ossius had presumably been called to court by Constans as one more way of following in his father's footsteps; if he had not previously made Ossius an ecclesiastical advisor, he now appointed him the president of the coming ecumenical synod at Sardica<sup>192</sup> as he had been of the previous ecumenical synod at Nicaea. Ossius, despite having been appointed by Constans, was prepared to act with deference towards Julius, and to show particular friendship to Athanasius; he may also, at least initially, have favoured Marcellus.

---

<sup>191</sup> Asclepas may have been dilated to Rome at the same time as Athanasius and Marcellus, as the Encyclical Letter texts of Athanasius, Theodoret and the Codex Veronensis all state -- unless Hilary's omission of the name indicates a correction based on sounder knowledge of the facts. Feder prints the texts in parallel: note the omission of Asclepas in the *FH* text at pp. 105, 106, 111.

<sup>192</sup> On Ossius' presidency, see De Clercq, pp. 332-3.

We know less about the churches in the Prefecture of Illyricum (the dioceses of Dacia, Macedonia and Illyricum) than we would like, but we know enough to know that there had been some important theological and political differences there in the recent past, which continued in the next few years. Valens and Ursacius had not been the only supporters of Eusebius there. Alexander, the former bishop of Thessalonica, had been accounted so also, as had Cyriacus, former bishop of Naissus. Maximus, bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, is one of those handful of Western bishops addressed by name by the Easterners' Encyclical Letter in the expectation of a sympathetic hearing. Protogenes, the bishop of Sardica, had apparently signed against Marcellus on four occasions, although he was to show him support at the Sardican synod.<sup>193</sup> Meanwhile, Sirmium elected Photinus, Marcellus' pupil, as its bishop some time before 345, and he had enough local support to survive two attempts to depose him before Constantius became master of the West. Gaudentius of Naissus, one of the leaders of the Sardican synod, had already defended Paul, presumably as he passed through on the way to Trier.<sup>194</sup> Two other bishops, Dionysius of Elis and Aetius of Thessalonica had been attacked (in Aetius' case) and deposed and restored (in Dionysius') by their current companions, the Easterners gleefully tell us.<sup>195</sup> This was to be the area which sent the largest number of bishops to the ecumenical synod, but it cannot be assumed that they were all ideologically, rather than opportunistically, wedded to the Westerners' position.

The enthusiasm of the bishops of the Gauls and of the Italian peninsula for the Sardican synod was not unbounded either, so far as we can tell. For whatever reason, Maximinus of Trier did not himself attend the synod, although he sent letters of support; only one bishop from the Gauls did attend, Verissimus of

---

<sup>193</sup> Protogenes joined in condemning Marcellus four times: Hilary, *FH A IV.1.16.3* (Feder p. 58.8-11); Protogenes and Cyriacus condemned Marcellus in synod in Constantinople: *A IV.1.3.4* (Feder p. 51.15-19).

<sup>194</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV.1.27.2* (Feder p.65.31 - p. 66.5).

<sup>195</sup> Aetius:Hilary, *FH A IV.1.20.2* (Feder p.61.18-22); Dionysius: *A IV.1.20.2* (Feder p. 61.12-13).

Lugdunum, and he seems to have left early.<sup>196</sup> Only eight bishops went from the whole of the Italian peninsula, in contrast to the fifty who had attended the synod of Rome. Julius of Rome sent two presbyters and a deacon, and strict instructions not to depart from the formula of Nicaea<sup>197</sup> (Constans' desire to emulate his father and hold a second Nicaea may have caused him to urge that a new creed be formulated). Three dissident bishops from Campania (one of whom had a rival bishop from the same see, Neapolis, in the Western party) and the clergy of Rimini were addressed as supporters by the Easterners in their encyclical.

Paul of Constantinople did not attend the synod. The Easterners accuse the Westerners of communicating with him by letter through Asclepas.<sup>198</sup> It is likely that this was a compromise to please Constans; there is no evidence that Western ecclesiastical leaders other than Maximinus of Trier, who was not present, ever took his case up of their own accord. Barnes is probably correct, however, in his assumption that Paul was exonerated by the Western synod, even though his name is not mentioned in any of its documents. The Easterners clearly believe him to be defended by the West, Socrates and Sozomen say that he was, Constans' demand for his restoration in 345 assumes that he was, and at the crucial moment in their encyclical the Westerners use a formula which covers him: 'carissimos quidem fratres et coepiscopos nostros Athanasium Alexandriae et Marcellum Ancyro-Galatiae et Asclepum Gazae et ipsos qui cum ipsis erant ministrantes deo, innocentes et puros pronuntiavimus' (καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς συλλειτουργοῦντας τῷ κυρίῳ in Athanasius' Greek).<sup>199</sup> Asclepas, the Easterners tell us, communicated with Paul both before and after the latter's disastrous return to Constantinople (he presumably accompanied Paul there),

---

<sup>196</sup> Although his name appears in two of the lists of those who signed different documents at Sardica, his name is included among Athanasius' list following the Encyclical Letter among those who signed afterwards, not those who signed at the time.

<sup>197</sup> See the very defensive letter of Ossius and Protogenes to Julius (*EOMIA* 1.2.iv, p. 644). The letter is re-edited by Martin Tetz, 'Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis, Glaubensfragen auf der Synode von Serdika (342)', *ZNW* 76 (1985), 243-69, at pp. 247-8, with textual commentary, pp. 248-9.

<sup>198</sup> Hilary, *FH A* IV.1.20.3 (Feder p. 61.27-30).

<sup>199</sup> Hilary, *FH B* II.1.8.1 (Feder p. 122.5-8)

and had not ceased to do so by the time of Sardica; in pronouncing Asclepas' co-ministers innocent, the Westerners pronounced Paul to be so.<sup>200</sup> They may or may not have written to the church in Constantinople telling it to expect Paul when they wrote to the churches in Egypt, Ancyra and Gaza. The Westerners' letter to Constantius is not specific either, merely asking that 'eos qui adhuc ... aut in exilio aut in desertis locis tenentur, iubeas ad sedes suas remeare'.<sup>201</sup> Constans' letter a year later specified names, and included Paul's.

Most important of all, for our purposes, it is impossible to ignore the fact that there was by now clearly a theological split of some magnitude between the theological supporters of Athanasius and those of Marcellus, however successfully the Western synod tried to conceal the fact in the documents they issued. Marcellus and Athanasius were themselves well aware of it. How far their supporters were aware of it coming into the synod is impossible to say; they cannot but have been aware of it going out.

#### **e. The synod that never was.**

The ecumenical synod at Sardica was to deal with three matters, which were probably detailed in the letters convoking the synod. These were summarised by the Westerners as follows: the holy faith and the integrity of truth, a just confirmation of the Westerners' judgement concerning those who were said to have been unjustly deposed, if their defenders could prove the injustice of the deposition, and the various injuries to the churches and their ministers which had been perpetrated.<sup>202</sup> The Eastern encyclical listed them rather differently: that the holy catholic church should be kept free from all dissensions and schisms, everywhere preserving the unity of the spirit and the fetters of charity

---

<sup>200</sup> Indeed, the criminous and the innocent cannot remain in communion without guilt passing to the latter. See *FH Appendix (Liber I ad Constantium 1.5.2 (Feder p. 184.10-13))*: quibus qui communionem suam imprudenter et incaute commiscent, quia fient socii scelerum, participes criminum necesse est eos, qui iam in hoc saeculo abiecti sunt et abdicati, cum advenerit dies iudicii, pati supplicia sempiterna.

<sup>201</sup> Hilary, *FH Appendix (Liber I ad Constantium 1.4 (Feder p. 183.17-20))*.



through upright faith, that the rule of the church and the judgements of the past should be firmly preserved, and that there should be no disturbances caused by emerging sects and perverse traditions, especially in the constituting or expulsion of bishops.<sup>203</sup> In other words, the problem of heresy, the cases of the disputed episcopal depositions and the alleged use of violence, particularly in electing and deposing bishops, were all to be looked at.

This agenda was probably set by the Westerners (in other words by Constans), since it corresponds to their concerns. The Eastern leaders, however, had no difficulty in re-applying it to their own view of things. The heresy threatening the Church was that of Marcellus, *haereticorum omnium execrabilior pestis*,<sup>204</sup> their encyclical tells us. He was rightly deposed for this. The person guilty of using violence, including in appointing and deposing bishops, is Athanasius; he too was rightly deposed. All the exiles then brought about more violence when they returned. The judgements against them were just, and carried out by people who made a thorough investigation of the cases; keeping the canons demands that these judgements be respected and held to.

The Eastern encyclical is written entirely on the attack. It wastes no time on a defence of the Easterners' own theology, or a refutation of the charge of Arianism, as the Dedication letter had, or on addressing the accusations of violence against the Easterners themselves. Behind this, however, there are some indications of real theological debate on the Eastern side as well as the Western.

All the signs concerning the Eastern encyclical are that it was composed in haste, by one mind, and that one of an uncompromising, provocative, albeit rhetorically talented, bent. The creed that was issued with the encyclical, however, the document to which the Eastern signatures are actually appended, both shows signs of considered debate and is to some extent more

---

<sup>202</sup> Hilary, *FHB* II.2.3 (Feder 128.4-11).

<sup>203</sup> Eastern letter in Hilary, *FHA* IV i.1 (Feder p. 49.8-21).

conciliatory.<sup>205</sup> It reuses the fairly inclusive Fourth Creed of Antioch with its three anathemata, and in the version twice reproduced by Hilary in different translations, adds another six anathemata, two of which guard against problems in the Eusebian theological system rather than those of their opponents.

The first four new anathemata were probably composed together, as they make a neatly balanced chiasmus: ‘Ὁμοίως καὶ τοὺς λέγοντας τρεῖς εἶναι θεούς, ἢ τὸν Χριστὸν μὴ εἶναι θεόν, ἢ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων μήτε Χριστὸν μήτε υἱὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι θεοῦ, ἢ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα [ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἅγια καὶ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία].<sup>206</sup> The two correctives to Eusebian theology, anathematising those who say there are three gods or that Christ is not [true] God, are balanced by two anti-Marcellan clauses, anathematising those who say that [Christ] is neither Christ nor son of God before the ages or that Father and Son and Spirit are the same.

It might have been one of the synods the Easterners held on the way to Sardica, of which Asterius of Arabia and Arius of Palestine told the Westerners,<sup>207</sup> which chose the Fourth Creed as a basis for further theological negotiation and added these first four of the new anathemata. The emperors had given leave to debate everything ‘de integro’, from the beginning.<sup>208</sup> From at least Constans’ point of view, this probably meant scrapping the Nicene creed also and replacing it with a new one, making him the new Constantine who brought about a new, more successful theological unity throughout the empire. Julius of Rome had warned the Western leaders to hold firm to Nicaea,<sup>209</sup> but at least some of the Eastern party would have been very happy with such a rethinking of Nicaea, and may have meant the Fourth Creed to be such.

---

<sup>204</sup> Hilary, *FH A* IV.1.2 (Feder p. 49.23).

<sup>205</sup> The creed is found in (1) Hilary, *FH A* IV.2.29.1-4 (Feder pp. 69-73), (2) Hilary, *De Syn* 34, (3) Codex Veronensis LX (58). All three versions (together with a Greek retroversion from Schultness’ Syriac) are printed in parallel in Feder, though the Verona codex is here cited from Turner’s edition in *EOMIA* I.2.iv, pp. 638-40.

<sup>206</sup> Greek from Feder’s reconstruction, pp. 73-73.

<sup>207</sup> In the Western letter, in Hilary, *FH B* II.1.7.4 (Feder p. 120.3-4).

<sup>208</sup> Hilary, *FH B*.II.2.3 (Feder p. 128.4-11).

<sup>209</sup> See Ossius and Protogenes’ letter to Julius, cited above.

The Easterners were to further refine the anathemata appended to their creed before they published it, perhaps this time at their final pre-synod synod in Philippopolis just outside Constans' territory.<sup>210</sup> Two more anathemata were added, woven grammatically into the previous four but without regard to their pleasing literary structure: ἡ [τοὺς λέγοντας] ἀγέννητον υἷόν, ἡ ὅτι οὐ βουλήσει ἢ θελήσει ἐγέννησε ὁ πατήρ τὸν υἷόν, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἅγια καὶ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. These are particularly interesting for being addressed directly against the theology of Athanasius, the only case we know of Athanasius' theology rather than his conduct being targeted by the leaders of the East. Athanasius had pronounced himself willing, in *Contra Arianos* I, to speak in certain qualified circumstances of two who were ἀγέννητος; he had also attacked his opponents for seeing the Son as a creation of the Father's will rather than coming from his essence.

This suggests that one move being considered by at least some of the Eastern leaders was an attempt, parallel to the Westerners' successful invention of 'Ariomania', to invent 'Marcellomania' and foist it on the Western party's leaders. In the end, this was not the path the Eastern encyclical took, preferring instead to isolate Marcellus, Athanasius and their companions as distinct, unrelated cases, one of heresy, one of a campaign of violence and the rest of canonical misdemeanours, and to attribute to their Western supporters naiveté, imprudence and stubbornness rather than heresy (although the letter does break down at the conclusion into mudslinging against various Western leaders, charges against Ossius and his party of introducing heresy, and general excommunication). Although the final letter is anything but conciliatory, this

---

<sup>210</sup> Even this version does not seem to have been the final one. A version with further emendations appears in Latin in Codex Veronensis and in Syriac in Codex Parisinus syr. 62, given in a Greek retroversion by Feder (pp. 68-73). This version makes several additions to the text Hilary translates, all connected with the Holy Spirit. The first two anathemata, dating back to the Fourth Creed embassy, become τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. In the new group of anathemata, those are anathematised who say ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσι θεοὶ ἢ ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐστὶ θεὸς ἢ ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἐστὶ θεοῦ ἢ ὅτι πρὸ αἰώνων οὐδὲ ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὐδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἢ ὅτι ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἢ ἀγέννητον τὸν υἷόν ἢ γεννητὸν τὸ πνεῦμα ἢ ὅτι βουλή ἢ θελήματι ὁ πατήρ ἐγέννησε τὸν υἷόν ἢ ὅτι ἐποίησεν ἢ ὅτι ἔκτισεν ἢ ὅτι προεχείρισεν ἢ ὅτι γνώμη γέγονεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς πάντα οἶδε ὁμοῦ σὺν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τούτους πάντας ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἅγια καὶ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

comparative restraint may be the result of an agreed policy urged by some of the Eastern party to avoid a blanket condemnation of Egyptian and Western theology: one hypostasis language, for example, is not ruled out by the creed the Easterners signed (indeed, is not ruled out by the East until the creed of Nike in 359).

That there was a group on the Eastern side pushing for restraint, theological and probably also political, in dealing with the West, and that this group was known of and recognised by the West, is suggested also by some otherwise rather surprising omissions from the list of those anathematised by the West: neither Maris of Chalcedon nor Macedonius of Mopsuestia, both of whom had been on the Mareotis commission, were condemned by the Westerners, nor was Dianius of Caesareá, although they had all been addressed by Julius as leaders of the Dedication synod, and Maris had been one of those who wrote to Julius against Athanasius and Marcellus.<sup>211</sup> It is possible that Maris did not even sign the Eastern creed, or only signed through a proxy (the name ‘Thelafius of Chalcedon’ appears instead of Maris). Macedonius was part of the delegation which took the ‘Long-winded’ Creed to the West in 345,<sup>212</sup> and Maris was present at the Constantinopolitan synod of 360,<sup>213</sup> but neither of them appears again on lists of those plotting against or hounding Athanasius.

Asterius of Arabia and Arius of Palestine (called Macarius, possibly an epithet, in the Westerners’ encyclical letter,<sup>214</sup> no doubt for obvious reasons) give us a clue to the actions of this group. These two bishops escaped their virtual house arrest in the imperial palace and joined the Westerners’ side, claiming that there were many who were ‘of right faith’ in the Eastern party,<sup>215</sup> but had been persuaded through fear or promise of gain to remain. It is not difficult to see the success such measures would have had, with Maris, Macedonius, Dianius and

---

<sup>211</sup> See above.

<sup>212</sup> See Athanasius, *De Syn* 26.1.

<sup>213</sup> See Brennecke, *Homöer*, p. 54.

<sup>214</sup> In the version in Codex Veronensis (*EOMIA* I,2,iv, p. 649 line 249).

<sup>215</sup> Hilary, *FH B* II.1.7.4 (Feder p. 121.6).

also with the likes of Basil of Ancyra, who risked losing his see to Marcellus if he changed sides.

The intended ecumenical synod ran its predictable course.<sup>216</sup> The Easterners arrived, dragging their feet, to find the Western party already holding debates and liturgies together. Billeted in the imperial palace, they shut themselves off there, sending rude messages to the Western party with their increasingly fatuous terms. The Westerners responded in kind, involving the local populace (who presumably joined in the catcalling with gusto) and warning of the danger of riots if the situation continued.<sup>217</sup> The Eastern leaders scoffed at their descent to such tactics. Acacius (or possibly Stephen) composed an encyclical letter on behalf of the Easterners, for which he may or may not have had the approval of his colleagues (depending on whether the creed was originally issued separately from the encyclical), and making the excuse of an Eastern imperial victory over the Persians, they withdrew once more to Philippopolis, inside Constantius' territory where they could be sure of cooperative imperial scribes, to publish their letter.<sup>218</sup>

The letter was addressed to every known dissident in the West, besides the main Eastern bishops who had remained at home. It deposed the bishops of Rome, Corduba, Sardica, Naissus and Trier and all who were in communion with them -- the entire West, in other words.<sup>219</sup> The author (Acacius or Stephen) claimed that the whole (Eastern) synod had ratified at least the depositions of these five named individuals, and left it to be understood that the further excommunication of all their allies was the synod's will also. It is rather to be hoped that, as at other points in the encyclical, he was exaggerating here; unexpected things can always happen at large regulatory gatherings, particularly those in which feelings are running high, but it is difficult to imagine bishops from nearly every

---

<sup>216</sup> For a careful – if partisanly Western – narrative, see De Clercq, pp. 342-54.

<sup>217</sup> For tumult in the city, see Hilary, *FH A* IV.1.19 (Feder p. 60.28 - p. 61.8).

<sup>218</sup> The sources for Philippopolis are conflicting. Socrates, *HE* II.20.9 claims that the Easterners held a separate council in Philippopolis from which they sent letters 'in all directions'; he is corrected by Sozomen, *HE* III.11.4, who makes Philippopolis a stop on the way to Sardica. See De Clercq, pp. 351-4.

province in the East agreeing deliberately to split the whole church along imperial political lines in this way.<sup>220</sup> Commentators are quick to see Sardica as the forerunner of 1054,<sup>221</sup> but the links between East and West were far too tightly-woven in the fourth century to make the comparison at all apt; at least half of the 'Western' party were Greek-speakers in any case, and more than half of them would have been reckoned as Easterners according to the redivision of the empire at the end of the century.

In political terms, however, Constantius had more than achieved his ends, at least for the time being. His brother was shamed and his pretensions well and truly snubbed; the Western leaders were stigmatised as country cousins too stupid and stubborn to know the difference between the true faith and heresy, or an honourable bishop and a thuggish charlatan. The Eastern Encyclical's rhetoric was nothing if not effective; it has left many a modern commentator with the same impression.

#### **f. The Western synod**

If the Easterners were confined together in the imperial palace, the Westerners seem to have slept, worshipped and met in groups around Sardica. They were anxious to demonstrate their freedom from the kind of imperial oversight which burdened the East, and with good reason, if Constans was attempting to use the

---

<sup>219</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV* 1.24.1 (Feder p. 63.23-28).

<sup>220</sup> More than one modern commentator has been taken in by the encyclical's rhetoric concerning the unreasonableness of the West revising the judicial decisions of the East, and accepted the proffered precedents of Rome ratifying the East's deposition of Paul of Samosata and the East's accepting Rome's decision on Novatian. Both of these examples are specious; the Oriens which condemned Paul was the diocese of Oriens, not the whole of Constantius' regions to be, and Rome constituted Paul's deposition, rather than ratifying it, whereas in the case of Novatian, he received more support in the East than in the West, most notably from the bishop of Antioch. 'Orientales episcopi' and 'occidentales episcopi', meanwhile, are meaningless terms in the canon law of the fourth century; there is no reason of any sort in ecclesiastical tradition to consider either as a voting bloc with distinctive rights as such. Acacius (or Stephen) is simply trading on the extant political situation, a 'novelty' in ecclesiastical terms if there ever was one.

<sup>221</sup> Lietzmann, *Constantine to Julian*, p. 206 says apocalyptically, 'A straight line runs from Serdika to the final separation in A.D. 1054.' So Barnard, *Council*, p. 5.



synod as a way of repeating his father's achievements. For this reason, presumably, they left the imperial palace to the Eastern party (having arrived first, and being in their patron's own regions, they would have had the choice of accommodation), probably lodging with Protogenes, his presbyters and wealthy layfolk in the city. They worshipped at least part of the time in groups also: we know from a letter of his in Athanasius' *Apologia Contra Arianos* that Ossius, at least, was given his own church in which to preside,<sup>222</sup> and Protogenes presumably continued to celebrate in the city's other principal church (there were at least two churches, both situated just outside the old city walls a few hundred metres from one another, in fourth-century Sardica).<sup>223</sup> There were presumably other churches, too, in a city of Sardica's importance: the imperial palace, once one of Constantine's principal residences, may also have had a Christian building of some sort attached, which the Easterners could have used.

The full synod, had it ever met, is most likely to have been intended to meet in the imperial palace, as with Nicaea (in which case the Easterners may only have shut themselves up in one wing of the palace, as Barnes suggests). The full synod, however, may only have been intended to meet part of the time, perhaps even only at the beginning and end of its time in Sardica.

We know from the three lists A, B<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>2</sup> mentioned above that the Western party met in three groups on at least one occasion, one important enough for each group to sign some document separately. These three groups were headed by Ossius, Protogenes, and Gaudentius together with Julius' presbyters. These same names appear together at the head of Athanasius' list, and (other than Julius' presbyters, absent from the list because the letter being signed is to Julius himself) at positions which may make them the heads of three quite different groups in Hilary's list. These four bishops (Julius, through his presbyters, Ossius, Protogenes and Gaudentius), together with Maximinus of Trier who

---

<sup>222</sup> Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 44.2.

<sup>223</sup> L.W. Barnard, 'The Council of Sardica -- Two Questions Reconsidered', in A.G. Poulter, ed., *Ancient Bulgaria: Papers presented to the International Symposium on the Ancient History*

communicated with them by letter, are precisely those who are singled out as leading the Western party in the Easterners' encyclical.<sup>224</sup>

It may well be that dividing the group in three had from the beginning been part of the Westerners' overall strategy both for ensuring freedom from too much imperial involvement and for breaking down the Eastern phalanx. Three more points are notable about both lists of groups (if Hilary's is such). The groups are flexible; those represented in Hilary's list are completely different from those in list AB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>, and a few names also appear within more than one group in list AB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>, suggesting that movement between the groups was allowed. Two groups, those led by Ossius and Protegenes, are notably smaller both times than the one led by Gaudentius: in list AB<sup>1</sup>B<sup>2</sup>, Ossius' group has twenty-six names, Protegenes' eighteen and that led by Julius' presbyters and Gaudentius forty-one names, while in the three conjectural sub-lists to be found in Hilary, Ossius' group has fifteen, Protegenes' sixteen and Gaudentius' twenty-nine. Finally, Athanasius, Marcellus and Asclepas appear both times in either Ossius' or Protegenes' list, once in each, Athanasius always in one and Marcellus and Asclepas in the other. It would appear, then, that two smaller groups met to deal with the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus and Asclepas, while the bulk of the synod considered some such problem as the iniquities of the Easterners, or possibly drafted canons to be presented to a plenary session led by Ossius.<sup>225</sup>

The three groups may have met in the different churches presided over by their leaders (assuming that there was a third church somewhere big enough for the group led by Gaudentius and the Roman presbyters), or they may have met in civic buildings. In any case, their existence goes some of the way towards explaining why the Western Sardican documents exist in so many different versions, and in particular how the so-called 'Western creed' can be so conspicuously present in two versions of the Westerners' encyclical letter, and

---

*and Archaeology of Bulgaria* (2 vols, Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 1983), 2, 215-31, at p. 216, and Barnard, *Council*, pp. 46-9.

<sup>224</sup> Hilary, *FH A IV.1.27.2* (Feder p. 65.31 - p. 66.2).

<sup>225</sup> On the deliberative procedure and Ossius' role in it, see Hess, pp. 24-41.

so conspicuously absent from the other two, or how the question of whether the Western synod did in fact officially issue the creed could have come to be in such dispute.

### **g. The Western Creed of Sardica**

Athanasius famously claims in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5 (PG 26, 800 C), issued in 362, that Sardica did not issue an official document about the faith, usually called the Western Creed:

Καὶ τὸ θρυληθὲν γοῦν παρὰ τινων πιττάκιον, ὡς ἐν τῇ κατὰ Σαρδικὴν συνόδῳ συνταχθὲν περὶ πίστεως, κωλύετε κἂν ὅλως ἀναγινώσκεισθαι ἢ προφέρεσθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ τοιοῦτον ὄρισεν ἡ σύνοδος. Ἠξίωσαν μὲν γάρ τινες, ὡς ἐνδεοῦς οὔσης τῆς κατὰ Νικαίαν συνόδου, γράψαι περὶ πίστεως, καὶ ἐπεχείρησάν γε προπετῶς· ἡ δὲ ἅγια σύνοδος ἢ ἐν Σαρδικῇ συναχθεῖσα ἠγανάκτησε, καὶ ὄρισε μηδὲν ἔτι περὶ πίστεως γράφεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀρκεῖσθαι τῇ ἐν Νικαίᾳ παρὰ τῶν Πατέρων ὁμολογηθείσῃ πίστει, διὰ τὸ μηδὲν αὐτῇ λείπειν, ἀλλὰ πλήρη εὐσεβείας εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι μὴ δεῖν δευτέραν ἐκτίθεσθαι πίστιν, ἵνα μὴ ἡ ἐν Νικαίᾳ γραφείσα ὡς ἀτελής οὔσα νομισθῇ, καὶ πρόφασις δοθῇ τοῖς ἐθέλουσι πολλακίς γράφειν καὶ ὀρίζειν περὶ πίστεως.<sup>226</sup>

This account is in some contrast to a fragment preserved in the Verona codex, from the collection of Theodosius the Deacon (here in C.H. Turner's version):

Dilectissimo fratri Iulio Osius et Protogenes.

---

<sup>226</sup> 'And indeed the memorandum much talked about by some, as put together in the synod at Sardica concerning the faith, prevent being read or brought forward at all. For the synod decreed nothing of such a sort. For some on the one hand held it fitting [to do so], on the grounds that the synod of Nicaea was deficient, and indeed rashly tried [to do so]; but the holy synod which gathered in Sardica on the other hand was vexed, and laid down nothing more concerning the faith to be written, but that one be satisfied with the faith confessed in Nicaea by the fathers, because it lacks nothing, but is full of piety, and that it was not necessary that a second faith be put forth, in order that the one written in Nicaea not be reckoned as being incomplete, and an opportunity be given to those wishing to write and to lay down concerning the faith many times.'

Meminimus et tenemus et habemus illam scripturam quae continet catholicam fidem factam apud Niceam: et consenserunt omnes qui aderant episcopi. Sed quoniam post hoc discipuli Arrii blasphemias commoverunt; tres enim questiones motae sunt: quod erat quando non erat; ... ratio quaedam coegit, ne quis ex illis tribus argumentis circumventus renuerit fidem et excludatur eorum spoliolum et ne fiat, latiore[m] et longiore[m] exponere priori consentientem ut igitur nulla reprehensio fiat, haec significamus tuae bonitati, frater dilectissime. Priora placuerunt firma esse et fixa, et haec plenius cum quadam sufficientia veritatis dictari: ut omnes docentes et catichizantes clarificentur et repugnantes obruantur, et teneant catho|licam et apostolicam fidem.<sup>227</sup>

Hanson sees this as irrefutable evidence that Athanasius is a blatant liar;<sup>228</sup> the synod did decree something beyond what was composed at Nicaea, as its presidents make clear in their letter. That ‘something’ is the continuation of the Westerners’ encyclical letter which is generally known as the Western Creed of Sardica, which is to be found in two versions, a Latin version in the Verona codex<sup>229</sup> and a Greek version in Theodoret’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*,<sup>230</sup> of which the Latin is not a translation. On the other hand, the same encyclical letter (again in a Latin and a Greek version neither of which is a translation of the other) can be found without the Western Creed in Athanasius’ *Apologia Contra Arianos*<sup>231</sup> (composed 349)<sup>232</sup> and Hilary’s *Fragmenta Historica*<sup>233</sup> (356).<sup>234</sup> At

---

<sup>227</sup> *EOMIA* 1,2,iv, p. 644. ‘Ossius and Protogenes to our most beloved brother Julius. We remember and hold and have that writing which contains the catholic faith made at Nicaea: and all the bishops who were there consented. But since after this the disciples of Arius moved blasphemies; for three questions were moved: that there was when he was not ... a certain argument compelled, lest anyone deceived by these three arguments should deny the faith and their spoil be excluded, and lest it happen, to set forth a wider and longer [faith] agreeing with the former, in order that there be no reproach, we signify to your goodness, most beloved brother. They were pleased that the former things be firm and fixed, and that these things be more fully declared with a certain sufficiency of truth: so that all teaching and catechising may become clear and those who object might be overthrown, and hold the catholic and apostolic faith.’

<sup>228</sup> Hanson, *Search*, p. 304 with note 105. He thinks that ‘few scholars’ later than Gwatkin believe Athanasius’ denials. One is Ulrich: see his discussion, pp. 98-106.

<sup>229</sup> *EOMIA* II,2,iv, pp. 651-3.

<sup>230</sup> Theodoret, *HE* II.8.37-52.

<sup>231</sup> Athanasius, *Ap c Ar* 42.1-47.6.

<sup>232</sup> At least that would seem to be true of this stratum of that multi-layered work: see Barnes, *Athanasius*, pp. 194-5 for an analysis much more convincing than Opitz’ assumption that the work is a literary unity, written in 357 (note to *Ap c Ar* 1.1 (p. 87)).

the very least, Athanasius disowned the Western Creed, if it was the Sardican synod's official creed, long before 362; his version has a valedictory sentence from Ossius where the creed begins in the other versions, while Hilary has a different valediction and 'explicit'. Both authors make it clear that no continuation of the letter should follow.

But did Sardica itself disown its so-called creed? This has to be considered at least a possibility. The letter given above is from Ossius and Protogenes. Ossius may have been the president of the synod, but he and Protogenes were also the leaders of the two smaller groups, albeit the more prestigious. They may have imagined they were carrying out a fairly straightforward task in ratifying the Western creed, particularly if Constans had requested that a new creed be drawn up. They must at some point have considered the matter settled, since the version of the encyclical letter with the creed attached circulated as far as Antioch, where the continuing Eustathians had a copy which they evidently believed to carry the authority of the synod.<sup>235</sup> But what if the largest group, the group led by Julius' own presbyters, refused to ratify this creed, on the grounds that they had been strictly charged by Julius not to go beyond Nicaea, and insisted that those groups which had ratified the creed refer the matter to the bishop of Rome, who returned a firm negative and asked for the creed to be cut out of as many copies of the encyclical as could be found? Athanasius' account would then fall into his usual pattern: a tendentious account of the facts (since the creed would have actually been issued in the name of the synod of Sardica, and passed by two of its presidents), which nonetheless is still more or less the truth, if by no means the whole truth. This version of events is speculative, but so must be any kind of attempt to make sense of the enormously complex problem of the documents issued by the Western synod at Sardica.<sup>236</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup> Hilary, *FH B.1.1-8* (Feder, pp. 103-126).

<sup>234</sup> Brennecke, *Hilarius*, p. 310, however, argues against the widely accepted 356 and in favour of 357.

<sup>235</sup> Ulrich, p. 106, plausibly suggests that Theodoret derived his copy from the library of the Eustathians in Antioch.

<sup>236</sup> The Western party at Sardica produced a considerable number of documents, besides issuing a series of synodal canons, themselves also fraught with problems. Nine are at least partly extant: the Encyclical Letter (in four versions, two Greek and two Latin, one of each with the

Athanasius had good reason for not wishing to go beyond Nicaea: it was very close to his own theology.<sup>237</sup> In addition, he could probably see very well even as early as 343 that holding Nicaea as non-negotiable was the best chance of thwarting Eastern attempts to circumvent it; if the Westerners admitted it to be in principle revisable by adding to it themselves, they would concede to the East almost all of their own remaining defensible ground. At Rome, Athanasius had managed to persuade Marcellus not to go beyond that theology, the theology of *Henos somatos* and the anathemata of Nicaea, even though it was not entirely Marcellus' theology and did not guard against what Marcellus saw as some of the most dangerous tendencies of Eusebian theology, above all the three hypostaseis. At Sardica, however, the theology which very nearly became orthodoxy was the theology of Marcellus.

The Western Creed of Sardica has long been recognised as Marcellan in its theology, but has generally been ascribed to Ossius and Protogenes, by dint either of assuming Marcellus' theology to be fairly widespread (e.g. Loofs, Gericke),<sup>238</sup> or of assuming Ossius and Protogenes to be particularly gullible (e.g. Hanson).<sup>239</sup> As Klaus Seibt has pointed out, however, it is not merely the

---

Western Creed integrated into the text, all four related but at least partially independent of one another; the Encyclical Letter is *CPG* 8560 and the attached statement of faith 8561), the beginning of a letter to Julius of Rome from Ossius and Protogenes (in Latin in the Verona codex, also summarised in Greek by Sozomen, *HE* III.12.6; *CPG* 8566); what purports to be a letter to Julius from the synod (in Latin, in Hilary's *Fragmenta Historica*; *CPG* 8564), which may, in fact, be most of the rest of the letter of Ossius and Protogenes to Julius; five letters to Egyptian churches (the synod's letter to the church at Alexandria (*CPG* 8562 = 2123.3, the synod's letter to the bishops of Egypt and Libya (*CPG* 8563), Athanasius' letter to the church at Alexandria (*CPG* 8567 = 2111), the synod's letter to the churches of the Mareotis (*CPG* 8565) and Athanasius' letter to the churches of the Mareotis (*CPG* 8568 = 2112), the first two in Greek in Athanasius' *Apologia contra Arianos* and the remaining three in Latin in the Verona codex), and the synod's letter to Constantius (in Latin in Hilary's collection; *CPG* 8569), as well as twenty-one canons (*CPG* 8570). In almost every case, the letters appear to be translated from the language they are not in; all four versions of the encyclical must have been translated at least once, and the Verona codex documents are probably a Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Latin document, possibly itself a translation of a Greek original.

<sup>237</sup> See above, chapter 2.

<sup>238</sup> Loofs, 'Glaubensbekenntnis', pp. 37-8; Gericke, p. 19.

<sup>239</sup> Hanson, *Search*, pp 303-4 notes some terminology characteristic of Marcellus in the creed, but concludes, 'Whether the profession is influenced by Marcellus or not cannot easily be



creed's one-hypostasis theology which resembles Marcellus': from its use of language, it is unmistakably either the work of Marcellus himself or deliberately modelled on his thought.<sup>240</sup> Phrases that can be paralleled in the *Contra Asterium* abound. The pair *μονογενῆ* and *πρωτότοκον* are taken and distinguished from one another, just as in the *Contra Asterium* (P4 S/V10 (Re 3, K 3)), and the second defined as *πρωτότοκον ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, and first-born of the new rather than the first creation, as there. The singling out for particular condemnation of the exegesis of John 10:30 ('I and the Father are one') as meaning one *διὰ τὴν συμφωνίαν καὶ τὴν ὁμόνοιαν* matches the long section from the *Contra Asterium* lambasting this view (P 83 S/V 125 (Re 63, K 72), P 84 S/V 74 (Re 64, K 73)), and the same counter-argument is used, that human beings are said to be in concord precisely because of the possibility of their also having quarrels and disagreeing with one another. The phrase *προσήνεγκε τῷ πατρὶ ἑαυτοῦ δῶρον, ὃν ἠλευθέρωσεν*, though it does not appear in any of the extant fragments of the *Contra Asterium*, is absolutely characteristic of Marcellus' soteriology, which comprises both the Word's action of freeing humankind from slavery to the devil by the Resurrection (P111 S/V 80 (Re 96 K 107)), and the bringing of redeemed humanity represented by his own body to the throne of God at the Ascension, to sit at the right hand of the Father (P116 S/V 84 (Re 114, K 127)). Finally, in discussing John 17:21 ('That they may be one in us'), the Creed makes a distinction: *ἀκριβῶς διέστειλε ἡ θεία φωνή ... οὐκ εἶπεν ...*, just as Marcellus distinguishes *τὸν σωτήρα ἀκριβῶς [λεγειν] προσήκει ... οὐ[κ] ... φησιν* (P85 S/V 75 (Re 65, K 74)). 'Ακριβῶς is indeed one of Marcellus' favourite words in discussing either scripture or doctrine.

The target of the 'Western creed' is the Fourth Creed of Antioch, together with the anathemata added by the Easterners when publishing it once more in their own encyclical. It was probably Asterius of Arabia and Arius of Palestine who brought this version across with them to the Westerners' party. The Fourth

---

determined.' He thinks, however, that 'there can be no doubt that Ossius and Protogenes were the authors (or main authors)' (p. 304 note 105).

<sup>240</sup> Scibt. *Markell*, pp. 143-4 note 133.

Creed had presented itself as a mild and conciliatory document. Marcellus was at pains to prove it was nothing of the kind.

About half of the 'Western creed' deals with the anathemata appended to date to the Fourth Creed. The theological propositions of these can be analysed as follows:

Those saying that the Son is **out of nothing (A)**, or **from another hypostasis and not from God (B)**, or that **there was a χρόνος** or an age **when he was not (C)**, the holy and catholic church knows as alien.

Likewise those saying **that there are three gods (D)**, or that **Christ is not God (E)**, or that he was not Christ *πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων* **(F)**, nor **Son of God (G)**, or **Father and Son and Holy Spirit to be the same (H)**, or the Son to be *ἀγέννητον* **(I)**, or that the Father did not **beget the Son by will (J)**, the holy and catholic church anathematises.<sup>241</sup>

The first part of the Western Creed<sup>242</sup> picks these up according to the following structure:

*We condemn and place outside the catholic church those asserting:*

**1. that Christ is indeed God, but not true God (E),**

because he is Son, and **yet not true Son (G)**, because he is at once *γεννητός* **(I)** and *γενητός* **(A)**.

and because, despite the fact that he is *πρὸ αἰώνων* **(F)**, they give him a beginning and an end, which he does not have as a moment in time but *παντὸς χρόνου* **(C)**.<sup>243</sup>

---

<sup>241</sup> Latin and reconstructed Greek in Feder, pp. 72-73.

2. And suddenly even two sand-vipers ἐγεννήθησαν<sup>244</sup> from the Egyptian cobra, Arius: Valens and Ursacius, who boast and do not doubt, saying that they are Christians, and that the Word, even the Spirit, was wounded and killed and died and rose,<sup>245</sup>

3. and, just as the whole battery of heretics contends, that **the hypostases of Father and Son and Holy Spirit are differentiated and separate (B, D).**<sup>246</sup>

*But we have received and been taught this, we hold this as the catholic and apostolic tradition and faith and confession:*

that **there is one hypostasis,** what they call *ousia*,<sup>247</sup> **of Father and Son and Holy Spirit (B, D).**<sup>248</sup>

No one of us denies τὸ γεγεννημένον (I), but [we deny] begotten for things, to wit those things which are known as invisible and visible things (Col 1:16), begotten as artificer of archangels and angels and the world, and for the human race,<sup>249</sup>

---

<sup>242</sup> I cite from the Greek text and section numbers in Tetz; I have usually preferred the readings of Stuart Hall, however, which generally give better sense.

<sup>243</sup> Western Creed 1-2 Tetz.

<sup>244</sup> According to Aristotle (*Historia Animalium* 5.34 = 558a25-30), the ἔχις is distinguished from other snakes because its eggs are secreted within itself and the young burst forth violently. A fairly vicious satire on the 'Arian' understanding of γεννάω is clearly intended; Arius' view of his opponents' understanding of the word is not dissimilar.

<sup>245</sup> Western Creed 3. This reading of S.G. Hall's ('The Creed of Sardica', p. 175), already suggested by J.H. Newman (*Treatises of Athanasius* I, p. 123 note u), is the only plausible way of making sense of the bizarre ὅτι ὁ λόγος καὶ ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα; the spirit describes the logos qua logos, distinguishing it from the man assumed (see Grillmeier, I, 278).

<sup>246</sup> Western Creed 3.

<sup>247</sup> This is perhaps the most crucial phrase in this creed. Theodoret, *HE* II.8.39 (p. 113.13-14 Parmentier-Scheidweiler) has ἦν αὐτοὶ οἱ αἱρετικοὶ οὐσίαν προσαγορεύουσι; the Verona codex has *quam ipsi graeci usian appellant* (*EOMIA* I,2,iv, p. 651.25). I suggest that the original had simply αὐτοῦ/ipsi, and that each of the groups identified is a gloss. The significance of this would be that Marcellus -- or at least the group that ratified his creed -- meant to indicate that by 'hypostasis' they meant precisely what the Eusebians meant by 'ousia', i.e. substance rather than person.

<sup>248</sup> Western Creed 4.

<sup>249</sup> Theodoret (*HE* II.8.41 (p. 114.5 Parmentier-Scheidweiler) reads τισιν, to which corresponds *quibusdam* in the Verona codex (*EOMIA* I,2,iv, p. 652.38). Turner (apparatus to 652.38)

for he could not exist forever (**C, F**) if he had got a beginning of being, because the Logos God, who always exists, has no beginning, and is never subject to an end.<sup>250</sup>

We do not say that **the Father is Son, nor therefore the Son Father (H)**,

but we confess the Son to be ... **true Word God (E)**, wisdom and power

and we hand on a **true Son (G)**.<sup>251</sup>

This allows us clearly to see, nearly twenty years after Nicaea, to what point the argument had come. The central issue, the eternity of the Logos/Son, was still not resolved. Ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων had been completely dropped by the East, for the time being -- indeed, as a positive affirmation, it had been dropped by Arius himself even before Nicaea.<sup>252</sup> But although the Easterners anathematised over and over again the statement that there was a time or an age or a καιρός when the Son was not, they would not anathematise either ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν as such, or 'before he came to be he was not.' Marcellus clearly saw this as the central problem of the Eastern position. For him (as for Athanasius), it meant that they proclaimed themselves not even to be Christians: a Son begotten in time, a Son who has come to be, a Son who has a beginning and an end, is not true Son and not true God, but one of the perishable world of coming to be and ceasing to be. If Christ is not true God, he cannot save; those who are willing to countenance a perishable Christ are willing to countenance the unravelling of the whole Christian mystery, and cannot be allowed (if the Western synod had

---

proposed κτισιν, which is at least palaeographically very attractive. Tetz then proposed an emendation of an emendation and reads κτίσμα (discussion in Tetz' 'Ante omnia de sancta fide', pp. 255-6). But Hall, who retains the transmitted reading (and whose interpretation I follow here) seems to make the most sense of the passage. See his discussion in 'Creed of Sardica', p. 180.

<sup>250</sup> Western Creed 5.

<sup>251</sup> Western Creed 6.

<sup>252</sup> For a full discussion of this point, see R.P.C. Hanson, 'Who taught ΕΞ ΟΥΚ ΟΝΤΩΝ?'

any power to prevent them) to remain in the Church disseminating such a view. It might be noted that, had Athanasius been drafting this section, he would certainly have picked up the fact that the Easterners, although they retain a form of the anathema ‘those saying he is from another hypostasis’, have dropped ‘or *ousia*’, but *ousia* language is for Marcellus the language of his opponents, not his own. It might also be noted that Marcellus has probably picked up some of his language from the continuing Eustathians (perhaps Asclepas?), since the argument that true birth argues a true Son was very much the theology of Eustathius; or perhaps Marcellus had been rereading Eustathius’ works.<sup>253</sup>

There are two ancillary problems, for Marcellus, which Nicaea clearly failed to solve, in the light of the current teaching of the ‘Easterners’. The first is that the doctrine of the mutability and passibility of the Logos, originally taught by Arius, has now been revived by Ursacius and Valens, and is therefore not being rejected by their fellow-travellers: the Nicene anathemata against saying that the Son of God is *τρέπτός* or *ἀλλοιωτός* have been quietly dropped.

Secondly, there is the thorny question of the three hypostaseis. Marcellus had polemicised against these from the first (what he made of Alexander’s teaching of them we do not know), because he saw them as of a piece with the assertion that the Logos was not true God;<sup>254</sup> *pace* Hanson, Marcellus was absolutely right to interpret the three hypostaseis as taught by Eusebius of Caesarea (and probably Asterius) thus.<sup>255</sup> Marcellus believed that the only way to exclude a doctrine of the three hypostaseis such as Asterius’, where each hypostasis was a quite separate entity with no real union but of will, was to insist on one hypostasis; the same end was eventually achieved by the word *homoousios*.

---

<sup>253</sup> See chapter 2 above.

<sup>254</sup> See Eusebius of Caesarea in *Urk* 3.3 (p. 5.5-10).

<sup>255</sup> Hanson (*Search*, p. 181) claims that ‘The search for the Christian doctrine of God in the fourth century was in fact complicated and exasperated by semantic confusion, so that people holding different views were using the same words as those who opposed them, but, unawares, giving them different meanings from those applied to them by those opponents.’ On the contrary, it appears that those who used them, and certainly Marcellus, knew perfectly well what their opponents meant by them -- which is why, from Nicaea on, they take such care to qualify the sense in which they are meant.

Athanasius' instinct here, it may be said, which left room for self-confessed Origenists, was more ecumenical, and therefore more meet for achieving a consensus. Athanasius never taught three hypostaseis, but he refused to attack them either, presumably out of *pietas* for Alexander -- a stance which was eventually to be crucial in restoring some kind of unity to Eastern doctrinal confession. It should be noted nonetheless that the 'Western Creed' does not anathematise three hypostaseis as such, but that the hypostaseis of Father and Son and Holy Spirit are διαφόρους and κεχωρισμένους, and that although it proclaims one hypostasis, it specifies this to be hypostasis in the sense of *ousia*.<sup>256</sup>

It may be casually remarked by a non-Origenist that Marcellus was perfectly right about the problems associated with teaching three hypostaseis (as Zahn, Harnack and various other German 'biblicists' have pointed out). For reasons of tradition and allegiance, however, the solution he proposed was unworkable in the East as a whole; the solution had to come instead by refining the word 'hypostasis' and restricting it to a very specific and narrow meaning, and doing the work Marcellus had wanted to do with 'one hypostasis' with 'one *ousia*' and 'one *physis*'.

A more detailed analysis of this section of the creed shows the subtlety of Marcellus' arguments; they both take the Eastern leaders on on their own ground and recast in ways more congenial to Marcellus' theology some of the theological problems they isolate. In the case of Christ's being 'God, but not true God', Marcellus is returning to a pre-Nicene debate with Eusebius of Caesarea;<sup>257</sup> in that of his being 'Son but not true Son', he is turning the tables on the Eusebians, who accused Marcellus himself of not believing in the sonship of Christ before the incarnation<sup>258</sup> (Marcellus had made the necessary adjustments to his language in this case in the Letter to Julius two years

---

<sup>256</sup> Western Creed 3 and 4,

<sup>257</sup> See note on Eusebius above.

<sup>258</sup> See for example Eusebius, *C Mar* II.1.1-2.



before).<sup>259</sup> Marcellus had objected to Eusebius of Caesarea's use of γεννητόν in *De Sancta Ecclesia*;<sup>260</sup> here he more or less rehearses Eustathius' distinction between the two. He turns the tables also on his enemies' accusation that he claims the Logos was not Christ before the ages;<sup>261</sup> despite the fact that they confess him to exist before the ages, it is they who give Christ a beginning and an end.

If the first half of the Western creed was a skilful refutation of the Easterners' theological jibes, however, often by convicting them out of their own mouths, the remainder was a mistake. Marcellus seems to have gone over the main body of the Fourth Creed two or three times after he had finished his criticism of the anathemata, picking out points which particularly interested or enraged him. He noted the word μονογενής, and returned to Asterius's pairing μονογενής καὶ πρωτότοκος, reiterating his arguments from the *Contra Asterium*.<sup>262</sup> He noted the clause inserted against his own alleged claim that Christ's kingdom would have an end, as usual making the Logos rather than Christ the subject of his repudiation of the view.<sup>263</sup> He modified the article τὸν σταυρωθέντα καὶ ἀποθανόντα καὶ ταφέντα by noting that what suffered specifically was the mortal human being capable of suffering.<sup>264</sup> His picture of the Ascension also added its own soteriological gloss, and by changing καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος το εὐθέτω καιρῷ καὶ ὀρισμένῳ, he was able to restore some of his own sense of the immediacy of Christ's return.<sup>265</sup>

This creed is the best sense we have of Marcellus' developed, mature theology, honed of its rough edges, full of life and conviction. His soteriological vision

---

<sup>259</sup> See above in this chapter.

<sup>260</sup> See above, chapter 2.

<sup>261</sup> See for example Eusebius, *C Mar* II.1.3, the continuation of the passage cited above.

<sup>262</sup> Fr. P 4 (S/V 10).

<sup>263</sup> Western Creed 10.

<sup>264</sup> The Latin, which says 'et hunc credimus passum, sed homo, quem se induit, quem adsumpsit ex Maria virgine, hominem qui potuit pati,' (*EOMIA* I,2,iv, p. 653.95-98) is probably a better rendition of the original; it is indeed the masculine subject doing the suffering, if through the man he assumed. Theodoret's καὶ τοῦτο οὐ πέπονθεν, ἀλλ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος (*HE* II.8.48 (p. 117.5-6 Parmentier-Scheidweiler) is surely meeting the text more than halfway.

<sup>265</sup> Western Creed 11.

comes out clearly: ‘We believe that on the third day he rose, not God in the human being, but the human being in whom God was<sup>266</sup>, and that he brought as a gift to his Father the human being whom he had delivered from sin and corruption.’<sup>267</sup> The obedience unto death delivers from sin; the Resurrection delivers from corruption; the Ascension brings life with God. The eternal Son is the subject of the saving action, but there is one masculine subject which covers both the Logos and the human being; Marcellus is here free of Nestorianism, although we cannot tell whether he still thought the Logos would withdraw from the flesh at the end of time.

Here we see the Marcellus who has learned from Eustathius and from Athanasius, and speaks clearly of the Son as eternal; he has never been so lucid in conveying exactly what was wrong with the Eusebian system, or how he might answer their criticisms of his own. Ossius and Protogenes, and probably more than Ossius and Protogenes, were presumably swept away by the power of Marcellus’ theological vision, and the clarity of his analysis of what was wrong with their opponents’, to agree to let him make his statement of faith (a step back to the long, technical pre-Nicene creeds of Alexander and the 325 synod of Antioch) the faith of Sardica. But it was Athanasius (most likely), together with Julius, whose instincts were clearer. It would have been an enormous tactical mistake, in the long term, for Marcellus’ creed to have been ratified as the synod’s faith. The Nicene creed was a basic baptismal confessional of faith onto which the absolute minimum of non-scriptural definition was grafted. That was its power, which the Eusebians and their heirs had recognised all along in using baptismal-type creeds as possible replacements. The synod of Sardica would have cheapened the achievement of Nicaea in being half so specific as Marcellus’ creed proposed being about the precise ways in which the divine economy might work. It was Athanasius who had grasped that the essential task of a conciliar creed that was attempting to be prescriptive must be to define as little as conceivably possible beyond what was already handed down. It is for

---

<sup>266</sup> I suggest emending the text here from ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ θεῷ to ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ᾧ ὁ θεός.

<sup>267</sup> Western Creed 11.

this sense of the need to leave room for theological unfolding, which no other theologian saw so early and so well, at least as much as for his political brilliance, that Athanasius, with all his faults, deserves to be thought of as the lasting hero of the Arian controversy.

But Marcellus should be thought of as one of its heroes as well. For more than a decade, from 328 to 340, he was the main theological opponent of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his party, and one of its two main political opponents. At the age of over fifty, having been bishop of one of the empire's major Christian communities for over twenty years, he gave up his bishopric rather than agree to Athanasius' deposition and accept Arius' theology as orthodox. At Rome 341 he was remembered as the champion of orthodoxy at Nicaea; at Sardica 343 he was still the theologian who was best able to pin down what was wrong with Eusebian theology; on both occasions he was the staunch confessor who had been deposed for refusing to accept the Eusebians' reversal of Nicaea and the reintroduction of the perverse theology of Arius. At the time of Rome and Sardica, it was doubtless Marcellus even more than Athanasius who seemed to many to be the real bastion of the faith, as is reflected in the order in which their names are given in the synod's letter to Julius.

Sardica, meanwhile, was not the disaster it is often depicted as having been. Admittedly, the Eastern and Western parties were unable to meet, or to reach agreement of any sort. The apparent rage of both parties against one another, however, concealed a great deal of difference of opinion, theological and probably also political, within the ranks of each. Although it was to be another fifteen years before there would be a major realignment, and although the ecclesiastical political situation continued to be less than satisfactory, theological debate continued vigorously both within and between the parties, and underneath the excommunications and mutual abuse, it was rather more subtle and fruitful than has often been assumed.

## **h. After Sardica**

Marcellus and Athanasius, at least, must have known that the way events had transpired at Sardica, there was little chance now of their regaining their sees during the reign of Constantius. What Athanasius knew or guessed of Constans' plans is unknown; in any case, the more pressure Constans put on his brother to accept the exiles back, the less welcome they were likely to be to his brother. A group from Sardica, knowing this, wrote to Constantius in a last appeal, begging him to decree that all judges in his territory should stop involving themselves in church matters, and urging that 'Catholics' should be allowed to live in peace without being compelled to join the worship of 'Arians', and that the exiled bishops be recalled.<sup>268</sup> Its sentiments are similar to those which Ossius expressed on a later occasion,<sup>269</sup> and one or two of its phrases sound like the partisans of the Eastern exiles rather than the exiles themselves<sup>270</sup> (besides the fact that its general tone was not in the least likely to recommend itself to Constantius, a fact of which the exiles themselves would have been more acutely aware than their champions). But it does contain one short section which sounds very like it was written by Marcellus: 'Who does not see? Who does not understand? After nearly four hundred years since the only-begotten Son of God saw fit to come to the aid of the perishing human race, as if there had been no apostles first, nor after their martyrdoms and deaths, any Christians, there is now spread abroad not a new and most loathsome plague breathing corruption but the Arian plague of abominable blasphemies. Did those who believed in earlier days have a vain hope of immortality? (Quis non videt, quis non intellegit? Post quadringentos fere annos, postquam dei unigenitus filius humano generi pereunti subvenire dignatus est, quasi ante non apostoli, non post eorum martyria et excessus fuerint Christiani, novella nunc et teterrima lues non corrupti aeris, sed exsecrandorum blasphemiorum Arriana effusa est. Ita illi, qui ante crediderunt,

---

<sup>268</sup> Hilary, *FH* Appendix I (Feder, pp. 181-184).

<sup>269</sup> In Athanasius, *Hist Ar* 44.1-11.

inanem spem immortalitatis habuerunt?)<sup>271</sup> The theology, the ecclesiology, the poetic vituperation and especially the four hundred years all have the Marcellan stamp. One might compare the theology in particular with a sentence of Irenaeus which we have already seen: ‘Quod non postulavit homo, quia nec speravit Virginem praegnantem fieri posse quae erat virgo et parere filium, et hunc partum Deum esse nobiscum, et descendere in ea quae sunt deorsum terrae quaerentem ovum quae perierat...’<sup>272</sup>

After this, however, we come to a silence. Marcellus disappears from the horizon. He continues to be much talked about, but he no longer talks. Athanasius continues to mention him in his historical works (though somewhat selectively) as one of the many victims of the ‘Arians’, and refuses Basil of Caesarea’s request to condemn him; the continuing Eustathians at Antioch remain in communion with him, as do various bishops of the Balkan peninsula and the West in general.<sup>273</sup> Marcellus can be found living in Ancyra, surrounded by a band of faithful followers, as late as 372 (he seems to have died in 374).<sup>274</sup> He may even be responsible for the burial of Paul of Constantinople at Ancyra in 350, as suggested above. But from his pen we hear no more.

Marcellus was around sixty when the synod of Sardica finished. This fact, coupled with his silence, has led R.P.C. Hanson to suggest he was not *compos mentis* enough to communicate with Athanasius in 372 (his deacon Eugenius did it for him),<sup>275</sup> and T.D. Barnes to conjecture that he was already suffering from senility when ‘the Western bishops dropped him in 345’ (which apparently

---

<sup>270</sup> For example, ‘nuper didicimus commenta haec fuisse inventa et a duobus Eusebiis et a Narcisso et a Theodoro et ab Stefano et Acacio et Menofanto et imperitis atque improbis duobus adulescentibus Ursacio et Valente’ (*FH* Appendix I.2 (Feder p. 184.5-8)).

<sup>271</sup> *FH* Appendix I.1 (Feder p. 183.21 - p. 184.5).

<sup>272</sup> Irenaeus, *AH* III.19.3

<sup>273</sup> Joseph T. Lienhard, ‘Did Athanasius Reject Marcellus?’, pp. 76-77.

<sup>274</sup> Martin Tetz, ‘Marcellianer und Athanasius von Alexandrien. Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasium des Diakons Eugenius von Ankyra’, *ZNW* 64 (1973), 75-121 ; Epiphanius, *Pan* 72.1.1.

<sup>275</sup> Hanson, *Search*, p. 222.

did not prevent him writing all the pseudo-Athanasian writings recently ascribed to him at a later date).<sup>276</sup> I have a different suggestion.

Hilary tells us that Marcellus' book (of which he himself has a copy) is orthodox, and that no synod ever condemned Marcellus after he was exonerated by the synod of Sardica.<sup>277</sup> Athanasius, however, 'separated Marcellus from his communion' before Photinus of Sirmium, Marcellus' pupil and former deacon, was condemned at a synod in Milan in 345.<sup>278</sup> The Westerners wrote to the Easterners to inform them of this; Hilary reports that the Easterners took the opportunity in their reply to attempt to tar Marcellus with the same brush as Photinus, but this was merely caused by a desire to introduce their own poisonous heresy in a creed they attempted to attach to the East-West agreement against Photinus.<sup>279</sup>

When Athanasius separated himself from communion with Marcellus, Hilary tells us, 'ingresso sese ecclesiae Marcellus abstinuit'; slightly later he implies that Marcellus himself took the initiative: 'ipso se Marcello abdicante solo sine ulla synodi auctoritate'. Hilary notes that Photinus took the starting point for his teaching from Marcellus' theology.<sup>280</sup>

Photinus' teaching is not clear in all its details (he was accused of believing that Christ was a 'mere man' -- like belief in a quaternity instead of a Trinity, one of those handy accusations of the patristic period that could be used against most opponents), but one thing is clear: he was condemned on all sides, except by his congregation, who seem to have adored him.<sup>281</sup> Simonetti thinks he really did teach that the Father was the subject of the actions of the Logos.<sup>282</sup> In any case, even friends of Marcellus have no scruples over condemning Photinus: the

---

<sup>276</sup> Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 93.

<sup>277</sup> Hilary, *FH B II.9.1.2 - 2.1* (Feder p. 146.8 - p. 147.1).

<sup>278</sup> Hilary, *FH B II.9.3* (Feder p. 147.10-22); Seibt, *Markell*, p. 13 with note 26.

<sup>279</sup> Hilary, *FH B II.9.2.2* (Feder p. 147.1-9).

<sup>280</sup> Hilary, *FH B II.9.3.1-2* (Feder p. 147.13-14, 18-19, 12-13 respectively).

<sup>281</sup> Hilary, *FH B II.9.1.1* (Feder p. 146.7-8).

<sup>282</sup> Simonetti, *Crisi*, pp. 204-205.



Westerners do, Athanasius does, even Eugenius the deacon and Marcellus' circle of followers do. The person who does not, of course, is Marcellus.

The way the chain of communion operated, Athanasius could not have communicated with Marcellus and condemned Photinus at the same time, if Marcellus and Photinus remained in communion. No more could the Westerners in general. The Easterners, as Hilary points out, were in any case on the look-out for an occasion to condemn Athanasius through a condemnation of Marcellus: if Rome and Sardica were wrong about the one, they must be wrong about the other.<sup>283</sup> It was a delicate point; if Marcellus refused to drop Photinus, the whole network of Western communion was in danger.

Marcellus did refuse to drop Photinus, whatever he thought of his theology, and probably for a very good reason: friendship. I have conjectured that it was Marcellus' friendship for Eustathius (or at least, admiration of his theology) which led Marcellus to be so bitter in his condemnation of Eusebius of Caesarea and of Paulinus of Tyre, and friendship for Athanasius (or at least, loyalty to their common theological cause) which led him to defy Constantine at Jerusalem. Once more, the same motive can be imputed to him here: he was not prepared to abandon his former pupil, however politically expedient it might have been.

And so Marcellus retreated into silence. He wrote no more, he entered no more into the controversy.<sup>284</sup> He withdrew from the Church which he loved so much

---

<sup>283</sup> Hilary, *FHB* II.9.1-3 (Feder pp. 146-147).

<sup>284</sup> It will be clear from this account that I do not accept any of the ascriptions of pseudo-Athanasian works to Marcellus after this date. The different reasons against Marcellan authorship of the *Sermo Maior* given by Simonetti ('Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcello d'Ancira', *RSLR* 9 (1973), 313-79; 'Ancora sulla paternità dello ps.-atanasiano "Sermo maior de fide"', *Vet Chr* 11 (1974), 333-43), M.J. Dowling ('Marcellus of Ancyra: Problems of Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity', PhD Dissertation (Belfast, 1987), pp. 5-16) and Alexandra Riebe ('Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research' MA Dissertation (Durham, 1992)) seem to me unanswerable; Seibt, in accepting Marcellan authorship, has merely addressed some of Simonetti's less convincing arguments, ignoring also what seems to me the most telling point of all, that in the *Sermo Maior*, it is the pre-incarnate Logos that is the image of the invisible God. Even Tetz ('Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra III: Die pseudoathanasianische Epistula ad Liberium, ein markellisches Bekenntnis' *ZKG* 83 (1972),

long enough for Athanasius to be re-established in his see at Alexandria without having to answer any awkward questions about intercommunion with universally condemned heretics. He himself probably returned to Ancyra in 361, if not before, under Julian's amnesty; he would have shared his status as anti-bishop at this point with his old rival Basil, himself deposed the previous year in favour of another Athanasius (with whom Basil of Caesarea would be on awkward terms).<sup>285</sup>

When Basil of Caesarea attempted to have Marcellus generally condemned, Marcellus' followers turned to Athanasius.<sup>286</sup> In order to show themselves of one mind with the orthodox of Athanasius' stamp, Eugenius and his colleagues anathematised Photinus of Sirmium. They found a formula which allowed

---

145-95) has given up the ascription to Marcellus of the Ekthesis Pisteos that is associated with the *Sermo Maior*, so it may safely be ignored. In the case of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, Tetz's analysis of the work ('Zur Theologie I') is full of interesting and suggestive observations, but as Simonetti pointed out ('Sulla paternità dell' *De incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos*', *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 5 (1953-55), 5-19), would only prove Marcellan authorship if we knew that it had to be by a named individual known to modern scholarship (a criticism which might also be levelled at Christoph Riedweg's ascription of the pseudo-Justinian *Cohortatio ad Graecos* to Marcellus on the basis of a TLG search of the works of eleven other authors (see Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?)*, *Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher Cohortatio ad Graecos)*, *Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 25 (Basle: Reinhardt, 1992), pp 167-82). Simonetti and Dowling ('Marcellus', pp. 18 ff, give a number of reasons, some good ones, for doubting Marcellan authorship, particularly the use of ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, which even Seibt's full textual study does not address. The only ps-Athanasian work whose ascription to Marcellus begins to be convincing (the only one which Marcus Vinzent (*Markell*, pp. CIII-CIV) accepts as possible, for example) is the little creed *Contra Theopaschitas (Epistula ad Liberium)*. M. Richard proposed in 1949 that it issued from Marcellan circles (Richard, 'Bulletin de patrologie', *MSR* 6 (1949), 117-133); Tetz ascribed it straight-forwardly to Marcellus in 1972 (Tetz, 'Zur Theologie I'). The theology is miahypoostatic, and the parallels with Marcellus's soteriology in particular are truly impressive. But as Simonetti (*Crisi*, p. 45) and Dowling ('Marcellus', pp. 36-37) have both pointed out, and as Richard himself acknowledged, this still cannot be considered probative of authorship by Marcellus himself. There are one or two phrases which sit oddly with Marcellus's theology elsewhere, μίᾱς εἰκόνοϋ τῆς τριάδοϋ, for example. Since it holds a place in the manuscript immediately before the creed of Eugenius, authorship by Marcellus's circle is as likely as authorship by Marcellus. In any case, even if this creed is by Marcellus, it is not a teaching document, merely an exposition of faith to inform its recipient of the beliefs of its author(s) – and it notably does not include any anathemata. As such it would be the only non-polemical theological work of Marcellus we have.

<sup>285</sup> Socrates, *HE* II.42.3; Sozomen, *HE* IV.24.5. Athanasius of Ancyra receives a prickly letter from Basil, who took offence at some remarks Athanasius was reported to have made about him (Basil, *Ep* 25). And at his death in 371, Basil feared a renewed outbreak of strife in Ancyra (*Ep* 29). On Basil's attitude to Marcellus, see Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 20 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 246-247.

<sup>286</sup> Lienhard, 'Did Athanasius Reject Marcellus?', pp. 76-7.

Marcellus' name to be cleared, beginning their letter with 'Eugenius ... here with our Father Marcellus'.<sup>287</sup> Athanasius and the bishops of Egypt, in signing Eugenius' document, recognised Marcellus' orthodoxy - without his personally condemning Photinus.

---

<sup>287</sup> Tetz, 'Markellianer', p. 78.

## Conclusion

One thesis cannot undo the negative opinion of Marcellus, both of his theology and of his general importance, that has built up in English-speaking scholarship over the last hundred and fifty years, because it is so largely a product of the desire of English-speaking scholarship to find and identify with the *via media*. In the nineteenth century, Athanasius' way was the *via media*, and Marcellus the Charybdis to Arius' Scylla; in the twentieth century, Kelly's 'majority of moderate Origenists' were the *via media*, and Marcellus the Scylla to Arius' Charybdis. To those who would argue that this was the way the protagonists saw the categories themselves, I would point out (as I have tried to document in this thesis) that these categories are not those of the first half of the controversy, but of its later years. 'Arianism' found its characteristic form only in Rome in 340; Marcellus was discovered to be a 'Sabellian' only in Eusebius of Caesarea's second work against him in 337-8. The earliest characterisations of the two groups saw the one as 'Eusebians' and the other as a motley group of individuals drawn together by their common anti-ecclesial activity of various kinds. These are still the characterisations which are largely being used at Sardica.

Instead of seeing Marcellus in the categories of the 350s and 360s, we should try to see him in the categories of the 320s, 330s and 340s, as Klaus Seibt and Markus Vinzent in their different ways have tried to do. To do that, I have tried to show, we need to look at each stage of the controversy during that period and ask what it looked like on the ground: what kind of status Marcellus had by the beginning of the controversy, what Alexander and his allies were attempting to do before and during Nicaea, how the events of the late 320s could have happened the way they did, what was the dynamic at Tyre, by what means a prestigious metropolitan bishop might be deposed by a group of bishops from outside his own province or even his own civil diocese (as Marcellus and Athanasius both were), and exactly what sort of claims Julius was making in receiving the exiles from the East.

We need to consider, I have argued, how the crucial language of the controversy -- the terms οὐσία, ὑπόστασις, φύσις, δύναμις, and the names *Arianoi*, *hoi peri Eusebion*, *Sabellios*, 'Easterners', 'Westerners' -- was used by different individuals at different points for different purposes, and what the reality behind the usage might have been. We have now been liberated by careful and fruitful scholarship from the beautifully-constructed myth of 'Arianism' -- an achievement in thinking our way out of an ancient category for twentieth-century scholarship to be really proud of. But we are still in hock to many more of the ancient categories. No one who has studied Marcellus thoroughly can agree that the term 'Sabellian' accurately describes him -- but he is still often described as such in general histories of the period and its doctrine. Sardica can still be seen as the archetypal cultural conflict between Eastern and Western Christianity, leading in a straight line to 1054 -- despite the fact that a clear majority of the 'Western' synod (including most of its leading players) was in fact Greek-speaking, and came from lands which reverted administratively to the East in 395, were Orthodox in 1054 and still are. Indeed, the part of the Orthodox world today which occupies territory that was part of the Roman Empire in 343 largely represents precisely those provinces which formed the bulk of the Western synod of Sardica.

Only when the events of the years 314-345 are properly studied for their own sake, and not through the eyes of the leading theologians of the years 351-381, does Marcellus' role in the controversy begin to become clear -- and indeed, do the events of 326-343 begin to make overall sense. I am far from claiming that my reading of the events of these years is the only possible one, but I believe at the end of this thesis that I have the right to claim that any alternative interpretation must be shown to make at least equal sense. T.D. Barnes (and to a much lesser extent, Richard Klein) have made sense of imperial policy during these years, and of Athanasius' relations with Constantius in particular; Alastair H.B. Logan has continually called for a greater appreciation of Marcellus' importance during this

period; Joseph Lienhard has made sense of Marcellus' theology during these years in relation to the later categories of the controversy; Joseph Lienhard, Markus Vinzent and Kelley McCarthy Spoerl have begun to make sense of developments in non-Eusebian anti-Marcellan polemic of the 340s. But for these approaches to bear their full fruit in scholarship of the controversy in general, the period between Nicaea and Sardica needs to receive the kind of attention that the period immediately before Nicaea and the period after 350 have received in the last 20 years.

Marcellus deserves better from the English-speaking scholarly world. Those who champion Nicaea for confessional reasons (as I do, evidently) should recognise his crucial role, both politically and theologically, in its eventual acceptance: his importance in mustering political support for Athanasius as well as himself in Asia Minor and the Balkan peninsula, and in lending much-needed credibility to Athanasius' claim to be the victim of an ideological campaign rather than his own ruffianly conduct is as great as his importance in pinning down the crucial weak points of his opponents' theology and making them clear to the West at large. Those who accept at some level the view Joseph Lienhard beautifully parodies, that the baton of orthodoxy was passed on from Athanasius to the Cappadocians to Augustine, must accept that it also passed through the hands of Marcellus -- however little either he or the Cappadocians would have relished the idea. Those whose interest in the controversy, meanwhile, is what might be termed 'anti-confessional' -- to 'unmake orthodoxy', and uncover the equally valid alternatives behind the rhetoric of the winners -- must recognise (as Maurice Wiles already has) that Marcellus is an equally worthy candidate with Arius for such an approach. Those who approach the period from a desire to understand the dynamic of Christianity as part of the wider picture of the changing world of the Late Roman Empire (which includes many of those in the first two categories, obviously) miss an essential ingredient if they ignore the very limited nature of Eastern episcopal support for the political and theological aims of the Eusebian party in the late 320s,



330s and early 340s, and the loud silence towards them of precisely those parts of the East where Marcellus found most support.

As with Lewis Carroll's Cheshire cat, Marcellus' powerful and painful contribution to the Arian controversy has vanished from the sight of English-speaking scholarship, until nearly all that is left is Athanasius' smile. Perhaps the time is now ripe for him slowly to reappear.

## APPENDICES

**1. The Order of the Fragments of the *Contra Asterium***

**2. Marcellus' *Contra Asterium*: A Translation of the Fragments**

**3. The Deposition of Eustathius of Antioch**

## APPENDIX ONE

### The Order of the Fragments of the *Contra Asterium*

#### 1. Introduction

The only major work to have survived in any form under the name of Marcellus of Ancyra is a writing commonly called *Contra Asterium*, which survives in fairly extensive fragments quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea and Acacius of Caesarea (the latter given in the *Panarion* of Epiphanius of Salamis).<sup>1</sup> Christoph Rettberg, in 1794, was the first to extract these fragments from the works in which they appear and to publish them together, giving them the numbers 1-115, in an ordering for the most part quite different to that in which they appear in Eusebius' works.<sup>2</sup> This numbering is generally prefixed 'Re'. Erich Klostermann included in his edition of Eusebius' works against Marcellus an improved version of Rettberg's ordering of the fragments (adding as a final 'fragment' the short, complete *Letter to Pope Julius*), identifying two duplicates and redividing some fragments which Rettberg had somewhat arbitrarily joined into one, thus giving a second numbering of the fragments, K 1-129, which is close but not identical to the first.<sup>3</sup> G.C. Hansen, in his second edition of Klostermann's work, improved the apparatus but made no change to the ordering of the fragments.

Klaus Seibt, in his Tübingen doctoral thesis of 1992,<sup>4</sup> established an entirely new order of the Marcellan fragments. The fragments have since been published in this

---

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Contra Marcellum* and *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, *passim*; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72.6.1-72.10.3.

<sup>2</sup> C. Rettberg, *Marcelliana, Accedit Eunomii, Εκθεσις πιστεως emendatior* (Göttingen 1794).

<sup>3</sup> E. Klostermann, *Eusebius' Werke 4: Gegen Marcell, Über die Kirchliche Theologie, die Fragmente Marcells*, GCS (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909); 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. rev. G.C. Hansen, (Berlin: Akademie, 1972).

<sup>4</sup> Published in revised form as K. Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).

order with a German translation and notes by Markus Vinzent,<sup>5</sup> and so I will designate this order 'S/V'. Vinzent made one extremely minor change in the order, reversing Seibt's fragments 105 and 106;<sup>6</sup> I will follow Vinzent's numbering rather than Seibt's here.

Rettberg's ordering had an internal logic, being broadly divided into topics, beginning with Jesus and ending with pagan culture, and placing fragments of like subject together. Its great fault, however, was that it frequently ignored Eusebius' indications on the order of the work from which he was quoting. A sequence such as the following, taken from Eusebius' *Contra Marcellum* with the fragments of Marcellus replaced by the numbers Rettberg gave them, illustrates his policy:

Re 59 (K 65, S/V 1, P 1)...After these things, having gone on a little

Re 29 (K 34, S/V 2, P 2). And also against these words he next (ἐξῆς) makes great opposition, after which he continues, saying

Re 30 (K 35, S/V 9, P 3). And after other things, he adds

Re 3 (K 3, S/V 10, P 4).<sup>7</sup>

If Eusebius uses the word ἐξῆς (in order, next) in introducing a fragment, Rettberg will generally place it after the previous one that Eusebius has cited. Other words of Eusebius', such as προ ὧν, ἐπισυνάπτει, ἐπιλέγει and ἐπιφέρει, which at least usually indicate that the next fragment comes somewhere after, rather than before, the last one quoted, Rettberg generally ignores.

Seibt's ordering is a great advance on Rettberg's, and has established the proper method for any future order: it must be based, as his is, on a close and careful

---

<sup>5</sup> M. Vinzent, *Marcell von Ankyra: Die Fragmente, Der Brief an Julius von Rom* (Leiden: Brill, 1997)

<sup>6</sup> A reversal which his own *Synopse der Fragmentenzählung Klostermann/Vinzent*, pp. 191-192, omits to make.

reading of Eusebius' indications. Seibt's order shows that in the *Contra Marcellum*, the work which most closely follows Marcellus' own order, Eusebius trawls three times through Marcellus' work in order, once citing passages which attack Asterius, Origen and the Eusebian bishops, once citing Logos passages, and once citing passages which have to do with the flesh of Christ and what becomes of it after the Last Judgement. I will call these three lists of passages A, B and C.<sup>8</sup> In addition, the *Contra Marcellum* has an introductory section dealing with Marcellus' alleged misquotations from Scripture and misunderstandings of it (not all of which hit the mark), and with one long passage of 'Hellenic argument': these passages are taken from various points at random in Marcellus' work, but do give one or two indications of order.

Seibt attempts to interweave Lists A, B and C, following Eusebius' clues (Eusebius often cites the same passage, or part of it, in more than one context), and adds the fragments of the introductory section, of the *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* and of Epiphanius' citing of Acacius of Caesarea's *Contra Marcellum* where he thinks it to be appropriate, also following the more sparse indications on order of *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* where possible. So Seibt's order follows Eusebius' indication that Marcellus' polemic against Origen (fragments S/V 19-22) comes as part of a section attacking the antecedents of the Eusebians towards the beginning of the work, while there is a further section attacking their theology and some of their conduct later in the work: Rettberg had mixed the fragments from these two sections (both in List A) together and scattered them about, seemingly at random.

Seibt's order is a considerable improvement on Rettberg's in its attention to such points. From time to time it appears to make less logical sense, as passages discussing the same Scripture text, for instance, are banished to different parts of

---

<sup>7</sup> ...μετὰ ταῦτα μικρὸν προελθὼν... καὶ πρὸς ταυτας δὲ τὰς φωνὰς πολλὴν ἐξῆς ποιεῖται τὴν ἀντίρρησιν, μεθ' ἣν ἐπισυνάπτει λέγων... καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει (*Contra Marcellum* I.4.4 (p. 18, line 14) - I.4.12 (p. 19, line 30)).

<sup>8</sup> For these lists in full, see Table 2.

the work according to Eusebius' apparent indications. Seibt argues that Marcellus returns throughout the work to exegetical points made previously, which certainly seems to be the case, causing this apparent circularity. But, as he and Vinzent both admit,<sup>9</sup> his order, though an improvement on Rettberg's, is still tentative in many places, and there are further improvements which might be made to it.

The room for this latitude in ordering, even after all of Seibt's careful work, comes from the fact that Eusebius' indications on the order of the fragments are by no means unambiguous. We can see this clearly by comparing his connectives for Marcellus' fragments with those he uses in his many citations from Scripture in the *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* (and many more might be cited from the *Demonstratio Evangelicum*), whose original order we can easily check. The indications *πάλιν* and *αὐθαίως*, for example, which might seem to introduce a citation of a passage immediately following the one previously mentioned, often do, but from time to time introduce one from somewhere quite different, even from another book of scripture entirely. In *ET* I.20.5 (p. 84, lines 10-11), for instance, Eusebius introduces a citation from 1 Jn 4.14 with *καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάλιν*. The quotations it follows (Jn 3.16-18) are closely thematically related, but come from the Gospel rather than the First Letter of John.

Even *ἐξῆς* can allow a gap of two or three verses or even more between the last passage cited and the one being introduced. In *ET* I.20.5 (p. 83, line 20), for example, Eusebius leads in to a quotation from Jn 1.18 with the phrase *τούτων δὲ πῶθεν ἢ γνῶσις τῷ εὐαγγελιστῇ, αὐτὸς δηλώσει λέγων ἐξῆς* ('And whence [came] the knowledge of these things to the evangelist, he himself will make plain, saying next'), although his last quotation was from Jn 1.15. In addition, Eusebius occasionally digresses, cites one or two passages from elsewhere in support of what he is saying, and then returns to the passage he was previously dealing with, still using a designation such as *ἐξῆς* or *προ ὧν*. This can be seen in *ET* I.20.4 (p. 82,

---

<sup>9</sup> Vinzent, *Markell*, p. X.



lines 32-33), (ὁ αὐτὸς εὐαγγελιστῆς ἐπιφέρων Jn 1.15), where Jn 17.5 and Jn 12.28 immediately precede the connective participle, which looks back to a citation of Jn 1.14 ten lines above.

In addition, on close inspection, much of the apparent evidence on the order of the Marcellan fragments in *ET* must be discounted. It makes no claims for the order of many of the passages it cites, but even when it does, these are generally illusory because Eusebius is referring back not to the *Contra Asterium* itself, but to his own earlier work the *Contra Marcellum*. This can be seen most clearly at one point where he quotes three connectives verbatim from the earlier work:

S/V 109 (Re 108, K 121, P 128)

καὶ πάλιν τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν λευκότερον τίθησιν ὧδε γράφων

S/V 110 (Re 54, K 60, P 106)

καὶ αὐθις μετὰ πάντα ἐπιφέρει λέγων

S/V 111 (Re 34, K 41, P 117).<sup>10</sup>

Eusebius, in fact, reuses in *ET* all of his earlier quotations from List B, the Logos list, of the *Contra Marcellum*. Apparent indications of Marcellus' order turn out to be indications of the order of the quotations in the *Contra Marcellum*. We can see this most clearly from the following sequence in *ET*:

'Listen, indeed, how he asserts, writing with these words in this way:

V/S 3 (Re 37, K 43, P 18)                      (*ET* I.18.1)                      (*CM* I.2.24)

'And next he adds

V/S 5 (Re 42, K 48, P 12)                      (*ET* I.18.2)                      (*CM* II.2: not I.2, as Vinzent)

'And again he adds

V/S 52 (Re 43=81, K 91, P 53)                      (*ET* I.18.2)                      (*CM* II.2.3)

---

<sup>10</sup> *ET* II.8.3-5 (p. 107, lines 23-31) = *CM* II.2.40-41 (p. 42, lines 24-32).

And he adds again, saying

V/S 7 (Re 36, K 42, P 20) (ET I.18.3-4) (CM II.3.1)

καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπάγει

V/S 8 (Re 44, K 49, P 21) (ET I.18.4) (CM II.3.2)<sup>11</sup>

Seibt, as can be seen from his numbering, attempted to take this sequence at face value, but balked at a consecutive numbering for the sequence 5-52-7, which is impossible if Eusebius' indications in List C of the *CM*, that fragment V/S 7 comes well before V/S 52, are accepted. In fact, however, none of these indications need be taken as direct evidence for the ordering of the *Contra Asterium*. This list simply describes the order Eusebius himself has given them in the *CM* (admittedly with rather large gaps between them), in which they are distributed between several different sections. The final link, between V/S 7 and 8, which are consecutive in the *CM*, is the same verbatim (apart from an additional λέγων) as the link in the earlier work.

Eusebius in *ET* can also move backwards through the order he established in his previous work:

V/S 94 (Re 40, K 46, P 105) (ET II.10.2) (CM II.2.35)

καὶ πάλιν

V/S 65 (Re 39, K 45, P 67) (ET II.10.3) (CM II.2.5)

καὶ ἀϋθις

V/S 52 (Re 43=81, K 91, P 53) (ET 2.10.3) (CM II.2.3)

καὶ πάλιν

V/S 5 (Re 42, K 48, P 12). (ET II.10.3) (CM II.2.1)<sup>12</sup>

It seems clear, therefore, that when Eusebius is quoting fragments already cited in the *CM*, his indications of order are not to be used to reconstruct the order of the

---

<sup>11</sup> *ET* I.18.1-4 (p. 78, line 34 - p. 80, line 4).

<sup>12</sup> *ET* III.2-3 (p. 110, line 35 - p.111, line 15).

*Contra Asterium*. However, the evidence is not quite as straightforward as to indicate that Eusebius simply used the *Contra Marcellum* as we have it. Eusebius occasionally cites a longer extract of the same passage in *ET* than he does in *CM*, as is the case with V/S 3 above (only two lines of which are cited in *CM*, compared with 14 lines in *ET*). He also, as previously noted, includes a number of new fragments. The new material (apart from a citation of an anti-Sabellian logion<sup>13</sup> at the beginning of the citations in Book 1, which Eusebius needs for a specific purpose) comes in blocks in chapters 2.1, 2.19, 2.21, 3.2-4, 3.10 and 3.12. Some of the new fragments fit well with material to be found in the *CM*: V/S 27, 30-33 and 43-44 fit nicely into the exegesis of Proverbs 8.22ff. (fragments V/S 23-26, 28-29, 34-42 and 45) in the *Contra Marcellum*, and V/S 85-86, 90, 92-93, 95 and 97, exegesis of Old Testament passages on God's unity such as 'I am' and 'there is none besides me', fit well with V/S 87, 89 and 91 on the same texts. Other sections are discrete and touch on topics- above all the Spirit- not addressed by the fragments cited in *CM*.

The best way of making sense of all these features of *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* (the exact citation of the links as well as the fragments of his earlier work, the use of the order found in the *Contra Marcellum* rather than the order that work bears witness to in the *Contra Asterium*, but occasionally with longer extracts from the same passage, the blocks of new material which often complement the old but sometimes themselves constitute new sections) is to assume that Eusebius did use his own earlier work, but a longer version of it than the one he published. Markus Vinzent has identified the *Contra Marcellum* (surely correctly) as precisely the 'expert witness' speech which Eusebius claims he gave at Marcellus' trial.<sup>14</sup> If so, Eusebius would have had to curtail his customary verbosity to the length of a reasonable trial speech. The *Contra Marcellum* as it stands is approximately 2500 sixteen syllable lines (the length of line by which scribes were paid). Assuming a

---

<sup>13</sup> *ET* I.15.1 (p. 74, line 33 - p. 75, line 9).

<sup>14</sup> Vinzent, *Markell*, XIX

speech delivery rate of 130 words (= c.300 syllables) per minute, it would have taken Eusebius about 2¼ hours to deliver, about as long as could ordinarily be considered reasonable for one sitting.<sup>15</sup> He might well have had to make cuts in his original text to bring it down to the required length. *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, which is slightly more than twice the length of the *Contra Marcellum*, probably represents something nearer the length Eusebius would have preferred to aim at.

This theory of an original longer version of the *Contra Marcellum* re-used by Eusebius for *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* would also explain why there are no links at all, of the sort which would indicate the order of the original text, between most of the fragments cited in *ET*. This is partly to be explained by the fact that Eusebius is now dealing generally with what he takes to be Marcellus' theological views in the abstract, rather than with refuting each of his errors in order, and such order as there is in *ET* is imposed by Eusebius' theological views, no longer by Marcellus'. But even where he cites several fragments in a row, he often gives little or no indication of their relative order:

S/V 73 (Re 62, K 71).

And at another time comparing the Logos of God to human Logos, and adding

S/V 87 (Re 55, K 61).

Wherefore at one time he declared that before the constitution of the world there was nothing else apart from God, and again in the very words he said that

S/V 77 (Re 93, K 104).

And at another time he compared the Logos of God to our word that gives meaning to things in the things that he wrote thus:

S/V 87 (Re 55, K 61).

---

<sup>15</sup> On the rate of speech delivery of Greek in this period, see P.M. Parvis, 'Theodoret's Commentary on the Epistles of St Paul: Historical Setting and Exegetical Practice' (unpublished D. Phil thesis, Oxford, 1975), p. 255-56. On how scribes were paid, see E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri, An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 87-88, 94-94.

And indeed having proclaimed him in these things meaningful Logos, going on next he affirms that he is one and the same thing with the father, inseparable in substance, saying thus somewhere

S/V 87 (Re 55, K 61).

And again he uses the same image in what he says

S/V 89 (Re 56, K 62).<sup>16</sup>

The consequence of my theory is that where Eusebius gives us new material in *ET*, culled from his hypothetical uncut version of the *Contra Marcellum*, his indications on order are valuable, as they may well reflect a passage in Eusebius' original work in which close attention is paid to Marcellus' text. Where he recycles material from his published version, there is nothing new to be gained from *ET* on the order of the *Contra Asterium*.

With this degree of uncertainty in Eusebius' evidence, it is obviously rash to expect to produce a conclusive ordering of the fragments of the *Contra Asterium* on the evidence we have. There are a number of fragments whose placing will always have to be somewhat arbitrary, in the absence of further evidence. It might appear rash even to be proposing another order, and suggesting a fourth scheme of numbering, when citing the fragments of Marcellus is already a ridiculously complicated enterprise, and a good new edition of them in Seibt's order has recently been published. I do not desire to supersede that edition, which is a good working text of the two works to be ascribed with certainty to Marcellus (although a published English translation, which I am currently working on, should still be useful). But I think that another close look at the evidence, both of Eusebius' indications of order and of Marcellus' fragments themselves, will give us a notably better picture of the kind of work Marcellus was attempting to write, of his method of argumentation and, for want of a better word, of his spirituality.

---

<sup>16</sup> *ET* I.17.1-3 (p 77, lines 7-35).

Since both Klostermann and Hansen unfortunately saw fit to retain only Rettberg's numbering (rather than Klostermann's or both) in the actual text of Eusebius which they each published, making referring back from Eusebius' text to other orders a laborious process, and demanding that both Klostermann's and Rettberg's orders must remain current until a new edition of Eusebius' texts is next produced (especially since Vinzent correlated the numbers of his edition with Klostermann's numbering and not, or not also, with Rettberg's), I have provided a table collating Rettberg's order with Klostermann's, Seibt's and mine by way of rendering cross reference between the different numberings somewhat more feasible.<sup>17</sup>

## **2. The proposed reordering of the Marcellan fragments.**

The general changes I want to propose to Seibt's order coalesce around three specific ones. Firstly, I think there are several good reasons for gathering all the fragments which are part of an exegesis of John 1.1 in one place, near the beginning of the *Contra Asterium*, and that Eusebius' order allows it. Secondly, I want to move Seibt's second block of material of attacks on the Eusebian bishops from where he placed it, at the end of the work, to the middle. Finally, I propose a gathering of soteriological material towards the end of the work, to be followed immediately (and finally) by the eschatological material. These moves also I believe Eusebius' indications of order, and the indications in the fragments themselves, will bear.

### **A. The proposed opening of the work (from Seibt's fragments 1-22, 23-46, 51-56, 66-68, 70-71).**

---

<sup>17</sup> See Table 1.



In list B, the second of his trawls through Marcellus' *Contra Asterium*, the list of extracts dealing with Marcellus' theology of the Logos, Eusebius gives us the following series of connectives:

And still more does he establish this through the things he writes in what follows, thus:

S/V 66 (Re 31, K 36, P 5).

And...he plainly introduces a mere word...from what he adds, saying:

S/V 67 (Re 41, K 47, P 13)

Having gathered such things together..., he adds, saying:

S/V 68 (Re 46, K 51, P 14)

And he adds to these things, subjoining next:

S/V 70 (Re 47, K 52, P 16)

And still he adds to these things, exposing his own understanding through what he adds next, saying:

S/V 71 (Re 28, K 33, P 17)<sup>18</sup>

If Eusebius were in fact trawling through the *Contra Asterium* in order, these fragments ought to come after the seven Logos fragments he has previously given, Seibt's nos. 5, 6, 52, 53, 61, 65 and 73. However, they would fit much better not in the middle of Marcellus' work but at the beginning of it, interspersed with S/V 5 and 6, and prior to fragments S/V 3, 4, 7, 8 and 11-16. Here is the evidence.

At the beginning of list B, Eusebius begins 'Having laid into those who said that the Son of God is truly God both living and subsistent, he makes his own opinion plain, writing thus:<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τοῦτο κατασκευάζει δι' ὧν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς οὕτω γράφει.... καὶ...ψιλὸν δὲ λόγον...εἰσάγων δῆλός ἐστιν ἐξ ὧν ἐπιφέρει λέγων... τοσαῦτα συνάγων...ἐπάγει φάσκων... καὶ προστίθησιν τούτοις ἐπιλέγων ἐξῆς... καὶ ἔτι τούτοις προστίθησιν, ἀπογυμνῶν τὸν ἴδιον νοῦν δι' ὧν ἐξῆς ἐπάγει, λέγων (CM II.2, p. 35, line 28 - p. 37, line 16).

<sup>19</sup> CM II.2.1-3 (p. 34, line 33 - p. 35, line 13)

S/V 5 (Re 42, K 48, P 12)

So then, before the coming down and the being born of the virgin there was only Word. Since what else was there before that which came down in the last days, as he also wrote, and that which was born from the virgin assumed human flesh? There was nothing other than Word.

‘Then going on, next he calls him eternal, thus defining him as ingenerate, and he writes thus:

S/V 6 (Re 48, K 53, P15)

So then, you hear the harmony of the Holy Spirit bearing witness to the eternity of the Word through many and various personae. And because of this, he begins from the eternity of the Word, saying ‘In the Beginning [ἐν ἀρχῇ] was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ He wishes to show the eternity of the Word using three successive testimonies.’

What these three successive testimonies consist in is surely what is demonstrated by S/V 70, which seems to follow on directly from the last extract:

70 (Re 47, K 52, P 16)

...in order that in saying ‘In the Beginning was the Word’, he might show the Word to be in the Father as a faculty [δυνάμει], for God is the Beginning of all things which came to be: ‘from whom are all things’, and in ‘and the Word was with God’, the Word being with God as an activity [ἐνεργεία], for ‘all things came to be through him, and apart from him not any one thing came to be’, and in having said ‘the Word was God’, that one should not divide the Godhead, since the Word was in him and he was in the Word; for he says ‘the Father is in me and I am in the Father.’

In S/V 68 and 71, we have two more references to testimonies in connection with this same scripture passage:

S/V 68 (Re 46, K 51, P 14)

But the holy Apostle and also disciple of the Lord John clearly and openly teaching in the beginning of the Gospel, as a thing unknown earlier among human beings, naming him Word of the Almighty, spoke thus: 'In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' Using not [just] one testimony he signifies the eternity of the Word.

S/V 71 (Re 28, K 33, P 17)

So now the holy apostle and also disciple of the Lord John, mentioning his eternity, became the true witness of the Word, saying 'In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' Making no mention here of the 'coming to be of the Word', but using three consecutive testimonies he was confirming the Word to be in the Beginning.

S/V 68 almost certainly does follow soon after S/V 67, as Eusebius' order claims, and S/V 71 should follow S/V 70 in the same way. And so we have the following passage (with probably short lacunae in between as marked):

S/V 67 (Re 41, K 47, P 13)...and those teaching them as being ashamed to mention the Word, which all the Divine Scriptures proclaim thus. For David says concerning it 'The heavens were made firm by the Word of the Lord', and again the same writer says 'He sent forth his Word and it healed them.' And Solomon: 'The wicked will seek me, but they will not find me. For they have hated wisdom, and the Word of the Lord they have not chosen.' And Isaiah said: 'For out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem.' And again Jeremiah says 'The wise were put to shame, and terrified and captured, because they rejected the Word of the Lord.' And Hosea the prophet also said 'They have hated the one refuting in the gates, and abominated the holy Word.' And Micah likewise also himself mentioning the Word said 'Out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem.'...(S/V 68) But the holy Apostle and also disciple of the Lord John clearly and openly teaching in the beginning of the Gospel, as a thing unknown earlier among human beings, naming him Word of the Almighty, spoke thus: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' Using not [just]

one testimony he signifies the eternity of the Word...[probably now a section of proof-texts on the eternity of the Word]. (S/V 6) So then, you hear the harmony of the Holy Spirit bearing witness to the eternity of the Word through many and various personae. And because of this, he begins from the eternity of the Word, saying 'In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' He wishes to show the eternity of the Word using three successive testimonies (S/V 70) in order that in saying 'In the Beginning was the Word', he might show the Word to be in the Father as a faculty (δύναμις), for God is the Beginning of all things which came to be: 'from whom are all things', and in 'and the Word was with God', the Word being with God as an activity (ἐνέργεια), for 'all things came to be through him, and apart from him not any one thing came to be', and in having said 'the Word was God', that one should not divide the Godhead, since the Word was in him and he was in the Word; for he says 'the Father is in me and I am in the Father.'... (S/V 71) So now the holy apostle and also disciple of the Lord John, mentioning his eternity, became the true witness of the Word, saying 'In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' Making no mention here of the 'coming to be of the Word', but using three consecutive testimonies he was confirming the Word to be in the Beginning.

One further indication that we might be on the right track is provided by Eusebius' introduction to S/V 6 quoted above: 'going on, next he calls him eternal.' All of the last four of these fragments have the eternity of the Logos as their subject.

It would appear that S/V 3, according to subject matter, ought to come next:

S/V 3 (Re 37, K 43, P 18)

So that it is in every way plain that no other name applies to the eternity of the Word than this which the most holy disciple of the Lord and apostle John said in the beginning of the Gospel. For when he, after the assumption of the flesh, is proclaimed Christ and also Jesus, Life and also Way and Day and Resurrection and Door and Bread and if there be any other [thing] named by the Divine Scriptures, ~not~ because of this is it fitting for us to be ignorant of the first name, which is Word. For because of this also the most holy evangelist and disciple of the Lord, mightily roused in spirit, mindful of the beginning from above and of nothing more new, said 'In the Beginning was the

Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, in order that he might show that, if there is some fresh and newer name, this belonged to him from the fresh and new economy according to the flesh.

This is not a difficult placing: all that the *Contra Marcellum* tells us of this fragment (which Eusebius includes in the introductory section on Scripture misuse) is that it comes before S/V 4 (Re 1, K 1).<sup>20</sup> S/V 4 would then come next:

S/V 4 (Re 1, K 1, P 19)

That no greater name has existed than Jesus of those named on the earth, the Gospel bears witness where the angel says to Mary, “Do not be afraid, for you have found favour with God. And behold, you shall conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and he shall be called the Son of the Most High.” And it is plain also from the prophecy of Zechariah, which prophesied of old concerning this name, for he says ‘The Lord showed me Jesus the great priest standing before the face of the angel of the Lord, and the Devil stood on his right to accuse him. And the Lord said to the Devil, ‘May the Lord who has chosen Jerusalem rebuke you.’ For when did he rebuke him? When he joined the human being beloved by him to his own Word. He said ‘The one who has chosen Jerusalem’, manifestly this of ours, concerning which the apostle says ‘But our Jerusalem is above, for this other is in bondage with her children.’ For at that time, having come to be in that same great Jerusalem, that is in our church, he rebuked the Devil according to the prophecy, having said ‘Depart from before me, Satan, for you are a stumbling-block to me.’ So then he is the great priest, of whom the then Jesus preserved the type. For it was not possible that that one be called a great priest, though having become glorious in all things, Moses not being called great; for Moses was so great that he was even called servant of God, and he was called ‘God of Pharaoh’ by God himself. But if someone should suppose Jesus to be

---

<sup>20</sup> *CM* 1.2.24 (p. 12, line30)

called great according to this, that he was deemed worthy to lead the people into the holy land, and he did many other wonders, let him know also through this, that the greatness spoken of in the case of Jesus belonged not so much to the prototype, but to the future bringing in a little later of his own people into this great Jerusalem.

This would give a sequence in which Marcellus begins by showing that, unlike the Eusebians, the Old Testament prophets spoke frequently of the Logos of God, goes on to tell us that John the Evangelist revealed it as eternal, mentions other witnesses of its eternity, shows us that the eternity of the Logos comes from its being an innate faculty as well as an activity of God, not to be divided from the Godhead, and sums up the section by reminding his readers that Logos is the eternal name, and other names come after the Incarnation, presumably following this with a discussion of the post-Incarnation names themselves.

So we now have in place the sequence S/V 67-68-6-70-71-3-4. But we can only justify this by finding a hole in Eusebius' order, where a jump backwards and later a jump forwards again might be disguised. S/V 67 cannot begin the jump backwards, since it is introduced by 'and he plainly introduces a mere word...from what he adds, saying', as we saw above. But S/V 66 is introduced by 'And still more does he establish this through the things he writes in what follows, thus'.<sup>21</sup> This cannot be considered an indication of a jump, but in Eusebius' normal practice it does leave room for one, if ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς means the things Eusebius puts next, rather than what Marcellus put next. We know of at least one clear jump backwards covered by such an ambiguous phrase, at the end of list A: 'And the one having said these things reproved the same, as proclaiming the Son 'God', writing thus'.<sup>22</sup> This follows S/V 128 (Re 91, K 102, P 88) and is followed by S/V 117 (Re 72, K 82, P 75), an extract which Eusebius has already established as coming earlier in this list.

---

<sup>21</sup> *CM* II.2.7 (p. 36, line 1).

<sup>22</sup> *CM* I.4.62 (p. 30, lines 20-21).



The jump forward I want to place after V/S 71 (Re 28, K 33, P 17), for reasons which will become clear later. This fragment is followed by the phrase ‘And he adds to these things, saying’,<sup>23</sup> which demands a move forward but does not specify how far. At least some of Eusebius’ neutral ‘moving forward’ formulas must inevitably cover a considerable gap, and so this assumption is not impossible either when supported by the other logical connections we will soon be able to make.

So from this sequence of Eusebius’ we are left with the extract V/S 66 (Re 31, K 36, P 5) to place before the sequence we have already established. For this we need to look at the opening that Seibt established for Marcellus’ work. Ignoring Eusebius’ ἀντίκτα (in my view rightly, given Eusebius’ imprecise use of the word elsewhere) which precedes the first fragment he cites in his introductory section on ‘Marcellus’ misuse of Scripture’<sup>24</sup> (and which Rettberg for that reason numbered 1, although we soon learn that it is preceded by Rettberg’s 37-- Seibt’s 3), Seibt places the first fragment of list A as his Fragment 1. So we have the following as Marcellus’ opening, according to Seibt, after presumably a few words mentioning that he is attacking a work written by Asterius in defence of a letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia:

S/V 1 (Re 59, K 65, P 1)

So now I shall begin from the letter which was written by him in order to reply to each of the things written not rightly. He has written that he ‘believes in God, the Father Almighty, and in his Son the only-begotten God, our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit,’ and he says that he had learned this mode of Godly piety from the Divine Scriptures. And I accept heartily the things that are said whenever he should say this, for this mode of Godly piety is common to all of us, to believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. But whenever he should say, having guessed at the power of the divine, more humanly for us, through a certain clever analysis, ‘the Father is Father and the Son, Son,’ it is no longer safe to praise such an analysis. For through such an analysis it comes about that the heresy currently thought up by them increases, which clearly, I think, is easy to

---

<sup>23</sup> *CM* II.2.14 (p. 37, line 17).

<sup>24</sup> *CM* I.2.1 (p. 9, line 1).

demonstrate from his writings. For he said that ‘it was necessary to acknowledge the Father to be truly Father and the Son truly Son and the Holy Spirit likewise.’

‘Whence next he attempts through longer things to dismantle the argument about these things’ Eusebius comments, ‘for he wishes to confess that Christ is mere and like to human Logos, and not a Son truly living and subsistent [having hypostasis].<sup>25</sup> These longer things may well have included S/V 66:

S/V 66 (Re 31, K 36, P 5)

So he seems consequently to have said that it says ‘he was begotten before the ages’; for the one who came forth becomes offspring of the Father who brought forth. But the other is no longer received by him either healthily or piously. For saying that the one which came forth from him is not Word, but simply ‘only Son’, and that this is the true mode of generation, is wont to convey a certain emphasis of a human aspect to the hearers.

The passage here cited, Proverbs 8.23, Marcellus will discuss at length later in the work, but this extract seems to fit fairly well into this early discussion of the difference between the appellations ‘Son’ and ‘Logos’. To place it before fragment S/V 67, if we accept the move of that fragment and those that follow already proposed, does less violence to Eusebius’ indications of Marcellus’ order, as we have seen.

Asterius went on, according to the proposed new order, to argue that the Son, having a different name, must be a different entity (hypostasis) from the Father, just as a human son is distinct from his father. Marcellus counters this move of Asterius’, as we have seen, by the claim that Son (and every other name implying a separate entity) is a title only to be applied after the Incarnation, and that before that we can only speak of the Logos.

---

<sup>25</sup> *CM I.4.7* (p. 18, lines 32-35).

Somewhere before S/V 6, according to List B, we have to fit in S/V 5. List B, as we have already seen earlier, begins as follows:

‘Having laid into those who said that the Son of God is truly Son both living and subsistent [having hypostasis], he makes his own opinion plain, writing in these very words thus:

S/V 5 (Re 42, K 48, P 12)

So then, before the coming down and the being born of the virgin there was only Word. Since what else was there before that which came down in the last days, as he also wrote, and that which was born from the virgin assumed human flesh? There was nothing other than Word.’

From here, we may assume, Marcellus went on to discuss Scriptural support for the title Logos, as in the sequence established above. And so we should place it after S/V 66 but before S/V 67.

The sequence I have just proposed (S/V 66-5-67-68-6-70-71-3-4)<sup>26</sup> has above all the advantage of gathering all the exegesis of John 1 together in one place. The only violence it does to Eusebius’ evidence, as I pointed out earlier, is to assume that, instead of trawling through Marcellus’ text from beginning to end in order for his list of Logos quotations (List B), Eusebius picked out a few fairly widely-spaced extracts first of all and then returned to an earlier point in the work and went through it somewhat more densely. Eusebius’ connectives do not actively suggest this, but they do allow it.

---

<sup>26</sup> P 5-12-13-14-15-16-17-18-19-20

Having proposed these changes to Seibt's ordering, I will add one or two more minor ones at this point. S/V 66 should come before S/V 5 in my proposed ordering, but could come anywhere between S/V 1 (P 1) and S/V 5 (P 12)- which are somewhat farther apart in the new reconstruction, as we shall see.

The question is how to take Eusebius' indication 'Having laid into those who said that the Son of God is truly Son both living and subsistent, he makes his own opinion plain.' Are those who believe in a Son with his own hypostasis here only Asterius and Eusebius of Nicomedia, mentioned in S/V 1 and 2, or do they include Paulinus and Origen, who are mentioned in the next extract but three in Eusebius' List A (the list of Marcellus' invectives against Origen and the Eusebian bishops)? If so, and S/V 5 comes after the section on Origen, we would have the order S/V 1-2-9-10-17-18-19-20-21-22, which is exactly the order of Eusebius' List A, followed by S/V 5-67-68-6-70-71-3-4. S/V 66 could come anywhere after S/V 1 in the first list, but by association of subject I will place it after S/V 10, because the Scripture passage with which it deals, Proverbs 8.22ff., is discussed immediately after the passage which is partly the subject of S/V 10, Colossians 1.15.

We now turn to Eusebius' List C, Marcellus' views on the flesh of Christ, and the remaining fragments from Seibt's opening section. I place S/V 7 and 8 after S/V 4:

S/V 7 (Re 36, K 42, P 20)

For the Word 'was in the Beginning', being nothing other than Word; but the human being united to the Word, not being formerly, became a human being as John teaches us, saying, 'And the Word became flesh.' So then, because of this he appears making mention of the Word alone; for if the Divine Scripture makes mention of the name either of Jesus or of Christ, it appears to name the Word of God being with human flesh. But if anyone should promise also to be able to show before the New Covenant the name of Christ the Son in the case of the Word alone, he shall find this to have been said prophetically, just as also is plain from this; for he says 'The kings of the earth have taken their stand and the rulers have gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ.'

V/S 8 (Re 44, K 49, P 21)

So reasonably before the coming down this was, as we have said many times, Word; but after the coming down and the assumption of the flesh, he obtained different appellations also, since ‘The Word became flesh.’

This order is suggested partly as following an assumed credal order of the opening statements (where the Son as Logos precedes the Son taking flesh), and partly for the sake of making true the statement of S/V 8 ‘So reasonably, before the coming down, this one was Logos, as we have said many times’. Next would follow a section of exegesis of Colossians 1.15b, as list C tells us,<sup>27</sup> with S/V 12 (P 23) added from the Scripture misuse section after S/V 11 as Seibt has established, giving us 7-8-11-12-13-14-15-16,<sup>28</sup> which would be followed in order by the section of exegesis of Proverbs 8.22ff., as also indicated by list C,<sup>29</sup> Seibt’s 23 to 45 (and probably, as we shall see in the next section, 46).<sup>30</sup> Next would follow the exegesis of Colossians 1.15a, also following the indications of list C,<sup>31</sup> and the established list S/V 51 to 56 (K 90 to 95).<sup>32</sup>

This gives us the re-established opening sequence S/V 1-2-9-10-66-17-18-19-20-21-22-5-67-68-6-70-71-3-4-7-8-11-12-13-14-15-16-23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30-31-32-33-34-35-36-37-38-39-40-41-42-43-44-45-46-51-52-53-54-55-56.<sup>33</sup> Only fragments S/V 47-50, 57-60, 61-65 and 69 remain so far unaccounted for from Seibt’s sequence 1 to 71.

---

<sup>27</sup> CM II.3.4 (p. 44, lines 24ff.).

<sup>28</sup> P 20 to 27.

<sup>29</sup> CM II.3.8 (p. 45, lines 29ff.).

<sup>30</sup> P 28 to 51.

<sup>31</sup> CM II.3.22 (p. 48, lines 16ff.).

<sup>32</sup> P 52 to 57.

<sup>33</sup> Renumbered as P 1 to 57.

**B. Seibt's fragments 47-50, 60-65, 69, 72-75, 113-128.**

Eusebius' List A, the list in which he picks out extracts where Marcellus 'slanders' the Eusebian party, falls, as Seibt recognised, into two main sections, with a couple of floating fragments in the middle. The first section (S/V 1-2-9-10-17-18-19-20-21-22)<sup>34</sup> focuses on the letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre which Asterius is defending, and attacks these named individuals and Origen, who 'became the teacher of Paulinus and of the others.'<sup>35</sup>

'Having said these things and having added other things for the overthrow of the fact that the Son came to be before the ages, he adds in these words'<sup>36</sup> S/V 46, a placing (after the exegesis of Proverbs 8.22ff) of Seibt's which is probably correct.

S/V 46 (Re 79, K 89, P 51)

But I ask those reading the holy scriptures, as having truly received seeds and beginnings of this exposition, to apply more demonstrations to the things which have been said, so that the opinions of those perverting the faith be exposed still more. 'For they have truly deserted the God who begot them, and dug for themselves leaky cisterns.'

'Having reviled such things also through these things, he attempts next to show that neither is the Son image of God, saying thus:'

S/V 51 (Re 80, K 90, P 52)

It follows, I suppose, to say a few short words concerning the image. For he wrote 'But the one who was born from him is other, "who is the image of the invisible God"'. Asterius makes mention

---

<sup>34</sup> P 1 to 4, 6 to 11.

<sup>35</sup> S/V 18 (P 7)

<sup>36</sup> *CM* 1.4.29 (p. 24, lines 1-2).



of ‘the image of the invisible God’ because of this, in order that he might teach ‘God differs from the Word so much, as much as even a human being seems to differ from its own image.’<sup>37</sup>

This introduces a section of extracts claiming that the human Christ, rather than the Logos, is the image of God, of which List A gives S/V 51, 53 and 54, and which Rettberg had already convincingly established as a sequence (Re 80-84, K 90-95, S/V 51-56, P 52-57).

List A next gives us the following two transitions:

(S/V 54)

and going on, again, he reviles saying thus

(S/V 60).

And after these things, having stretched out a long discourse (μακρὸν λόγον), he adds

(S/V 113).<sup>38</sup>

Seibt has the ‘μακρὸν λόγον’ cover nearly half of Marcellus’ ten-thousand-line work, and relegates all the remaining fragments of List A (S/V 113-128) to the end of the work. These fragments contain bitter attacks on the theology and the actions of Asterius, Narcissus of Neronias, Eusebius of Caesarea and Paulinus of Tyre. According to Seibt, Marcellus ended his work with these attacks. But there is good evidence for placing them, not at the end of the *Contra Asterium*, but in the middle.

First of all, let us look at fragments S/V 113 and 114, which Seibt makes the beginning of the end of Marcellus’ work. (114 comes from Acacius of Caesarea’s *Contra Marcellum*, as quoted in Epiphanius, rather than Eusebius’, but its placing after S/V 113 (Re 85, K 96) was established by Rettberg.)

---

<sup>37</sup> *CM*1.4.30 (p. 24, lines 9-10).

<sup>38</sup> *CM*1.4.32-34 (p. 24, line 23- p. 25, line 14).

S/V 113 (Re 85, K 96)

So what will he say against these things? For I do not think him to have anything to say against this. For I do not also think that he would confess clearly and openly concerning other things, which he hides in his own mind, as is clearly to be learned from the things which he wrote. For he says ‘The Father who begat from himself the only-begotten Word and First-born of all creation, the One who begat the one, the Perfect, the Perfect, the King, the King, the Lord, the Lord, God, God, the unvarying image of both essence and will and glory and power.’ These words clearly expose his base opinion concerning divinity. For how is the one having been begotten Lord and God, as he already said, able to be ‘the image of God’? For the image of God is one thing, and God another. So if image, not Lord or God, but image of the Lord and God. But if being Lord and God, the Lord and God is no longer able to be image of the Lord and God.

S/V 114 (Re 86, K 97)

Then he wishes him to be nothing of which he spoke before; for he says him to be the image of all these. So then, if he is the image of essence, he is no longer able to be the same essence; and if he is the image of will, he is no longer to be will itself, and if the image of power, no longer power; and if the image of glory, no longer glory. For the image is not image of itself but of some other.

Seibt assumes that S/V 113 sums up all of Marcellus’ own arguments against Asterius, and takes the references to βασιλεύς to mean that this fragment comes after Marcellus’ discussion of Christ’s kingship before the Last Judgement. But Marcellus is clearly more interested in the word εἰκών in this list at this point than in the word βασιλεύς. Rettberg placed this fragment immediately after the series Re 80-84 (S/V 51-56, K 90-95), which also deals with Marcellus’ theology of image, a placing I would agree with.

Marcellus’ theology of image (which is very different from that of his friends Eustathius and Athanasius) was, I maintain, central to his thought. For Marcellus, it is the man Jesus who is the image of God. The Logos before the Incarnation cannot be the image of the invisible God, being itself invisible: an image (Marcellus

is here thinking of a statue) exists in order to make what is unseen seen. It is his dwelling on the craziness of thinking otherwise, in my reconstruction, that leads him thence to animadvert on those who believe in two or three essences, and on the crimes of the Eusebians in general: this follows the order of list A. It is notable that he nowhere in this section mentions Eusebius of Nicomedia, the original target, with Asterius, of the work, which also argues against this being simply the work's summing-up.

But if fragments S/V 113-128 come immediately after fragments S/V 51-56, how does Marcellus, having raged at length against the Eusebians in general and Eusebius of Caesarea in particular, come to return tamely to exegesis and to his former careful picking apart of Asterius' argument? I think we can see two traces of this change of gear, one in Marcellus' own words and one in Eusebius'.

S/V 57 (Re 23, K 28)

So now because of this it seems to me to hold good even now to go through things concerning which I have not yet been through earlier. For most of the things written by him have become clear from the things already written by us. He says 'From the womb before the daystar I begot you.' For he thought assuredly, I suppose, that the hijacked preposition 'from' would agree with the thought of the heresy. Wherefore, having taken away the most proper meaning from the syllable, he wished to signify his birth of old from above.

We cannot tell what 'because of this' refers to, but I would suggest that 'this' was the necessity of refuting every last argument of Asterius' in case any of them should happen to take in the unwary. (Eusebius uses a similar argument to explain his writing of *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* after he has already written one work against Marcellus).<sup>39</sup> This phrase would mark a shift back from invective against the Eusebians to measured argument once more. This fragment comes from Eusebius' introductory misuse of Scripture section, but it is part of a group of three

---

<sup>39</sup> *ET* I.1.2 (p. 62, lines 10ff.).

fragments of exegesis of Ps 109.3 (S/V 57-58-59), the last of which appears in list C after S/V 56.

The second indication of a hiatus is in Eusebius' own comment, *τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν, ἐπαναλαβὼν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς τὸν λόγον τοῦτον δογματίζει τὸν τρόπον* ('Having said so many things, having taken up from the beginning he waxes dogmatic about the Logos in this way', or possibly 'having taken up the discourse from the beginning he asserts in this way'.)<sup>40</sup> What does Eusebius mean by 'having taken up from the beginning'? Would this not be covered by Marcellus' going back to discuss the begetting of the Son after a long digression?

Further support is given to this theory by the two fragments which precede this comment of Eusebius', S/V 74 and 75 (Re 64-65, K 73-74). These discuss Asterius' exegesis of John 10.30, 'I and the Father are one'. Jesus says this, Asterius claims, 'Because of the perfect harmony in all things, both words and works.' Marcellus violently disagrees with this exegesis:

S/V 74 (Re 64, K 73, P 84)

So if he himself says these things, 'I came forth from the Father and I am come', and again 'and the Word which you hear is not mine but that of the Father who sent me', and 'those things which the Father has are mine', it is clear that he was also reasonably saying this, 'The Father is in me and I am in the Father', in order that the Word, who says this, might be in God, and the Father in the Word, because the Word is the power of the Father. For a witness worthy of belief has called him 'the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.' Not, as Asterius said, 'So because of the perfect harmony in all words and works, the Saviour says "I and the Father are one"', but because it is impossible for either the Word to be divided from God or God from his own Word. For if Asterius thinks the Saviour to have said this 'because of the harmony in all things', and does not, having regard to the second economy, wish to learn the truth, it is necessary to remind him how sometimes it is possible to see disharmony according to the appearance. For thus the words teach us. For what kind of harmony is this, in the time of suffering, when he says 'Father, if it is possible, let this cup

---

<sup>40</sup> CM II.2.26 (p. 39, lines 27-28).

pass', but also adds this, 'only, not as I will but as you will.' For it was not of one agreeing to say first of all 'Let this cup pass'; but also the thing that is added seems to be nothing pertaining to harmony, for he says 'Let not my will, but yours, come to pass, Father.' You hear how the letter makes clear the lack of harmony according to the appearance, the one willing and the other not willing. For that the Father was willing it is clear from the fact that what he wanted happened. And that the Son was not willing it is clear from the fact that he pleaded to be let off. And again he says 'I do not seek my will, but the will of the Father who sent me.' So how then does he say the Saviour to have said 'because of the harmony in all things' 'I and the Father are one?'

S/V 75 (Re 64, K 74, P 85)

How is the Son able to have harmony with the Father, or the Father with the Son, the Son saying 'All things which the Father has are mine'? For it was directly of the Son defrauding the Father to say 'All things which the Father has are mine.' For thanks to this, having omitted to say 'All things which the father has are common', he said 'All things which the Father has are mine'. Though it was not proper for the one who is in harmony to speak thus, but 'All things which the Father has are common.' For if the Acts of the Apostles, praising the harmony of the ones then coming to the faith, said 'All things were common to them', and it behoves to think all things to be common in the case of human beings who are able to be in harmony, by how much more was it necessary for the father and the Son to share commonness, being divided into two hypostases? But now in saying 'All things which the Father has are mine', the Son seems to be defrauding the Father; and now in saying him not to be lord over even his own word, but his Father to be- for he says 'The word which you hear is not mine, but that of the Father who sent me'- he shows the Father to be appropriating the proper things of his child. But each seems according to the thought of Asterius not to have consequently been said. For it was necessary for the one in harmony not to appropriate the just things belonging to another, for this indeed would be greedy, but to think the things belonging to each to be common. So that when we look at the human flesh, not, as Asterius wrote, will we thus find the Saviour to have said 'I and the father are one'. For not 'because of the perfect harmony in all words and works', as he wrote, did the Saviour say 'I and the Father are one'. For if this were so, he would assuredly have said 'I and the father are in harmony with one another in all things'. But now he said 'I and the father are one.' So then, if there was some disharmony among them, and it is necessary for the lord to speak the truth, it is fitting that Saviour know accurately, that when he should say 'I and the Father are one', then he says this, not looking to the human being he assumed, but to the Word which came forth from the father. For if there should seem to be any disharmony, this ought to be referred to the weakness of the flesh which the Word assumed, not having had it before; but if oneness should be said, this seems to belong to the Word. Because of this, he not only

reasonably said 'I and the Father are one', but also this: 'I am with you for so long a time, Philip, and you say "Show me the Father"?', clearly not to these eyes, but to the intelligible eyes, able to see intelligible things. For the Father exists invisible to the eyes of the flesh, and also his Word. He did not say this to Philip: 'So because of the harmony in all things.'

Rettberg noticed that there is harmony in all things, both words and ideas, between these fragments and his Re 63 (S/V 125, K 72, P 83):

For Asterius asserted according to this, that the Father and the Son are one and the same only according to the fact that they are in harmony in all things. For he spoke thus: 'And because of the perfect harmony in all things, both words and works, the Saviour says 'I and the Father are one.'

Rettberg must be right in placing this fragment before S/V 74. But if this is so, S/V 74 and 75 come in the middle of the anti-Eusebians section. This would mean that Eusebius' 'Having said so many things, having taken up from the beginning' would indeed come after the anti-Eusebians section, as we had thought.

It remains to follow through the implications of this reordering, and to make sure it contradicts none of Eusebius' definite indications as to order.

One apparent problem comes to light:

S/V 60 (Re 24, K 29)

So how do those 'full of guile and wickedness', to speak apostolically, transfer the saying to his first creation, as they think it is, David having clearly spoken these things concerning his birth according to the flesh?

According to List A, this fragment must come before S/V 113, and so before the anti-Eusebian section. But Seibt connects it with fragments S/V 57-59, the exegesis of Psalm 109.3, which, as we have just established, come after the anti-Eusebian material. This does look plausible, since the fragment must come from a section of



psalm exegesis, since it mentions David. But it could well refer to some other short passage of psalm exegesis (perhaps LXX Ps 38.7 μέντοι γε ἐν εἰκόνι διαπορεύεται ἄνθρωπος), which Eusebius saw no need to cite Marcellus' thoughts on.

From the beginning of the section on the theology of image, we now have the following order:

S/V 51-52-53-54-55-56-60-113-114-115-116-117-118-119-120-121-122-123-124-72-125 -74-75-126-127-128-57-58-59.

Leaving aside fragments S/V 76-112, which I will argue in the next section to constitute the end of the work, we are now left with fragments S/V 47-50, 61-65 (the first and last of which come after S/V 53, according to list B),<sup>41</sup> 69, 72 (which should come shortly before 74, according to list B)<sup>42</sup> and 73 (which comes somewhere after 65, according to list B).<sup>43</sup>

In the case of these fragments, the placing begins to become somewhat arbitrary, but I will make what suggestions I can. The grouping S/V 61-65 is proposed by Seibt because the new fragments 62-63-64 are grouped together in *ET* (though without any order indications), and come shortly after 61 (whose subject-matter they to some extent resemble):

S/V 61 (Re 49, K 54, P 63)

So now, what was this that 'came down' before the incarnation (ἐνανθρώπησις)? Surely, I suppose, he says 'the Spirit'. For if he should wish to say something other than this, the angel will

---

<sup>41</sup> *CM* II.2.5-6 (p. 35, lines 25-36).

<sup>42</sup> *CM* II.2.15 (p. 37, line 21).

<sup>43</sup> *CM* II.2.6 (p. 35, line 32).

not permit him, having said to the Virgin 'The holy Spirit will come upon you.' But if he will say that it is Spirit, let him hear the Saviour saying 'God is Spirit.'

S/V 62 (not in Rettberg or Klostermann; P 64)

'The spirit of our person, Christ the Lord, was entrapped in their corruptions.'

S/V 63 (Re 51, K 56, P 65)

Here also likewise the prophet discusses the Word's having assumed our flesh.

S/V 64 (Re 51, K 57, P 66)

A Spirit can never be productive of a shadow. But that God himself is Spirit, the Saviour said 'God is Spirit'. And that God is light, he himself teaches us, saying 'I am the light'.

S/V 65 (Re 39, K 45, P 67)

So now let him also learn that the Word of God came, not 'called Word according to usage', as they say, but being true Word.

After these, according to list B, comes S/V 73:<sup>44</sup>

S/V 73 (Re 63, K 71, P 74)

For if the inspection of the Spirit should be made alone, the Word should reasonably appear to be one and the same with God; but if the addition according to the flesh should be inspected in the case of the Saviour, the Godhead seems to spread out by power alone, so that reasonably the monad is truly undivided.

---

<sup>44</sup> See note 43.

S/V 73 is a dead end in list B, if what I have argued above is correct: Eusebius then returned to a point much earlier in Marcellus' work. But the subject-matter (the Spirit, the Word and God) matches to some extent.

The subject-matter also matches to some extent with that of fragments S/V 47-50, a free-floating group cited only in *ET*:

S/V 47 (Re 60, K 66, P 68)

For it is impossible for three hypostases, if there were such, to be united with a monad, unless the triad should first have its origin from a monad. For the holy Paul said these things to have been summed up in a monad, which belong to God in no wise with respect to oneness; for the Word and the Spirit alone belong to God with respect to oneness.

S/V 48 (Re 60, K 67, P 69)

So then, if the word should appear having come forth from the Father himself and coming to us, but the Holy Spirit, as Asterius also confessed, proceeds from the Father, and again the Saviour says concerning the Spirit 'He will speak not from himself, but he shall speak those things which he hears, and he shall proclaim to you the things which are to come. He shall glorify me, because he will receive from what is mine and declare it to you,' does not the monad appear here clearly and manifestly with ineffable reason, broadening to a triad but in no wise enduring to be divided? For if the Word proceeds from the Father, and it is confessed that the Spirit himself proceeds from the Father also, and again that the Saviour says concerning the Spirit 'He shall receive from what is mine, and declare it to you', is it not luminously clear that a certain hidden mystery is being uncovered? For how, unless the monad, being indivisible, should be broadened into a triad, is it possible for him at one time to say, concerning the Spirit, at one time that he proceeds from the Father, and at another time to say, 'He will receive from what is mine, and declare it to you', and again, having breathed on the disciples, to have said 'Receive the Holy Spirit'? For how, if he proceeds from the Father, does he promise to receive this ministry from the Son? For it is necessary, if there be 'two divided persons', as Asterius said, either for the Spirit, proceeding from the father, not to need the ministry of the Son (for it is necessary for everything proceeding from the Father to be perfect, in no wise needing help from another), or, if he receives from the Son, and from his power ministers the grace, he no longer proceeds from the Father.

S/V 49 (Re 60, K 68, P 70)

But if the Gospel says that, having breathed on the disciples, he said 'receive the Spirit', it is clear that the Spirit went out from the Word. So if the Spirit went forth from the Word, how does the same 'proceed' again 'from the Father'?

S/V 50 (Re 60, K 69, P 71)

So not rightly nor fittingly did he say that 'there are three hypostases', having said it not once but even twice.

One more fragment which seems to match the subject-matter of this section is S/V 72:

S/V 72 (Re 61, K 70, P 73)

That the economy according to the flesh belongs to the human being we know, but that the eternity is united to the Father according to the Spirit we have come to believe.

According to list B, this fragment comes before S/V 74:

S/V 72 (Re 61, K 70, P 73)

Going on, next he adds these things to these things

S/V 74 (Re 64, K 73, P 84).<sup>45</sup>

Seibt placed S/V 73 between S/V 72 and 74, because of an indication to this effect in *ET*:

S/V 72 (Re 61, K 70, P 73)

---

<sup>45</sup> See note 42

Indeed in this way having given the Logos to be in God, he next declares to be one and the same with him, saying here

S/V 73 (Re 62, K 71, P 74)

and again going on he says

S/V 74 (Re 64, K 73, P 84).<sup>46</sup>

Because this is *not* the order in which these fragments appear in the *Contra Marcellum*, we should take these indications seriously, especially since they come shortly after some new citations from Marcellus' original work.

We are left with fragment S/V 69.

69 (Re 38, K 44, P72 )

For Sabellius himself also having slipped from the right faith, knew neither God nor his holy Word accurately. For the one not knowing the Word did not know the Father either. For it says 'No-one knows the Father except the Son', that is the Word. For the Word provides the knowledge of the Father through himself. For thus also he was saying to those of the Jews thinking at that time that they knew God, but setting aside his Word, through whom only God is known: 'No-one recognises the Father except the Son and whoever the Son should reveal him to.' For since it was not possible to know God otherwise, he teaches human beings to know him through his own Word; so that he also stumbled, not knowing the Father or his Word accurately.

This might come almost anywhere in the work, but I will place it between S/V 50 and S/V 72.

So we now have the tentative order S/V 61-62-63-64-65-47-48-49-50-69-72-73-74. S/V 72 and 73 have to be placed as close as possible to 74 because Eusebius uses the word ἐξῆς of both connections. There will still be something of a gap in the scheme I am about to propose.

---

<sup>46</sup> ET II.3.4-2.4.2 (p. 102, lines 16-30).

This sequence, as has been noted, if it is correct, must come after S/V 53. It must also come before S/V 126, since S/V 74 and 75 follow directly on from S/V 125. If we assume that S/V 113 and 114 continue the discussion of the theology of image of fragments S/V 51-56, and so should not be interrupted with extraneous material, this section must come between fragments S/V 115 and 125.

After this point, the placing very much does become arbitrary, since we must assume this section to be part of the refutation of the theology of one or more of the Eusebians, without any other information to help us. It seems likely that Narcissus of Neronias is implicated, since fragments S/V 47-50 mention three hypostaseis, and Narcissus is cited as believing in three ousiai, which Marcellus at least viewed as a synonym. I have placed our hypothetical section on the Spirit and the monad and triad after S/V 116, the mention of Narcissus' belief in three ousiai, which seems to usher in a long theological discussion, but it could probably also be placed before or after S/V 124. This would give us the order up to this point as 1-2-9-10-66-17-18-19-20-21-22-5-67-68-6-70-71-3-4-7-8-11-12-13-14-15-16-23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30-31-32-33-34-35-36-37-38-39-40-41-42-43-44-45-46-51-52-53-54-55-56-60-113-114-115-116-61-62-63-64-65-47-48-49-50-69-72-73-117-118-119-120-121-122-123-124-125-74-75-126-127-128-57-58-59.

### **C. Seibt's fragments 76-112.**

The remaining fragments are found at the ends of Lists B and C, with one in the 'Scripture misuse' section of the *Contra Marcellum* and eight in *ET*:

(List B) S/V 76-77-87-88-89-91-94-96-98-109 [110,111]

(List C) 57-58-59-78-79-80-81-82-83-99-100-101-102-103-104-105-106-107-108-109.

('Scripture misuse') 112.



(*ET*) 84-86, 90, 92-93, 95, 97

Seibt identified, following the above indications of order, a group of fragments which involve exegesis of Exodus 3.13ff and then other Old Testament texts proving that God the Father and the Logos are one God: S/V 85-86-87-89-92-93-95-97. According to list B, fragments S/V 76-77 must go before this section, and 88 and 91 must be placed before and after 89.<sup>47</sup> S/V 90, a New Testament passage, also comes in this section, according to the indications of *ET*, some time after 86 and probably before 91 (also a New Testament passage).<sup>48</sup>

This gives us the order S/V 76-77-85-86-87-88-89-90-91-92-93-95-97, which agrees with Seibt so far. However, I think fragments S/V 84, 94, 96 and the whole sequence 78-83 are best placed elsewhere than where Seibt placed them. 84 is one of his more arbitrary placings: *ET* does not place it in a sequence, or connect it with any other 'new' fragment (certainly not S/V 85 and 86), but cites it along with S/V 106 and 109<sup>49</sup> in the eschatology section- the section where Rettberg placed it, and where one would expect to find it, in fact:

S/V 84 (Re 114, K 127, P 116)

[He said that] the Word of God had prepared human flesh to become immortal through the resurrection, and has taken his seat at the right hand of the Father, wearing it like some crown of victory.

Fragment S/V 94 is one of those which could be placed anywhere, but list B signifies that it should come between S/V 91 and 96:<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> *CM* II.2.26-31 (p. 39, line 29 - p.40, line 24); *CM* II.2.31-34 (p. 40, line 27 - p. 41, line 10).

<sup>48</sup> *ET* II.19.2-8 (p. 123, line 14 - p. 124, line 21).

<sup>49</sup> *ET* III.10.6 (p. 167, lines 7-9).

<sup>50</sup> *CM* II.2.34-35 (p. 41, lines 6-20).

S/V 91 (Re 68, K 77, P 100)

What then? Unless, giving heed to the Spirit, we think the Monad to be indivisible in power, will we not miss the mark, the Word clearly teaching us, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him alone shall you serve'? And he also proclaims the same thing through the Gospel according to Mark; for one certain scribe having come to him, and asking "Which is the first of the commandments?", he answered him thus, saying "First of all: 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and you shall love the Lord your God with all your soul and with all your strength.' This is first; and the second is like this one: 'You shall love your neighbour as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these." And the scribe answered him, "You have spoken well, Teacher, in truth, because God is one and there is no other besides him." But the Scribe, seeming to have learned Godly piety from the Law, appears as praising the word of the Saviour, who is saying 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one', and binding himself with an oath that he had spoken well; for he said 'in truth you have said that God is one and there is no other besides him.' But those boasting that they know the mysteries of the New Covenant, these even wish to imagine 'a second God divided from the Father by hypostasis and by power.'

And going on again, he affirms, saying:

S/V 94 (Re 40, K 46, P 105)

...not 'called the Word according to usage', though those teaching otherwise should burst with lying, but being properly and truly Word.

And he adds:

S/V 96 (Re 45, K 50, P 107)

For what else was the hidden mystery than that concerning the Word? But this former mystery was thus hidden 'in God', so that no-one of the former people should know clearly the things according to the Word, but we should enjoy now the riches 'of the glory' and of the hidden mystery.

Fragment S/V 91 clearly belongs to the section on Old Testament exegesis demonstrating that the Father and the Logos are one God. Fragment S/V 96, I will argue, begins (or nearly begins) a section on soteriology. Fragments 92, 93, 95 and 97 (a sequence of new fragments in *ET*) clearly still belong to the section of OT exegesis: 94 marks a shift, I would argue, back from the immanent God (Father and undivided Logos) of the previous section to the Logos coming forth as activity (ἐνέργεια) for the Incarnation.

S/V 96 would then begin the section on soteriology (preceded by 110, I will hazard shortly), followed by S/V 98, and then by Seibt's section 78 to 84.

Seibt placed his fragments 78 and 79 after his fragments 76 and 77 because they share the words δόξα and ἐξουσία:

S/V 76 (Re 92, K 103, P 92)

For before the whole creation there was a certain quiet, as is likely, the Word being in God. For if Asterius has believed God to be 'creator of all things', it is clear that he too will confess with us, the one to exist eternally, never ever having received a beginning of being, and the other things to have come to be by him, and to have come to be from what was not. For I do not think him to believe in this also the one who says certain things also to be ingenerate, but to be persuaded precisely that both the heavens and the earth, and all things which are in the heavens and on the earth, came to be by God. So now if he should believe this, it is necessary for him to confess this also with us, that there was nothing else except for God. So the Word had his own glory (δόξα), being in the Father.

S/V 77 (Re 93, K 104, P 93)

Asterius names the authority (ἐξουσία) given to him Glory, and not only glory but pre-cosmic glory, not considering that, the world not yet having come to be, there was nothing else apart from God alone.

S/V 78 (Re 94, K 105, P 109)

For the human being received authority (ἐξουσία) not only over affairs on earth, but also reasonably over affairs in the heavens; for if, when he became both 'a human being' and 'mediator between God and human beings', then 'All things were created for him', as the apostle said, 'things in the heavens and things on the earth', it follows to know exactly that the authority is given to him not only of the things on earth, but also of the things in the heavens.

S/V 79 (Re 95, K 106)

For if the Holy Gospel speaks concerning a certain glory (δόξα) given to him from the Father, the human being appears to have received this through the Word. For having become 'mediator of God and human beings', according to the holy apostle, by means of the glory given to him from the Father he glorified Godly-pious human beings.

Admittedly, three of these fragments do draw on exegesis of the same passage (Col 1.15ff., which is a thread which runs throughout the *Contra Asterium*) and are probably part of the same argument. But they reflect different ends of that argument, the glory according to the first and second economies, as Marcellus would say. It is possible to view fragments S/V 77 and 78 as interrupted precisely by the Old Testament demonstration of the oneness of God with which we have just been dealing.

Fragment S/V 96, which I would place shortly before fragments S/V 78 and 79, also mentions glory, as we have seen:

S/V 96 (Re 45, K 50, P 107)

For what else was the hidden mystery than that concerning the Word? But this former mystery was thus hidden 'in God', so that no-one of the former people should know clearly the things according to the Word, but we should enjoy now the riches 'of the glory' and of the hidden mystery.

This passage also draws on Colossians 1 (here, vv. 25-27), providing the connecting link between it and the other 'glory' passage, John 12.27-28, being drawn on in S/V 78 and 80 (and S/V 76 and 77). Marcellus goes on from V/S 96 (according to my ordering) to discuss the fittingness of the Logos for loosing the punishment appointed for Adam (V/S 98), and the role of the man Jesus Christ, united to the Logos, as the one mediator between God and human beings, receiving authority both over things on earth and things in the heavens (V/S 78) by receiving glory from the Father through the Logos (V/S 79), by being united to the Logos and being raised to 'more than human glory' in heaven (V/S 80), and by defeating on earth the devil Adam was formerly deceived by (V/S 81).

According to List C, next we have

V/S 82 (Re 35=97, K 109, P 113)

For this is 'the Beloved', the human being united to the Word, concerning whom the Evangelist said 'This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased.'

Here I would add the stray fragment

V/S 112 (Re 109, K 122, P 114)

This is the one concerning whom Paul said 'the pre-appointed Son of God.'

List C now adds<sup>51</sup>

S/V 83 (Re 98, K 110, P 115)

---

<sup>51</sup> *CM* II.3.35 (p. 51, lines 14-19).

The Word of the invisible God was going to be born through the Virgin, and to assume human flesh, also in order that through it, having prevailed against the Devil, who formerly overpowered the human being, he might prepare him to become not only incorruptible and immortal, but even enthroned in the heavens with God.

Seibt places next, probably correctly

S/V 84 (Re 114, K 127, P 116)

[He said that] the Word of God had prepared human flesh to become immortal through the resurrection, and has taken his seat at the right hand of the Father, wearing it like some crown of victory.

And after this sequence, I would argue, follows the sequence on eschatology (V/S 99 to 109), which caused Marcellus so much trouble and earned him the title of heretic. Asterius and the Eusebians have been lost sight of (since as long ago as fragment S/V 94, my fragment 105), and he is caught up in a sense of awe and excitement at the wonder of God's design, as he understands it. It is not entirely just to say that Marcellus believed Christ's kingdom would have an end, in the sense that that was not what he intended to say, but that is an inference from what he says that could be fairly easily made. But the consequences of this part of the work do bear out the views of historians such as T.D. Barnes, who claim that an ancient bishop's first duty in times of controversy is never to explain too clearly exactly what he believes.<sup>52</sup>

The last of the fragments, in my order, is S/V 109:

S/V 109 (Re 108, K 121, P 128 )

But if someone should ask concerning this flesh which became immortal in the Word, what do we say to him? That *we* do not think it is safe to be dogmatic concerning things which we have not



learned precisely from the Divine Scriptures. For how is it possible for those even overturning the dogmas of others to do this? But we shall say to those wishing to learn the exact account concerning this from us, that being persuaded by the holy apostle, we know that it is fitting for us to see the hidden mysteries thus, as he said; he says 'For now we see through a mirror in an enigma, but then face to face; now we know in parts, but then we will know just as we have also been known.' So do not ask me concerning things which I have not learned clearly from the Divine Scriptures. So now, because of this, neither will I be able to speak clearly concerning that divine flesh made fellow to the divine Word. But now I believe the Divine Scriptures, that God is One, and the Word of that [One God] on the one hand came forth of the Father, in order that 'All things' might come to be 'through him', but on the other after the time of judgement and the setting right of all things, and the disappearance of every opposing force, 'then he will be subjected to the one who subjected all things to him', 'to the God and Father', in order that thus the Word be in God, just as also he was before, before the world was. For there being earlier nothing other than God alone, but all things being about to come to be through the Word, the Word went forth with active energy, this being the Word of the Father.

This sounds very much like a peroration, gathering together the argument of the last forty-six fragments. There are two more fragments in List B, which are cited after S/V 109, and have similar points to make, but probably come from earlier in the argument. Eusebius cites them thus:

'And again he puts the same idea more clearly, saying:

S/V 110 (Re 54, K 60, P 106)

For before the world was, the Word was in the Father. But when God Almighty proposed to make all thing which are in the heavens and on the earth, the genesis of the world needed active energy, and because of this, there being nothing other than God, for all things are confessed to have come to be by him, then the Word having come forth became maker of the world, who earlier was preparing it intelligibly inside, as the prophet Solomon teaches us; saying 'When he prepared the heavens I was with him, and when he made firm the springs of that which is under heaven, when he was making strong the foundation of the earth, I was with him doing the joinery. I was the one in whom

---

<sup>52</sup> T.D. Barnes, *Constantine*, p. 240; *Athanasius*, p.16.

he rejoiced.’ For the Father rejoiced reasonably with wisdom and power, making all things through the Word.

‘And again, after all things (μετὰ πάντα), he adds, saying

S/V 111 (Re 34, K 41, P 117)

And because of this he does not name himself Son of God, but everywhere calls himself Son of Man, in order that he might prepare the human being through such a confession to become by fiat son of God because of fellowship with him, and after the end of the act to be again united as Word to God, fulfilling this which had been said earlier by the apostle: ‘Then he will be subject to the one who subjected all thing to him, in order that God might be all in all.’ For then there will be this which was formerly.’<sup>53</sup>

Since S/V 110 is concerned with the ‘first economy’, the creation of the world, I have placed it just after S/V 94, as a kind of summing up of the argument of the previous section before Marcellus goes on to discuss the saving work of Christ. S/V 111 deals precisely with that saving work, and I have placed it just before S/V 99 (and so after S/V 84) as part of a summing up of the soteriological section, leading into the eschatological section. Μετὰ πάντα I take to refer to all that Eusebius has said in this section.

This gives us the following order for the end of the *Contra Asterium*:

S/V 76-77-85-86-87-88-89-90-91-92-93-95-97-94-110-96-98-78-79-80-81-82-112-83-84 -111-99-100-101-102-103-104-105-106-107-108-109.

Adding this to the two orders previously established, we have the following suggested order for the fragments of the *Contra Asterium*:

---

<sup>53</sup> CM II.2.39-41 (p. 42, line 15 - p. 43, line 6).

V/S 1-2-9-10-66-17-18-19-20-21-22-5-67-68-6-70-71-3-4-7-8-11-12-13-14-15-16-  
23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30-31-32-33-34-35-36-37-38-39-40-41-42-43-44-45-46-51-  
52-53-54-55-56-60-113-114-115-116-61-62-63-64-65-47-48-49-50-69-72-73-117-  
118-119-120-121-122-123-124-125-74-75-126-127-128-57-58-59-76-77-85-86-87-  
88-89-90-91-92-93-95-97-94-110-96-98-78-79-80-81-82-112-83-84-111-99-100-  
101-102-103-104-105-106-107-108-109.

As noted, some of these suggestions are much more tentative than others. But this gives us what I believe to be the closest approximation so far of the order of Marcellus' original text.

**Table 1: Collation of the Fragment Numberings**

| <i>Re</i> | <i>K</i> | <i>S/V</i> | <i>P</i> | <i>Re</i> | <i>K</i> | <i>S/V</i>   | <i>P</i>     | <i>Re</i> | <i>K</i> | <i>S/V</i>   | <i>P</i>     |
|-----------|----------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------------|--------------|
| 1         | 1        | 4          | 19       | 115       | 128      | <i>Pref.</i> | <i>Pref.</i> | 115       | 128      | <i>Pref.</i> | <i>Pref.</i> |
| 2         | 2        | 12         | 23       | 59        | 65       | 1            | 1            | 59        | 65       | 1            | 1            |
| 3         | 3        | 10         | 4        | 29        | 34       | 2            | 2            | 29        | 34       | 2            | 2            |
| 4         | 4        | 13         | 24       | 37        | 43       | 3            | 18           | 30        | 35       | 9            | 3            |
| 5         | 5        | 14         | 25       | 1         | 1        | 4            | 19           | 3         | 3        | 10           | 4            |
| 6         | 6        | 15         | 26       | 42        | 48       | 5            | 12           | 31        | 36       | 66           | 5            |
| 7         | 7        | 16         | 27       | 48        | 53       | 6            | 15           | 76        | 86       | 17           | 6            |
| 8         | 8        | 11         | 22       | 36        | 42       | 7            | 20           | 77        | 87       | 18           | 7            |
| 9         | 9        | 26         | 31       | 44        | 49       | 8            | 21           | 32        | 37       | 19           | 8            |
| 9         | 10       | 28         | 33       | 30        | 35       | 9            | 3            | 32        | 38       | 20           | 9            |
| 10        | 11       | 29         | 34       | 3         | 3        | 10           | 4            | 32        | 39       | 21           | 10           |
| 11        | 12       | 27         | 32       | 8         | 8        | 11           | 22           | 78        | 88       | 22           | 11           |
| 12        | 13       | 30         | 35       | 2         | 2        | 12           | 23           | 42        | 48       | 5            | 12           |
| 12        | 14       | 31         | 36       | 4         | 4        | 13           | 24           | 41        | 47       | 67           | 13           |
| 13        | 15       | 32         | 37       | 5         | 5        | 14           | 25           | 46        | 51       | 68           | 14           |
| 13        | 16       | 33         | 38       | 6         | 6        | 15           | 26           | 48        | 53       | 6            | 15           |
| 14        | 17       | 35         | 40       | 7         | 7        | 16           | 27           | 47        | 52       | 70           | 16           |
| 15        | 18       | 36         | 41       | 76        | 86       | 17           | 6            | 28        | 33       | 71           | 17           |
| 16        | 19       | 37         | 42       | 77        | 87       | 18           | 7            | 37        | 43       | 3            | 18           |
| 17        | 20       | 38         | 43       | 32        | 37       | 19           | 8            | 1         | 1        | 4            | 19           |
| 18        | 21       | 39         | 44       | 32        | 38       | 20           | 9            | 36        | 42       | 7            | 20           |
| 19        | 22       | 40         | 45       | 32        | 39       | 21           | 10           | 44        | 49       | 8            | 21           |
| 20        | 23       | 41         | 46       | 78        | 88       | 22           | 11           | 8         | 8        | 11           | 22           |
| 20        | 24       | 42         | 47       | 112       | 125      | 23           | 28           | 2         | 2        | 12           | 23           |
| 20        | 25       | 43         | 48       | 110       | 123      | 24           | 29           | 4         | 4        | 13           | 24           |
| 21        | 26       | 44         | 49       | 111       | 124      | 25           | 30           | 5         | 5        | 14           | 25           |
| 22        | 27       | 45         | 50       | 9         | 9        | 26           | 31           | 6         | 6        | 15           | 26           |
| 23        | 28       | 57         | 89       | 11        | 12       | 27           | 32           | 7         | 7        | 16           | 27           |
| 24        | 29       | 60         | 58       | 9         | 10       | 28           | 33           | 112       | 125      | 23           | 28           |
| 25        | 30       | 58         | 90       | 10        | 11       | 29           | 34           | 110       | 123      | 24           | 29           |
| 26        | 31       | 59         | 91       | 12        | 13       | 30           | 35           | 111       | 124      | 25           | 30           |
| 27        | 32       | 123        | 81       | 12        | 14       | 31           | 36           | 9         | 9        | 26           | 31           |
| 28        | 33       | 71         | 17       | 13        | 15       | 32           | 37           | 11        | 12       | 27           | 32           |
| 29        | 34       | 2          | 2        | 13        | 16       | 33           | 38           | 9         | 10       | 28           | 33           |
| 30        | 35       | 9          | 3        | 113       | 126      | 34           | 39           | 10        | 11       | 29           | 34           |
| 31        | 36       | 66         | 5        | 14        | 17       | 35           | 40           | 12        | 13       | 30           | 35           |
| 32        | 37       | 19         | 8        | 15        | 18       | 36           | 41           | 12        | 14       | 31           | 36           |
| 32        | 38       | 20         | 9        | 16        | 19       | 37           | 42           | 13        | 15       | 32           | 37           |
| 32        | 39       | 21         | 10       | 17        | 20       | 38           | 43           | 13        | 16       | 33           | 38           |
| 33        | 40       | 121        | 79       | 18        | 21       | 39           | 44           | 113       | 126      | 34           | 39           |
| 34        | 41       | 111        | 117      | 19        | 22       | 40           | 45           | 14        | 17       | 35           | 40           |
| 35=97 109 | 82       | 113        |          | 20        | 23       | 41           | 46           | 15        | 18       | 36           | 41           |
| 36        | 42       | 7          | 20       | 20        | 24       | 42           | 47           | 16        | 19       | 37           | 42           |
| 37        | 43       | 3          | 18       | 20        | 25       | 43           | 48           | 17        | 20       | 38           | 43           |
| 38        | 44       | 69         | 72       | 21        | 26       | 44           | 49           | 18        | 21       | 39           | 44           |
| 39        | 45       | 65         | 67       | 22        | 27       | 45           | 50           | 19        | 22       | 40           | 45           |
| 40        | 46       | 94         | 105      | 79        | 89       | 46           | 51           | 20        | 23       | 41           | 46           |
| 41        | 47       | 67         | 13       | 60        | 66       | 47           | 68           | 20        | 24       | 42           | 47           |
| 42        | 48       | 5          | 12       | 60        | 67       | 48           | 69           | 20        | 25       | 43           | 48           |
| 43=81 91  | 52       | 53         |          | 60        | 68       | 49           | 70           | 21        | 26       | 44           | 49           |
| 44        | 49       | 8          | 21       | 60        | 69       | 50           | 71           | 22        | 27       | 45           | 50           |
| 45        | 50       | 96         | 107      | 80        | 90       | 51           | 52           | 79        | 89       | 46           | 51           |
| 46        | 51       | 68         | 14       | 43=81 91  | 52       | 53           |              | 80        | 90       | 51           | 52           |
| 47        | 52       | 70         | 16       | 82        | 92       | 53           | 54           | 43=81 91  | 52       | 53           |              |
| 48        | 53       | 6          | 15       | 82        | 93       | 54           | 55           | 82        | 92       | 53           | 54           |
| 49        | 54       | 61         | 63       | 83        | 94       | 55           | 56           | 82        | 93       | 54           | 55           |
| 50        | 55       | 95         | 103      | 84        | 95       | 56           | 57           | 83        | 94       | 55           | 56           |
| 51        | 56       | 63         | 65       | 23        | 28       | 57           | 89           | 84        | 95       | 56           | 57           |
| 51        | 57       | 64         | 66       | 25        | 30       | 58           | 90           | 24        | 29       | 60           | 58           |
| 52        | 58       | 98         | 108      | 26        | 31       | 59           | 91           | 85        | 96       | 113          | 59           |
| 53        | 59       | 88         | 97       | 24        | 29       | 60           | 58           | 86        | 97       | 114          | 60           |
| 54        | 60       | 110        | 106      | 49        | 54       | 61           | 63           | 87        | 98       | 115          | 61           |
| 55        | 61       | 87         | 96       | -         | -        | 62           | 64           | 71        | 81       | 116          | 62           |
| 56        | 62       | 89         | 98       | 51        | 56       | 63           | 65           | 49        | 54       | 61           | 63           |
| 57        | 63       | 85         | 94       | 51        | 57       | 64           | 66           | -         | -        | 62           | 64           |
| 58        | 64       | 86         | 95       | 39        | 45       | 65           | 67           | 51        | 56       | 63           | 65           |
| 59        | 65       | 1          | 1        | 31        | 36       | 66           | 5            | 51        | 57       | 64           | 66           |

| <i>Re</i> | <i>K</i> | <i>S/V</i> | <i>P</i> |
|-----------|----------|------------|----------|
| 60        | 66       | 47         | 68       |
| 60        | 67       | 48         | 69       |
| 60        | 68       | 49         | 70       |
| 60        | 69       | 50         | 71       |
| 61        | 70       | 72         | 73       |
| 62        | 71       | 73         | 74       |
| 63        | 72       | 125        | 83       |
| 64        | 73       | 74         | 84       |
| 65        | 74       | 75         | 85       |
| 66        | 75       | 90         | 99       |
| 67        | 76       | 97         | 104      |
| 68        | 77       | 91         | 100      |
| 68        | 78       | 92         | 101      |
| 69        | 79       | 93         | 102      |
| 70        | 80       | 124        | 82       |
| 71        | 81       | 116        | 62       |
| 72        | 82       | 117        | 75       |
| 73        | 83       | 120        | 78       |
| 74        | 84       | 122        | 80       |
| 75        | 85       | 118        | 76       |
| 76        | 86       | 17         | 6        |
| 77        | 87       | 18         | 7        |
| 78        | 88       | 22         | 11       |
| 79        | 89       | 46         | 51       |
| 80        | 90       | 51         | 52       |
| 81=43     | 91       | 52         | 53       |
| 82        | 92       | 53         | 54       |
| 82        | 93       | 54         | 55       |
| 83        | 94       | 55         | 56       |
| 84        | 95       | 56         | 57       |
| 85        | 96       | 113        | 59       |
| 86        | 97       | 114        | 60       |
| 87        | 98       | 115        | 61       |
| 88        | 99       | 119        | 77       |
| 89        | 100      | 126        | 86       |
| 90        | 101      | 127        | 87       |
| 91        | 102      | 128        | 88       |
| 92        | 103      | 76         | 92       |
| 93        | 104      | 77         | 93       |
| 94        | 105      | 78         | 109      |
| 95        | 106      | 79         | 110      |
| 96        | 107      | 80         | 111      |
| 97        | 108      | 81         | 112      |
| 97        | 109      | 82         | 113      |
| 98        | 110      | 83         | 115      |
| 99        | 111      | 99         | 118      |
| 100       | 112      | 100        | 119      |
| 100       | 113      | 101        | 120      |
| 101       | 114      | 102        | 121      |
| 102       | 115      | 103        | 122      |
| 103       | 116      | 104        | 123      |
| 104       | 117      | 106        | 125      |
| 105       | 118      | 105        | 124      |
| 106       | 119      | 107        | 126      |
| 107       | 120      | 108        | 127      |
| 108       | 121      | 109        | 128      |
| 109       | 122      | 112        | 114      |
| 110       | 123      | 24         | 29       |
| 111       | 124      | 25         | 30       |
| 112       | 125      | 23         | 28       |
| 113       | 126      | 34         | 39       |
| 114       | 127      | 84         | 116      |
| 115       | 128      | Pref.      | Pref.    |

| <i>Re</i> | <i>K</i> | <i>S/V</i> | <i>P</i> |
|-----------|----------|------------|----------|
| 41        | 47       | 67         | 13       |
| 46        | 51       | 68         | 14       |
| 38        | 44       | 69         | 72       |
| 47        | 52       | 70         | 16       |
| 28        | 33       | 71         | 17       |
| 61        | 70       | 72         | 73       |
| 62        | 71       | 73         | 74       |
| 64        | 73       | 74         | 84       |
| 65        | 74       | 75         | 85       |
| 92        | 103      | 76         | 92       |
| 93        | 104      | 77         | 93       |
| 94        | 105      | 78         | 109      |
| 95        | 106      | 79         | 110      |
| 96        | 107      | 80         | 111      |
| 97        | 108      | 81         | 112      |
| 35=97     | 109      | 82         | 113      |
| 98        | 110      | 83         | 115      |
| 114       | 127      | 84         | 116      |
| 57        | 63       | 85         | 94       |
| 58        | 64       | 86         | 95       |
| 55        | 61       | 87         | 96       |
| 53        | 59       | 88         | 97       |
| 56        | 62       | 89         | 98       |
| 66        | 75       | 90         | 99       |
| 68        | 77       | 91         | 100      |
| 68        | 78       | 92         | 101      |
| 69        | 79       | 93         | 102      |
| 40        | 46       | 94         | 105      |
| 50        | 55       | 95         | 103      |
| 45        | 50       | 96         | 107      |
| 67        | 76       | 97         | 104      |
| 52        | 58       | 98         | 108      |
| 99        | 111      | 99         | 118      |
| 100       | 112      | 100        | 119      |
| 100       | 113      | 101        | 120      |
| 101       | 114      | 102        | 121      |
| 102       | 115      | 103        | 122      |
| 103       | 116      | 104        | 123      |
| 105       | 118      | 105        | 124      |
| 104       | 117      | 106        | 125      |
| 106       | 119      | 107        | 126      |
| 107       | 120      | 108        | 127      |
| 108       | 121      | 109        | 128      |
| 54        | 60       | 110        | 106      |
| 34        | 41       | 111        | 117      |
| 109       | 122      | 112        | 114      |
| 85        | 96       | 113        | 59       |
| 86        | 97       | 114        | 60       |
| 87        | 98       | 115        | 61       |
| 71        | 81       | 116        | 62       |
| 72        | 82       | 117        | 75       |
| 75        | 85       | 118        | 76       |
| 88        | 99       | 119        | 77       |
| 73        | 83       | 120        | 78       |
| 33        | 40       | 121        | 79       |
| 74        | 84       | 122        | 80       |
| 27        | 32       | 123        | 81       |
| 70        | 80       | 124        | 82       |
| 63        | 72       | 125        | 83       |
| 89        | 100      | 126        | 86       |
| 90        | 101      | 127        | 87       |
| 91        | 102      | 128        | 88       |

| <i>Re</i> | <i>K</i> | <i>S/V</i> | <i>P</i> |
|-----------|----------|------------|----------|
| 39        | 45       | 65         | 67       |
| 60        | 66       | 47         | 68       |
| 60        | 67       | 48         | 69       |
| 60        | 68       | 49         | 70       |
| 60        | 69       | 50         | 71       |
| 38        | 44       | 69         | 72       |
| 61        | 70       | 72         | 73       |
| 62        | 71       | 73         | 74       |
| 72        | 82       | 117        | 75       |
| 75        | 85       | 118        | 76       |
| 88        | 99       | 119        | 77       |
| 73        | 83       | 120        | 78       |
| 33        | 40       | 121        | 79       |
| 74        | 84       | 122        | 80       |
| 27        | 32       | 123        | 81       |
| 70        | 80       | 124        | 82       |
| 63        | 72       | 125        | 83       |
| 64        | 73       | 74         | 84       |
| 65        | 74       | 75         | 85       |
| 89        | 100      | 126        | 86       |
| 90        | 101      | 127        | 87       |
| 91        | 102      | 128        | 88       |
| 23        | 28       | 57         | 89       |
| 25        | 30       | 58         | 90       |
| 26        | 31       | 59         | 91       |
| 92        | 103      | 76         | 92       |
| 93        | 104      | 77         | 93       |
| 57        | 63       | 85         | 94       |
| 58        | 64       | 86         | 95       |
| 55        | 61       | 87         | 96       |
| 53        | 59       | 88         | 97       |
| 56        | 62       | 89         | 98       |
| 66        | 75       | 90         | 99       |
| 68        | 77       | 91         | 100      |
| 68        | 78       | 92         | 101      |
| 69        | 79       | 93         | 102      |
| 50        | 55       | 95         | 103      |
| 67        | 76       | 97         | 104      |
| 40        | 46       | 94         | 105      |
| 54        | 60       | 110        | 106      |
| 45        | 50       | 96         | 107      |
| 52        | 58       | 98         | 108      |
| 94        | 105      | 78         | 109      |
| 95        | 106      | 79         | 110      |
| 96        | 107      | 80         | 111      |
| 97        | 108      | 81         | 112      |
| 35=97     | 109      | 82         | 113      |
| 109       | 122      | 112        | 114      |
| 98        | 110      | 83         | 115      |
| 114       | 127      | 84         | 116      |
| 34        | 41       | 111        | 117      |
| 99        | 111      | 99         | 118      |
| 100       | 112      | 100        | 119      |
| 100       | 113      | 101        | 120      |
| 101       | 114      | 102        | 121      |
| 102       | 115      | 103        | 122      |
| 103       | 116      | 104        | 123      |
| 105       | 118      | 105        | 124      |
| 104       | 117      | 106        | 125      |
| 106       | 119      | 107        | 126      |
| 107       | 120      | 108        | 127      |
| 108       | 121      | 109        | 128      |

**Table 2: The Sequence Attested by Eusebius' *Contra Marcellum*  
in the Seibt/Vinzent (and Parvis) numberings**

**Introduction: Marcellus' misuse of scripture (CM 1.2-3):**

4 (19) [and going on] 12 (23).  
37 (42) [and again] 112 (114).  
57 (89) [and going on again] 58 (90).  
3 (18) [and again, going on] 4 (19).  
24 (29) [and again] 25 (30).  
23 (28)

**List A: Against the Bishops (CM 1.4)**

1 (1) [and after these things, having gone on a little]  
2 (2) [after which he continues]  
9 (3) [and after other things adds]  
10 (4) [and again he adds]  
17 (6) [then he writes thus]  
18 (7) [and afterwards, having said some things]  
19 (8) [then next he adds]  
20 (9) [and he adds]  
21 (10) [then after other things]  
22 (11) [after other things he adds]  
36 (41) [having added other things he adds]  
46 (51) [he attempts next to show the Son is not image of God]  
51 (52) [and afterwards having said some things he adds]  
53 (54) [and he adds]  
54 (55) [and going on again]  
60 (58) [and after these things, having stretched out a long discourse, he adds]  
113 (59) [and having passed on again to the bishops, he writes thus]  
115 (61) [and after other things, he adds]  
116 (62) [he passes from Narcissus to Eusebius]  
117 (75) [and he adds these things]  
118 (76) [then next he heaps up a long and nonsensical endless discourse and he adds]  
119 (77) [and again next]  
120 (78) [and having passed from these things, he again pillories Asterius, and again turns to Paulinus]  
121 (79) [and having left Paulinus he again has leisure for Eusebius]  
122 (80) [and after other things, he adds]  
123 (81) [then he passes on to Narcissus]  
124 (82) [and having passed on from Narcissus to Asterius]  
125 (83) [and again he attacks Eusebius, saying]  
126 (86) [manifestly lying, both in the things he said and in the things he again next introduces about him]  
127 (87) [and after other things]  
128 (88) [and the one having said these things reproved the same, writing thus]



**List B: the Logos (CM 2.2)**

[Having laid into those who said that the Son of God is truly Son both living and subsistent]

5 (12) [then going on, next he calls him eternal, and writes thus]

6 (15) [and after other things he adds]

52 (53) [and he adds]

53 (54) [and again after other things he adds]

61 (63) [but he still more desires honour, writing thus]

65 (67) [and again he adds these things]

73 (74) [And still more does he establish this through the things he writes in what follows, thus]

66 (5) [and he plainly introduces a mere word from what he adds]

67 (13) [having gathered such sayings, he adds]

68 (14) [and he adds next]

70 (16) [and still he adds next]

71 (17) [and he adds to these things, saying]

72 (73) [going on, next he adds these things]

74 (84) [and after short things, he adds]

75 (85) [Having said such things, having taken up from the beginning, he waxes dogmatic about the Logos in this manner]

76 (92) [and having said these things, he adds after other things]

77 (93) [Having said these things, he manifests his understanding more clearly]

87 (96) [And he is still more generous when he says these things next]

88 (97) [and again he adds]

89 (98) [and afterwards, having said some things, he adds]

91 (100) [and going on again, he affirms]

94 (105) [and he adds]

96 (107) [and after these things again he used a human image]

98 (108) [and he adds to these things after other things]

109 (128) [and again he puts the same idea more clearly, saying]

110 (106) [and again, after all things, he adds, saying]

111 (117).

**List C: the flesh of Christ and its destination (CM 2.3-4)**

7 (20) [and after these things he adds]

8 (21) [And after the aforesaid things, going on, next, he writes]

11 (22) [Having said such things, he refers to the flesh the apostolic words ‘Who is the image of the invisible God...’, not being ashamed to take such words with reference to the flesh, about which Marcellus himself, going on, writes]

106 (125). [And again he adds about the same flesh]

106 (125). [And he writes thus]

13 (24) [and he confirms the words, adding next]

14 (25) [and he adds]

15 (26) [and again he adds]  
 16 (27). [So these are the things through which he said that he was named First-born of all creation because of the flesh, and see how he also refers 'the Lord created me the beginning of his ways for his works' again to the flesh... writing  
 26 (31) [and next he adds]  
 28 (33) [and after other things he adds, saying]  
 29 (34) [and he adds again, saying]  
 34 (39) [and he adds]  
 35 (40) [and again he confirms the same saying, proclaiming]  
 38 (43) [and he adds next]  
 39 (44) [but he still adds next, saying]  
 40 (45) [and after other things again he adds]  
 41 (46) [and again he adds]  
 42 (47) [then next, having gone through certain other things, he adds]  
 45 (50) [Having put forward certain such interpretations, again he passes to the apostolic words]  
 52 (53) [and he remains clarifying the same thing more nakedly]  
 53 (54) [but also having said barefacedly]  
 106 (125) [he affirms at the present moment that the flesh is the image of the invisible God, asserting]  
 53 (54) [and again, after the things that have been set forth, he adds]  
 55 (56) [and again he adds]  
 56 (57). [After these things, he attempts to establish that also 'from the womb before the morning star I begot you' was said about the flesh]  
 59 (91) [In addition to these things, going on, again he adds]  
 78 (109) [and again, after other things, he adds]  
 79 (110) [and again he adds these things]  
 80 (111) [and again he adds]  
 81 (112) [and he adds still, saying]  
 82 (113) [and again he adds]  
 83 (115) [In addition to all these things, he attempts to show that also 'The Lord reigned, let the earth rejoice' is referred to the flesh, and he says thus]  
 99 (118) [and after other things he adds]  
 100 (119) [and again he adds]  
 101 (120) [and after short things, he adds]  
 102 (121) [and still more working on the same discussion, he writes]  
 103 (122) [and after other things, he writes]  
 104 (123) [and he adds after other things]  
 106 (125) [after other things, he adds to these]  
 107 (126) [Marcellus adds these things to the things that have been said]  
 108 (127) [Having said these things, and as it were perceiving himself having fallen into a pit of absurdity, he attempts to recall himself, confessing in a certain way that he knew nothing of the things he was saying, wherefore he adds]  
 109 (128).

## APPENDIX TWO

### MARCELLUS' *CONTRA ASTERIUM*:

#### A TRANSLATION OF THE FRAGMENTS

##### **Preface** Preface (Re 115, K 128)

For he, having put together a certain one treatise, says he did this because of making known the one God.

##### **P1** S/V1 (Re 59, K 65)

So now I shall begin from the letter which was written by him in order to reply to each of the things written not rightly. He has written that he 'believes in God, the Father Almighty, and in his Son the only-begotten God, our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit,' and he says that he had learned this mode of Godly piety from the Divine Scriptures. And I accept heartily the things that are said whenever he should say this, for this mode of Godly piety is common to all of us, to believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. But whenever he should say, having guessed at the power of the divine, more humanly for us, through a certain clever analysis, 'the Father is Father and the Son Son,' it is no longer safe to praise such an analysis. For through such an analysis it comes about that the heresy currently thought up by them increases, which clearly, I think, is easy to demonstrate from his writings. For he said that 'it was necessary to acknowledge the Father to be truly Father and the Son truly Son and the Holy Spirit likewise.'

##### **P2** S/V2 (Re 29, K 34)

But I will remind you ( $\sigma\epsilon$ ) of those things which he himself has written, allying himself with the things written badly by Eusebius, in order that you may know that he has clearly departed from his earlier promise. For he wrote thus in these words: 'For the point of the letter is to refer to the will of the Father the begetting of the Son, and not to declare the begetting of God a passion. Which the wisest of the Fathers declared in their own treatises, guarding against the impiety of the heretics, those who falsely announced the childbirth of God was something bodily and passive, teaching the emanations.

##### **P3** S/V 9 (Re 30, K 35)

With the result that Asterius, wishing to exonerate Eusebius who had written badly, having made mention of both 'the nature of the father' and 'the nature of the begotten', became himself accuser of himself. For it would have been far better to have left 'the depth of the thought of Eusebius lying in brevity' as he himself wrote, unexamined, than that he, having used such a theory, should lead the wickedness of the writing to the light.

##### **P4** S/V10 (Re 3, K 3)

But now let us examine a certain one thing of those written by Asterius. For he said this: 'For the Father is one [entity], the one who begot from himself the only-begotten Word and the first-born of all creation.' He wrote 'only-begotten and first-born', having joined them both together, much being the difference in these names, as it is easy even to the very ignorant to know. For it is clear that 'only-begotten', if it be truly 'only-begotten', is no longer able to be 'first-born', and the first-born as 'first-born' is not able to be 'only-begotten'.

**P5 S/V 66 (Re 31, K 36)**

So he seems consequently to have said that it says 'he was begotten before the ages'; for the one who came forth becomes offspring of the Father who brought forth. But the other is no longer received by him either healthily or piously. For saying that the one which came forth from him is not Word, but simply 'only Son', and that this is the true mode of generation, is wont to convey a certain emphasis of a human aspect to the hearers.

**P6 S/V 17 (Re 76, K 86)**

But having departed from the true knowledge he showed us now also the crafty theory. For not being able to establish his own will 'from the divine scriptures', he reverts to 'the wisest fathers' as he thinks, saying 'Which the wisest of the fathers have declared in their own treatises.' Asterius says that his own fathers declared a declaration concerning God from their very own personal choice. For the name of 'dogma' depends on human will and judgement. And that this holds thus bears witness for us sufficiently the dogmatic skill of the doctors, and also the things that are called 'dogmata of the philosophers' bears witness. But that also 'those things which seemed good to the senate' still, even now, are called 'dogmata of the senate', no-one, I think, is ignorant.

**P7 S/V 18 (Re 77, K 87)**

For having wanted to defend the Eusebius who wrote the letter badly, he says 'having unfolded the dogma first in a non-teacherly way, he composed the letter, for the letter was not made for the Church or for the ignorant, but for the blessed Paulinus', calling him blessed because of this, that he holds the same opinion as Asterius. So then, since indeed we have learned from the 'most wise fathers' of Asterius, I believe it follows to name also the one who became teacher of Paulinus and of the others. For from the letter of Paulinus the one who became teacher of him too should become luminously clear to us.

**P8 S/V 19 (Re 32, K 37)**

Not remembering the Gospel teaching Paulinus wrote these things, confessing 'some to have been moved thus by themselves, but others to have been led this way 'by the reading of the men spoken of before.' Then finally, as though bringing in some crown of the demonstration, he subjoined something from the sayings of Origen to his own letter, as being able better to persuade than the evangelists and apostles. And these are the sayings: 'It is time, having resumed concerning the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, to go through a few things of those omitted then; concerning the Father, that being inseparable and indivisible he becomes Father of the Son, not putting him forth, as some think. For if the Son is an offshoot from the Father, and an offspring from him, such as those things which are offspring of animals, it is necessary for the one putting forth and the one put forth to be a body.'

**P9 S/V 20 (Re 32, K 38)**

Origen wrote these things, not having wished to learn from the holy prophets and apostles concerning the eternity of the Word, but giving himself more dares to learn to narrate a second essence [ὑπόθεσις = ὑπόστασις?] of the Word.

**P10 S/V 21 (Re 32, K 39)**

That Origen writing such things used his own opinions, is plain from the fact that he also overturns his own things many times. At least it is consequent to mention what things he says concerning God in another place. And he writes thus: 'For God did not begin to be Father being hindered, as those human beings who become fathers, by the fact of not being able to be fathers up to this time. For if God was always perfect, and the power of being a father is with him, and it was good for him to be father of such a son, why does he delay and deprive himself of the good, even, so to speak, from when he is able to be father? The same also indeed must be

said concerning the Holy Spirit.’ So how, Origen having written this also, did the blessed (according to him) Paulinus not think it without danger to hide this, but to use the opposite things for the establishment of the things which seemed good to him, in as much as it was not possible even for Origen himself to render account at all?

**P11 S/V 22 (Re 78, K 88)**

Though, if it is necessary to tell the truth concerning Origen, it is fitting to say this, that having recently left off learning according to philosophy, and having preferred to be involved with the divine words before the precise comprehension of the Scriptures, and because of the great ambition of his schooling from outside having begun to write more quickly than was necessary, seduced by the words of philosophy, because of them also he wrote some things not well. And it is clear: for still remembering the teachings of Plato and the difference of the Archai in his work, he wrote a book on the Archai [*De Principiis*] and placed that title to the work. And the best example of this is the fact that not from anywhere else at all did he make the beginning itself of the words, or the title of the book, but from the sayings spoken by Plato; for he wrote beginning thus: ‘those who have believed and those who have been persuaded.’ You may find this saying thus spoken in Plato’s *Gorgias*.

**P12 S/V 5 (Re 42, K 48)**

So then, before the coming down and the being born of the virgin there was only Word. Since what else was there before that which came down in the last days, as he also wrote, and that which was born from the virgin assumed human flesh? There was nothing other than Word.

**P13 S/V 67 (Re 41, K 47)**

...and those teaching them as being ashamed to mention the Word, which all the Divine Scriptures proclaim thus. For David says concerning it ‘The heavens were made firm by the Word of the Lord’, and again the same writer says ‘He sent forth his Word and it healed them.’ And Solomon: The wicked will seek me, but they will not find me. For they have hated wisdom, and the Word of the Lord they have not chosen.’ And Isaiah said: ‘For out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem.’ And again Jeremiah says ‘The wise were put to shame, and terrified and captured, because they rejected the Word of the Lord.’ And Hosea the prophet also said ‘They have hated the one refuting in the gates, and abominated the holy Word.’ And Micah likewise also himself mentioning the Word said ‘Out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem.’

**P14 S/V 68 (Re 46, K 51)**

But the holy Apostle and also disciple of the Lord John clearly and openly teaching in the beginning of the Gospel, as a thing unknown earlier among human beings, naming him Word of the Almighty, spoke thus: ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ Using not [just] one testimony he signifies the eternity of the Word.

**P15 S/V 6 (Re 48, K 53)**

So then, you [*sing*] hear the harmony of the Holy Spirit bearing witness to the eternity of the Word through many and various personae. And because of this, he begins from the eternity of the Word, saying ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ He wishes to show the eternity of the Word using three successive testimonies.

**P16 S/V 70 (Re 47, K 52)**

...in order that in saying ‘In the beginning was the Word’, he might show the Word to be in the Father in power, for God is the beginning of all things which came to be: ‘from whom are all things’, and in ‘and the Word was with God’, the Word being in power with God, for ‘all things came to be through him, and apart from him not any one thing came to be’, and in having said



‘the Word was God’, that one should not divide the Godhead, since the Word was in him and he was in the Word; for he says ‘the Father is in me and I am in the Father.’

**P17 S/V 71 (Re 28, K 33)**

So now the holy apostle and also disciple of the Lord John, mentioning his eternity, became the true witness of the Word, saying ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ Making no mention here of the ‘coming to be of the Word’, but using three consecutive testimonies he was confirming the Word to be in the beginning.

**P18 S/V 3 (Re 37, K 43)**

So that it is in every way plain that no other name applies to the eternity of the Word than this which the most holy disciple of the Lord and apostle John said in the beginning of the Gospel. For when he, after the assumption of the flesh, is proclaimed Christ and also Jesus, Life and also Way and Day and Resurrection and Door and Bread and if there be any other [thing] named by the Divine Scriptures, ~not~ because of this is it fitting for us to be ignorant of the first name, which is Word. For because of this also the most holy evangelist and disciple of the Lord, mightily roused in spirit, mindful of the beginning from above and of nothing more new, said ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, in order that he might show that, if there is some fresh and newer name, this belonged to him from the fresh and new economy according to the flesh.

**P19 S/V 4 (Re 1, K 1)**

That no greater name has existed than Jesus of those named on the earth, the Gospel bears witness where ‘the angel says to Mary, “Do not be afraid, for you have found favour with God. And behold, you shall conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and he shall be called the Son of the Most High.”’ And it is plain also from the prophecy of Zechariah, which prophesied of old concerning this name, for he says ‘The Lord showed me Jesus the great priest standing before the face of the angel of the Lord, and the Devil stood on his right to accuse him. And the Lord said to the Devil, ‘May the Lord who has chosen Jerusalem rebuke you.’ For when did he rebuke him? When he joined the human being beloved by him to his own Word. He said ‘The one who has chosen Jerusalem’, manifestly this of ours, concerning which the apostle says ‘But our Jerusalem is above, for this other is in bondage with her children.’ For at that time, having come to be in that same great Jerusalem, that is in our church, he rebuked the Devil according to the prophecy, having said ‘Depart from before me, Satan, for you are a stumbling-block to me.’ So then he is the great priest, of whom the then Jesus preserved the type. For it was not possible that that one be called a great priest, though having become glorious in all things, Moses not being called great; for Moses was so great that he was even called servant of God, and he was called ‘God of Pharaoh’ by God himself. But if someone should suppose Jesus to be called great according to this, that he was deemed worthy to lead the people into the holy land, and he did many other wonders, let him know also through this, that the greatness spoken of in the case of Jesus belonged not so much to the prototypical thing, but to the future bringing in a little later of his own people into this great Jerusalem.

**P20 S/V 7 (Re 36, K 42)**

For the Word ‘was in the beginning’, being nothing other than Word; but the human being united to the Word, not being formerly, became a human being as John teaches us, saying, ‘And the Word became flesh.’ So then, because of this he appears making mention of the Word alone; for if the Divine Scripture makes mention of the name either of Jesus or of Christ, it appears to name the Word of God being with human flesh. But if anyone should promise also to be able to show before the New Covenant the name of Christ the Son in the case of the Word alone, he shall find this to have been said prophetically, just as also is plain from this; for he says ‘The kings of the earth have taken their stand and the rulers have gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ.’



**P21 S/V 8 (Re 44, K 49)**

So reasonably before the coming down this was, as we have said many times, Word; but after the coming down and the assumption of the flesh, he obtained different appellations also, since 'The Word became flesh.'

**P22 S/V 11 (Re 8, K 8)**

And let not Asterius think this to be implausible, if his body, being younger, was able to attain such great venerability; but let him consider, that even if it should follow that the human flesh is younger, nonetheless, the Word having deemed it worthy to assume this through the holy virgin, having united his own to it, not only made 'the first-born of all creation', the man created in himself, but also wishes him to be the origin of all things, not only of those on the earth, but also of those in the heavens.

**P23 S/V 12 (Re 2, K 2)**

So then, not only does the apostle say that he is the 'first-born' of the 'new creation', but also 'first-born from the dead', because of nothing other, it seems to me, but in order that it might be able to be known through the 'first-born from the dead' how 'the first-born of all creation' was also said. For our Lord Jesus Christ did not rise first from the dead; but the one raised through Elisha the prophet rose first, and Lazarus also rose before his resurrection, and in the time of the Passion 'many bodies of those who had fallen asleep' rose.

**P24 S/V 13 (Re 4, K 4)**

So then if he is 'first-born of all creation', and 'in him all things were created', it is fitting for us to know that the apostle now makes mention concerning his economy according to the flesh.

**P25 S/V 14 (Re 5, K 5)**

So he is named 'first-born of all creation' because of the genesis according to the flesh, not because of the first 'creation'- as they think.

**P26 S/V 15 (Re 6, K 6)**

So then, this most holy Word was not named 'first-born of all creation' before the Incarnation [ἐνανθρώπησις]- for how is it possible that the eternal being should be the first-born of someone?- but the first 'new' human being, in whom God wanted 'to sum up all things', this one the divine scriptures name 'the first-born of all creation'.

**P27 S/V 16 (Re 7, K 7)**

You hear how not only these things, but also the pre-existing things 'in the heavens and on the earth' it turns out to have 'been created' 'in him' according to the new creation.

**P28 S/V 23 (Re 112, K 125)**

For it is not out of place, I think, to remind you a little at present of proverbs from outside. *Either he is dead or he teaches letters.* Someone might suppose this proverb to be said, according to the appearance of the letter, against the teachers of letters; also since a certain other of the proverbs among them said 'Letters were being taught and I was going to school'[Demosthenes 18]. But those who wrote the commentaries said that it does not hold thus; but when, they say, the Sicilians having defeated the Athenians in battle they saved only those pretending to education, considering them as teachers for the children, but all the others they killed, and some from them having fled and having returned being asked by the Athenians

concerning certain people belonging to them, they say they said 'Either he is dead or he teaches letters'.

But why also might someone suppose *A goat to the sword* to have been said, not having learned earlier the things said concerning it? Assuredly, I suppose, that the proverb was said because of the fact that the goat being sacrificed looks up at the sword. But not at all, indeed, did the ancients say this. For neither would the thing have been said to be a proverb, if indeed this held thus, for it was consequent to think this from the appearances, but they say this to have been said concerning those who procure bad things for themselves. For they say Medea, in Corinth, having killed the children hid the sword on the spot; but the Corinthians, sacrificing a black goat according to an oracle which had been given to them, lacked a sword, and the goat, digging with his foot, found the sword of Medea and was sacrificed with it.

'But what does *oak trees aplenty* mean?', someone says; for it is not possible to know the proverb from the surface meaning. The ancients, as they said, living off acorns before the cultivation of wheat, when this 'fruit', as they thought, was later found, taking note of it and rejoicing at the change, they said 'Oak trees aplenty!'. And they said that this was the proverb.

And again another proverb having been said by many wise people among them, in many and various books, it is necessary to mention at present the things those who chose to interpret proverbs wrote concerning it, [lacuna?] in order that we might expose Asterius, even from the learnings of those outside, as knowing precisely the distinctive character of the proverb, but having feigned ignorance in the present, in order that he might seem to establish his own will plausibly through the use of the proverbial saying. And it is *the craft of Glaukos*. The wise ones from outside, having made mention of this proverb, interpreted it differently. For a certain one of them said a certain Glaukos, having become expert at a certain craft which was most marvellous of many, it was lost together with him in the sea, and no-one has heard of it to this day. And another, having testified to Glaukos' having musical expertise in the highest degree, speaks of the four bronze disks prepared by him, for the making of a certain melodious harmony of the sounds of the playing; from which the proverb was said. And a certain other says there lies a marvellous mixing-bowl and stand of the dedications of Aluattes, made by Glaukos of Chios. And another, that Glaukos himself dedicated a bronze tripod at Delphi, so fashioned with regard to its thicker parts that being struck, its feet, on which it stood, and the covering above, and the crown that was on the basin, and the rods placed through the middle made a noise with the sound of a lyre. And again another, that the proverb was made from a certain Glaukos seeming to have done something special. You see how the difficulty of the proverb is demonstrated even through this, through the fact that not even those wishing to explain this parable take their stand on the same interpretation. Thus the practice of the proverb seems even in the case of those outside to be a certain thing which is difficult to find.

Therefore also a certain of the wise ones among them having gathered the proverbs spoken by many and variously, wrote six books on them, two of metrical ones, and four of unmetrical. But those outside named these proverbs, it seems to me, because of nothing other than since, having read the proverbs of the most wise Solomon, and knowing from them that it was not possible to learn anything clearly from the surface of the things said in them, and themselves wishing to emulate the prophetic writing, they wrote the same way as he. Then, having been able to devise no other name more fitting than that, they also named these proverbs.

**P29** S/V 24 (Re 110, K 123)

For because of this the most holy prophet Solomon said 'And to receive turnings of words', and again, 'and sayings of the wise and enigmas.'

**P30** S/V 25 (Re 111, K 124)

Because of which, it seems to me, this most wise prophet also wrote the first words of the prophecy in proverb form.

**P31 S/V 26 (Re 9, K 9)**

So now this chapter of Proverbs said 'the Lord created me', not wishing to present the beginning of the Godhead, as they think, of our Saviour, but the second economy according to the flesh; wherefore it also appropriately makes mention of creation of the human flesh.

**P32 S/V 27 (Re 11, K 12)**

So then, reasonably, the old things having passed away, and all things being about to be new through the newness of our Saviour, our lord Christ cried out through the prophet saying, 'the Lord created me as the beginning of his ways.'

**P33 S/V 28 (Re 9, K 10)**

So then, the creation belongs to the business concerning the *anthropos*. Wherefore he says 'the Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works'. 'He created me' clearly through the virgin Mary, through whom God chose to unite the human flesh to his own Word.

**P34 S/V 29 (Re 10, K 11)**

So then, this being thus, it follows to consider in the understanding what this chapter said proverbially: 'the Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works.' For truly our lord God created, having made that which is not; for it was not existent flesh, which the Word assumed, but [it was] non-existent [flesh that] 'he created as the beginning of his ways'.

**P35 S/V 30 (Re 12, K 13)**

For he became for us, who are about to live our lives justly, the way of Godly piety; the beginning of all ways after these things.

**P36 S/V 31 (Re 12, K 14)**

He reasonably called our lord Saviour the 'beginning' of 'the ways' because of this, that he also became the beginning of the other ways, which we had after the first way, indicating the things handed on through the holy apostles, who preached this new mystery to us 'with a lofty proclamation' according to the prophecy.

**P37 S/V 32 (Re 13, K 15)**

Therefore he says 'He created me as the beginning of his ways for his works.' But what sort of works does he speak of? Those of which the Saviour says 'My father is working until now, and I also am working', and again he says 'I have finished the work which you gave to me.'

**P38 S/V 33 (Re 13, K 16)**

For who would have believed before the demonstration of the facts that the Word of God would assume our flesh, having been born through the virgin, and that he would display the whole Godhead in it bodily?

**P39 S/V 34 (Re 113, K 126)**

Therefore this is 'The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways for his works.'

**P40 S/V 35 (Re 14, K 17)**

'He founded me before the age,' calling this foundation the pre-appointed economy according to his flesh. As also the apostle says, 'For no-one is able to lay any other foundation than the one already laid, which is Jesus Christ.' But he mentions one age here, from which he said the

things according to Christ were founded, though many ages have passed by, as David said, 'The one who existed before the ages.'

**P41 S/V 36 (Re 15, K 18)**

For Asterius having said 'the Word came to be before the ages', the phrase itself exposes him as lying; so that he misses not only the fact, but even the text. For if Proverbs says 'He set me as a foundation before the age,' how did he say 'he was begotten before the ages'? For it is one thing for him to have been 'set as a foundation', and another to have been 'begotten before the ages'.

**P42 S/V 37 (Re 16, K 19)**

So just as God the Almighty appointed beforehand the church of old, so also the economy of Christ according to the flesh, through whom he appointed beforehand to call the race of the Godly-pious to sonship, having laid the foundation first in his thought. Because of this the apostle clearly proclaims, saying 'the Son of God appointed beforehand in the Holy Spirit.'

**P43 S/V 38 (Re 17, K 20)**

So then, even if especially this new mystery appeared 'in the last of the times', so that because of this it was pre-appointed before this age, the prophet reasonably said 'he founded me before the age', clearly that which is according to the flesh, because of the fellowship with the one who is truly his son, the Word.

**P44 S/V 39 (Re 18, K 21)**

Then he says 'in the beginning', 'before making the earth.' What sort of earth is this other than clearly our flesh, which became earth again after the disobedience? For he says 'You are earth, and to earth you shall return.' For it was necessary for this to obtain healing, having had fellowship in some way with the holy Word.

**P45 S/V 40 (Re 19, K 22)**

Then he says 'before making the depths'; here the prophet says proverbially that the depths are the hearts of the saints which have in their depths the gift of the spirit.

**P46 S/V 41 (Re 20, K 23)**

So now what is this passage, also: 'Before the springs of water came forth'? He says they are the holy apostles. And the book of Exodus sets forth for us this mystery, proclaiming of old the types of the apostles. For the apostles being twelve in number, he mentions twelve springs.

**P47 S/V 42 (Re 20, K 24)**

So, reasonably, the Lord spoke concerning the genesis according to the flesh through the prophet Solomon, saying 'before the springs of water came forth.'

**P48 S/V 43 (Re 20, K 25)**

For thus the saviour said to the holy springs, 'Go teach all the nations.'

**P49 S/V 44 (Re 21, K 26)**

From all sides it is clear the holy apostles are also named springs figuratively by the prophet.

**P50 S/V 45 (Re 22, K 27)**

So then, since indeed we have spoken concerning the things which precede, it follows also to fulfil the remainder. And there remains the part concerning the mountains and the hills. For he says 'before the mountains were established and before all the hills, he begets me.' He calls mountains and hills the apostles and the successors of the apostles, in order that he might signify proverbially their just way of life beyond other human beings.

**P51 S/V 46 (Re 79, K 89)**

But I ask those reading the holy scriptures, as having truly received seeds and beginnings of this exposition, to apply more demonstrations to the things which have been said, so that the opinions of those perverting the faith be exposed still more. 'For they have truly deserted the God who begot them, and dug for themselves leaky cisterns.'

**P52 S/V 51 (Re 80, K 90)**

It follows, I suppose, to say a few short words concerning the image. For he wrote 'But the one who was born from him is other, "who is the image of the invisible God"'. Asterius makes mention of 'the image of the invisible God' because of this, in order that he might teach 'God differs from the Word so much, as much as even a human being seems to differ from its own image.'

**P53 S/V 52 (Re 43=81, K 91)**

Because of this he reasonably adds 'Who is the image of the invisible God.' When was he in a state of having become image other than when he assumed the form 'according to the image and likeness'? For earlier, as I have said many times, there was nothing other than the Word.

**P54 S/V 53 (Re 82, K 92)**

So then it is luminously clear that before the taking on of our body, the Word was not in himself the 'image of the invisible God'. For it is fitting for the image to be seen, in order that what is not seen in the meantime is able to be seen through the image.

**P55 S/V 54 (Re 82, K 93)**

So how did Asterius write that the Word of God was 'the image of the invisible God'; for images point to those things of which they are images even when they are absent, so that even the one who is absent seems to appear through them? But if, God being invisible, it happens that the Word also is invisible, how is the Word itself capable of being 'the image of the invisible God', itself also being invisible? For it is impossible that that which is not seen should appear at any time through the invisible.

**P56 S/V 55 (Re 83, K 94)**

Wherefore on all sides it is clear that the flesh which came to belong to the Word was called by the holy apostle the 'image of the invisible God', in order that through the visible even the invisible might be made to appear. And the apostle says 'He is the image of the invisible God.' Now, manifestly, when he assumed the flesh which was made after the image of God, he became the true image of the invisible God. For if, through this image, we were made worthy to know the Word of God, we ought to believe the Word of God himself saying through the image, 'I and the Father are one.' For no one is able to know either the Word or the father of the Word apart from this image.

**P57 S/V 56 (Re 84, K 95)**

So thus also the apostle says, just as we said a short time ago, 'He emptied himself, taking the form of a slave,' through the form of a slave signifying for us the human flesh, forming which our lord God said to his own wisdom, 'let us make a human being according to our own image and likeness,' well naming the human flesh 'image.' For he knew precisely that it would be a little later the image of his own word.

**P58 S/V 60 (Re 24, K 29)**

So how do those 'full of guile and wickedness', to speak apostolically, transfer the saying to his first creation, as they think it is, David having clearly spoken these things concerning his birth according to the flesh?

**P59 S/V 113 (Re 85, K 96)**

So what will he say concerning these things? For I do not think him to have anything to say concerning this. For I do not also think that he would confess clearly and openly concerning other things, which he hides in his own mind, as is clearly to be learned from the things which he wrote. For he says 'the Father who begat from himself the only-begotten Word and first-born of all creation, the One who begat the One, the Perfect, the Perfect, the King, the King, the Lord, the Lord, God, God, the unvarying image of both essence and will and glory and power. These words clearly expose his base opinion concerning divinity. For how is the one having been begotten Lord and God, as he already said, able to be 'the image of God'? For the image of God is one thing, and God another. So if image, not Lord or God, but image of the Lord and God. But if being Lord and God, the Lord and God is no longer able to be image of the Lord and God.

**P60 S/V 114 (Re 86, K 97)**

Then he wishes him to be nothing of which he spoke before; for he says him to be the image of all these. So then, if he is the image of essence, he is no longer able to be the same essence; and if he is the image of will, he is no longer to be will itself; and if the image of power, no longer power; and if the image of glory, no longer glory. For the image is not image of itself but of some other.

**P61 S/V 115 (Re 87, K 98)**

For behold, the thing according to Asterius does not grieve us so much, if he was led on to write such things, but that some also of those seeming to be leaders of the Church, having forgotten the apostolic tradition, and having dared to honour the outside things more than the divine, they dare to write and to teach some such things, which no less depend upon the error of those aforementioned.

**P62 S/V 116 (Re 71, K 81)**

For having read the letter of Narcissus the president of Neronias, which he wrote to a certain Chrestus and Euphronius and Eusebius, how, Ossius the bishop having asked him if, like Eusebius of Palestine said there were two essences, this he also would say, I know from the writings that he answered that he believed there to be three essences.

**P63 S/V 61 (Re 49, K 54)**

So now, what was this that 'came down' before the Incarnation [*enanthropesis*]? Surely, I suppose, he says 'the Spirit'. For if he should wish to say something other than this, the angel



will not permit him, having said to the Virgin ‘The holy Spirit will come upon you.’ But if he will say that it is Spirit, let him hear the Saviour saying ‘God is Spirit.’

**P64 S/V 62** (not in Rettberg or Klostermann)

‘The spirit of our person, Christ the Lord, was entrapped in their corruptions.’

**P65 S/V 63** (Re 51, K 56)

Here also likewise the prophet discusses the Word’s having assumed our flesh.

**P66 S/V 64** (Re 51, K 57)

A Spirit can never be productive of a shadow. But that God himself is Spirit, the Saviour said ‘God is Spirit’. And that God is light, he himself teaches us, saying ‘I am the light’.

**P67 S/V 65** (Re 39, K 45)

So now let him also learn that the Word of God came, not ‘called Word according to usage’, as they say, but being true Word.

**P68 S/V 47** (Re 60, K 66)

For it is impossible for three hypostases, if there were such, to be united with a monad, unless the triad should first have its origin from a monad. For the holy Paul said these things to have been summed up in a monad, which belong to God in no wise with respect to oneness; for the Word and the Spirit alone belong to God with respect to oneness.

**P69 S/V 48** (Re 60, K 67)

So then, if the word should appear having come forth from the Father himself and coming to us, but the Holy Spirit, as Asterius also confessed, proceeds from the Father, and again the Saviour says concerning the Spirit ‘He will speak not from himself, but he shall speak those things which he hears, and he shall proclaim to you the things which are to come. He shall glorify me, because he will receive from what is mine and declare it to you,’ does not the monad appear here clearly and manifestly with ineffable reason, broadening to a triad but in no wise enduring to be divided? For if the Word proceeds from the Father, and it is confessed that the Spirit himself proceeds from the Father also, and again that the Saviour says concerning the Spirit ‘He shall receive from what is mine, and declare it to you’, is it not luminously clear that a certain hidden mystery is being uncovered? For how, unless the monad, being indivisible, should be broadened into a triad, is it possible for him at one time to say, concerning the Spirit, at one time that he proceeds from the Father, and at another time to say, ‘He will receive from what is mine, and declare it to you’, and again, having breathed on the disciples, to have said ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’? For how, if he proceeds from the Father, does he promise to receive this ministry from the Son? For it is necessary, if there be ‘two divided persons’, as Asterius said, either for the Spirit, proceeding from the father, not to need the ministry of the Son (for it is necessary for everything proceeding from the Father to be perfect, in no wise needing help from another), or, if he receives from the Son, and from his power ministers the grace, he no longer proceeds from the Father.

**P70 S/V 49** (Re 60, K 68)

But if the Gospel says that, having breathed on the disciples, he said ‘receive the Spirit’, it is clear that the Spirit went out from the Word. So if the Spirit went forth from the Word, how does the same ‘proceed’ again ‘from the Father’?

**P71 S/V 50 (Re 60, K 69)**

So not rightly nor fittingly did he say that 'there are three hypostases', having said it not once but even twice.

**P72 S/V 69 (Re 38, K 44)**

For Sabellius himself also having slipped from the right faith, knew neither God nor his holy Word accurately. For the one not knowing the Word did not know the Father either. For it says 'No one knows the Father except the Son', that is the Word. For the Word provides the knowledge of the Father through himself. For thus also he was saying to those of the Jews thinking at that time that they knew God, but setting aside his Word, through whom only God is known: 'No one recognises the Father except the Son and whoever the Son should reveal him to.' For since it was not possible to know God otherwise, he teaches human beings to know him through his own Word; so that he also stumbled, not knowing the Father or his Word accurately.

**P73 S/V 72 (Re 61, K 70)**

That the economy according to the flesh belongs to the human being we know, but that the eternity is united to the Father according to the Spirit we have come to believe.

**P74 S/V 73 (Re 62, K 71)**

For if the inspection of the Spirit should be made alone, the Word should reasonably appear to be one and the same with God; but if the addition according to the flesh should be inspected in the case of the Saviour, the Godhead seems to spread out by activity alone, so that reasonably the monad is truly undivided.

**P75 S/V 117 (Re 72, K 82)**

For having dared to separate the Word from God, and to name the Word another God, standing apart from the Father in both essence and power, unto how great a blasphemy he fell it is possible clearly to learn easily from the very words written by him. And he wrote in these words thus: 'And indeed the image and that of which it is the image are not to be thought to be one and the same, but two *ousiai* and two *pragmata* and two *dunameis*, as also so many names.'

**P76 S/V 118 (Re 75, K 85)**

So how did these, having turned to the same most wicked path of those outside, not choose both to teach and to write the same things, Eusebius having said likewise to both Valentinus and Hermes, and Narcissus to both Marcion and Plato?

**P77 S/V 119 (Re 88, K 99)**

[Saying that he had learned from report that Eusebius preached some things, having been once in Laodicea, and concerning things which he did not know, as having learned from report, he writes, and adds, saying] it was necessary on the contrary to call out to the Lord with tears and grievings, 'We have sinned, we have been impious, we have been lawless, and we have done evil in your sight, and now repenting we ask to obtain clemency from you.' These things were fitting for him, these things it was advantageous to say, because of the measureless kindness and clemency of God. Although it was consequent for God, giving heed with clemency and justice, to reply, saying 'If an enemy had reproached me, I would have borne it, and if one who hated me had boasted against me, I would have hidden from him. But you, O equal-souled man, my leader and my friend; who sweetened food for me when we were together, we went in fellowship in the house of God.'; for that he is with us his priests, we know from his saying, for he said 'I will be with you for all the days of your life until the end of the age.' Then consequently assuredly I suppose he would also have added to the foregoing the following

words: 'Let death come upon them, and may they go down alive to Hades; because evil is in their hearts.' For the Scripture says 'Those being dead in ignorance of impiety are swallowed up by Hades'; for they were dead, though seeming to be alive.

**P78 S/V 120 (Re 73, K 83)**

But the apostle writes such things concerning the faith of the Galatians; but Eusebius, transferring the apostolic meaning, because of which the apostle said this for the sake of the foregoing reason: 'My children, with whom I am again in labour until Christ should be formed in you', blamed the Galatians as not having right opinion concerning God. For he was truly in labour with a certain keen and bitter labour, because he knew the Galatians were not thinking like that man concerning Godly piety, nor were they saying 'Two essences and entities and powers and Gods'.

**P79 S/V 121 (Re 33, K 40)**

But his father Paulinus, being also persuaded by these words, is not vexed both to say and to write the same things, at one time saying Christ to be a second God, and this one to have become God more humanly, and at another affirming him to be a created thing. But that this holds thus, he also said to us once, going through Ancyra, that Christ was a created thing. [And again, making things up, he says to have conversed with Paulinus. Then he slanders the blessed one as] having spoken of many Gods.

**P80 S/V 122 (Re 74, K 84)**

And thus also Eusebius of Caesarea wrote, he also holding the same opinion as Paulinus and the ones outside about the gods. For he wrote that God was not alone, but that 'the only true God' was one. So now, Paulinus the father of Asterius having learned from this also, he thought there to be newer gods.

**P81 S/V 123 (Re 27, K 32)**

Since from where will they be able to show us from the divine words, that 'one is ingenerate and one is generate' thus, as they have believed him to have been born, neither prophets nor evangelists or apostles having said this?

**P82 S/V 124 (Re 70, K 80)**

So that although someone should say this, establishing there to be a first and second God, as Narcissus wrote with these very words, 'For neither does the one saying "Let us make a human being according to our own image and likeness" permit, because he and his father are two', we have heard the Lord himself bearing witness, and from part of the Holy Scriptures. So now, if Narcissus should wish because of this to separate the Word from the Father by *dynamis*, let him know that the prophet who wrote as God having said 'Let us make a human being according to our own image and likeness', he also wrote 'God made the human being.'

**P83 S/V 125 (Re 63, K 72)**

For Asterius asserted according to this, that the father and the Son are one and the same only according to the fact that they are in harmony in all things. For he spoke thus: 'And because of the true harmony in all things, both words and works, the Saviour says 'I and the Father are one.'

**P84 S/V 74 (Re 64, K 73)**

So if he himself says these things, 'I came forth from the Father and I am come', and again 'and the Word which you hear is not mine but that of the Father who sent me', and 'those things which the Father has are mine', it is clear that he was also reasonably saying this, 'The Father is

in me and I am in the Father', in order that the Word, who says this, might be in God, and the Father in the Word, because the Word is the power of the Father. For a witness worthy of belief has called him 'the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.' Not, as Asterius said, 'So because of the perfect harmony in all words and works, the Saviour says "I and the Father are one"', but because it is impossible for either the Word to be divided from God or God from his own Word. For if Asterius thinks the Saviour to have said this 'because of the harmony in all things', and does not, having regard to the second economy, wish to learn the truth, it is necessary to remind him how sometimes it is possible to see disharmony according to the appearance. For thus the words teach us. For what kind of harmony is this, in the time of suffering, when he says 'Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass', but also adds this, 'only, not as I will but as you will.' For it was not of one agreeing to say first of all 'Let this cup pass'; but also the thing that is added seems to be nothing pertaining to harmony, for he says 'Let not my will, but yours, come to pass, Father.' You hear how the letter makes clear the lack of harmony according to the appearance, the one willing and the other not willing. For that the Father was willing it is clear from the fact that what he wanted happened. And that the Son was not willing it is clear from the fact that he pleaded to be let off. And again he says 'I do not seek my will, but the will of the Father who sent me.' So how then does he say the Saviour to have said 'because of the harmony in all things' 'I and the Father are one?'

**P85 S/V 75 (Re 65, K 74)**

How is the Son able to have harmony with the Father, or the Father with the Son, the Son saying 'All things which the Father has are mine'? For it was directly of the Son defrauding the Father to say 'All things which the Father has are mine.' For thanks to this, having omitted to say 'All things which the father has are common', he said 'All things which the Father has are mine'. Though it was not proper for the one who is in harmony to speak thus, but 'All things which the Father has are common.' For if the Acts of the Apostles, praising the harmony of the ones then coming to the faith, said 'All things were common to them', and it behoves to think all things to be common in the case of human beings who are able to be in harmony, by how much more was it necessary for the father and the Son to share commonness, being divided into two hypostases? But now in saying 'All things which the Father has are mine', the Son seems to be defrauding the Father; and now in saying him not to be lord over even his own word, but his Father to be- for he says 'The word which you hear is not mine, but that of the Father who sent me'- he shows the Father to be appropriating the proper things of his child. But each seems according to the thought of Asterius not to have consequently been said. For it was necessary for the one in harmony not to appropriate the just things belonging to another, for this indeed would be greedy, but to think the things belonging to each to be common. So that when we look at the human flesh, not, as Asterius wrote, will we thus find the Saviour to have said 'I and the Father are one'. For not 'because of the perfect harmony in all words and works', as he wrote, did the Saviour say 'I and the Father are one'. For if this were so, he would assuredly have said 'I and the Father are in harmony with one another in all things'. But now he said 'I and the Father are one.' So then, if there was some disharmony among them, and it is necessary for the Lord to speak the truth, it is fitting that Saviour know accurately, that when he should say 'I and the Father are one', then he says this, not looking to the human being he assumed, but to the Word which came forth from the Father. For if there should seem to be any disharmony, this ought to be referred to the weakness of the flesh which the Word assumed, not having had it before; but if oneness should be said, this seems to belong to the Word. Because of this, he not only reasonably said 'I and the Father are one', but also this: 'I am with you for so long a time, Philip, and you say "Show me the Father"?', clearly not to these eyes, but to the intelligible eyes, able to see intelligible things. For the Father exists invisible to the eyes of the flesh, and also his Word. He did not say this to Philip: 'So because of the harmony in all things.'

**P86 S/V 126 (Re 89, K 100)**

For they wish the Saviour to be a man; and it is plain from the fact that Eusebius transferred the meaning of the words of the Apostle to his own will. For as wishing to give birth from a certain old labour pain to the greatest blasphemy, he poured forth from his own treasury evil, according to the saying of the Saviour. For wishing to show the Saviour to be only a man, as

revealing the greatest mystery of the Apostle, ineffable to us, he spoke thus: 'Wherefore most clearly also the divine Apostle shouts and cried out the ineffable to us, and handed down mystical truth about God: 'God is one', then says after the one God, 'one mediator between God and human beings, the man Jesus Christ.' So now, if he says him to be a man, giving heed only to his economy according to the flesh, assuredly he also confesses this, that he does not even have hope in him. For the prophet Jeremiah said 'Cursed is the man who places his hope in man.'

**P87 S/V 127 (Re 90, K 101)**

But the aforementioned, having considered little bits of the holy prophet, as expounding a certain ineffable and concealed truth about God of the Apostle, said 'One God, and one mediator between God and human beings, the man Jesus Christ.' And the one who wrote these things also boasting very much about remembering the Scriptures did not consider that the most holy apostle who wrote this also wrote this: 'The one who exists in the form of God did not consider being to equal God a thing to be held on to, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, coming to be in the likeness of a human being, and having been found in the form of a human being.' You see how, as indeed foreseeing in the Spirit the wickedness of these, the holy Apostle thus in a different place wrote 'As a human being', in order that he might put a stop to such great blasphemy of theirs.

**P88 S/V 128 (Re 91, K 102)**

So how does Eusebius, not having paid attention to these things, wish the Saviour to be only a human being? Not openly daring to say this, but he is convicted of wishing this by his own words.

**P89 S/V 57 (Re 23, K 28)**

So now because of this it seems to me to hold good even now to go through things concerning which I have not yet been through earlier. For most of the things written by him have become clear from the things already written by us. He says 'From the womb before the daystar I begot you.' For he thought assuredly, I suppose, that the hijacked preposition 'from' would agree with the thought of the heresy. Wherefore, having taken away the most proper meaning from the syllable, he wished to signify his birth of old from above.

**P90 S/V 58 (Re 25 K 30)**

For it being dark before because of the ignorance of Godly piety, but the day being about to appear- for he says 'I am the day'- he reasonably names the morning star.

**P91 S/V 59 (Re 26, K 31)**

So now because of this the star making clear the day being reasonably named by the prophet David, it is no longer right that the daystar be sought, 'What indeed is this?' For this was the star having appeared then, the one both bringing and making clear the day to the magi. So it is luminously clear that the 'Before the daystar I begot you' was said by the lord Almighty concerning the Word born through the virgin with human flesh, the Gospel also clearly signifying this, first that our lord was born through the Virgin, and secondly that the star appeared indicating the day.

**P92 S/V 76 (Re 92, K 103)**

For before the whole creation there was a certain quiet, as is likely, the Word being in God. For if Asterius has believed God to be 'creator of all things', it is clear that he too will confess with us, the one to exist eternally, never ever having received a beginning of being, and the other things to have come to be by him, and to have come to be from what was not. For I do not think him to believe in this also the one who says certain things also to be ingenerate, but to be



persuaded precisely that both the heavens and the earth, and all things which are in the heavens and on the earth, came to be by God. So now if he should believe this, it is necessary for him to confess this also with us, that there was nothing else except for God. So the Word had his own glory, being in the Father.

**P93 S/V 77 (Re 93, K 104)**

Asterius names the authority given to him Glory, and not only glory but pre-cosmic glory, not considering that, the world not yet having come to be, there was nothing else apart from God alone.

**P94 S/V 85 (Re 57, K 63)**

So now, whom does Asterius think is the one saying 'I am the one who is', the Son or the Father? For he said 'There are two hypostases, the Father and the Son', looking to the human flesh which the Word of God assumed and imagining thus because of this, 'thus dividing the Son of God from the Father, as also one might divide the son of a human being from his father according to nature.'

**P95 S/V 86 (Re 58, K 64)**

So now, if he will say the Father, dividing himself from the Son, to have said these things to Moses, he will not confess the Son to be God. For how is it possible for the one saying 'I am the one who is' not to confess at the same time that he says himself to be 'the one who is' in contradistinction to the one who is not? But if he should say the Son, divided by hypostasis, to have said this, namely, 'I am the one who is', he will be thought to say the same thing again concerning the Father. And each of these is impious.

**P96 S/V 87 (Re 55, K 61)**

For just as all things which came to be came to be by the Father through the Word, thus also things which are said by the Father are signified through the Word. For because of this also the most holy Moses names the Word 'messenger' here, because he appeared because of nothing other than in order to announce to Moses those things which he knew to be profitable to the Sons of Israel. And he knew it to be profitable to think there to be one God. Wherefore also he said to him 'I am the one who is', in order that he might teach there to be no other God apart from himself. And this is easy, I think, for those thinking well to know also from a certain small and humble example from our world. For it is impossible for anyone to separate the word of a human being by power and by hypostasis; for the word is one and the same with the human being, and is separated in nothing other than only in the energy of the act.

**P97 S/V 88 (Re 53 K 59)**

For God indeed needed no other preparation, such as matter or some other human preparation, for the contrivance, except this preparation which was in his own thought. So since it was impossible for God to think concerning the contrivance of heaven apart from the Word and the Wisdom which belongs to the Word, he reasonably said 'When he prepared the heaven, I was with him.'

**P98 S/V 89 (Re 56, K 62)**

Here the Father says to Moses 'I am the one who is', but he clearly is speaking through the Word. For all things soever which the Father should say, in all cases he appears speaking these things through the Word. But this is clear also from us ourselves, as to liken little things to great and divine things; for all things soever which we wish, according to that which is possible, both to say and to do, we do by our word [= rationality].



**P99 S/V 90 (Re 66, K 75)**

For he himself confesses, saying 'The Father is in me and I am in the Father.' And that he did not say this simply or haphazardly is clear also from another apostolic saying. For the one having said 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism' said 'one God and Father who is above all, and through all, and in all.' You see that not even here does he depart from the harmony, but even here has thought the same thing. For having said 'One Lord' he said again 'one God', in order that whenever he should make mention of one Lord he should embrace also the Father, and whenever he should speak concerning the Father he should bear witness that the Word is not apart from God.

**P100 S/V 91 (Re 68, K 77)**

What then? Unless, giving heed to the Spirit, we think the Monad to be indivisible in power, will we not miss the mark, the Word clearly teaching us, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him alone shall you serve'? And he also proclaims the same thing through the Gospel according to Mark; for one certain scribe having come to him, and asking "'Which is the first of the commandments?'" he answered him thus, saying "'First of all: 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and you shall love the Lord your God with all your soul and with all your strength.' This is first; and the second is like this one: 'You shall love your neighbour as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these.'" And the scribe answered him, "'You have spoken well, Teacher, in truth, because God is one and there is no other besides him.'" But the Scribe, seeming to have learned Godly piety from the Law, appears as praising the word of the Saviour, who is saying 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one', and binding himself with an oath that he had spoken well; for he said 'in truth you have said that God is one and there is no other besides him.' But those boasting that they know the mysteries of the New Covenant, these even wish to imagine 'a second God divided from the Father by hypostasis and by power.'

**P101 S/V 92 (Re 68, K 78)**

But that the divine scripture knows to call the monad Lord and God has become clear already, even from the things said before, through the things God said through his servant Moses: 'And God said again to Moses, "Thus you shall speak to the sons of Israel: 'The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob has sent me to you.'" You see how showing us here one person he calls the same Lord and God. And again likewise the scripture says 'And the Lord spoke all these words, saying "I am the Lord your God who brought you out from the land of Egypt, from the house of slavery. There shall be to you no other gods besides me.'" You hear how he declares there to be one God only through the pronoun. And again a little later, he says 'I am the Lord your God, saying himself to be Lord and God. But what else do we learn through another scripture? 'And you will know today' he says, 'and you will not be twisted in understanding, that the Lord your God, he is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath, and there is none besides him.' And again, in the same book of Deuteronomy, he says 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord, and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.' And again in the same book, 'See, see that I am, and there is no God besides me; I shall kill and I shall give life; I shall strike, and I shall heal.' So how did Asterius, pretending to 'follow the Holy Scriptures simply and fearfully, not know this portion, which says 'The Lord your God, he is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath', and 'there is yet no other besides him' and 'he is one' and 'there is no other besides him'?

**P102 S/V 93 (Re 69, K 79)**

So how will the holy prophet Jeremiah not openly convict him as teaching otherwise? For he spoke thus, prophesying for us the things concerning the Saviour: 'He is God, there shall not be reckoned another one with him. He discovered every way of knowledge, and he gave to Jacob his son and to Israel the one beloved by him. After these things he appeared on the earth, and he went around with human beings.'

**P103 S/V 95 (Re 50, K 55)**

But the Father seems to be in the Word, although it seems not so to Asterius and to those thinking the same things as he. For this seems good to the marvellous prophet Isaiah, the one saying through the Holy Spirit 'And they will worship you, and they will pray in you; because God is in you, and there is no other besides you. For you are God.' You see how he overturns root and branch the crafty wickedness of those teaching otherwise.

**P104 S/V 97 (Re 67, K 76)**

But if you even wish also to hear another prophecy of the same one making firm for us one God, he says 'I am God first, and I am for the coming things.' For the 'I' is indicative of one person, for the two sayings signify one person for us. For having said 'I' he adds also 'am', so that through the two parts of the phrase, the pronoun and the complement, the monad of the Godhead is born witness to. But if he should consider also another testimony, again I will provide for him the same prophet saying 'I am first and I am after these things, and besides me there is no God.' If Asterius thinks the Son to be 'divided by hypostasis from the Father like the Son of a human being', being scandalised from the human flesh which he assumed because of us, let him show us the one saying these things. For the saying here also is of one person spoken of. So who is the one saying 'there is no God besides me'? And let him hear also another prophecy saying 'There is no-one who is just and Saviour besides me.' If he should think there to be two Gods, it is necessary for him to confess the other to be neither just nor Saviour. And if one be neither just nor Saviour, how is it possible still to be God? For he is declared to be one, just and Saviour. And again he says 'Before me there came to be no other, and after me there will be none, I am God, and outside me there will be no Saviour. But if he wishes also to hear the saying of another prophet, perhaps I suppose having been said to him and those disposed likewise to him concerning the Godhead, let him hear the same Isaiah saying 'Be converted, wanderers, be repentant in heart, and remember the former things from of old, because I am God [ὁ θεός] and there is none besides me.' He did not say 'I am divine', in order that even through the addition of the article he might demonstrate clearly God as being one. And what also does Hosea the prophet say? Does not he also bear witness to the same things, saying 'I brought you up from Egypt and you shall know no God besides me, and there is no saviour besides me'? And again Malachi says 'Did not one God create us? Is there not one father of us all?' But I suppose Asterius will say David to have said nothing concerning this, although being the oldest of the other prophets besides Moses, and because of this be doubtful whether to think there to be 'two Gods divided by hypostasis' or also not. So then, in order that he might not say this, I judge it also to follow to show him to him saying the same things as those holy ones who have previously spoken: 'Listen, my people', he says, 'And I will speak to you; Israel, and I will thoroughly witness to you. If you should hear me, there shall not be a recent God among you, nor shall you worship an alien God. For I am the Lord your God.' The one showing himself and saying 'I am', is it not clear that he is showing there to be one God, that is himself?

**P105 S/V 94 (Re 40, K 46)**

...not 'called the Word according to usage', though those teaching otherwise should burst with lying, but being properly and truly Word.

**P106 S/V 110 (Re 54, K 60)**

For before the world was, the Word was in the Father. But when God Almighty proposed to make all thing which are in the heavens and on the earth, the genesis of the world needed active energy, and because of this, there being nothing other than God, for all things are confessed to have come to be by him, then the Word having come forth became maker of the world, who earlier was preparing it intelligibly inside, as the prophet Solomon teaches us; saying 'When he prepared the heavens I was with him, and when he made firm the springs of that which is under heaven, when he was making strong the foundation of the earth, I was with him doing the

joinery. I was the one in whom he rejoiced.’ For the Father rejoiced reasonably with wisdom and power, making all things through the Word.

**P107 S/V 96 (Re 45, K 50)**

For what else was the hidden mystery than that concerning the Word? But this former mystery was thus hidden ‘in God’, so that no-one of the former people should know clearly the things according to the Word, but we should enjoy now the riches ‘of the glory’ and of the hidden mystery.

**P108 S/V 98 (Re 52, K 58)**

For who thus either of the holy angels or of just men was worthy to loose from the character of God the punishment appointed for him, except the Word himself, being with him and fashioning together with him, to whom the father said ‘Let us make a human being according to our image and likeness’, the one able to fashion with him not being another God. For he says ‘I am God first and I am after these things, and there is no God other than me.’ So neither was any younger God, nor any other being God after these things, able to work with God. But if someone using some little and human example according to us should through an image examine the divine activity: just as a certain skilled sculptor, wishing to form a statue, should look first at the patterns of it and the impression in himself, then consider the breadth and length as much as is fitting, should examine a proportion of the whole in the case of each part, and having prepared suitable material of bronze and made a pattern of the statue which is going to be in his own mind, and having thought that he sees intelligibly, and being conscious in himself that Reason is working with him, by which he reckons and with which he is accustomed to do all things, for nothing not done by reason is beautiful, beginning this perceptible work he gives encouragement to himself as to another, saying ‘Come let us make, let us fashion a statue’; thus the Lord God of all, making the ensouled statue from earth, gives encouragement not to some other but to his own word, saying ‘Let us make a human being’, not the same way as for the other things; for by the Word the whole creation came to be.

**P109 S/V 78 (Re 94, K 105)**

For the human being received authority not only over affairs on earth, but also reasonably over affairs in the heavens; for if, when he became both ‘a human being’ and ‘mediator between God and human beings’, then ‘All things were created for him’, as the apostle said, ‘things in the heavens and things on the earth’, it follows to know exactly that the authority is given to him not only of the things on earth, but also of the things in the heavens.

**P110 S/V 79 (Re 95, K 106)**

For if the Holy Gospel speaks concerning a certain glory given to him from the Father, the human being appears to have received this through the Word. For having become ‘mediator of God and human beings’, according to the holy apostle, by means of the glory given to him from the Father he glorified Godly-pious human beings.

**P111 S/V 80 (Re 96 K 107)**

And he made the human being who had fallen through disobedience worthy to be joined to his own Word through the virgin. For what sort of greater glory might there be among human beings than this glory? For having said ‘I have glorified’ you, he continues, saying ‘and I shall glorify again’, in order that because of his excessive love of human beings he might render immortal the formerly mortal human being in the second glory after the resurrection of the flesh, and glorify him with such great glory that he is not only freed from the former slavery, but also made worthy of more than human glory.

**P112 S/V 81 (Re 97, K 108)**

In order that, as I said, he might prepare the human being himself, formerly deceived by the Devil, to conquer the Devil again; because of this he assumed the human being, in order that he might prepare this one consequently to receive the first-fruits of authority.

**P113 S/V 82 (Re 35=97, K 109)**

For this is 'the Beloved', the human being united to the Word, concerning whom the Evangelist said 'This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased.'

**P114 S/V 112 (Re 109, K 122)**

This is the one concerning whom Paul said 'the pre-appointed Son of God.'

**P115 S/V 83 (Re 98, K 110)**

The Word of the invisible God was going to be born through the Virgin, and to assume human flesh, also in order that through it, having prevailed against the Devil, who formerly overpowered the human being, he might prepare him to become not only incorruptible and immortal, but even enthroned in the heavens with God.

**P116 S/V 84 (Re 114, K 127)**

[He said that] the Word of God had prepared human flesh to become immortal through the resurrection, and has taken his seat at the right hand of the Father, wearing it like some crown of victory.

**P117 S/V 111 (Re 34, K 41)**

And because of this he does not name himself Son of God, but everywhere calls himself Son of Man, in order that he might prepare the human being through such a confession to become by fiat son of God because of fellowship with him, and after the end of the act to be again united as Word to God, fulfilling this which had been said earlier by the apostle: 'Then he will be subject to the one who subjected all thing to him, in order that God might be all in all.' For then there will be this which was formerly.

**P118 S/V 99 (Re 99, K 111)**

Then indeed the one having come down and the one having taken flesh from the Virgin was established as king over the church, clearly in order that through the Word the human being, having formerly fallen from the kingdom of heaven, might be able to attain the kingdom. So God, wishing this human being who earlier fell from the kingdom because of disobedience to become Lord and God, worked this economy. So the most holy prophet David says prophetically 'The Lord has become king, let the earth rejoice.'

**P119 S/V 100 (Re 100, K 112)**

Because of which cause, as our lord Christ having received a beginning of kingdom from some time, the prophecy says 'And I have been established king by him.'

**P120 S/V 101 (Re 100, K 113)**

For because of this also he will reign having come to be in the human flesh, and having been established as king through the Word the human being earlier deceived 'at the beginning of all things' by the Devil 'will abrogate both power and authority'. 'For it is necessary for him to reign', he says, 'until such time as his enemies be placed under his feet.' So now the holy

apostle says this to be the end of the kingdom of our lord Christ, all things being subjected under his feet.

**P121 S/V 102 (Re 101, K 114)**

Here the apostle reveals the greatest mystery to us, saying the kingdom of Christ will have an end; and this end, whenever all things be subjected under his feet.

**P122 S/V 103 (Re 102, K 115)**

We have said in our foregoing sayings our lord Christ to have had a beginning of kingdom, using demonstrations from the divine scriptures. There is one which says 'And I will be established king by him on Zion his holy mountain', and another which says 'The Lord has become king, the nations have raged', and again, 'The Lord has become king, let the earth rejoice.' And it is possible to show for testimony things having gone well of absolutely myriads of sayings, that the human being received a beginning of kingdom through the Word. So if he received a beginning of kingdom before absolutely not more than four hundred years, there is nothing strange, if the apostle says the one having attained this kingdom such a short time before to hand the kingdom over, clearly to the God who established him king, as the scripture says.

**P123 S/V 104 (Re 103, K 116)**

So then, he seems to have become distant from the Father for so long a time by *energeia* alone because of the reason of the flesh, until the coming time of the judgement should appear, in order that, those having pierced him then having looked on the one whom they pierced, according to the prophecy, thus the remainder should consequently also happen. For all things being about to be subject to Christ in the time of the end, as the apostle said, 'He will be subject to the one who subjected all things to him.' So now, what do we learn concerning the human flesh, which the Word assumed because of us not absolutely four hundred years before? Or rather, will the Word have this also in the coming ages, or only until the time of judgement? For it is necessary for the thing said by the prophet to be made firm by work. For he says 'They shall look on the one whom they have pierced'. And clearly they pierced the flesh.

**P124 S/V 105 (Re 105, K 118)**

...having held the human body and having shown it to the eyes, he said 'Does this scandalise you? So if you were to see the Son of Man ascending where he was before? The Spirit gives life, but the flesh profits nothing.'

**P125 S/V 106 (Re 104, K 117)**

For that not in order that the Word should be benefited did he assume our flesh, but in order that the flesh should obtain immortality because of the fellowship with the Word, is plain also from the very utterance of the Saviour. For concerning the flesh, having which he was conversing with the disciples, he says this: 'Does this scandalise you? So if you should see the Son of Man going away where he was before? The Spirit gives life, the flesh profits nothing. So if he confesses the flesh to profit him nothing, how is it possible for the thing which is from the earth and profiting nothing also to be with the Word in the coming ages as being advantageous to him? For because of this the Almighty God, the Lord, seems to say to him 'Sit on my right until I place your enemies as the footstool of your feet. Seeming to separate him by energy alone because of the human flesh, and appointing as it were some said time for him of the sitting on the right hand, thus he says to him: 'Until I place your enemies as the footstool of your feet'. But interpreting this prophetic saying of David more clearly for us, I suppose, the holy apostle said thus: 'For it is necessary for him to reign, until he should place his enemies as the footstool of his feet.' So then, the economy and kingdom according to his human being seems to have some limit. For that which was said by the apostle means nothing other than this: 'Until he should place his enemies as the footstool of his feet.' So then, when he should have



the enemies as a footstool of feet, he no longer needs this kingdom in part, being king of all things generally. For he reigns together with the God and Father, whose word he was and is, for neither did the Word himself receive a beginning of kingdom qua himself, but the human being deceived by the Devil became a king through the power of the Word, in order that having become king he might conquer the Devil who had earlier deceived him. Because of this also the Acts of the Apostles teach thus concerning this man, whom the Word of God assumed and having assumed causes to sit at the right hand of the Father, saying 'Whom it is necessary for Heaven to receive until the times of restoration.' And these, as appointing some limit and fixed time, in which it is fitting for the economy according to the human being to be one with the Word, speak thus. For what else does 'Until the times of restoration' intend than [the time] which it was of concern to us to signify, in which it is necessary for all things to obtain the final restoration? So now, if in the time of the restoration of all things Paul said that the creation itself is to be transferred from slavery to freedom, for he said that 'Creation itself will be freed from the slavery of corruption for the freedom of the glory of the children of God, how would it be possible for the form of a slave, which the Word assumed, being the form of a slave, still to be with the Word? But then clearly and manifestly in some short time of the ages past and to come, the holy-speaking Paul said the economy of the Word according to the flesh to have happened to come to be because of us, and that this, just as a beginning, thus also will have an end, thus, I suppose, having said 'Then the end, whenever he should hand over the kingdom to the God and Father.'

**P126 S/V 107 (Re 106, K 119)**

So then, not because of himself but because of us he assumed the human flesh. But if he appears assuming it because of us, but all things which are according to us by his *pronoia* and *energeia* will have an end in the time of judgement, there will no longer be any need of this partial kingdom.

**P127 S/V 108 (Re 107, K 120)**

But if someone should say because of this the human flesh to be worthy of the Word, that because of the resurrection it has been made immortal, let him know that not everything that is immortal is worthy of God. For God is also greater than immortality itself, the one who by his own will is able to make also immortal those things which are not. But that not everything immortal is worthy to be united to God is clear also from the powers and authorities and angels being immortal not to belong to the oneness of God.

**P128 S/V 109 (Re 108, K 121)**

But if someone should ask concerning this flesh which became immortal in the Word, what do we say to him? That we do not think it is safe to be dogmatic concerning things which we have not learned precisely from the Divine Scriptures. For how is it possible for those even overturning the dogmas of others to do this? But we shall say to those wishing to learn the exact account concerning this from us, that being persuaded by the holy apostle, we know that it is fitting for us to see the hidden mysteries thus, as he said; he says 'For now we see through a mirror in an enigma, but then face to face; now we know in parts, but then we will know just as we have also been known.' So do not ask me concerning things which I have not learned clearly from the Divine Scriptures. So now, because of this, neither will I be able to speak clearly concerning that divine flesh made fellow to the divine Word. But now I believe the Divine Scriptures, that God is One, and the Word of that [One God] on the one hand came forth of the Father, in order that 'All things' might come to be 'through him', but on the other after the time of judgement and the setting right of all things, and the disappearance of every opposing force, 'then he will be subjected to the one who subjected all things to him', 'to the God and Father', in order that thus the Word be in God, just as also he was before, before the world was. For there being earlier nothing other than God alone, but all things being about to come to be through the Word, the Word went forth with active energy, this being the Word of the Father.



## APPENDIX THREE

### The Deposition of Eustathius of Antioch

#### 1. The End of Eustathius of Antioch and the Resurrection of Eusebius of Nicomedia.

The date of and the reason for the fall of Eustathius, the leader, with Alexander, of the anti-Eusebian movement at Nicaea, is crucial to any reconstruction of the events which followed Nicaea, and to any attempt to explain the reversal of the fortunes of both the Eusebians and the anti-Eusebian coalition in the ensuing decade.

Every date between 326 and 331 has been suggested for Eustathius' deposition,<sup>1</sup> but the important question in this regard is whether Eustathius was deposed before or after the return of Eusebius and Theognis from exile. Was Eustathius' downfall, though presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea, in fact the work of Eusebius of Nicomedia, as all the fifth century historians claim? Or was the return of Eusebius and Theognis, and, indeed, Arius, to some degree a reaction to Eustathius' departure?

The evidence for the dating is well summarised in three articles, Henry Chadwick's 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', R.P.C. Hanson's 'The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch', and R.W. Burgess' 'The Date of the Deposition of Eustathius of Antioch'.<sup>2</sup>

Chadwick's evidence is as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> 326: Schwarz, Chadwick; 327: Simonetti, Barnes; 328: R.W. Burgess, 329: Hanson; 330/1: Sellars et al.

<sup>2</sup> H. Chadwick, 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS* 49 (1948), pp. 27-35; R.P.C. Hanson, 'The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch', *ZKG* 95 (1984), pp. 171-179; R.W. Burgess, 'The Date of the Deposition of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS* ns 51 (2000), pp. 150-160.

1. Paulinus of Tyre, who succeeded Eustathius to the see of Antioch (*CM I.4.4*), was already dead by the time Asterius wrote his defence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, since Asterius refers to him as *μακάριος*, a term generally applied to the dead (*CM I.4.17*). Since Asterius' defence must have been written before Eusebius' return in December 327, Eustathius must have been deposed in 326. (This argument was originally put by Edvard Schwartz.)<sup>3</sup>
2. Asclepas of Gaza is mentioned in the letter of the Eastern bishops at Sardica as having been deposed seventeen years previously. The letter of the Western bishops tells us that this was done at Antioch 'in the presence of his enemies and Eusebius of Caesarea.' This presumably implies the presidency of Eusebius of Caesarea, which is highly unlikely to have happened during Eustathius' episcopate, although it could have been at the same synod which deposed Eustathius. Chadwick dated the synod of Sardica to 342, which would give a date for Asclepas' deposition of 326.
3. The Empress Helena made a pilgrimage to Palestine sometime after Nicaea, during which she would probably have passed through Antioch. This might have been in reparation for the execution by Constantine of his son, her grandson Crispus, in spring of 326. She might well have met Eustathius, who might have made some inappropriate remark about her colourful past, leading to swift retribution from Constantine.

Those who have favoured 327 have also embraced Chadwick's reasoning, at least on the first two points, but have dated the synod of Sardica to 343 (as was established by Hamilton Hess, in favour of Frederick Loofs and against Schwartz)<sup>4</sup>. These include Simonetti and T.D. Barnes. R.P.C. Hanson, however, provided in his article the following counter-arguments to Chadwick, arguing (at this point) for the date 328 or 329:

1. Asterius, known to have sacrificed during the persecutions, would have been too much of a coward to risk Constantine's anger by defending Eusebius before he

---

<sup>3</sup> Schwartz (1911), p. 397

<sup>4</sup> Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), pp.140-144.

was reinstated, and so his defence must have been written after that event. In any case, μακάριος is not used exclusively of the dead.

2. The letter of the Western bishops does not state that Eusebius of Caesarea presided over Asclepas' deposition, merely that he was present. Eustathius might have been the president, and Eusebius of Caesarea, as Asclepas' metropolitan, simply the accuser. In any case, Athanasius is said by the Easterners to have agreed to the deposition of Asclepas, which he must have done after he became bishop in 328. If this is so, this statement and the figure of seventeen years before Sardica cannot both be correct. (Chadwick had seen this point and argued in a footnote that Athanasius' agreement must be meant to be encompassed in his predecessor's signing of the deposition, but Hanson considers this argument, not unreasonably, to be inherently implausible).
3. The idea that Constantine would have allowed Helena by a public pilgrimage of reparation to publicise something he wished to conceal, and to forget as far as possible, is unlikely.

Hanson is surely right on the third point, and to some extent on the second. Athanasius' signing Asclepas' deposition would not be an insuperable difficulty, since it was common to ask bishops to subscribe to synodal proceedings even some time after the synod itself, but it does offer a small counterweight to the case for 327. But his view that Asterius was too much of a coward to stand by his friends in their exile is unfair (a quite different form of courage is involved here than that needed to face the threat of prolonged physical torture), and his claim that Eustathius would have stood together with Eusebius of Caesarea to depose someone whom the Westerners at Sardica later unhesitatingly pronounced innocent (and they were choosy about such judgements) is unconvincing. He produces no examples of μακάριος used of the living, and although some could be adduced from Lampe, none involves the use of the word as an epithet for a still-living named individual. Asterius does not use the word of any of his other friends, including Eusebius of Nicomedia, whom he is supposed to be defending. It seems likely, therefore, that Paulinus

was indeed dead when Asterius wrote. I will argue below that Hanson's case for a date after the return of Eusebius and Theognis is driven by his view (which I believe to be mistaken) that Eustathius was deposed for Sabellianism. His date of 328, however, has lately received some vindication in the article of R.W. Burgess.

Burgess proposes the date of late (October-December) 328, for the following reasons:

1. A Syriac chronicle (the *Liber Calipharum*, or *Chronicon miscellaneum ad annum Domini 724 pertinens*) states that Eustathius was bishop for four years. (Burgess recognises that this could give any date from about January 328 to October 329, depending on whether the counting is inclusive or not, and whether it is a round figure).
2. Jerome, in his Latin translation and continuation of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronici canones*, which derives its information, like the *Liber Calipharum*, from a lost Greek continuation of the *Chronici*, mentions the deposition of Eustathius in an entry which extends through the years 328 and 329. This same entry, in Burgess' reconstructed Greek original (which he dates to Antioch in 350), includes in order the ordination of Athanasius, the ordination of Eulalius (who Burgess thinks succeeded Eustathius) and the dedication of Constantinople (which we know from other sources to have been on 11 May 330).
3. Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, which may, though indirectly, be based on the same source, gives the date of 640 (Seleucid era), which Burgess reckons would have been the regnal year '24 Constantine', i.e. 1 October 328- 30 September 329 in the Antiochene reckoning, in the lost *Continuatio Antiochiensis*.
4. The evidence of Philostorgius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Gelasius claims that Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea were involved in engineering the synod which deposed Eustathius.
5. The dating of the deposition of Asclepas of Gaza is not significant: the Easterners at Sardica were presumably wrong in their calculation, and they

would only have been out by a year, owing to the vagaries of the various oriental calendars, if he was actually deposed in early 329.

Late Syriac chronicles are notoriously inaccurate in their dating of bishops' reigns and numbers of years, as Burgess himself allows, and the different possibilities for errors to be transmitted in dates even when making use of early sources are legion, above all where they involve translation into other languages and different dating systems; and even his Antiochene source of 350 is at least as likely to be mistaken as the Eastern bishops at Sardica. However, Burgess has brought new information to an old question, which is to be welcomed, and there are one or two other indications favouring a date of 328, though earlier rather than later in that year, which will be considered shortly.

Crucial to the question of the particular dating of Eustathius' deposition are the reason for his fall, and the relative order of this event and the return from exile of Eusebius of Nicomedia. Those who date Eustathius' fall to late 328 or later see it as due to Eusebius' machinations, and so consequent on his return. Others, for example Barnes, have seen Eusebius' return as rather a consequence of Eustathius' fall. And if his downfall is supposed to have been for theological reasons, for the heresy of Sabellianism, like Marcellus, this would strongly suggest a date after the reinstatement of Eusebius and Theognis, whose theology would thereby be supposed to have been finally deemed acceptable to Constantine, for whatever reason. Providing a secure date for the return of Eusebius is therefore an important step in making a final judgement on the relative order of the two events.

**a. The date of the returns of Arius, Eusebius and Theognis.**

Socrates and Sozomen give us a letter, which they designate as coming from Eusebius and Theognis, petitioning an unspecified synod of bishops which has already accepted Arius back into communion to allow the petitioners back also,

and to petition the Emperor to the same end. This letter presents us with a problem: was it the same synod, in session long enough for Eusebius and Theognis, exiled to Gaul, to hear of Arius' vindication, which exonerated first the presbyter and then the bishops, or were they two different synods, composed of enough of the same people for the exiled bishops to address the second as the same body as the first?

In the past, a number of scholars used this letter, a passage in Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*, a passage from Philostorgius and an odd remark of Athanasius' to argue that there had actually been a second session of the synod of Nicaea, with the original 250 bishops recalled for the occasion, some time in late 327-328. T.D. Barnes actually dated it to December 327, in defiance of the barriers winter travel would certainly have constituted to such a gathering.

The passage in Eusebius is as follows:

Ἄλλὰ γὰρ ἀπάντων εἰρηνευομένων μόνοις Αἰγυπτίοις ἄμικτος ἦν ἡ πρὸς ἀλλήλους φιλονεικία, ὡς καὶ αὐθις ἐνοχλεῖν βασιλέα, οὐ μὴν καὶ πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐγείρειν. οἷα γοῶν πατέρας ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον προφήτας θεοῦ πάσῃ περιέπων τιμῇ καὶ δεῦτερον ἐκάλει καὶ πάλιν ἐμεσίτετε τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀνεξικακῶς, καὶ δώροις ἐτίμα πάλιν...

VC III.23<sup>5</sup>

The question is whether οἱ αὐτοί are the whole company of the bishops who had gathered at Nicaea (the description of which immediately precedes this passage), or merely the Egyptians. In the context, it seems to me to make much more sense to understand them as being the Egyptians, Alexander and the Melitians, in fact, whose quarrel had not been resolved at Nicaea.

---

<sup>5</sup> 'When all were at peace, however, among the Egyptians alone the mutual bitterness remained undiluted, so that the Emperor was troubled yet again, though still not roused to anger. So with every honour he treated them as fathers, or rather prophets of God, called them a second time, again mediated tolerantly between the same people, and again honoured them with gifts' (tr. Cameron and Hall, slightly altered).



An odd sentence in Athanasius' *Apology Against the Arians*, one which is also used by those who favour this theory as evidence for a second session of Nicaea, may hide an explanation for this. Athanasius says: 'But in the synod at Nicaea the heresy was anathematised and the Arians driven out, but the Melitians for some reason or other were received; for it is not now necessary to name the cause.' The Greek continues,

οὐπω γὰρ πέντε μῆνες παρήλθον, καὶ ὁ μὲν μακαρίτης Ἀλέξανδρος τετελεύτηκεν, οἱ δὲ Μελιτιανοὶ δέον ἡρεμεῖν καὶ χάριν ἔχειν, ὅτι κἂν ὅλως ἐδέχθησαν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς κύνας οὐκ ἐπιλαθόμενοι ὧν ἐξήρασαν πάλιν τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐτάραττον. ('For not yet five months passed, and the blessed Alexander is dead, but the Melitians- it being necessary to be at peace and to have gratitude that they were received at all- but they, like dogs not forgetting what they had vomited up, again were troubling the churches.')

*Ap c Ar 59.3*

This is an extremely odd sentence, both grammatically and chronologically. The aorist-perfect sequence of tenses at the beginning is surprising, and it is very difficult to make the second οἱ δὲ construe at all, unless as in the translation above it is taken to be resumptive. In addition, οὐπω γὰρ πέντε μῆνες παρήλθον, καὶ ὁ μὲν μακαρίτης Ἀλέξανδρος τετελεύτηκεν is a very odd way to say that after five months Alexander died. It is all the odder, because Alexander certainly did not die five months after Nicaea, but on 17<sup>th</sup> April 328.

For the latter reason, Athanasius is often held to be talking about a second session of Nicaea which exonerated Arius, Eusebius and Theognis, about whose existence Athanasius is otherwise entirely silent because he hates to admit that Arius was legitimately exonerated by a synod with the same status as that which deposed him. But it makes better sense of the double oddness of construction and chronology to assume that something, perhaps quite a long passage, has dropped out, and what Athanasius actually said to have happened 'not five months' after Nicaea was some trouble caused by the Melitians which eventually ended in a reconciliation in the presence of the emperor Constantine between 'the blessed Alexander' and the Meletians, who however once

Alexander was dead, ‘not having forgotten what they had vomited up again were troubling the churches’. In this case, the ‘γὰρ’ of ‘οὐπω γὰρ πέντε μῆνες παρήλθον’ would be explaining why it was not necessary to give the cause of their being received at Nicaea, the subject of the previous sentence: the whole settlement had had to be reviewed five months later in any case. This passage would be parallel to the passage in *Apology Against the Arians* 76.3 (see also 74.3-4), where Athanasius speaks in not dissimilar terms (once again using the phrase ‘the blessed Alexander’) of the Meletian problem, and describes a synod held by Ossius where the Meletian clergy were accepted but the ordinations of Colluthus were pronounced invalid.

Not five months after Nicaea would be November or early December; this would presumably be the date of the first stirrings of the Meletian problem after Nicaea, but the problem must have taken some time to arbitrate. Ossius’ visit to Alexandria is not likely to have happened until the spring, unless he was already there, having returned there with Alexander after Nicaea. If Eusebius’ words imply a synod at Nicomedia or nearby at which Constantine was physically present, this is unlikely to have taken place until the spring of 327, for Constantine was in the West from the beginning of April 326 until then (he is attested in Thessalonica in late February 327, and Constantinople on June 11<sup>th</sup>). But it is possible that Eusebius’ language leaves room for mediation and approval of synodal acts by Constantine’s representative, Ossius, rather than by the emperor himself.

One more synod which is used as evidence for a second session of Nicaea is mentioned in Philostorgius:<sup>6</sup>

After three whole years [he says that] Eusebius and Maris and Theognis, having obtained a return by the decree of the Emperor Constantine, put forth a symbol of heretical faith and everywhere sent letters for the overthrow of the synod in Nicaea; and deposed Alexander of Alexandria and excommunicated him, because reverting he had turned again to the homoousion. But also they laid a charge against Eustathius of Antioch of intercourse with a

slave girl and enjoyment of shameful pleasure; the Emperor sentenced him to banishment, making him an exile to the West. And he says that the full complement of this lawless synod was two hundred and fifty, and that they made Nicomedia the workshop of their lawless deeds.

Philostorgius, *HE* II.7 (Photius)

After three whole years he [Constantine] also decreed return to the Eusebians. And indeed, having returned from the Gauls, they assembled a synod of two hundred and fifty bishops in Nicomedia, and deposed Alexander and all those preaching the homoousios.

Philostorgius, *HE* II.7<sup>a</sup> (Nicetas)

This synod of two hundred and fifty at Nicomedia which undid the work of Nicaea completely may be to some extent Eusebian wishful thinking- Alexander was certainly never deposed in his lifetime- but Philostorgius' account of it may be more accurate than is generally allowed. But a synod held by Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris and Theognis 'for the overthrow of the synod in Nicaea' cannot be the same synod which reinstated them, an ecclesiastical judgement that must have been made before their return from exile (Constantine was always careful to have his own ecclesiastical appointments or depositions ratified by an ecclesiastical synod, usually manoeuvred in such a way as to sustain the fiction that the decision was theirs). This would be an entirely different synod, having nothing to do with Constantine, but held by Eusebius to call his friends and supporters around him once more, and attempt to put paid to the theology which had triumphed at Nicaea, but whose champions were apparently all now either dead or disposed of. Alexander was already dead by this time, and Eustathius already deposed, but the Nicomedian synod made the futile gesture of denouncing the former, as well as taking the opportunity to subscribe to the deposition of the latter.

From this it should be clear that the second session of the Council of Nicaea which met at Nicomedia and received Arius back into communion, settled the

---

<sup>6</sup> Philostorgius, *HE* II.7 (p. 18.21 - p. 19.10).

Melitian question, demoted Colluthus, reinstated Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis and deposed Eustathius rests on extremely shaky ground. In addition to the problems already noted, there are some further difficulties. There is no precedent anywhere in the ancient world for a *σύνοδος* or a *concilium*, meeting two years after an earlier one, being designated the same synod in such a way that to speak of the 'synod of Nicaea' one would naturally mean both meetings (far less if the second actually took place at Nicomedia). The idea of 'sessions' of a council does not actually occur until the Council of Trent; and ascription of them to Nicaea is based on the view that that synod can be reified as existing apart from the people who actually attended it (again a theology which does not appear before Trent), and was so by those who attended it. Athanasius, in particular, has to be regarded firstly as believing it to be a matter of unquestionable fact that there was a second session of Nicaea, which could only be agreed (however reluctantly) to constitute the same synod, so that he slips unconsciously into speaking of it in the same breath as the first session, and secondly as nonetheless concealing its existence as far as he can.

In addition, there is the time needed for the synod to exonerate Arius, for the news to come to Eusebius and Theognis in Gaul, and for their letter of petition to be brought back, read, and acted upon. If we assume Eusebius and Theognis were in somewhere like Trier (whither Athanasius was later sent), since Philostorgius tells us they were in Gaul, and Constantine had claimed to have exiled them 'as far away as possible', they would have been at least twenty-five days by *cursus publicus* from Nicomedia, even assuming the emperor was well enough disposed to them at the time to allow them to use it. This would make the optimum time for their hearing of Arius' exoneration and petitioning the synod for their own restoration nearly two months, even without the time the synod would have taken to debate and make a decision on these two matters. If the time for the petition to the emperor, his acceptance and the recall of the Bithynian bishops is added, so that Eusebius and Theognis could then themselves participate in the later part of the synod, is added, the minimum time required becomes four months or more. But even discounting this part of

Philostorgius' picture, the 'second session' of Nicaea at Nicomedia would have been appreciably longer than the first.

For this reason, and because of the general difficulties involved with a recalling of those who were at Nicaea, the synod which received Arius and Euzoius and Eusebius and Theognis is now generally thought to be a local Bithynian synod, or more likely two consecutive local synods, since according to the canons of Nicaea these should now have been happening twice-yearly.<sup>7</sup>

The question may be asked whether Constantine would have considered a local Bithynian synod sufficient to reinstate Arius (there is no difficulty in the case of Eusebius and Theognis, who were not deposed at Nicaea). It is possible that the synod which exonerated Arius was slightly larger than one province, including token representatives from other nearby provinces, although it must have been nearly enough composed of the same people as the local Bithynian synod for Eusebius and Theognis to think of them as such. But there is no evidence at all that any of the anti-Eusebian party signed up to the reinstatement of Arius at this point- he would never have been such a successful shibboleth in later years, if they had.

We are now left dividing the evidence for a second session of Nicaea among a whole series of different occasions. Eusebius' account of a recall by Constantine of 'the same people' refers to the Egyptians, as do Athanasius' references to some event connected with the Melitians which began 'not five months' after Nicaea and involved the intervention of Ossius and a synod which demoted Colluthus but upheld the ordinations of Melitius; if this synod met in the presence of Constantine, it cannot have done so before March 327.

The death of Alexander, the deposition of Eustathius, the reception of Arius and Euzoius, and the reinstatement of Eusebius and Theognis would therefore have

taken place on four separate occasions. Separate again would be the large synod at Nicomedia, possibly including like-minded bishops from other provinces also, which took place after the return of Eusebius and Theognis (presumably the next scheduled provincial synod), and which issued a creed, possibly somewhat akin to the Second Creed of Antioch, and sent various letters, perhaps including one composed by Asterius the Sophist in defence of the theology of Eusebius of Nicomedia, in the form of a commentary on the creed. Philostorgius is the only direct evidence for such a synod after the return of Eusebius and Theognis, but it has several attendant probabilities. It is likely that Eusebius and Theognis, once back in harness, would have moved to reassert their authority as firmly as possible; there would have been another synod scheduled for Lent in any case. It would provide a good setting for Asterius' letter, which is both defence of Eusebius and commentary on a creed much like the Second Creed of Antioch, a combination not otherwise readily explicable. And it would provide a strong impetus for Marcellus to write his *Contra Asterium*, which would now be aimed not simply at one personal rival, but at the whole Eusebian phalanx at their strongest.

Such a synod might well also have been the occasion for the alliance of the Meletians with the Eusebians which occurred about this time, which Athanasius complains of in the *Apology Against the Arians* and elsewhere. If this alliance actually took place at a large synod, it would explain why Athanasius (and hence the other church historians) makes no mention of this synod: it suits him to present this alliance as a small, personal affair, rather than the agreement of a substantial number of bishops that his ordination was suspect.

Can we date these putative events? The starting point is the assertion of Philostorgius that Eusebius, Maris and Theognis were restored after 'three whole years (μετὰ τρεῖς ὅλους ἐνιαυτούς)', a phrase which occurs in both Photius' and Nicetas' resumés of Philostorgius at this point. This is more

---

<sup>7</sup> So Simonetti, Hanson and Williams.; T.D. Barnes still thinks in *Athanasius* that there was a larger synod in December or January 327/8 which both considered the Melitian problem and



precise than ancient historians usually are, and deserves to be treated with some respect for its accuracy. We still do not know whether it means three whole years after Nicaea or three whole years after they were sent into exile, nor whether it refers to the date of the synod which re-instated them, the date of Constantine's letter to them allowing their return, or the date when they actually set foot once more in Bithynia, but whichever of these events Philostorgius is using for his date occurred in either late July or early August 328, or else October or November.

The key to fixing their exoneration more exactly is a letter of Constantine to Arius dated 25<sup>th</sup> November which is given in Socrates.<sup>8</sup> It asks why, having been informed 'some time since' that he might come to Constantine's court, Arius still delays, and instructs him to take the *cursus publicus* and come to court (the word means an army encampment) immediately, in order to first experience the Emperor's clemency and regard, and then return to his own country. If this letter was written in November 328, it was probably written at Trier (where Constantine spent the autumn and winter of 328/9), which may well have been where Eusebius and Theognis were in exile. Arius himself was in Illyricum, halfway between Trier and Nicomedia.

The question is what relation Constantine's letter has to the synod which exonerated Arius. It would seem from the petition of Eusebius and Theognis to the synod which had already exonerated Arius that the ordinary order of events was for an episcopal synod to make a decision and then to formally petition Constantine for its decision to be carried out- although naturally the synod would take care to be sure in advance that Constantine was likely to look favourably on the petition. In this case, it is likely that Constantine himself took the initiative, writing to Arius to ask him to submit a creed (presumably that which is given by Socrates at 3.26), and then called a synod to reconsider his case. That synod would probably have taken place at Nicomedia or Nicaea,

---

reinstated Arius, Eusebius and Theognis.

<sup>8</sup> Socrates, *HE* 1.25.

even if Constantine was in the West (as he probably was from May 18<sup>th</sup> 328 until the following summer), since the body who exonerated Arius had to be in some sense the same body who had excommunicated him. The presence of Constantine himself would not have been necessary; imperial commissioners from Nicomedia could have performed any functions necessary to ensure that the gathering acted as Constantine wished. Having received formal notice of its decision, he would have contacted Arius to ask him to present himself at court, have the sentence of exile formally revoked and return to the East, and, on hearing nothing from Arius, would have written to him a second time with the same offer.

Constantine must have passed through Illyricum in the summer of 328: he is attested at Oescus in Dacia Ripensis on July 5<sup>th</sup>, and Trier on September 27<sup>th</sup>, where he spent the winter. He could have been in close contact with Arius at this period, which is in fact exactly when he would need to have contacted Arius for the first time, to begin the process of his reinstatement to the presbyterate.

Into the period between Constantine's initial approach and the letter of November 25<sup>th</sup> we need to fit an initial letter from Constantine to Arius to ask for a creed on the basis of which he and Euzoius might be pardoned (which might only have taken a day, if Constantine acted when he was passing through whichever part of the country Arius was in), Arius' reply (the same), instructions from Constantine to officials asking them to assemble a synod to try the case (about fifteen days), the time for the synod to be convoked and to assemble (at least three weeks, even if it was only a local synod), the time for the synod to transact its business with regard to Arius and Euzoius (at least a week), an account of the acts of the synod to be sent to Constantine, now in Trier (twenty-five days), and his first letter to Arius calling him to court (fifteen days), as well as time for this first letter to have been 'some time since' when Constantine sent a second. This would mean Constantine first contacted Arius some time between the middle of July and the middle of August, and the synod

which exonerated him met some time between the end of August and the end of September.

According to the canons of Nicaea, a provincial synod of Bithynia would have been due to meet in early October. It seems unlikely that Constantine would have called a synod for the week or the fortnight before one was due to meet anyway; there is too little time, however, for Arius to have been exonerated at this synod, for a letter to have been despatched to Constantine at Trier, and for Constantine to have written twice to Arius by November 25<sup>th</sup> and left him any time actually to make the journey to court before he wrote the second letter. The synod which exonerated Arius should therefore be placed at the beginning of the period in question, around the last week in August- bearing in mind that it might have been even earlier, if Constantine wrote to Arius from Dacia rather than waiting until he was in Illyricum.

The synod which exonerated Eusebius and Theognis must therefore be the ordinary autumn provincial synod of Bithynia in the first week of October, to square with the Philostorgius evidence, since the other possible date from Philostorgius, late July/early August, would have been too soon (i.e. Arius himself would not have had time to be received yet). Arius may have been waiting for the result of the petition to this synod before he travelled to court, since it would have been further security for him that Constantine did indeed mean clemency.

The major difficulty with this chronology is a document given only in the late fifth-century historian Gelasius of Cyzacus, a letter from Constantine to Alexander asking that he receive Arius back into the church at Alexandria, which would seem to demand for Arius' reinstatement a date before Alexander's death. It is true that Ehrhardt judges that this document, the only independent one Gelasius gives for this period, may be, for once, genuine, since there is no evidence of anti-Arian rhetoric. But Gelasius is not a difficult author to impugn. If this were a forgery, designed simply to pad out the narrative at

this point like some general's speech, anti-Arian rhetoric would be out of place, since it is included to demonstrate Constantine's sudden shift back towards the Arians. On the other hand, the use by Constantine of the word 'co-decree' for his role at Nicaea looks suspect: Constantine always insisted on the claim that ecclesiastical decisions were made by only ecclesiastical authorities, which he would ratify, but not overtly take part in. Philostorgius' evidence of the 'three whole years', and the consequent necessity that Constantine's letter to Arius of November 25<sup>th</sup> should be 25<sup>th</sup> November 328, would seem to have the better claim to authenticity.

#### **b. The cause of the deposition of Eustathius.**

If Eusebius and Theognis were exonerated at a synod in Bithynia in early October 328, they may have received letters from Constantine recalling them from exile around the first of November, if they too were at Trier. Even if they had set out immediately, they could not have reached Bithynia before December, and they certainly would not have had time to begin a plot to unseat Eustathius before the end of the year. If Burgess is right in his evidence for 328 as the date of Eustathius' deposition (and Schwartz's argument that Asterius wrote defending Eusebius on his reinstatement after the death of Eustathius' successor Paulinus also still stands, even if the Asclepas evidence does not), Eusebius and Theognis cannot have been directly involved in it, despite the claims of the church historians. Eustathius cannot have been deposed as a Sabellian at this period, the victim of a new resurgence of Eusebian theological influence: there simply would not have been time for Eusebius to re-establish a power-base. Eustathius must have been deposed on some other rationale.

The one which immediately presents itself is sexual irregularity. This is directly given as the reason, or the alleged reason, for Eustathius' deposition by Sozomen, Theodoret and Philostorgius, and implicitly by Socrates ('As some affirm, [this happened] for other and unsatisfactory reasons, though none other have been openly assigned: this is a matter of common occurrence; the bishops

are accustomed to do this in all cases, accusing and pronouncing impious those whom they depose, but not explaining their warrant for so doing' (*HE* I.24.1)).

It is true that the two stories which detail the charges, Theodoret's and Philostorgus', are rather different: Theodoret has Eustathius accused of being the father of an illegitimate child, Philostorgius of 'intercourse with a slave-girl and shameful pleasure'. It is true also that none of the fourth-century evidence is this specific: Athanasius claimed Eustathius was deposed for speaking slightly of the Emperor's mother,<sup>9</sup> the letter of the Easterners at Sardica speaks vaguely of Eustathius and a certain Quimatius 'de quorum vita infami ac turpi dicendum nihil est; exitus enim illorum eos omnibus declaravit',<sup>10</sup> and Socrates adduces an encomium of Eusebius of Emesa by George of Laodicea, which claims Eustathius was deposed for Sabellianism on the indictment of Cyrus of Beroea.<sup>11</sup> But I will argue that in this case, despite his apparent untrustworthiness, we ought to believe Theodoret, and that there are good reasons why all the other commentators are extremely hazy about exactly why Eustathius was deposed.

The first point to note is that, despite R.W. Burgess's assertion that 'the circumstances of the deposition of Eustathius are fairly clear',<sup>12</sup> virtually all the ancient commentators are extremely hazy as to their details. Every account we have of his fall is different, and nearly all seem to be characterised by a lack of specific knowledge, and to be reliant on various forms of rumour and hearsay. Eusebius of Caesarea, who certainly knows what happened, since he presided at the deposition, is extremely coy. Granted that the *Vita Constantini*, in which he alludes to the episode, is spectacularly coy about much of the ecclesiastical politics of the period it covers, he also seems to have been coy about passing the information on to his associates: the Easterners at Sardica, who include two people, Narcissus of Neronias and Macedonius of Mopsuestia, who were

---

<sup>9</sup> *Historia Arianorum* 4.1

<sup>10</sup> CSEL 65, p. 66, lines 25-27. This 'Eustasius' with whom Ossius was close need not be Eustathius of Antioch, but is generally assumed to be, including by Feder (index, p. 273).

<sup>11</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.24. This work is usually dated somewhere in the 350s.

intimately bound up with Antiochene politics at this period (though probably did not attend the synod which deposed Eustathius), seem only to have the vaguest idea of Eustathius' crimes- and their letter does not pull punches in ascribing any crimes they do know of to their enemies. The fact that Eustathius left a dedicated band of schismatic followers behind him, with whom Athanasius and Marcellus were both in communion, who lasted to the 381 Council of Constantinople and beyond, suggests that there was at least room for serious doubt in the popular mind as to the justice of the sentence. And the fact that Eustathius lived in post-Eusebian tradition as a heretic as much as an adulterer suggests that even on the part of his enemies there was a lack of that long-lived traditional memory of his crimes that developed around those of Athanasius and Marcellus.

Socrates plumps for a charge of heresy. After the synod of Nicaea, he tells us, Eustathius of Antioch and Eusebius of Caesarea wrote against one another, Eusebius accusing those who approved of the word *homoousios* of following Sabellius and Montanus, and Eustathius in particular of being a follower of Sabellius, and Eustathius accusing his opponents of polytheism and the holding of pagan views, and Eusebius in particular of perverting the Nicene creed.<sup>13</sup> Socrates does not, unfortunately, quote from the documents themselves, but his comments are interesting and suggestive, for two reasons above all. In the first place, the word *homoousios*, though defined by Nicaea, is notoriously absent from the vocabulary of most of the anti-Eusebians until Athanasius takes it up once more in the early 350s. Socrates may be projecting the word, standard in his own day, back into the earlier debate, but he appears at this point to have access to at least two actual texts, or at least to fairly specific descriptions of them. In addition, the accusations thrown back and forth between Eusebius and Eustathius, of Sabellianism and Montanism on the one hand and polytheism and paganism on the other, exactly mirror those made in the attacks against one another of Eusebius and Marcellus a few years later.

---

<sup>12</sup> Burgess, 'Eustathius'.

<sup>13</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.23



In consequence of this disagreement, Socrates tells us, a synod at Antioch deposed Eustathius, on indictment by Cyrus of Beroea, ‘as a supporter of the Sabellian heresy’; he gives his source as an encomium of Eusebius of Emesa by George of Laodicea.<sup>14</sup> Socrates also tells us ‘As some affirm, [this happened] for other and unsatisfactory reasons, though none other have been openly assigned: this is a matter of common occurrence; the bishops are accustomed to do this in all cases, accusing and pronouncing impious those whom they depose, but not explaining their warrant for so doing.’

Sozomen spells out this last hint of Socrates.<sup>15</sup> ‘It was most generally believed that he [Eustathius] was deposed merely on account of his adherence to the faith of the council of Nicaea, and on account of his having accused Eusebius, Paulinus of Tyre and Patrophilus of Scythopolis ...of favouring the heresy of Arius. The pretext resorted to for his deposition, however, was that he had defiled the priesthood by unholy deeds.’

The one person above all others who ought to know what happened to Eustathius, because he presided over the synod which deposed him, is, however, strangely silent about the circumstances surrounding his departure. Eusebius of Caesarea, in the *Vita Constantini*, describes the events in Antioch in the most oblique terms possible, as follows:

While all were enjoying a happy life under these conditions, and the Church of God was everywhere in every way and in every province increasing, once more Envy, who seeks opportunity against good things, was limbering up to attack the prosperity so rich in benefits. He perhaps hoped that the Emperor would himself change his attitude to us in irritation at our troubles and disorders. He therefore lit a great flame and plunged the church of Antioch into disasters of tragic proportions, so that the whole city was all but completely destroyed. The church people were split into two factions, while the general population of the city including the magistrates and military personnel were stirred up to warlike attitudes, and even swords might well have been used, had not God’s oversight and fear of the emperor quelled the passions of

---

<sup>14</sup> Socrates, *HE* I.24. This work is usually dated somewhere in the 350s.

<sup>15</sup> Sozomen *HE* II.19

the mob, and once more the emperor's patience, in the manner of a saviour and physician of souls, applied the medicine of argument to those who were sick.

He negotiated very gently with the congregations, sending the most loyal of the proven courtiers who held the rank of *comes*, and he exhorted them in frequent letters to adopt a pacific attitude. He taught that they should behave in a manner befitting godliness, and using persuasion and pleading in what he wrote to them, pointing out that he had personally listened to the one who caused the sedition. These letters of his too, which are full of helpful instruction, we would have produced at this point, but they might bring discredit on the persons accused.

(*VC* 3.59.1-4)<sup>16</sup>

Eusebius is here describing the situation at the time of a second synod at Antioch which he presided over, after the death of Eulalius, nine months or so after the departure of Eustathius, in order to boast about the fact that, though the synod elected him bishop of Antioch, he refused to take accept the appointment (or at least pretended reluctance, and was taken seriously by Constantine) on the grounds that it contradicted the canons of Nicaea. He passes entirely over the origin of the disturbance:<sup>17</sup> Eustathius only appears as 'the one who caused the sedition' and 'the persons accused'. But Eusebius does make it clear that he has information he could provide to the detriment of Eustathius and his friends, but is generously refraining from doing so. The question arises as to why.

One possible answer is that Constantine had asked him to, indeed had asked for the whole affair to be hushed up as far as possible. This would not be unlike him; it would match his behaviour in another sexual scandal which threatened to bring bad publicity on his reign, the Crispus affair. This was Constantine's

---

<sup>16</sup> Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, tr. with commentary by A. Cameron and S.G. Hall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), p. 147.

<sup>17</sup> It is true that Eusebius also glides over the deposition of Athanasius at the synod of Tyre, and makes no mention at all of the synod which deposed Marcellus, but this is clearly because they have been re-instated by Constantine's sons at the time he is writing, and it does not suit the purpose of his work to draw attention to this particular controversy. In the case of the original dispute between Alexander and Arius he is happy enough to give the emperor's letter rebuking them. But here his attitude is something nearer the typical court gossip's: 'I could tell more, but I won't'.

execution of his own son for some sexual transgression, and had taken place two years previously; in that case also, specific information is extremely difficult to come by, and gossip abounds.

Two years previously, around the time of the Crispus affair, Constantine had turned that hysterical side of his nature which surfaces from time to time in his letters regarding church affairs to sexual transgressions, issuing, as T.D. Barnes has shown, a raft of legislative measures which he rightly brands 'morbid and unwholesome.' On 1 April 326 Constantine issued a general edict drastically revising existing law on adultery, abduction of women and elopement, providing a sentence of death by burning for rapists, eloping couples and accomplices alike, besides death by boiling lead down the throat for serving-maids involved in an elopement.<sup>18</sup> Two years later, his views on sexual purity and impurity are unlikely to have changed, and he is likely to have regarded sexual transgression by a bishop, indeed, one of the two most venerable bishops of the East, with all of his customary hysteria in such matters, particularly when the bishop in question was one he had allowed to guide his ecclesiastical policy to such an extent.

This view of Constantine's reaction is of course speculation, but it would explain a number of difficulties in the evidence for Eustathius' fall as we have it. It would explain the confusion about what actually happened: if Constantine decreed that the affair should be should be hushed up, it would explain why even Eustathius' enemies other than those who were actually present never heard the full story, though of course that would not have precluded a plethora of hints and arch innuendo, soon to be developed into rumours of all kinds. It would explain why Eustathius' departure was greeted with such spectacular and long-lasting popular unrest: the full story necessary to quell the rumours could not be made known. It would explain why Athanasius could claim twenty years later without fear of definite knowledge to the contrary that Eustathius' only crime had been to speak ill of the emperor's mother. And it would explain an

---

<sup>18</sup> Barnes, *Constantine*, pp. 219-220.

otherwise utterly inexplicable volte-face in Constantine's ecclesiastical policy immediately after this event, that of reinstating Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia.

Can we reconstruct a possible series of events? Apart from their claim that Eusebius and Theognis were directly involved in the deposition, which surely stems simply from an earlier common source (perhaps Sabinus) who put two and two together and made five, the various church historians give us a number of pieces of information which may be valuable.

Theodoret gives us a story which does have the ring of folklore, but is surprisingly exact about its details, and may well describe some of the actual events.

Eusebius [of Nicomedia, erroneously described as now bishop of Constantinople]...at first feigned a desire of going to Jerusalem, to see the celebrated edifices there erected; and the emperor, who was deceived by his flattery, allowed him to set out with the utmost honour, providing him with carriages, and the rest of his equipage and retinue. Theognis...travelled with him. When they arrived at Antioch, they put on the mask of friendship, and were received with the utmost deference. Eustathius, the great champion of the faith, treated them with fraternal kindness. When they arrived at the holy places, they had an interview with those who were of the same opinions as themselves, namely Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, Aetius, bishop of Lydda, Theodotus, bishop of Laodicea, and others who had imbibed the Arian sentiments; they made known what they had hatched to them, and went with them to Antioch. The pretext for their journey was, that due honour might be rendered to Eusebius; but their real motive was their war against religion. They bribed a low woman...and then repaired to the council, and then, when all the spectators had been ordered to retire, they introduced the wretched woman...[and] these truth-loving judges condemned him as an adulterer. When the other bishops, who upheld the apostolical doctrines, being ignorant of all these intrigues, openly opposed the sentence, and advised Eustathius not to admit to it, the originators of the plot promptly repaired to the emperor, and endeavoured to persuade him that the accusation was true, and the sentence of deposition just; and they succeeded in obtaining the banishment of this champion of piety and chastity, as an adulterer and a tyrant. He was conducted across Thrace to a city of Illyricum.

(Theodoret, *HE* 1.20)

In order for us to assume that Theodoret was right about most of the details of this account, but wrong about the identity of the visitors from the imperial court, we have to assume that underlying this account is a letter which speaks of 'those from Constantinople' or 'those from Thrace' or 'those from the imperial court', and that Theodoret has supplied the names. If this assumption is correct, we have the following facts:

1. A group from the imperial court, pretending to be on an expedition or pilgrimage to look at the building work in Jerusalem, and travelling at the emperor's expense, passed through Antioch and were received with customary hospitality by Eustathius.
2. In Palestine, they met with Eusebius of Caesarea, Aetius of Lydda, Patrophilus of Scythopolis and others, including Theodotus of Laodicea, who was either in Palestine at the time or was picked up on the way there or the way back.
3. All of these then returned to Antioch, where what was presumably an ordinary provincial synod was taking place.
4. Announcing that they had private matters to discuss, they dismissed the onlookers, produced evidence of sexual misconduct on the part of Eustathius, and pronounced him deposed. Other bishops present remonstrated, but the emperor upheld the sentence and had him conducted into exile in Illyricum.

One other piece of evidence which Socrates gives us is suggestive. He claims that Eustathius was deposed for heresy on the evidence of Cyrus of Bereoa. Bereoa had been Eustathius' see before he was translated to Antioch. It is possible that Cyrus, even unwillingly (since he himself was later deposed for 'Sabellianism'), provided the evidence which brought about Eustathius' downfall.

How would all of this have happened in practice? Firstly, the group that deposed Eustathius must surely have had the emperor's agreement before they

embarked on what would otherwise have been a very risky strategy. The first move of whoever constructed the plot, once they had gathered the necessary evidence, real or trumped-up, would have been to take it to Constantine. If I am right about Constantine's reaction, and his desire to hush things up, the cloak and dagger tactics adopted by the posse were on his insistence. He chose Eusebius of Caesarea (metropolitan of another see in the same diocese, and someone Constantine thought well of) to execute his plans for a quick, clean deposition; Eusebius need not even have been in on the strategy before this point (it is hard to imagine him taking part in a plan of this kind if he knew it was based on false evidence, if indeed it was based on false evidence). Whoever Constantine sent from Nicomedia with the message for Eusebius was presumably an ecclesiastical figure (hence the excuse of a holy pilgrimage), and quite possibly the same person who had originally brought him evidence of Eustathius' misconduct, in order to keep the number of those who knew any details to a minimum.

If it was not Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis who took the details to the emperor and journeyed to Palestine to enlist Eusebius of Caesarea and the others, there seems to be no way of knowing who it was, although Theodore of Heraclea and Menophantes of Ephesus would seem to be likely candidates. But it was someone in Syria, perhaps Theodotus of Laodicea, who presumably discovered or planted the evidence in the first place.

If the Syrian provincial synod that was hijacked was the ordinary twice-yearly one, it would presumably be the spring 328 synod, after which Constantine would have begun procedures to have Arius recalled and reinstated. This could have taken place during Lent, as Nicaea had prescribed, but it might also have taken place in Eastertide: the diocesan synod the following year presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea stipulates the third week of Eastertide for the spring synod, which may have been the custom of that part of the world. Easter was on April 14<sup>th</sup> in 328, which means the synod would have met in the week beginning



April 28<sup>th</sup>- just about in time to hear of the death of Alexander of Alexandria (whose illness may have featured in the timing of the strike on Eustathius).

Arbitrarily, let us fix on May 1<sup>st</sup> as the date of Eustathius' deposition. News of it would have reached Constantine at Sardica: he is attested there on May 18<sup>th</sup> (shortly after which date the news would have reached him) and was in the area (just over the border from the diocese of Thracia) until at least July 5<sup>th</sup>. Soon afterwards, he would have heard that his measures which were intended to keep events quiet in Antioch had had, as usual with his church politics, exactly the opposite effect: there were major riots in the city, and they were having to be quelled by soldiers. By the middle of July, now on the road for Trier, he would have made up his mind to completely reverse his previous Eastern church policy, undo the Nicene settlement which Eustathius had championed, and invite Arius to return from exile.

### **c. The departure of Ossius of Corduba.**

If I am right about Eustathius' conviction on the grounds of sexual misconduct, and in my speculation as to Constantine's reaction to it, there would be likely to have been further consequences in terms of Constantine's eastern church policy. Constantine has an established *modus operandi* with those who fail him: a great show of peace and reconciliation, followed by an angry disposing of the person concerned some little time later.<sup>19</sup> As we have seen in chapter two, his deposition of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis, three months after the great show of peace and reconciliation at Nicaea, fits this pattern well. In the case of Eustathius, where we know so few of the details, Constantine's actions are a little more difficult to trace, but Eusebius describes here Constantine's usual rhetoric of peace and reconciliation, though between factions rather than with

Eustathius himself. And, as already noted, events which happen around this time may well represent the sort of angry volte-face Constantine displays in the cases of Maximin and Licinius, as well as Eusebius and Theognis. The recalling of first Arius and then Eusebius and Theognis is one consequence; another may well be the departure of Ossius of Corduba.

As I mentioned at the beginning of chapter three, although it is clear from the records that Ossius of Cordoba ceases from his role as trusted advisor to Constantine soon after 326 or so (he makes no more appearances as such after the Melitian synod, which probably took place by the summer of 327 at the latest), no satisfactory reason for his departure has yet been advanced: although De Clercq alleged disgust at Crispus' execution, it is hard to believe that, having accompanied Constantine for so long, and having seen the executions of Licinius and his relatives after a great show of clemency towards them had been made, Ossius would have had much still to learn about the Emperor's character, or his habitual mode of dealing with those he perceived as a threat. Since there is no direct evidence at all as regards the reason for his departure, any reason suggested must be speculation, but that speculation must at least weigh up the probabilities.

If Constantine reacted with some hysteria to Eustathius' apparently proven misdemeanour, whatever it was, one natural reaction for him to have had at this point would have been a sense of having been failed by Ossius. Ossius had been responsible for most of the imperial policy concerning the Council of Nicaea, which had been intended by Constantine to settle the major on-going disputes of the Eastern churches, and so to contribute to the unity of the empire. He had been responsible for the events at Antioch in the spring of 325- the appointment of Eustathius as Bishop of Antioch and the provisional excommunication of Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodore of Laodicea and Narcissus

---

<sup>19</sup> I owe this suggestion to an unpublished paper of Dr Paul Parvis, given at the Scottish Universities' Church History Reading Party, entitled *Colonel Mustard in the Ballroom at the Council of Nicaea*.

of Neronias- and in general for the presentation of Alexander, Eustathius and their friends as the orthodox side.

With the disgrace of Eustathius, the leader of the Eastern party Constantine had been assured was the orthodox party, the whole of Ossius' policy had begun to unravel. Eustathius was one of the strongest voices at Nicaea. In finding the Eustathius whom he had listened to and believed in the orthodoxy of to be a fornicator, in other words, in his eyes, a fraud, Constantine might well have felt Ossius had made a fool of him, had failed him utterly in his role as ecclesiastical advisor- and consequently, that perhaps the banning of Arius and even the discrediting of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis had also been wrong. We can hear one of these reproaches coming through Eusebius' description of Constantine's letters to the congregation at Antioch above- 'he [Constantine] had personally listened to the one who caused the sedition'. He might well have felt that it was Ossius' fault that he had. In any case, we hear no more of Ossius at the imperial court from the time of the meeting with Alexander and the Melitians. The influence at court of the Ossius-Eustathius-Alexander alliance was now well and truly dead, and that of the Eusebians once again in the ascendant.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Editions regularly cited by name of editor

Feder, A., ed., *S. Hilarii Pictavensis Opera IV, Tractatus Mysteriorum, Collectanea Antiariana Parisina (Fragmenta Historica) cum Appendice (Liber I ad Constantium), Liber ad Constantium Imperatorem (Liber II ad Constantium), Hymni, Fragmenta Minora, Spuria*, CSEL 65 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1916)

Feltoe, Charles Lett, ed., *The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria*, Cambridge Patristic Texts (Cambridge: University Press, 1904)

Gryson, R., ed., *Scripta Arriana Latina, I, Collectio Veronensis, Scholia in Concilium Aquileiense, Fragmenta in Lucam Rescripta, Fragmenta Theologica Rescripta*, CCL LXXXVII, Pars I (Turnhout: Brepols, 1982)

Klostermann, E., ed., *Eusebius Werke IV, Gegen Markell, Über die Kirchliche Theologie, Die Fragmente Marcells*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn G.C. Hansen, GCS (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972)

Martin, Annik, with Micheline Albert, *Histoire 'Acéphale' et Index Syriaque des Lettres Festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, SCh 317 (Paris: Du Cerf, 1985)

Opitz, Hans-Georg, *Athanasius Werke*, II.1-7 and III.1-2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1934-41)

Rettberg, C.H.G., *Marcelliana, accedit Eunomii Ἐκθεσις πίστεως emendatio* (Göttingen, 1794)

Schulthess, F., *Die syrischen Kanones der Synode von Nicaea bis Chalcedon nebst einigen zugehörigen Dokumenten*, A.G.G., phil.-hist. Kl. NF 10 (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1908)

Thomson, Robert W., tr., *Agathangelos, History of the Armenians* (Albany: New York State University, 1976)

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. and tr., *Athanasius, Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. xxi-xxiii.

Vinzent, Markus, *Asterius von Kappadokien, Die Theologische Fragmente, Einleitung, Kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae XX (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Markell von Ankyra: Die Fragmente und der Brief an Julius von Rom*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae XXXIX (Leiden: Brill, 1997)

## II. Secondary literature

Abramowski, L., *Formula and Context: Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Collected Studies Series CS 365 (Ashgate: Variorum, 1992)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Die Synode von Antiochien 324/25 und ihr Symbol', *ZKG* 86 (1975), 356-366

Ananian, P., 'La data e le circostanze della consecrazione di s. Gregorio Illuminatore', *Le Muséon* 64 (1961), 43-73 and 317-60

Bardy, Gustave, 'Antioch (Concile et canons d')', *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique* I, 689-698

\_\_\_\_\_, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son École*, Études de Théologie Historique (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils, 1936)

Barnard, Leslie W., *The Council of Serdica 343 A.D.* (Sofia: Synodal Publishing House, 1983)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Council of Sardica -- Two Questions Reconsidered', in A.G. Poulter, ed., *Ancient Bulgaria: Papers presented to the International Symposium on the Ancient History and Archaeology of Bulgaria* (2 vols, Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 1983), II, 215-231

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Eusebians', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 25 (1980), 63-76

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Pope Julius, Marcellus of Ancyra and the Council of Sardica: A Reconsideration', *RTAM* 38 (1971), 69-79

\_\_\_\_\_, *Studies in Athanasius' Apologia Secunda* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1992)

Barnes, Timothy D., *Athanasius and Constantius, Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Crimes of Basil of Ancyra', *JTS* ns 47 (1996), 550-554

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Date of the Council of Gangra', *JTS* ns 40 (1989), 121-124

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Emperors and Bishops, A.D. 324-344. Some Problems', *American Journal of Ancient History* 3 (1978), 53-75

\_\_\_\_\_, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Panegyric, History and Hagiography in Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*', in *The Making of Orthodoxy, Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 94-123

Brennecke, Hanns Christof, 'Lukian von Antiochien in der Geschichte des Arianischen Streites', in *Logos, Festschrift für Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993*, ed. Hanns Christof Brennecke, Ernst Ludwig Grasmück and Christof Marksches, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), pp. 170-192

\_\_\_\_\_, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer, Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Beiträge zur historische Theologie 72 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988)

Buisson, L., 'Die Entstehung des Kirchenrechts', *Z.S.S.K.A.* 52 (1966), 1-175

Calder, W.M., et al., 'Asia, Roman Province', *OCD*, pp. 189-190

Casson, L., *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1974)

Chadwick, Henry, 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS* 49 (1948), 27-35

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Origin of the Title "Oecumenical Council"', *JTS* ns 23 (1972), 132-135

Connelly, R.H., *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents, Texts and Studies VIII.4* (Cambridge: University Press, 1916)

Corcoran, Simon, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs, Imperial Prouncements and Government AD 283-384*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)

De Bruyne, D., 'Deux lettres inconnues de Théognius, l'évêque de Nicée', *ZNW* 27 (1928), 107-110

De Clercq, Victor C., *Ossius of Cordova, A Contribution to the History of the Constantinian Period*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity 13 (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954)



De Dominicis, M.A., 'Il problema dei rapporti burocratico-legislativi tra "Occidente" ed "Oriente" nel Basso impero.', *RIL*, Cl. di lettere, 87 (1956), 283-441

de Riedmatten, H., *Les actes de procès de Paul de Samosate: Étude sur la christologie du III<sup>e</sup> au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paradosis 6 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1952)

Dossetti, Giuseppe Luigi, *Il simbolo di Nicea et di Constantinopoli*, Testi e Ricerche di Scienze Religiose 2 (Rome: Herder, 1967).

Dowling, M.J., 'Marcellus of Ancyra: Problems of Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity', PhD Dissertation (Belfast, 1987)

Drake, H.A., *Constantine and the Bishops, The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2000)

Eltester, Walther, 'Die Kirchen Antiochias im 4. Jahrhundert', *ZNT* 36 (1937), 251-286

Faivre, A. 'La documentation canonico-liturgique de l'Eglise ancienne', *R.S.R.* 54 (1980), 204-15, 279-295

Feige, Gerhard, *Die Lehre Markells von Ankyra in der Darstellung seiner Gegner*, Erfurter Theologische Studien 58 (Leipzig: Benno Verlag, 1991)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Markell von Ankyra und das Konzil von Nizäa (325)', in *Denkender Glaube in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Festschrift aus Anlass der Gründung der Universität Erfurt*, ed. Wilhelm Ernst and Konrad Feieries, Erfurter Theologische Studien 63 (Leipzig: Benno Verlag, 1992), pp. 277-296

Ferne, Brian Edwin, *Introduzione alla storia delle fonti del diritto canonico* (Rome: Pontificia Università lateranense, 1998)

Garitte, Gérard, *Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange*, ST 127 (Citta del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946)

Gaudemet, J., *Les Sources du droit de l'Eglise en Occident du II. au VII. siècle* (Paris: du Cerf, 1985)

Gericke, Wolfgang, *Marcell von Ancyra, Der Logos-Christologie und Biblizist, Sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie und zum Neuen Testament*, Theologischen Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte X (Halle: Akademischer Verlag, 1940)

Girardet, Klaus M., *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht, Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites (313-315) und zum Prozess des Athanasius von*

*Alexandrien*, Antiquitas, Reihe 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte 21 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1975)

Green, H. Benedict, 'Matthew 28:19, Eusebius, and the *lex orandi*', in *The Making of Orthodoxy, Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 124-141

Gregg, Robert C., ed., *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments, Papers from The Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, September 5-10, 1983, Oxford, England*, Patristic Monograph Series 11 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985)

Gregg, Robert C., and Dennis E. Groh, *Early Arianism, A View of Salvation* (London: SCM Press, 1981)

Gregory, Timothy E., 'Urban Violence in Late Antiquity', in R.T. Marchese, ed., *Aspects of Graeco-Roman Urbanism* (Oxford: BAR, 1983), pp. 138-161

Grillmeier, Aloys, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, Vol. I, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, revised edn, tr. John Bowden (London: Mowbrays, 1975)

Gwatkin, Henry Melvill *Studies of Arianism, Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction Which Followed the Council of Nicaea*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900)

Hakobian, V., *Kanonagirk 'Hayoc' I* (Erevan, 1964)

Hall, Stuart G., 'The Creed of Sardica', *StPat* XIX (1989), 173-184

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Some Constantinian Documents in the *Vita Constantini*', in Samuel N.C. Lieu and Dominic Montserrat, eds, *Constantine: History, Historiography and Legend* (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 86-103

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The *Thalia* of Arius in Athanasius' Accounts', in *Arianism*, ed. Gregg, pp. 17-58

Hanson, R.P.C., 'The Date and Authorship of Pseudo-Anthimus De Sancta Ecclesia', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 83 (1983), 251-254

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch', *ZKG* 95 (1984), 171-179

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God, The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Who Taught ΕΞ ΟΥΚ ΟΝΤΩΝ?', in *Arianism*, ed. Gregg, pp. 79-83

Hefele, K.-J., and H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* I (Paris: Letouzey, 1907)

Hess, Hamilton, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica A.D. 343, A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958)

Honigmann, E., 'La liste originale des pères de Nicée', *Byzantion* 14 (1939), 17-76

\_\_\_\_\_, *Patristic Studies*, Studi e Testi 173 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1953)

T. Honoré, 'Codex', *OCD*, 355

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Law and Procedure, Roman: 1. Civil Law', *OCD*, 827-829

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Lawyers, Roman', *OCD*, 835-836

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Legal Literature', *OCD*, 838-839

Hübner, Reinhard, 'Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankyra', in *Ecriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse*, ed. Marguerite Harl, (Leiden: Brill, 1971), pp. 199-229

Le Bachelet, X. 'Ancyre, conciles d', *DTC* I, 1173-1177

L'Huillier, Pierre, 'Origine et développement de l'ancienne collection canonique grecque', "*Messenger*" de l'exarchat du patriarcat russe en Europe occidentale, 93-96 (1976), 53-65

Joannou, P.-P., *Discipline Générale Antiquie I.2, Les canons des Synodes Particuliers*, Pontificia Commissione per la redazione del codice di diritto canonico orientale, *Fonti* 9 (Rome: Tipografia Italo-Orientale 'S. Nilo', 1962)

Jones, A.H.M., *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602, A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey* (3 vols and map folder, Oxford: Blackwell, 1964)

Kannengiesser, Charles, 'La date de l'Apologie d'Athanase "Contre les païens" et "Sur l'incarnation du Verbe"', *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 58 (1970), 383-428, reprinted in Kannengiesser, *Arius and Athanasius, Two Alexandrian Theologians*, Collected Studies Series CS 353 (Hampshire: Variorum, 1991)

Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Creeds*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn (London: Longman, 1972)

\_\_\_\_\_, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968)

Klein, Richard, *Constantius II. und die christliche Kirche*, *Impulse der Forschung* 26 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977)

Laeuchli, Samuel, *Power and Sexuality: The Emergence of Canon Law at the Synod of Elvira* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1972)

Lawlor, Hugh Jackson, and John Ernest Leonard Oulton, *Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*, II, *Introduction, Notes and Index* (London: SPCK, 1928)

Lebon, J., 'Sur un concile de Césarée', *Le Muséon* 51 (1938), 89-132

Lienhard, Joseph T., 'Acacius of Caesarea: *Contra Marcellum*. Historical and Theological Considerations,' *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 10 (1989), 1-22

\_\_\_\_\_, *Contra Marcellum. Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Did Athanasius Reject Marcellus?', in *Arianism after Arius, Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, ed. Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), pp. 65-80

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research', *Theological Studies* 43 (1982), 486-503

Lietzmann, Hans, *A History of the Early Church*, III, *From Constantine to Julian*, tr. Bertram Lee Wolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Symbolstudien XIII', *ZNW* 24 (1925), 193-202

Löhr, Winrich, *Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenparteien, Studien zur Synodgeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte (Witterschlick / Bonn: Verlag Wehle, 1986)

Logan, Alastair H.B., 'Marcellus of Ancyra and anti-Arian Polemic', *St Pat* XIX (1989), 189-197

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325: Antioch, Ancyra, and Nicaea', *JTS* ns 43 (1992), 428-446

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Marcellus of Ancyra, defender of the faith against heretics – and pagans', *St Pat* XXXVII (2001), 550-564

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Marcellus of Ancyra on Origen and Arianism', in *Origeniana Septima* (Leuven: University Press, 1999)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Marcellus of Ancyra (Pseudo-Anthimus), 'On the Holy Church': Text, Translation and Commentary', *JTS* ns 51 (2000), 81-112

- Loofs, Friedrich, 'Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Homousianer von Sardika', AAB, Phil.-hist. Klasse (1909), 3-39
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Patristica, Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Alten Kirche*, ed. H.C. Brennecke, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 71 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Die Trinitätslehre Marcell's von Ancyra und ihr Verhältnis zur älteren Tradition', SAB (1902), 764-781
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Zur Synode von Sardica', *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 82 (1909), 279-297 (reprinted in Loofs, *Patristica*, pp. 173-188)
- Loose, Uta, 'Zur Chronologie des arianischen Streites', ZKG 101 (1990), 88-92
- Lorenz, Rudolf, 'Die Christusseele im arianischen Streit. Nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Quellenkritik des Arius und zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Athanasius', ZKG 94 (1983), 1-51
- Lumpe, A., 'Zur Geschichte der Wörter *Concilium* und *Synodus* in der antiken christlichen Latinität,' AHC 2 (1970), 1-21.
- Lyman, Rebecca, *Christology and Cosmology, Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism', in *Arianism after Arius, Essays in the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, ed. Michele R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), pp. 45-62
- Maassen, Friedrich, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Graz / Leipzig, 1870)
- McMullen, Ramsay, *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966)
- Meigne, Maurice, 'Elvire: Concile ou collection?', RHE 70 (1975), 361-387
- Miller, K. *Itineraria Romana: Römische Reisewege am der Hand der Tabula Peutingeriana* (Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder, 1916)
- Newman, J.H., *Arians of the Fourth Century* (London: Rivington, 1833)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Select Treatises of St Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*, Library of Fathers (2 vols, Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842-44)
- Opitz, Hans-Georg 'Die Zeitfolge des arianischen Streites von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 328', ZNW 33 (1934), 131-159

Parvis, P.M., 'Theodoret's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul: Historical Setting and Exegetical Practice', D.Phil. Thesis (University of Oxford, 1975)

Parvis, Sara, 'Marcellus or Vitalis: Who Presided at Ancyra 314?', *St Pat XXXIV* (2001), 197-203

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Canons of Ancyra and Caesarea (314): Lebon's Thesis Revisited', *JTS* ns 52 (2001), 625-636

Pietri, Charles, *Roma Christiana, Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 224, 2 vols (Rome: Écoles françaises de Rome, 1976),

Price, S.R.F., *Rituals and Power, The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Richard, Marcel, 'Bulletin de patrologie', *MSR* 6 (1949), 117-133

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Le comput paschal par octaétéris', *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), 307-339

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Un opusculé méconnu de Marcel évêque d'Ancyra', *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 6 (1949), 5-24, reprinted in Richard, *Opera Minora* II, ed. E. Dekkers et al. (Turnhout: Brepols / Leuven University Press, 1977), no. 33

Riebe Alexandra, 'Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research', MA Dissertation (Durham, 1992)

Riedweg, Christoph, *Ps.-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?), Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher Cohortatio ad Graecos)*, Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 25 (Basle: Reinhardt, 1992)

Sage, Michael M., *Cyprian*, Patristic Monograph Series 1 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979)

Schäferdiek, Knut, 'Wulfila, vom Bischof von Gotien zum Gotenbischof', *ZKG* 90 (1979), 253-292 (107-146)

Schneemelcher, W. 'Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien 341', in *Bonner Festgabe Johannes Straub zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Adolf Lippold and Nikolaus Himmelmann (Bonn: Rheinland-Verlag, 1977), pp. 319-346

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Serdika 342, Ein Beitrag zum Problem Ost und West in der Alten Kirche', in *Evangelische Theologie, Sonderheft: Ecclesia semper reformanda (Theologische Aufsätze, Ernst Wolf zum 50. Geburtstag)*, ed. W. Schneemelcher and K.G. Steck (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1952), pp. 83-104, reprinted in Schneemelcher, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur Patristik*,



ed. W. Bienert and K. Schäferdiek, *Analecta Vlatadon* (Thessalonica: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1974), pp. 338-364

Schwartz, E., 'Die Kanonensammlungen der alten Reichskirche', *GS IV*, 159-275

Seibt, Klaus, 'Ein Argumentum ad Constantinum in der Logos- und Gotteslehre Markells von Ankyra', *St Pat* 26 (1993), 415-420

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Markell von Ancyra', *TRE* 22 (1992), 83-89

\_\_\_\_\_, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 59 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994)

Sellers, R.V., *Eustathius of Antioch and His Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: University Press, 1928)

Simonetti, Manlio, 'Ancora sulla paternità dello ps.-atanasiano "Sermo maior de fide"', *Vet Chr* 11 (1974), 333-343

\_\_\_\_\_, *La Crisi Ariana nel IV Secolo*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 11 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975)

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Sardica II. Council', *EEC* II, 757

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcello d'Ancira', *RSLR* 9 (1973), 313-379

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Sulla paternità dell' *De incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos*', *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 5 (1953-55), 5-19

Skarsaune, O., 'A Neglected Detail in the Creed of Nicaea (325)', *Vig Chr* 41 (1987), pp. 34-59

Skeat, T.C., 'The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine', *JTS* ns 50 (1999), 583-623

Stead, G.C., 'Athanasius' Earliest Written Work', *JTS* n.s. 39 (1988), 76-91.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977)

Stein, Ernst, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, I, *De l'État Romaine à l'État Byzantin (284-476)*, ed. and tr. Jean-Remy Palanque ([Paris]: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959)

Strutwolf, Holder, *Die Trinitätslehre und Christologie des Euseb von Caesarea, Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung seiner Platonismusrezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 72 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1999)

Studer, B., *Gott und unsere Erlösung im Glauben der alten Kirche* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1985)

Talbert R.J.A., ed., *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

Telfer, W., 'Paul of Constantinople', *Harvard Theological Review* 43 (1950), 30-92

\_\_\_\_\_, 'When Did the Arian Controversy Begin?', *JTS* 47 (1946), 129-142

Tetz, Martin, 'Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis, Glaubensfragen auf der Synode von Serdika (342)', *ZNW* 76 (1985), 243-269

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien (341) und Marcellus von Ancyra: zu den Glaubenserklärung des Theophronius von Tyana und ihren Folgen' in *Oecumenica et Patristica: Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989), pp. 199-218

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien. Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasium des Diakons Eugenius von Ankyra', *ZNW* 64 (1973), 75-121

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Zum altrömischen Bekenntnis. Ein Beitrag des Marcellus von Ancyra', *ZNW* 75 (1985), 107-127

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien', *ZKG* 90 (1979), 304-338

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I. Eine Markellische Schrift "De incarnatione et contra Arianos"', *ZKG* 75 (1964), 217-270.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra II. Markells Lehre von der Adamsohnschaft Christi und eine pseudoklementinische Tradition über die wahren Lehrer und Propheten', *ZKG* 79 (1968), 3-42

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra III: Die pseudoathanasianische Epistula ad Liberium, ein markellisches Bekenntnis' *ZKG* 83 (1972), 145-195

C. Toumanoff, 'The Third Century Armenian Arsacids -- A Chronological and Geneological Commentary', *REA* 6 (1969), 233-281

Trevett, Christine, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Turner, C.H., 'A note on Canon 13 of Ancyra', in Charles Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, 5<sup>th</sup> edn, rev. C.H. Turner (London: Longman and Co., 1919), pp. 327-330

Ulrich, Jörg, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*, PTS 39 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994)

Vaggione, Richard Paul, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, OECS (Oxford: OUP, 2000)

Vinzent, Markus, 'Die Entstehung des "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnisses"', in Wolfram Kinzig, Christolf Marksches, and Markus Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis, Studien zur sogenannten 'Traditio Apostolica', zu den 'Interrogationes de fide' und zum 'Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis'*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 74 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), pp. 185-409

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Die Gegner im Schreiben Markells von Ankyra an Julius von Rom', *ZKG* 105 (1994), 285-328

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Gottes Wesen, Logos, Weisheit und Kraft bei Asterius von Kappadokien und Markell von Ankyra', *Vig Chr* 47 (1993), 170-91

\_\_\_\_\_, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV, Eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ankyra und Photin von Sirmium*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae XXXVI (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996)

Vives, J., T. Marín and G. Martínez, *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos* (Barcelona / Madrid, 1963)

Warmington, B.H., 'The Sources of Some Constantinian Documents in Eusebius' Church History and Life of Constantine', *St Pat* XVIII.1 (1985), 93-98

Wiles, M.F., *Archetypal Heresy, Arianism Through the Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Person or Personification? A Patristic Debate about Logos', in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament, Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*, ed. L.D. Hurst and N.T. Wright (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp.281-289

Williams, Rowan, *Arius, Heresy and Tradition* (London: DLT, 1987); revised edn (London: SCM, 2001)

Winkelmann, F., 'Die Bischöfe Metrophanes und Alexander von Byzanz', *BZ* 59 (1966), pp. 47-71

Zahn, Theodor, *Marcellus von Ancyra, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (Gotha: F.A. Perthes, 1867)

J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain*, Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 112 (1918)