



Durham E-Theses

Marcellus of Ancyra in modern research

Riebe, Alexandra

How to cite:

Riebe, Alexandra (1992) *Marcellus of Ancyra in modern research*, Durham theses, Durham University.
Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5779/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA
IN MODERN RESEARCH

BY

ALEXANDRA RIEBE

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

1992
MA DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS
DURHAM UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY



21 JUL 1992

Abstract

This thesis gives a detailed overview of modern research on Marcellus of Ancyra. It is divided into three parts: the first part deals with the person of Marcellus, his life, work, theology and historical influence as seen by different scholars. Especially in the questions of chronology and Marcellus' orthodoxy, a consensus is yet to be achieved.

The second, largest part analyses in detail the ascriptions of certain pseudepigrapha to the pen of Marcellus by modern scholarship: the writings *De Sancta Ecclesia*, *Sermo Maior de Fide*, *Ekthesis Pisteos*, *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, *Contra Theopaschitas* (or *Epistula ad Liberium*).

A critical review of modern scholarly literature in this matter shows that only *De Sancta Ecclesia* and *Contra Theopaschitas* could have a claim to Marcellan authorship, but also that the real problem is one of methodological decisions: are the undisputed Fragments of Marcellus the only criterion for ascribing other works to him? Is the apparent shift towards orthodoxy which is documented in Fragment 129 (*Epistula ad Iulium*) genuine? If so, does it open the way towards the ascription of clearly orthodox writings which show differences in their theology to the theology of the Fragments? Modern scholarship has not yet come up with a final answer to these questions; the thesis can only point to new fields of research and make French, Italian and especially German literature accessible to English scholars for this purpose by summarizing the results achieved so far.

The third part of the thesis contains translations of some short texts dealt with in part two.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROLOGUE	iv
INTRODUCTION: THE EXISTING MONOGRAPHS	1
1. Th. Zahn	1
2. W. Gericke	5
PART I: THE PORTRAIT OF MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA	9
1. The Life of Marcellus	10
2. The Works of Marcellus	15
3. Sabellian or Orthodox?	20
4. ...οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος	27
PART II: WORKS RECENTLY ASCRIBED TO MARCELLUS	30
1. <i>De Sancta Ecclesia</i>	31
2. <i>Sermo Maior de Fide</i>	38
3. Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως	47
4. <i>De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos</i>	50
5. <i>Contra Theopaschitas</i>	67
Part III: ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS	85
1. The <i>Epistula ad Iulium</i>	86
2. The <i>De Sancta Ecclesia</i>	86
3. The Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως	90
4. The <i>Contra Theopaschitas</i>	94
EPILOGUE	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Nicholas Armitage for preparing the typescript of this thesis for submission, and above all her supervisor, the Very Revd Dr George Dion Dragas, for all his encouragement and assistance in researching this dissertation.

Statement of Copyright

“The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without her prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.”

Prologue

Marcellus of Ancyra is one of the most intriguing figures of fourth century Church history. He has fascinated and still fascinates scholars with his daring theology, which appears to run entirely counter to the *Zeitgeist* of that period. Yet, in most major works about the early history of dogma his influence in the Arian Controversy is overshadowed by the powerful personality of Athanasius. Consequently, research about Marcellus of Ancyra is mainly a matter of collecting disparate articles from disparate periodicals - not to mention the fact that most of them are not in English but in German, French, Italian or Spanish. 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; both were written by German scholars and are not easily accessible in Britain.

Unfortunately the same is true for very recent scholarly work on Marcellus. The major theses of M. J. Dowling (Belfast, 1987) and J. T. Lienhard (Freiburg i. Br., 1986) have not been published; the (East-) German thesis of G. Feige (Erfurt, 1987), of which I know only the title, will not be available on inter-library loan even in Germany until September 1991. I regret that I cannot include it in my work, although I have included it in the bibliography.

The aim of this thesis is, therefore, to give an overview of the recent research on Marcellus of Ancyra which not only provides sufficient detail for the reader who wishes to form his own judgements, but is also short enough to be practical and "user friendly".

The thesis is divided into three parts, the first one dealing with the personality of Marcellus as scholars describe it, the second with the writings which have recently been ascribed to Marcellus (other than the fragments of his book against Asterius and the *Epistula ad Iulium*, whose authenticity is not doubted) and the arguments in favour of and against these ascriptions. I have deliberately given the arguments in some detail so as to allow the reader to judge whether a case is argued convincingly or not. In the third part I

give my translation of some shorter texts dealt with in parts One and Two to make comparisons between genuine works and those recently ascribed to Marcellus possible.

Introduction

The Existing Monographs

There are only two monographs extant on Marcellus of Ancyra: one is Th. Zahn's "Marcellus of Ancyra", the other is W. Gericke's "Marcell von Ancyra. Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist", published in 1940.¹ I will give a brief outline of both works, concentrating on their respective theological interpretations of Marcellus.

1. Th. Zahn

Zahn sees Marcellus as a kind of living anachronism, "less than any of his contemporaries a child of his time", who stood up against the dominant Origenistic line of thought and wanted to have his Trinitarian theology and Christology determined by biblical principles.² He was part of the minority which won the victory over the (badly organised) Arian majority in Nicaea, a minority which had been constantly accused of Sabellianism. The Nicene majority, on the other hand, accused the Eusebians and Arians of polytheism, a charge especially emphasised by Marcellus, and seen by Zahn to be a correct understanding of the Eusebian error.³ Marcellus was the one theologian who, understanding the Nicene Creed to be set against the danger of Eusebian/Arian polytheism, recognised its weaknesses in this task and tried to do something about them. Zahn believes that Marcellus' book against Asterius, who at the time was the most prominent exponent of the Eusebian view, was the first literary attack against, and the

¹ Th. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (1867). W. Gericke, "Marcell von Ancyra. Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist" (1940).

² Zahn (1867) p. 7.

³ Ibid. p. 31.

first major attempt to deal with, the Eusebian problem on the part of the Nicenes since the beginning of the Arian controversy - Athanasius had not yet come into prominence, Marcellus was fighting on his own. Against Jerome's remark that Marcellus wrote many more works Zahn finds it possible that this book might have been the only one that Marcellus wrote.¹

Very interesting is Zahn's view on this work and Marcellus' influence. According to Zahn, in his fight against the hidden polytheism of Asterius and his Eusebian supporters Marcellus revealed methodological principles which made him *the* scriptural theologian of his time, and not merely because Marcellus always bases his dogmatic points on lengthy passages of Scripture - nearly all theologians of his time do the same. Neither can the fact that he sometimes misses the literal meaning of a passage serve as an argument against Zahn's claim. The Arians especially emphasise their own biblicism, and object to 'unscriptural' terms like the new ὁμοούσιον; Asterius apparently referred to himself as one who follows the Scriptures in a humble and simple fashion. But in Zahn's view Marcellus penetrated behind the façade of the Arians' appeal to Scripture, perceiving that it was for them (as indeed for many others) no longer the norm of dogma, that exegesis was largely determined by and a matter of convention, that theology consisted mainly in following Church authorities and majorities. He fought against the growing influence of non-Christian philosophy on Christian theology, dismissing "dogma" as merely human idea and opinion, and therefore not fitting for Christian theology.² He believed not only in the salvation declared in Scripture, but also in Scripture itself, that it was possible to find the truth and to fight all heresies simply by relying fully on the Bible.³ For this reason Marcellus dropped the concept and term of the 'eternal generation', because it was not to be derived from Scripture and not suited to the defence of the ὁμοούσιον against the Arians: "No theologian of this time recognized the difference between faith and creed on

¹ Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 86. Zahn (1867) p. 44.

² Zahn (1867) p. 52f..

³ Ibid. p. 61.

the one hand, and the 'scientific' means of defending it on the other as clearly as Marcellus."¹ His attitude towards the Nicene Creed is the easy liberty of the (chief) co-author and co-creator of a relevant document, who still knows about the historical circumstances of its development, and is therefore able to distinguish between eternal value and the accidental, historically developed form of theological terms and positions.² It is for this reason that Marcellus is such an important and influential figure in the history of theology and dogma, unique in his approach, not understood by his opponents.

Zahn also gives an elaborate description of Marcellus' teaching, based on the fragments of his book against Asterius and the *Epistula ad Iulium*.³ This is not the place to demonstrate Zahn's position in detail; I shall give only a few interesting points.

Zahn believes that Marcellus' Logos doctrine implies the danger of dividing up the Logos into two parts, one that remained with God and one that became man, and that Marcellus was seemingly not aware of this danger.

The phrase ^αἐν καὶ ^λταυτόν ὁ λόγος εἶναι τῷ ^{Θεῷ}θεῷ interpreted by Zahn not as indicating an identification of God and Logos, but as referring to the unity between God and Logos even after the Incarnation; for Zahn, the expanding of the Monad takes place in the coming down of the Logos, but only ἐνεργεία; the Monad itself remains undivided. Marcellus' monad is, according to Zahn, "not the Father, but the one divine being which is above all exigencies of history into which God enters..."⁴

¹ Ibid. p. 62: "Es ist wohl keinem Theologen der alten Zeit in so unverkennbarer Weise der Unterschied zwischen Glauben und Glaubensbekenntnis einerseits und den Mitteln wissenschaftlicher Rechtfertigung andererseits aufgegangen als ihm."

² Ibid. p. 63.

³ Ibid. pp. 99-185.

⁴Ibid. pp. 145: "... die Monas nicht der Vater, sondern das alle Gegensätze der Geschichte überdauernde göttliche Wesen ist..."

He seems to suggest that Marcellus believed in a kind of immanent Trinity but refused to apply the term Triad to the divine being before the beginning of history, in which God revealed his previously hidden true (Trinitarian) being.¹

In his creed in the *Epistula ad Iulium* Marcellus is not deceptive or unclear in the way he refers to the eternal reign of the Logos with the Father. Zahn states that Marcellus does not speak with reference to Lk. 1:33 but simply from the basis of his Logos doctrine - the Logos will be resumed into the Father, the Father's kingdom is eternal, therefore the Logos will reign eternally.²

Zahn sees in Marcellus an original and in some points advanced theological thinker whose unique theology died with him.³ He places him in one line of tradition with Irenaeus, with whom he shares his scepticism toward philosophical speculation, his monotheism and to an extent the concept of ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, although Marcellus' eschatology lacks a true sense of communion between God and redeemed, renewed mankind. For Zahn, it is Irenaeus, not Origen, who is the basis of a "healthy" Christian theology, and it was Marcellus who saved some of his points in times of trial.

Zahn did not intend to rehabilitate Marcellus - his interest is not in his 'orthodoxy'⁴. Yet it is quite noticeable that Zahn finds Marcellus' biblical orientation, his scepticism towards dogma and tradition, and his emphasis on monotheism, all very appealing. It could be argued that this is a typical feature of (German?) Protestantism - a hundred years later M. Tetz is attracted to Marcellus by the same points, whereas the attitude of Catholic scholars like, for example, M. Richard or M. Simonetti appears to be much cooler. Zahn sees Marcellus' main weakness in his eschatological doctrines, not in the absence of a true concept of the Trinity.

¹ See *ibid.* pp. 148ff., especially pp. 154-155.

² *Ibid.* p. 181f..

³ *Ibid.* p. 184.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 245; cf. *ibid.* p. 6.

2. W. Gericke

W. Gericke in his monograph¹ tries to understand Marcellus in the greater context of early Church developments. He thinks in the categories of his much admired F. Loofs², and therefore tries to place Marcellus in relation to the 'Antiochene' and 'Alexandrian' traditions. The greatest influence he sees in the Antiochene tradition; for example, he finds the Antiochene notion of the Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the Λόγος προφορικός reflected in the way Marcellus distinguishes between the Logos proceeding from the Father, and the Logos resting in God: the Logos cannot proceed from God because he is an integral part of the Godhead which consists of Father, Logos and Spirit; Spirit and Logos proceed from the Father in the second and third economy alone.³ The specifically economic-homousian features of Marcellus' Trinitarian theology are Antiochene heritage: Gericke places Marcellus in one line with Theophilus of Antioch, Paul of Samosata and Eustathius of Antioch.⁴ So are Marcellus' refusal to apply the term 'Son' to the pre-incarnate Logos,⁵ his interpretation of the generation as a procession since the Logos is eternal,⁶ and his distinction between δύναμις and ἐνέργεια as the two modes of existence of the Logos.⁷ Gericke even manages to find Antiochene roots for Marcellus' interpretation of 1

¹ W. Gericke, "Marcell von Ancyra. Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist" (1940).

² Cf. *ibid.* VIII, where Gericke tells us that he was inspired to the thesis by a seminar on the life and work of F. Loofs; cf. also *ibid.* p. 183.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 118-122. Cf. e.g. frgs 55, 60, 61, 63, 73, 103.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 130f., 136. Gericke follows Loofs who analysed five books of Irenaeus' and found a source "IQT", which he ascribed to Theophilus of Antioch (F. Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien, Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus* (Leipzig 1930)). In both Marcellus and the Antiochenes Gericke finds an "unphilosophical" understanding of the Logos - Gericke (1940). p. 131.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 132; cf. Frgs 49, 91. Paul of Samosata in particular refused to apply the term 'Son' to the pre-incarnate Logos. Gericke here cites Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata* (Leipzig 1924) p. 243.

⁶ Gericke (1940) p. 133ff.; cf. frgs 32, 33, 129 (= *Epistula ad Iulium*). Only Marcellus avoids the term γεννάσθαι completely; it is to be found in IQT, Paul of Samosata and Eustathius of Antioch. Again, Gericke relies on Loofs for his statements.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 137-142. Gericke names Theophilus of Antioch *Ad Autol.* II, 22, and follows Loofs as far as Paul of Samosata and Eustathius of Antioch are concerned.

Cor. 15:24-28¹. In his ‘henprosopic’ Christology, however, Marcellus differs from the ‘dyoprosopic’ Christology of Antioch.²

Despite the title of his book, Gericke denies that Marcellus is a “biblicist” in the sense that he would base his theology exclusively on the Bible. Quite the opposite is the case: Marcellus read his theological system, which he had partly developed himself, partly inherited, into the Bible and labelled it scriptural.³

Analysing Marcellus’ New Testament text in detail, Gericke finds that with Marcellus the ‘Western’ text is predominant, not influenced by the Alexandrian version and mainly following the ecumenical ‘D’-version.⁴ His exegetical method is ‘Antiochene’, as long as it fits into his system, but he is quite capable of allegorising in the ‘Alexandrian’ fashion.⁵

A word has to be said about Gericke’s translation of the Fragments and the *Epistula ad Iulium* (Gericke, pp. 192-247). F. Scheidweiler in his article “Markell von Ancyra”⁶ of 1955 analyses this translation and finds in it a number of mistakes - apparently Gericke’s philological abilities were limited. Since he bases his arguments on the texts he translated himself, his interpretation is to be handled with care.

Gericke sees Marcellus as a systematic theologian of considerable influence and originality, who tried to unite the disparate traditions of Antioch and Alexandria, but failed because the differences between the two were too great after all. This position between two theological mainstreams explains why Marcellus remained lonely and was

¹ Gericke does so with considerable difficulty, basing his hypothesis on the assumption that Marcellus “remembered” an old Antiochene tradition of interpreting this passage (p. 147), and then “rediscovered” the original Pauline sense of the text, only to interpret it in a dyoprosopic way - and dyoprosopic Christology was to be found at Antioch (p. 148); all this after a remark that Marcellus was not so much a biblicist in his interpretation of 1 Cor. 15:24ff., but simply chose it because it “fitted into his system” (p. 142f.).

² Ibid. pp. 155f., 160, 162f..

³ Ibid. p. 170: “Marcell hat sein System, das er teils ererbt, teils selbständig ausgebaut hat, in die Bibel hineingelesen, für biblisch ausgegeben und so biblisch maskiert.” Cf. *ibid.* p. 187.

⁴ Ibid. p. 177.

⁵ Ibid. p. 180.

⁶ F. Scheidweiler, “Markell von Ancyra”, *ZNTW* 46 (1955) pp. 202-214.

misunderstood.¹ Another reason why Marcellus was isolated and hated so much is found by Gericke in Marcellus' attitude towards dogma and tradition: he exposed the arrogance of his opponents, who identified human dogma with divine revelation, and insisted on the Bible as a yard-stick and basis for every doctrine. Although Marcellus himself could not keep his theology free from any human speculation, and he himself failed by his own standards and could not escape his time and traditional setting, his opponents felt that Marcellus' principle of 'back to Scripture' must shake their confidence in dogma and doctrinal formulae; but tragically even he did not experience the 'historical' Christ of the Bible, but chased after a Logos which was the product of his own speculation. Yet without him Christian theology would have fallen prey to even further "Hellenisation", and it is only thanks to his insistence on monotheism that the doctrine of the Trinity became a doctrine of Triunity.²

From Gericke's assessment of Marcellus it is quite apparent that he, even more than Zahn, was attracted by Marcellus' alleged 'Protestantism'. The strongly emphasised antagonism of Bible versus tradition, revelation versus (human) dogma, Antiochene versus Alexandrian tradition, betrays a typical Protestant, anti-Catholic sentiment, and Gericke just about escapes likening Marcellus to Luther.³ The categories in which he thinks are, therefore, quite anachronistic. Gericke stands in line with a long tradition of German Protestant history of dogma of which J. T. Lienhard says: "The older German historians of dogma were still influenced by, or reacting against, Ferdinand Christian Baur (and therefore Hegel). They looked for two grand streams or schools which are eventually resolved into one; thus Loof's³ biblical, Antiochene theology and philosophical,

¹ Gericke (1940) p. 183 n. 13 and foll..

² Ibid. pp. 189ff..

³ Ibid. p. 190: "Eine echte Begegnung mit der in der Bibel sich uns erschließenden Offenbarungswirklichkeit war ihm - zwölf Jahrhunderte vor Luther - eigentlich versagt."

Alexandrian theology, or Harnack's vision of Christianity being gradually replaced by dogmatic Catholicism."¹

¹ J. T. Lienhard, "Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research", *ThS* 43 (1982) p. 503.

PART I

The Portrait of Marcellus of Ancyra

Chapter 1

The Life of Marcellus

The date of Marcellus' birth, where he was born, and whether he was a child of Christian parents, is unknown. H. M. Gwatkin believes that his "ignorance of Scripture" indicates that he was probably of "heathen origin", since he did not even have "a student's knowledge of the text as a whole",¹ but this view is not current any more. The first thing that we know certainly about Marcellus is that he was present as a Bishop at the Synod of Ancyra in AD 314, and that he most probably presided over it:

σύνοδος θεία καὶ ἱερὰ τοπικὴ δύο καὶ δέκα ἐπισκόπων συναθροισθεῖσα
ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ τῆς Γαλατίας, ἧς ἐξῆρχε Μάρκελλος τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπίσκοπος
καὶ Αἰγυρικόλαος Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας, κανονικῶς τυπώσασα τὴν
διόρθωσιν τῶν ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ παραπεσόντων.²

The next thing we know is that he was present at the Council of Nicaea in AD 325. He himself tells us so in the beginning of his *Epistula ad Iulium*:

ἐπειδὴ τινες τῶν καταγνωσθέντων πρότερον ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ ὀρθῶς πιστεύειν,
οὓς ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νικαίαν συνόδῳ διήλεγξα, κατ' ἐμοῦ γράψαι...³

He supported the homoousian party against the Arians, of whom he was presumably one of the most prominent opponents. About the following years we find two views held in modern scholarship. The traditional chronology is that Marcellus attended the Synods of Tyre and Jerusalem in AD 335 and in the same year presented the Emperor Constantine with an anti-Arian book, which was not well received. Traditionally, the fact that the book was not accepted by the Emperor is traced to Marcellus' absence from the dedication of Constantine's

¹ Henry Melvill Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism* (1900) p. 80 fn. 1.

² In Mansi II, 539. Cf. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra* (1867) p. 8f..

³ Frg. 129.

new Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in AD 335; this view, however has been disputed by J. T. Lienhard, who argues that the book had been written and presented much earlier.¹ Consequently, Marcellus was deposed in AD 336 from his see, but returned in AD 337 after Constantine's death, only to be deposed again in the autumn of AD 338 or the spring of AD 339.² The more recent view is that Marcellus had written and presented his book already, around AD 330, and was deposed in the early AD 330s.³ This chronology rests on the observation that Eusebius' *Contra Marcellum* gives the impression of having been written in great haste, most likely in order to justify Marcellus' first deposition, whereas the *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* was obviously written after a longer period of thought and reflection. Eusebius died in AD 339, when Marcellus had been deposed for a second time.⁴

At the Synod of Constantinople in AD 339, Athanasius of Alexandria and Asclepas of Gaza were also deposed from their sees. Marcellus, Athanasius, Asclepas and others turned to Julius of Rome for help.⁵ This was the starting point for a lengthy correspondence between Julius and the Easterners. Scholarly opinion again diverges on the chronology here. It is generally agreed that the Eusebians had already written to Julius, asking him to confirm their condemnation of Marcellus and the others, when Marcellus arrived in Rome. Zahn believes that this could not have been earlier than the summer of AD 340.⁶ About the events that followed, however, there are again two different views. It is traditionally assumed that Julius

¹ Concerning Marcellus' book see Chapter 2. Cf. W. Gericke *Marcell von Ancyra* (1940) p. 10; Zahn (1867) p. 35, and J. T. Lienhard *Contra Marcellum* (1986) [1986a] p. 17f..

² Cf. e.g. Gericke (1940) p. 6; R. P. C. Hanson *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (1988) [1988b] p. 217; Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* II, 42; Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History* II, 33.1-4.

³ Cf. Hanson (1988b) p. 127.

⁴ Cf. Lienhard (1986a) p. 17f..

⁵ Cf. Zahn (1867) p. 68 (Mil. frag. III § 14); Lienhard (1986a) p. 18.

⁶ Zahn (1867) p. 68. According to Zahn the synod took place in the autumn of AD 341, since Marcellus himself tells us that he spent fifteen months in Rome (ἐμοῦ ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ τρεῖς ὅλους μῆνας ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πεποιηκότος).

wrote back to the Easterners, inviting them to a Synod on the matter. They refused to attend. Marcellus wrote his Epistle to Julius around AD 340/1. It is not quite clear whether he wrote this letter before the Synod,¹ which would then have been called in response to it, or during the Synod.² The Synod itself took place either in AD 340 or in AD 341; opinions differ on this point. Marcellus, together with Athanasius and Asclepas, was declared orthodox and received into communion by the Synod. Julius informed the Eusebians of this, who replied vigorously with explicit condemnations of Marcellus from the Dedication Council of Antioch in AD 341.³

A completely different view is held by M. Tetz.⁴ Following W. Schneemelcher's dating of the Dedication Council on the 6th of January AD 341⁵, he states that the Council first dealt with the case of Theophronius of Tyana, who was accused of Marcellianism and who produced a personal declaration of faith in order to clear himself of the charge. In this so-called 'Antiochene Creed' Marcellus is referred to as somebody already condemned, and the tone of the writing is rather harsh.⁶ With Theophronius' case cleared, the Council produced a more general and moderate (though still anti-Marcellian) declaration, the so-called 'Second Antiochene Creed', which was the official profession of faith of the Council. The so-called 'First Antiochene Creed' is in fact part of the answer to Julius of Rome, written in the course

¹ Hanson (1988b) p. 218.

² This might be Lienhard's view (cf. Lienhard, (1986a) p. 18f.); he is not quite clear on this point - nor is Gericke (Gericke, (1940) p. 17).

³ Lienhard, "Basil of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra and 'Sabellius'...", *CHUSA* 58 (1989) [1989b] p. 158; Gericke (1940) p. 17.

⁴ Martin Tetz, "Die Kirchenweihsynode von Antiochien (341) und Marcellus von Ancyra" (1989) pp. 199-217.

⁵ Schneemelcher, "Die Kirchenweihsynode von Antiochien 341" (1977) pp. 319-346.

⁶ Tetz (1989) pp. 202ff., p. 206. Athanasius gives the text of the three Antiochene Creeds in his *De Synodis* 23f..

of the correspondance about Marcellus, Athanasius and Asclepas.¹ Marcellus wrote his letter to Julius with the knowledge of Theophronius' declaration of faith and the Antiochene Creeds, immediately before and with regard to the Synod of Rome in AD 341. Tetz even believes that Marcellus developed certain features of his own profession of faith under the influence of Theophronius' declaration.²

The next thing we know about Marcellus is that he attended the Council of Sardica in AD 343. The Synod split up before it had really started - the Western Bishops accepted Athanasius, Marcellus and Asclepas as orthodox and received them into communion, while the Easterners renewed their condemnation of these Nicene Bishops. The Creed of the Synod of Sardica appears to bear traces of Marcellus' theological influence.³

It is not known what happened to Marcellus after this. Hanson believes that he returned to Ancyra in AD 344 or "about then".⁴ The majority of scholars, however, seem to assume that Marcellus never returned to his see, although the sources are contradictory on this point.⁵ Apparently he was regarded as their rightful bishop by the congregation of Marcellians at Ancyra. In 370, this group wrote an *Expositio Fidei* to Athanasius in order to prove their orthodoxy. They refer to themselves as οἱ μὲν κληρικοὶ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ τῆς Γαλατίας μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μαρκέλλου συναγόμενοι.⁶

¹ Tetz (1989) p. 207. Athanasius gives the formulae in this order; Tetz claims to have put the three Creeds back in their chronological order.

² Tetz (1989) p. 209f.. Tetz believes that the phrase "Our Lord Jesus Christ" was taken up by Marcellus from Theophronius.

³ Tetz (1989) pp. 209-212.

⁴ Hanson (1988b) p. 219.

⁵ Athanasius (*Apologia Secunda* 1 and 58), Socrates (*Ecclesiastical History* II, 24) and Sozomen (*Ecclesiastical History* III, 23-24) mention disturbances at Marcellus' return, whereas Hilary (*Coll. Antiarian*. B II 9.2) states that Marcellus never returned to his see.

⁶ Text from Tetz's critical edition in "Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien...", *ZNTW* 64 (1973) pp. 75-121 (text on pp. 78-84).

Marcellus died in or around 374, as a very old man.¹

¹ Epiphanius (*Panarion* 72.1) tells us that Marcellus died two or three years before the time when Epiphanius was writing these very words.

Chapter 2

The Works of Marcellus

Until very recently, the only writings known to have been definitely Marcellan were the fragments of his book against Asterius the Sophist and his letter to Julius of Rome.¹ Since the newly-ascribed writings will be dealt with separately, this chapter is concerned only with the Fragments and the Epistle to Julius.

1. The Fragments

Whether the book against Asterius, which has come down to us in fragments preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea and Epiphanius of Salamis² is identical with the book which Marcellus presented to Constantine is not known. Some scholars, for example Zahn, Gericke, Hanson and Dowling³, seem to believe that the two are identical, although they never explicitly argue the case. J. T. Lienhard, on the other hand, does not seem to identify the book against Asterius (to which he refers as *Contra Asterium*) with the book which Marcellus wrote to Constantine, but he does not explicitly say so either.⁴ From the way Eusebius refers to the book against Asterius, it seems likely that it was indeed the book presented to Constantine: he says the book was of “endless length and countless words”, that

¹ In 1949 M. Richard ascribed the little heresiological treatise *De Sancta Ecclesia* to Marcellus, and since then a number of other works have been ascribed to him. This is examined in detail in Part II.

² Eusebius of Caesarea, *Contra Marcellum* and *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72. These fragments were first edited by H. G. Rettberg in his *Marcelliana: collected fragments* (1794). In 1906 E. Klostermann added the fragments and the *Epistula ad Iulium* as an appendix to his edition of the works of Eusebius, “Eusebius Werke IV”, GCS 14 (1906).

³ Zahn (1867) pp. 44ff.; Gericke (1940). p. 9f.; Hanson (1988b) p. 217f.; M. J. Dowling, *Marcellus of Ancyra* (1987) p. 45.

⁴ J. T. Lienhard (1989b) p. 157, and also (1986a) p. 17.

Marcellus tried to flatter the Emperor by dedicating it to him, and that Marcellus wrote just one book.¹

The title of the work against Asterius is not known. Because of its peculiar exegesis of 1 Cor. 15:24-28, which implies the notion of the return of the Logos into the Father at the end of time, found especially in frg. 121, Hilary believed that its title was *De Subiectione Domini*,² but this is obviously a wrong assumption because the work is by no means chiefly concerned with this particular theologoumenon. Its main concern is monotheism, as Eusebius himself acknowledges in frg. 128: he wrote just one book in order to make known the one God, διὰ τὸν ἕνα γνωρίζειν θεόν.³ Dowling finds it possible that “these words formed part of the original title”⁴. For practical reasons I will follow Lienhard and refer to the book as *Contra Asterium*, although there is no evidence that this was its actual title.

The *Contra Asterium* is the main source for our knowledge of Marcellus’ theology. Whether it is accurate is another matter: we only know what Eusebius chose to quote from it, and of course he had no interest in presenting Marcellus in too favourable a light. Although it is unlikely that Eusebius actually misquoted Marcellus - this would have made a defence on the part of Marcellus far too easy - he must have omitted a great deal from the long work. For example, there is no mention of Arius and his subordinationism, and no reference to the Council of Nicaea and its ὁμοούσιον to be found in the extant fragments; but of course, it is possible that they may have occurred in passages which Eusebius simply left out.⁵

¹ Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* 1.3, 2.4, frg. 128.

² Frg. 22, MSL 10, 651B, quoted by Gericke (1940) p. 10.

³ Whether this remark can actually serve as an argument for the identity of the book against Asterius with the book presented to Constantine is not quite clear (cf. above, n. 1), since it can also mean that Marcellus did not divide his book into different parts or chapters in order to emphasise the concept of unity.

⁴ Dowling (1987) p. 52.

⁵ Cf. Dowling, loc. cit..

The reliability of a picture of Marcellan theology derived from the *Contra Asterium* fragments also depends on the degree to which Marcellus changed his views in the course of his crusade against the Arians between 330 and 341, and more specifically on whether the views found in the *Contra Asterium* itself are in some respects the product of the heat of battle. One's decision on this matter largely determines one's understanding of the *Epistula ad Iulium* as either a sincere writing which indicates moderation and some change of mind, or a tactical and deceptive writing which gives the false impression of orthodoxy in order to gain Julius' support. The understanding of the *Contra Asterium* implies also the methodological problem of to what extent it is to be used as a yardstick for ascribing other works to Marcellus. M. J. Dowling, for example, maintains that there are "no grounds for doubting that the fragments... indeed represent Marcellus' theology", and therefore that "any work which differs significantly in its theology from the Fragments does not have a very strong claim to Marcellan authorship".¹ Dowling here stands in line with the sceptical approaches of M. Richard and M. Simonetti as far as change of mind in Marcellus is concerned.

J. T. Lienhard, on the other hand, argues that "between AD 330 and 340 Marcellus changed some of his doctrines in order to preserve others"²; his main interest being monotheism and the one hypostasis, he was prepared to give up some of the most notorious points of his book against Asterius: that the Logos is anhypostatic, that the Godhead expands from a Monad to a Triad in the course of saving history, that Christ's kingdom will have an end when Christ gives up the flesh and returns as the Logos into the Father. "Marcellus and his followers came to realise that they had to confess that God's eternal Word is also Son, Wisdom and Power, and that the Kingdom will have no end."³ According to Lienhard the

¹ Dowling, (1987) p. 2.

² Lienhard, (1986a) p. 270.

³ Ibid. p. 271.

Contra Asterium is therefore our only major source for Marcellan theology, but it gives only the theology of the “early” Marcellus.¹

2. The *Epistula ad Iulium*

This epistle gives a slightly altered picture of Marcellus. Marcellus included in it a profession of faith which has always been the focus of scholarly interest. Two things are remarkable about it. First, the Creed which Marcellus introduces as portraying the faith which he has been taught from the scriptures bears striking resemblances to the Roman Creed²; and second, it contains points which differ from the theology of the *Contra Asterium*.

As regards the first point, the fact that his profession of faith is almost identical with the Roman Creed has led many scholars to the assumption that this was a cunning and deceptive manoeuvre on the part of Marcellus to win Julius’ favour.³ Martin Tetz, however, approaches the *Epistula ad Iulium* from a different angle, and comes to a different conclusion⁴: Marcellus’ profession of faith starts much earlier in the text, not with πιστεύω οὖν εἰς θεὸν παντοκράτορα..., but already with the section before, πιστεύω δὲ ἐπόμενος ταῖς θείαις Γραφαῖς, ὅτι εἰς θεός..., a phrase also found in frg. 121 of the *Contra Asterium*; the elements of the Roman Creed form only the final part of Marcellus’ profession of faith, the two parts

¹ Athanasius in his *Historia Arianorum* 6, and Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastica Theologia* 2, tell us that Marcellus was already an old man when he was deposed; therefore, it would be most inappropriate to speak of the ‘young’ Marcellus.

A description of the theology of the Fragments is easily accessible (see e.g. Lienhard, “Marcellus of Ancyra in modern research”, *ThS* 43 (1982) pp. 486-503, especially pp. 488ff.) and therefore a detailed examination of Marcellus’ theology in the Fragments need not be included in this work.

² A point already noted by J. Ussher, *De Romanae Ecclesiae Symbolo Apostolico Vetere*, (1647) p. 9: “Idemque ipsum Graecum a Marcello Ancyrano professioni fidei suae ad Iulium Romanum antistitem insertum, apud Epiphanium in Haeresi LXXII legitur...”. Cf. Dowling (1987) p. 54f..

³ R. Hübner, “Gregor von Nyssa und Marcell von Ankyra” in *Ecriture et Culture Philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse* (1971) p. 212 n. 1.

⁴ M. Tetz “Zum altrömischen Bekenntnis...”, *ZNTW* 75 (1984) pp. 107-127.

belonging together and following the Rule of Faith. Marcellus himself added τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν Κύριον τοῦ υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, which was accepted by Julius and added to the current Roman Creed. This addition is, therefore, Marcellus' contribution to the Roman Creed.

With regard to the second point, Marcellus confesses the μονογενῆς υἱὸς λόγος, thereby applying the term Son to the pre-incarnate Logos. He accepts that his kingdom shall have no end, and does not make any reference to an expansion of the Monad into a Triad or a contraction at the end of time. All these points differ from his position in the *Contra Asterium*. Two interpretations of this are possible and held in modern scholarship. M. J. Dowling (and with him all those who interpret the *Epistula ad Iulium* as a cunningly deceptive writing) believes that the concessions made are merely tactical, and that the real Marcellus, "Marcellus in his unguarded moments"¹, is to be found in the fragments of the *Contra Asterium*. Therefore the *Epistula ad Iulium* must be interpreted in the light of the fragments. J. T. Lienhard (and with him Martin Tetz) believes the profession of faith to be sincere: "...it is clear that Marcellus and his followers gradually gave up most of the distinctive doctrines of the *Contra Asterium* in order to retain one: to the end the Marcellians did not use the phrase 'three hypostases' of God, the phrase that is practically shorthand for the 'Cappadocian settlement'"; "...the letter to Julius is a short but perfectly honest confession of Marcellus' faith in AD 341. The *Contra Asterium* was probably written in 328. The intervening twelve or thirteen years gave Marcellus enough time to reconsider his ideas; Eusebius' five books gave him material to reflect on; and his deposition gave him leisure enough."²

¹ Dowling (1987) p. 56.

² Lienhard (1986a) pp. 159, 152.

Chapter 3

Sabellian or Orthodox?

The question of whether Marcellus was orthodox or heretic - and if the latter, what kind of heretic? - has always been part of (and often the chief motive behind) research on Marcellus of Ancyra, and the question is still very much an open one. The reason for this lies partly in the ambiguity of early-church statements about him.

On the one hand, Marcellus of Ancyra has been accused of Sabellianism by Eusebius¹ and the Easterners following him: the Synod of Antioch in AD 341 condemned him by name²; the fourth Oration against the Arians (transmitted under the name of Athanasius, whose authorship has been and still is disputed) is generally understood to be directed against Marcellus, although the heretics referred to are called Sabellians and Marcellus is never mentioned by name³; to the easterners in Sardica in AD 343 (not, after all, Philippopolis⁴) Marcellus was even worse than just a Sabellian, teaching a mixture of the heresies of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata and the Montanists, or as Hilary put it, “haereticorum omnium execrabilior pestis”⁵. Hilary also tells us that in AD 345, shortly after Sardica, Athanasius broke off communion with Marcellus, who in response refrained from entering a church, and he interprets this as an acknowledgement of his heresy on the part of Marcellus.⁶ Finally,

¹ *Contra Marcellum*, 1.2, 4, 10, 25 and many others.

² Referred to above.

³ Cf. e.g. R. P. C. Hanson, “The source and significance of the Fourth ‘Oratio Contra Arianos’ attributed to Athanasius”, *Vigiliae Christianae* 42.3 (1988) [1988a] pp. 257-266. See also T. E. Pollard, *Johannine Christology and the Early Church* (1970) pp. 298f..

⁴ L. W. Barnard, *The Council of Sardica 343 AD* (1983) pp. 48f..

⁵ *Frg. III* § 2, cf. § 4.

⁶ *Collect. Antiar.* B II 9.2 (22) and 3 (23).

Marcellians (although not Marcellus) are counted among the heretics anathematized by the Council of Constantinople in AD 381.

On the other hand Marcellus was a strong supporter of the orthodox party in Nicaea in AD 325; the Westerners received him into communion in AD 341, and the Western party in Sardica in AD 343 declared him orthodox; Athanasius defended Marcellus' orthodoxy in a number of writings which date from AD 357-358, after his alleged break-off¹ - Gericke interprets Athanasius' temporal rejection in AD 345 as politically motivated because Athanasius was at the time negotiating with the Emperor about his return to his see, and Marcellus simply kept a low profile in order to help him² - and Epiphanius, who appears to be not quite sure about Marcellus' heresy himself, tells us the famous anecdote of Athanasius' smile: when asked by Epiphanius what he thought of Marcellus, Athanasius smiled and neither defended nor condemned him, but found him, although "not far from error, justified".³

Athanasius in AD 371 accepted the *Expositio Fidei* of the Marcellian delegation from Ancyra under the deacon Eugenius as orthodox,⁴ and much to Basil's annoyance - since Basil fought the Marcellians, whom he saw as obstacles to a unified Church, from the very beginning of his pontificate - Athanasius refused to condemn Marcellus even when urged to do so by Basil in a letter.⁵ Marcellus was never condemned in person by an Ecumenical Council.

¹ *Apologia de Fuga* 3.3-6; *Apologia Secunda* 32.1-4; *Historia Arianorum* 6. Cf. Hanson (1988b) p. 220.

² Gericke (1940) p. 21.

³ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72.4.4.

⁴ For a critical edition of the text of the *Expositio* and a detailed interpretation of the whole event, see Tetz (1973).

⁵ Ep. 69 (AD 371).

There is also the additional problem that we do not know whether those who opposed Marcellus' teaching always identified it with Sabellianism; Epiphanius, for example, clearly did not¹, nor, according to T. E. Pollard, did Hilary². Neither do we know exactly what the teaching of Sabellius was: "we must simply accept that this name became attached to a type of theology in which the distinctions between the 'three persons' in the Godhead were denied. It is probable that there was a connection between the historical Sabellius and the later portraits of him, but it is not possible for us to say just how faithful these portraits were."³ Consequently, scholars have had to evaluate Marcellus' theology afresh.

1. Was Marcellus a Sabellian?

So, was Marcellus a Sabellian? The unanimous answer of all scholars is 'No'. If Sabellian teaching indeed meant the denial of any sort of distinction within the Godhead, then Marcellus' theology is not accurately described when labelled "Sabellian". Marcellus' concept of the πλατύνεσθαι of the Monad into a Triad in the course of saving history,⁴ the fact that he does not use the terms Logos and God interchangeably, although he states that they are ἐν καὶ ταὐτόν (frg. 71, cf. frg. 58), and that he does not teach the Incarnation of the Father but of the Logos⁵ speaks clearly of the fact that his teaching is not what is conceived to be Sabellian; therefore "It is not helpful to speak of Marcellus as a Sabellian, especially as the

¹ Cf. Dowling (1987) p. 182, and also C. Riggi, "La διαλογία des Marcelliens dans le Panarion 72" in *Studia Patristica* XV.1 (1984) pp. 386 to 373, pp. 372f..

² T. E. Pollard, "Marcellus of Ancyra, a Neglected Father", *Epektasis* (Paris 1972) pp. 187-196, p. 191: "Much better theologians than Eusebius, however, like Basil (Ep. 125) and Hilary (De Trinitate), never equated Marcellus' teaching with Sabellianism."

³ Dowling (1987) p. 187; Cf. Zahn (1867) pp. 196-214.

⁴ Frgs 76, 121; cf. T. E. Pollard (1970) p. 251.

⁵ Frgs 42, 76, 94, 95, cf. frgs 100, 116.

distinctive features of Marcellus' theology do not appear in the stock descriptions of Sabellianism until after Marcellus himself had become the subject of controversy. It is more helpful to think of Marcellus as reviving - with some modifications - the Logos doctrine of the Apologists"¹. Much more difficult to answer is the question:

2. Was Marcellus Orthodox?

Until very recently, this question has been mainly decided on the basis of the fragments of the *Contra Asterium*, with surprisingly little regard to the *Epistula ad Iulium*, the criterion of Marcellus' orthodoxy being his doctrine of the Trinity. There are two mainstreams to be identified, one supporting and the other disputing his orthodoxy.

As regards the first, Th. Zahn, when contrasting Marcellus' teaching with Sabellianism, finds very moving words to describe his doctrine of the Trinity: "Marcellus' εἰς θεός bears in himself eternally that triplicity which manifests itself in revelation for what it is... The Triad is, unlike that of Sabellius, not an illusion, but a reality which should never be thought of or taught as being without the immanent eternal monad. Finally, the Triad is not a successive one as with Sabellius, but rests at every moment equally and eternally in God, while it is historically simultaneous."² Zahn, in other words, understands Marcellus' teaching to be truly Trinitarian, even though there is a very strong (but essentially legitimate) emphasis on the unity.

The favourite label for Marcellus' doctrine, however, is "economic monotheism"³. This is supposed to mean that the oneness of God is emphasized in the interests of the

¹ Dowling (1987) p. 196.

² Zahn (1867) p. 215.

³ F. Loofs, "Die Trinitätslehre Marcell's...", *SPAW* (1902) p. 774; cf. C. Andersen, "Zur Entstehung...", *ZNTW* 52 (1961) pp. 32f..

soteriologically important unity of Creator and Redeemer.¹ Marcellus is understood to be interested not in God *a se*, but “in the God who has acted in history, in creation, redemption and revelation... the living, active, dynamic God of the Bible”;² the God of *Heilsgeschichte*.³ He is even seen to be, in a way, ahead of his time in that the notion of the full divinity of the Spirit - an issue generally understood to have been discussed in the second half of the fourth century - is for Marcellus a natural result of his concept of the divine Monad which expands into a Triad.⁴

As regards the second mainstream, the clearest vote against Marcellus' orthodoxy is found in T. E. Pollard's *Johannine Christology* (1970). He objects mainly to the notion of an expanding and contracting Godhead, a notion which he calls “expansionistic modalism”.⁵ He denies that Marcellus holds a doctrine of the Trinity, because it is not an eternal Trinity which he teaches, but a God who “expanded to meet the needs of the world”.⁶ Marcellus' real heresy is, therefore, not Sabellianism, because the God of Sabellius is always only one, but the fact that he subjects the eternal God to history: “The motive of modalism was better than its result. An unfolding purpose does not imply an unfolding essence. The eternal God may intervene in history; he cannot be said to have a history.”⁷

¹ Cf. M. Tetz, *Marcell III* (1972) p. 168.

² T. E. Pollard (1972) p. 191.

³ T. E. Pollard (1970) p. 251.

⁴ Cf. F. Loofs (1902) p. 772f.; cf. A. M. Ritter, “Das Konzil von Konstantinopel...”, *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* xv (1965) p. 301 fn. 7.

⁵ T. E. Pollard (1970) p. 266.

⁶ *Idem*.

⁷ *Idem*. Pollard here quotes from H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (1954) p. 138.

Although they do not express themselves as clearly, the majority of scholars seem to recognize this concept of a changing God to be the real problem with Marcellus' doctrine of the Trinity.

The two most recent works on Marcellus, however, the theses of Dowling (1987) and Lienhard (1986), approach the matter from a different angle. The question is not whether the theology of the *Contra Asterium* was heretical - both scholars basically agree that it was - but rather, whether Marcellus changed some of his views, so that it is possible, at least, to say that he approached orthodoxy.

Dowling brusquely rejects this possibility. Referring to Basil's complaint about the Romans, who still fail to condemn Marcellus (Ep. 69), Dowling remarks: "It seems odd that, if Marcellus' views had developed in such a way that he was capable of writing works like the *Sermo Maior de Fide* and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* (works whose theology led to their being attributed eventually to Athanasius) Basil should have been completely unaware of this."¹ Referring to the Ancyran *Expositio Fidei* of the Deacon Eugenius, Dowling points to the fact that even in this writing which is designed to assure Athanasius of the orthodoxy of the Marcellians in Ancyra, there is no mention of a substantial change of mind in Marcellus, or new and orthodox writings from his hand: "For that matter it would have been a good idea to write to Basil, too, to reassure him that Marcellus had retracted his earlier views and inform him that, if he cared to read certain other writings by Marcellus, he could see for himself that the former 'heretic' now had a very strong emphasis on the divine plurality."² The only possibility that Dowling acknowledges is that Marcellus in his old age and for the sake of peace on the anti-Arian and anti-Pneumatomachian front, "may well have been prepared to acquiesce in a move on the part of his former congregation to have their name cleared once and for all... he might have decided that to insist on the kind of statement which

¹ Dowling (1987) p. 273.

² Ibid. p. 274.

we find in the fragments would only do more harm than good.”¹ But this is as far as Dowling would go.

J. T. Lienhard, on the other hand, believes that Marcellus and his followers modified their views in the process of controversy. He sees Marcellus as the upholder of Monotheism at the centre of a surrounding ‘miahypostatic’ tradition² which eventually came to confess orthodox positions while insisting on the one hypostasis of God. “The idea of God as a Monad that expands into a Triad is not the heart of Marcellus’ thought... the heart of his thought is his - ultimately inadequate - insistence on Christian Monotheism and the eternity of the Word.”³ Therefore, to him Marcellus is guilty not so much of heresy as rather of inadequacy in meeting the Arian challenge.

From what has been said, it is clear that the question of whether Marcellus was and remained a heretic or not is not at all easy to decide. Evaluations of Marcellus’ theology seem to be partly dependent on the theological traditions to which their respective scholars belong. For example, it is easy to see that ‘economic’ Trinitarianism has a special appeal to Western, especially Protestant theology, which is itself more interested in salvation, experience and the Biblical concept of the living God, rather than in speculation about God’s inner being. Marcellus, here, is understood as the defender of Bible-based Monotheism, when it had to face its most *serious* threat - hence Zahn’s, Loof’s, Gericke’s and Tetz’s enthusiasm for Marcellus.

Theological tradition, however, does not explain why two excellent scholars like Dowling and Lienhard, totally independently of each other inasmuch as they do not know of each other’s thesis, come to diametrically opposed conclusions on the basis of the same texts. I am in no position, at present, to say which of the two is right.

¹ Ibid. p. 272.

² Lienhard (1986a) p. 268, p. 270.

³ Ibid. p. 270.

Chapter 4

“οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος”

In modern scholarship it is generally understood that Marcellus' influence on the history of dogma in the fourth century was considerable. This is far too complex a matter to be dealt with in short here.¹ Therefore, we shall have just a quick look at the one theological trace which Marcellus left in the history of dogma which is still visible today, namely, the formula in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed: οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος, which is directed against Marcellus and his notion of the eschatological rendering of the kingdom and the reassumption of the Logos into the Father. G. W. H. Lampe in 1948 had observed that assertions of the eternity of Christ's kingdom (against Marcellus) are found in the Dedication Council in Antioch in AD 341 and explicitly so in its fourth Creed: οὐ ἡ βασιλεία ἀκατάπαυστος οὕσα δυνάμει εἰς τοὺς ἀπείρους αἰῶνας. The Westerners in Sardica confess an eternal kingdom of the Logos; the Easterners maintain the notion of an eternal kingdom of the Logos; they also maintain the notion of an eternal kingdom of Christ in the Formula Macrostichos in AD 345, and in Epiphanius' *Ancoratus* 118 and 119 we find two Creeds which explicitly uphold the same view. The last Creed Lampe mentions is the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed.²

A. M. Ritter in his book (1965) about the Council of Constantinople and its Symbol mentions Marcellus merely in a footnote. He obviously takes it for granted that a formula like *whose kingdom shall have no end* was one among other formulae which were

¹ For all the details, see J. T. Lienhard (1986a) which is chiefly devoted to Marcellus' influence on fourth century Greek theology.

² G. W. H. Lampe, “Some notes on the significance of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ...”, *JThS* 49 (1948) pp. 70f..

unquestionably directed against Marcellus¹ and which appear in nearly all post-Nicene Eastern Creeds.

E. Molland in his article “Des Reich kein Ende haben wird” (1970) goes into more detail. He observes that “whose kingdom shall have no end”, which is a quotation of Lk. 1:33, appears only in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed and the Creeds found in Epiphanius.² His explanation of this phenomenon is that Lk. 1:33 was quoted not in synodal symbols but in baptismal creeds, first visible in 348 with Cyril of Jerusalem. Epiphanius also refers to the creeds quoted by him which contain Lk. 1:33 as baptismal creeds.³

But Lk. 1:33 must have been part of the argument against Marcellus earlier than that. Marcellus himself in his *Epistula ad Iulium* quotes Lk. 1:33, although with the reservation κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου μαρτυρίαν, which Molland interprets as indicating that Marcellus must have been confronted with Lk. 1:33 before his exile, and tried to come to terms with it in the *Epistula ad Iulium*.⁴

The fact that Lk. 1:33 appears in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed is explained by Molland as a result of the fact that originally it was not a synodal but a baptismal creed;⁵ it was used at the baptism of Nectarius after Gregory of Nazianzus had resigned and, after the Council of AD 381, became the local baptismal creed of Constantinople; as such it is mentioned at Chalcedon as the ἕκθεσις of the 150 Fathers of Constantinople.

¹ Ritter (1965) p. 192, n. 1: “fraglos gegen Markell gerichtete Wendungen”.

² E. Molland, “Des Reich kein Ende haben wird...”, *Opuscula Patristica* (Oslo 1970) pp. 246ff..

³ Idem..

⁴ Ibid. p. 248.

⁵ Ibid. p. 236f..

Whether Molland is right or not on this particular point or not is not the question here¹; but what appears to be quite clear is that οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος was indeed directed against Marcellus. Emphases of this kind had become a standard feature at least in the Creeds of the East by the middle of the Fourth Century, and fascinatingly οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος has survived to this day as an indirect indication of Marcellus' enormous influence in his time.²

¹ A. M. Ritter (1965) p. 190f., and J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (1950) p. 182ff., hold that it actually was the synodal Creed.

² Cf. J. T. Lienhard, "The exegesis of 1 Cor. 15.24-28...", *Vigiliae Christianae* 37 (1983) p. 341.

PART II

Works Recently Ascribed to Marcellus

Chapter 1

De Sancta Ecclesia

The first work to be ascribed to Marcellus in addition to undisputed fragments and the letter to Julius was the short treatise *De Sancta Ecclesia*. It was discovered in 1901 by Cardinal Giovanni Mercati¹. The MSS name Anthimus of Nicomedia, who was martyred in 302 under Diocletian, as the author; but this is certainly not correct since the chief target attacked in the writing is Arianism, a heresy which arose, of course, somewhat later. Marcel Richard² examined the letter more closely in 1949 and came to the conclusion that Marcellus of Ancyra was the author. His arguments are mainly theological:

- “Pseudo-Anthimus rejects the three hypostases as does Marcellus”;
- “He rejects the three persons, as does Marcellus”;
- “He rejects the notion of the eternal generation of the Logos, as does Marcellus”;
- “He believes that to confess such a generation would be the equivalent of confessing a second God, as does Marcellus”;
- “He is hardly or not at all concerned with Arian subordinationism, like Marcellus”;
- “He attacks specifically Asterius the Sophist and Eusebius of Caesarea, as does Marcellus”;
- “He believes that the Arians derived their doctrines from Valentinus, Hermes, Plato, and Marcion (or the Marcionite Apelles), as does Marcellus”.³

In view of the fact that in §18 the question of the divinity of the Holy Spirit is tackled, Richard believes *De Sancta Ecclesia* to have been written “a long time after the tract

¹ Greek text in: G. Mercati, “Anthimi Nicomediensis” in *Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica. Studi et Testi* 5 (1901). MS: cod. ambros. M257.

² M. Richard, “Un Œpuscule méconnu de Marcel évêque d’Ancyre”, *MSR* VI (1949), pp. 5-28.

³ *Ibid.* p. 16.

against Asterius, at a time when the question of the Holy Spirit was of high interest, i.e. sometime in the third quarter of the fourth century”.¹ This leads him to the conclusion that “Marcellus remained faithful to his views and that his profession of faith to Pope Julius was not a sincere expression of his beliefs”.² Richard’s views were accepted by M. Tetz and Manlio Simonetti and remained unchallenged until 1983 when R. P. C. Hanson published an article disputing his ascription of the work to Marcellus.³ Having been unable to obtain Richard’s article, as he admits himself⁴, he recognises the following arguments in favour of Marcellan authorship: the use of the word Ἀρειομανία for abusing the Arians, the rejection of the three hypostases (traced back to the gnostic heretic Valentinus and correctly ascribed to Asterius), and the use of the term “prosopon” to mean ‘character in which God chooses to speak in Scripture’.⁵

But Hanson nevertheless argues against Marcellan authorship, appealing to six points in his discussion:⁶

- The use of prosopon in this specific way is very old, appearing first in Justin Martyr in the middle of the third century, thus rendering the prosopon argument “not impressive”.

- The references to Asterius and Eusebius are all in the past tense, so while possibly of “Marcellan provenance” not necessarily “directly by the pen of Marcellus himself.”

- “Among the philosophers to whom the author of *De Sancta Ecclesia* attributes the origins of the Arian heresy is Aristotle, which points, he says, not to Arius (who together

¹ Ibid. p. 22.

² Ibid. p. 27.

³ R. P. C. , “The Date and Authorship of Pseudo-Anthimus’ *De Sancta Ecclesia*”, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 83 (1983) pp. 251-254.

⁴ Ibid. p. 251, n. 2.

⁵ Ibid. pp. 251-252.

⁶ To be found on pp. 252-254 of his article.

with his disciples disliked the introduction of the word οὐσία into definitions of the relation of the Son to the Father and therefore “would have a natural distaste for Aristotelian philosophy”) but to neo-Arianism, promoted by Aetius and Eunomius from about 358 onwards, which “could rightly be described as unduly influenced by Aristotle... for the capacity of its proponents to use Aristotle’s logic in order to show the absurdity of their opponents’ *homoousian* doctrine”.

- A complaint about the ἐντέχνου σοφιστείας also points to the neo-Arians, who were less interested in Biblical truth than the Arians of the first generation and “more concerned with the technicalities of philosophy”.

- The Arians, Hanson observes, are not accused of teaching a creation of the Son out of nothing, normally the standard accusation, but that τὸ βουλήσει θεοῦ ὑποστῆναι τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον ἀπεφήναντο. This militates, in Hanson’s view, against Marcellan authorship.

- Similarly, the teaching that the Spirit should not be worshipped or adored but called δοῦλος and ὑπηρετής “is precisely that of Eunomius, who uses exactly the word ὑπερέτης for the Holy Spirit”. The work therefore cannot be placed “earlier than about 365, because it was only then that the subject of the Holy Spirit came into prominence in theological circles”, at which time Marcellus must have been very old.

Hanson feels it possible that the disciples both of Eustathius and of Marcellus assimilated with each other to a large extent, and that their “one-hypostasis-language” survived for quite some time even after the Council of Alexandria in 362. It is, he concludes, “best to attribute this little work to some author who derived from the Eustathian and Marcellan tradition of theology in Antioch, writing as late as the 370s or 380s, and not to the hand of Marcellus himself.”¹ If Hanson is right on this we are in the position to allow for personal development and changes in Marcellus’ theology in the course of time - even if his followers held fast to his original beliefs. Richard’s position,

¹ Ibid. p. 254.

however, has been supported recently by Alastair H. B. Logan in his conference-paper on “Marcellus of Ancyra and Anti-Arian polemic”.¹

Logan argues against Hanson with regard to both terminology and theology:²

- The abusive term Ἀρειομανία occurs outside Athanasius no earlier, he says, than 341 (in Julius’ letter to the Eusebians) and 343 (Letter of the Western Council of Sardica).

- The term ἔντεχνος occurs three times in the fragments of Marcellus, which Logan understands to indicate that it was a favourite term of Marcellus’.

- The use of the term δόγμα resembles Marcellus’ understanding of it as merely human opinion.³

- The phrase ἐκ προσώπου τινός used of God’s speaking is characteristic of Marcellus.⁴

- The Arians specifically attacked in *De Sancta Ecclesia*, Eusebius of Caesarea and Asterius “were central in the anti-Arian polemic in the 340s, [but] virtually disappear from then on... who but Marcellus would have reproached Eusebius of Caesarea in particular for employing the Arian shibboleth ἀγέννητος when a more representative figure could have been cited?”

- The rejection of the three hypostases is typical of Marcellus, while “the followers of Marcellus in the 370s whom we can actually identify... accept three hypostatic prosopa as something they have long believed”.

¹ Alastair H. B. Logan, “Marcellus of Ancyra and Anti-Arian Polemic”, *Studia Patristica* XIX (1987). The volume was actually published in 1989.

² Ibid. pp. 190-193.

³ Logan follows M. Tetz in this; cf. Tetz, “Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra II”, *ZKG* 79 (1968) p. 29f.. Logan (1987) p. 190.

⁴ Cf. Tetz “Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I” *ZKG* 75 (1964) pp. 251-255.

- “The early Arians and their opponents do allude to the logic and syllogisms of Aristotle”.¹
- “The derivation of heresy from philosophers, particularly Plato and Aristotle, is the *Leitmotiv* of Hippolytus’ *Refutation of All Heresies*, and Hippolytus himself refers to the ἔντεχνα σοφίσματα of the heretics.²
- The concept of the “voluntary generation” of the Son is not so Neo-Arian, since Marcellus’ denial of it was one of the targets of the Creed of the Long Lines (AD 344) and of the Council of Sirmium (351).³
- “The status of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Trinity was debated... in the late 330s and early 340s precisely in response to Marcellus’ criticisms and his own characteristic theology.”⁴

Having thus refuted Hanson in detail, Logan proceeds to examine more closely the actual heresiological catalogue, which, he believes, finally proves Marcellan authorship.

In his article, Richard had drawn attention to the fact that two obscure heretics, Hermes and Seleucus, are mentioned in *De Sancta Ecclesia*.⁵ They are also mentioned in another work, namely in Filastrius of Brescia’s *Div. Her. Lib. 55*, where they are identified as Galatian. Since they were “doubtless hardly known outside this area”⁶ it is open to question where Filastrius got his information from. Richard suggests that under those conditions Marcellus of Ancyra was the most likely source; he even goes on to say that it is not unlikely that one of the “many writings” of which Jerome tells us (*De*

¹ For example, Eusebius of Nicomedia in his *Ep. ad Paulinum*.

² Cf. Hippolytus, *Ref. X*, 2.

³ Cf. Athanasius, *De Synodis* 26, VIII.

⁴ Cf. Eusebius, *Eccl. Theol.* III, 4-6; *Contra Marcellum* I, 1. 11; *Eccl. Theol.* I, 10, 5; II, 7. 13; Athanasius, *De Synodis* 23, 5-6 on the Council of Antioch of 341; 24, 4.

⁵ § 6; Richard (1949) p. 24.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 25.

Vir. Ill. 86) and which Richard¹ believes to be of mainly heresiological content (dealing with the heretics of Galatia) fell into the hands of Filastrius.

Logan shares Richard's views in the matter. He demonstrates that Filastrius follows *De Sancta Ecclesia* in a number of cases and at times does not follow his other major source, Hippolytus, but apparently somebody else - as Logan believes, Marcellus.

Marcellus is not counted among the heretics by Filastrius: in fact he is altogether absent from his catalogue. Logan's conclusion is that "Marcellus, developing the heresiological thesis implied in the Fragments, wrote *De Sancta Ecclesia* and the more detailed heresiological discourse underlying it... the minor differences between the Fragments and *De Sancta Ecclesia* are readily explicable as the result of Marcellus' further researches to substantiate his heresiological treatise on the origins of Arianism."¹

Other scholars have variously either accepted or defended Richard's view, although in a less detailed manner. Tetz for example accepts Richard's thesis without question and uses the *De Sancta Ecclesia* in his articles as Marcellan although he remarks that "the short piece about the Holy Church hardly tells us anything new about Marcellus' theology."²

Dowling, in his very critical doctoral thesis on Marcellus³, accepts the ascription of *De Sancta Ecclesia* on the grounds of Richard's arguments. Commenting on the fact that some controversial points characteristic of Marcellus are absent from the work he adds: "But given that the more controversial aspects of Marcellus' theology were in fact logical extensions of his basic monotheism and economic trinitarianism, the absence of these Christological points from the *De Sancta Ecclesia* is not an argument against Marcellan authorship, nor is it an argument in favour of the view that in later life Marcellus abandoned some of the opinions which he expressed in his book against Asterius".⁴

¹ Logan (1987) p. 196f..

² Tetz (1964) p. 222.

³ Dowling, *Marcellus of Ancyra...* (1987).

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 44.

One's attitude towards *De Sancta Ecclesia* determines, in a sense, the way in which other works attributed to Marcellus are to be judged, especially if Richard's late date for it is accepted. If Logan, who suggests "the late 330s and early 340s"¹ as the date when *De Sancta Ecclesia* was written, is right, one cannot be too generous in allowing for an early change of mind in Marcellus. *De Sancta Ecclesia* appears to be very much in line with Marcellus' book against Asterius.

¹ Logan (1987) p. 194.

Chapter 2

Sermo Maior de Fide

The second work to be attributed to Marcellus was the so-called *Sermo Maior de Fide*, also known as *Epistula ad Antiochenos*, (not to be confused with Athanasius' *Tomus ad Antiochenos*¹). E. Schwartz published the *Sermo Maior* in *Der s.g. Sermo Maior de Fide des Athanasius*² as part of a catena which B. de Montfaucon in 1706 had published in a more rudimentary form³ without the lemmata in which he left out fragments he believed did not belong to the *Sermo Maior*. The fragments which contain the *Sermo Maior* are in Schwartz' edition nos 1-29; 33-34; 54-61; 63-78. Schwartz includes also frg. 80, because it contains a formula characteristic of the *Sermo Maior*. The other fragments are excerpts from various Athanasian and pseudo-Athanasian writings⁴. Schwartz published the full text of the MS, including all the lemmata which give us the titles, and sometimes even the first lines, of these writings. Interestingly enough, long passages, especially in the first part of the *Sermo Maior*, are actually quotations from Athanasius' *De Incarnatione*⁵. The lemmata treat them as excerpts from the *Sermo Maior*,

¹ For practical reasons I will stick to the first title, although *Epistula ad Antiochenos* is probably the correct one.

² E. Schwartz, "Der s.g. Sermo Maior de fide des Athanasius", *SBAW* (1925).

³ Cf. Schwartz (1925) p. 3.

⁴ For details see Schwartz (1925) pp. 41-53.

⁵ The passages in the *Sermo Maior* (with their Schwartz numbering) which give quotations from Athanasius' *De Incarnatione* (numbered as in Migne, PG) are:

<i>Sermo Maior</i> :	Schwartz fragments:	De Incarnatione:	Migne reference:
Chapter 4	Frg. 5	Chapter 8	PG 25, 109c
Chapter 5	Frg. 6	Chapter 9	PG 25, 112a
Chapter 6	Frg. 7	Chapter 9	PG 25, 112a-112c
Chapter 7	Frg. 8	Chapter 17	PG 25, 125a
Chapter 7	Frg. 9	Chapter 20	PG 25, 132b
Chapter 8	Frg. 11	Chapter 26	PG 25, 141c
Chapter 9	Frg. 12	Chapter 31	PG 25, 149d
Chapter 10	Frg. 13	Chapter 43	PG 25, 173a

Continued on next page

so obviously the *Sermo Maior* contains these passages not as quotations but as part of its own original text. Both the Greek and the Armenian manuscripts¹ name Athanasius as the author. Modern scholarship, however, does not agree with this ascription to Athanasius. In 1899 K. Hoss² and A. Stülcken³ both disputed Athanasian authorship, finding differences with genuine works in terminology and Christology, and since then the *Sermo Maior* has been counted among the pseudo-Athanasian writings. E. Schwartz in his work on it attributed the *Sermo Maior* to Eustathius of Antioch⁴. From the casual use of the phrase ὁμοιος τῷ πατρὶ and the fact that the problem of the divinity of the Holy Spirit is absent from the work he settled for a date “between 325 and 350”⁵, when the Homoians had not yet appeared on the scene.

In 1954, however, F. Scheidweiler published an article⁶ in which he disputed Schwartz’s thesis and attributed the *Sermo Maior* to Marcellus (that it was not Athanasian

Continued from previous page

Chapter 11	Frg. 14	Chapter 17	PG 25, 125b-125c
Chapter 12	Frg. 15	Chapter 41	PG 25, 168d-169a
Chapter 12	Frg. 16	Chapter 42	PG 25, 169c

Athanasius’ *De Incarnatione* as a whole is to be found in Migne PG 25, 96ff..

¹ The extant Greek fragments were published by E. Schwartz (op. cit., 1925). The more complete Armenian version was discovered and published in English translation by R. P. Casey in *The Armenian version of the pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes (Sermo Maior de Fide) and of the Expositio Fidei* (1947). Cf. R. P. Casey, “Armenian Manuscripts of St. Athanasius of Alexandria”, *Harvard Theological Review* XXIV (1931), pp. 43-59. The *Sermo Maior de Fide* has also been edited by H. Nordberg, “Athanasiana: Five Homilies, Expositio Fidei, Sermo Maior”, *Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 30, 2 (Helsinki 1962).

² K. Hoss, *Studien über das Schriften und die Theologie des Athanasius* (1899).

³ A. Stülcken, “Athanasiana. Literar- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen”, *Texte und Untersuchungen* XIX, 4 (1899). Especially pp. 61-66.

⁴ E. Schwartz (1925) p. 58.

⁵ Ibid. p. 57.

⁶ Felix Scheidweiler, “Wer ist der Verfasser des sog. Sermo Maior de Fide?” *BZ* 47 (1954), pp. 333-357.

he took for granted¹). His main argument against the ascription to Eustathius is that Eustathius in his other works avoids the *hiatus*², which is not the case in the *Sermo Maior*. Scheidweiler then analyses the *Sermo Maior* chapter by chapter³.

In the third part of the article he argues for Marcellan authorship on the grounds of the following observations:

1. In frg. 40 the author of the *Sermo Maior* defends his interpretation of Prov. 8:22, which he takes to refer to the man Jesus.⁴ In the course of his defence he quotes those who say: *a quadringentis annis est operatio corporis domini, et quomodo in eum quidam referunt quod dictum est dominus creavit me principium viarum suarum in opera eius, cum dicat scriptura ante montes et colles, ante fontes et ante saeculum generatum et creatum?* thus attacking his understanding of the passage.

Scheidweiler believes (see p. 349) that this understanding of Prov. 8:22 and the mention of those four hundred years are indicative of Marcellus' authorship (cf. frg. 9 and frgs 115/6). In addition, Scheidweiler quotes a passage from the Makrostichos which refutes Marcellus and his disciple Photinus: βδελυσσόμεθα... τοὺς λόγον μὲν μόνον... καλοῦντας..., Χριστὸν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μεσίτην καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ εἶναι πρὸ αἰώνων θέλοντας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τότε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου σάρκα ἀνείληφε πρὸ τετρακοσίων οὐχ ὄλων ἐτῶν, and concludes: "But who around the middle of the fourth century had an interest to defend Marcellus apart from Marcellus himself?"

¹ "Mit Athanasius hat das Werk nichts zu tun: darüber sind sich alle Sachverständigen einig." Ibid. p. 333.

² Ibid. p. 334.

³ Ibid pp. 336-348. He gives the numbers of the fragments both as published by Schwartz and as published by Casey, because the Greek fragments only make one third of the Armenian.

⁴ Fragment 40 exists in a complete form only in Latin, though there is a shorter Greek version given together with the Latin by Schwartz (1925) p. 14f..

This is Scheidweiler's main point. He adds further¹:

2. The 'biblicistical' method of exegesis associated with Marcellus (by Zahn and Gericke) also appears in the *Sermo Maior* ².

3. A favourite construction of Marcellus³, namely εἰ δὲ τις... νομίζοι / ἐθέλοι λέγειν / βούλεται... ἀκουέτω / γνῶτω ὅτι... is to be found in the *Sermo Maior*, frg. 70: ἐὰν δέ τις λέγει... ἀκουέτω ὅτι....

4. The interpretation of Proverbs 8:22ff. in Marcellus, frgs 9, 14-15, resembles the interpretation in the *Sermo Maior* chapters 21-23 (Schwartz, frgs 56-59). "Marcellus understands Prov. 8:22/26 to be referring to the man Jesus (frgs 9-27), 8:27/30 to the Logos (frgs 59, 60)."⁴

5. In both the fragments of Marcellus' book and the *Sermo Maior* Logos/Sarx Christology is predominant.

6. Both Marcellus and the author of the *Sermo Maior* invent quotations from Scripture. See Marcellus frg. 30: ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἡ ἡμέρα, and the *Sermo Maior* 25, frg. 61: ὃς καλεῖται υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου πρόβατον ἄμπελος ἄρτος δένδρον...

7. Both Marcellus and the author of the *Sermo Maior* hold that Christ had "many names".

8. Marcellus reads Rom. 1:4 προορισθέντος; the author of the *Sermo Maior* reads ὀρισθέντος but interprets it as if he had read προορισθέντος.

These are the points which Scheidweiler has in favour of Marcellan authorship, and from the use of the phrase ὁμοιος τῷ πατρὶ in the *Sermo Maior* he draws the conclusion

¹ Scheidweiler (1954) p. 349-353.

² Cf. Th. Zahn, *Markell von Ankyra: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (1867) p. 114; W.Gericke, "Markell von Ankyra: Der Logos-Christologie und Biblizist", *Theologische Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirche- und Geistesgeschichte* (1940), pp. 179f..

³ Examples can be found e.g. in frgs 1, 54, 76, 80 and 120.

⁴ Cf. Schwartz (1925) p. 18f..

that the work was written against Anomoians in Antioch, around 358¹. He adds however that Marcellus has made certain concessions to orthodoxy², and has become more moderate in his attitude. For example, the interpretation of 1 Cor. 15:24ff. which opens chapter 25 of the *Sermo Maior* (Schwartz, frg. 60) excludes the understanding of 1 Cor. 15:29 as referring to the pre-existent Logos³, who goes back into the Father at the end of all ages, and suggests rather that it refers to the ascended Jesus Christ who surrenders his kingdom to God. Scheidweiler believes this to indicate that Marcellus in later life refrained from defending his more extreme position of the book against Asterius, and would utter only this more moderate opinion; Scheidweiler sees indications of this more moderate approach in the *Epistula ad Iulium*.⁴

Martin Tetz in 1964 mentioned Scheidweiler's article⁵, but did not make use of its hypothesis, because in his view the *Sermo Maior de Fide* has not been well transmitted; this makes its examination extremely difficult, and the results are uncertain because of the uncertain transmission⁶. Four years later, however, he was prepared to follow Scheidweiler on the grounds of "Verwandtschaft" ("relatedness") between the *Sermo Maior* and *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos*, which he counted among the Marcelliana⁷, and included in a lengthy article in which he tried to prove close relationships - if not a dependence of the one on the other - between Marcellus and the Pseudo-Clementine

¹ Scheidweiler (1954) p. 357.

² Ibid. p. 353.

³ Ibid. p. 344; p. 351.

⁴ Ibid. p. 355.

⁵ Martin Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I", *ZKG LXXV* (1964), p. 222.

⁶ Loc. cit..

⁷ Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra II", *ZKG LXXVII* (1969), p. 3.

tradition. It was Manlio Simonetti¹ who in 1973 first disputed Scheidweiler's ascription of the *Sermo Maior* to Marcellus.

Simonetti's main point he drew from frg. 40, the same fragment on which Scheidweiler chiefly based his ascription to Marcellus. Simonetti argues that the author of the *Sermo Maior* understands the *creavit* of Prov. 8:22 to refer to the Incarnation of the Son, the *genuit* of verse 25 to refer to his eternal generation from the Father. This, he says (p.321), is the interpretation of Athanasius and all authors who follow him, but not the interpretation of Marcellus, since Marcellus understands both *creavit* and *genuit* as referring to the Incarnation of the Logos. In addition, he quotes *Sermo Maior*, frgs 22, 54, and 63, in which references to the eternal generation of the Logos are made where Marcellus would have spoken of the Incarnation (p.322). Simonetti does not regard Scheidweiler's arguments as sufficient to prove Marcellan authorship. In view of its Christology he dates the *Sermo Maior* around 440-50, and locates it in an area of Antiochene influence ("ambiente Antiocheno").

A year later, Simonetti amplified this last brief speculation as to the origin of the *Sermo Maior*, and came up with his own solution to the problem of authorship². He examined the *Sermo Maior* again, together with the *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως*, and observed that some elements in them point to an Athanasian background, e.g. the use of the word *homousios*, and imagery like that of well and river, root and tree, light and splendour, which suggest a generation of the Son from the Father without separation³. The exegetical style, however, points to the Origenist tradition. Simonetti notes that the distinction between 'letter' and 'spirit' in the understanding of Scripture and the corresponding distinctions between the incarnate Christ and the divine Logos on the one hand, and

¹ Manlio Simonetti, "Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcello d'Ancira", *RSLR IX* (1973) pp. 313-329.

² Simonetti, "Ancora sulla paternità dello ps.-atanasiano 'Sermo maior de fide'", *Vetera Christianorum* 11/ 2 (1974) pp. 333-343.

³ *Ibid.* p. 338.

between immature and perfect Christians (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1) on the other, are typical of Origen¹. So the *Sermo Maior* and the *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως* have, in Simonetti's view, features that bear a clear Athanasian stamp, and also features that are distinctly Origenist, especially as regards the rather 'wide' exegetical style². From this Simonetti deduces that the author must be a man writing in the middle of the fourth century, who belongs to that Alexandrian 'ambience', whose Trinitarian theology is close to that of Athanasius and whose exegetical style follows the Origenist tradition. Simonetti suggests Didymus the Blind as the author of both the *Sermo Maior* and the *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως*, finding the following resemblances between these two books and Didymus' own undoubted works: a differentiation between the spiritual interpretation of Scripture and an interpretation according to the letter³; a distinction between the incarnate Christ and the divine Logos⁴; a differentiation between beginners and mature, 'perfect' Christians⁵; and the use of the term κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος⁶.

Simonetti concedes that two objections might be raised to his ascription of these works to Didymus. One is that from the phrase ὡς ἐπιστήμονας οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θείων it could be deduced that the author must be a bishop (as Schwartz and Scheidweiler had indeed deduced). The second is that the Christology is of the Logos/Anthropos type, whereas the dominant Christology in fourth-century Alexandria was of the Logos/Sarx type. But the conclusion that the author must be a bishop from the phrase ὡς ἐπιστήμονας οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θείων is considered by Simonetti to be an

¹ Simonetti mentions *De Principiis* III. 2.4; *Homily on Leviticus* 1.4; *Homily on Numbers* 27.1; *Homily on Joshua* 6.1, 9.9; *Homily on Ezekiel* 7.10; *Commentary on John* XIII. 33.37; *Oratio* 27.5; *Martyrs* 1.

² Simonetti (1974) p. 340.

³ Ibid. p. 342: cf. Didymus *Commentary on Zechariah*.

⁴ Loc. cit.. Cf. Didymus *Commentary on Zechariah*; *Commentary on ψψ* 30 and 13.

⁵ Loc. cit.. Cf. Didymus *Commentary on Zechariah*; *Commentary on ψψ* 22.1-2 and 35.9.

⁶ Loc. cit.. Cf. Didymus *Spir.* 51.52, *Commentary on the Psalms*.

unnecessary one, and he notes also that Origen's Christology was of the Logos/Anthropos type¹. So Simonetti remains convinced² that Didymus the Blind is the anonymous author of both the *Sermo Maior* and the *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως*.

Somewhat different in outline is the critique of Scheidweiler's thesis by M.J.Dowling³. He does not deal with Simonetti's ascription to Didymus, but he does argue against Marcellan authorship, bringing six points to bear upon the discussion⁴:

1. "the comment about the four hundred years is much too general a comment to be given such weight";

2. the distinction between the 'creation' of Christ's humanity at the incarnation and the 'generation' of the Son from the Father made in frg.40 are not in line with Marcellus' interpretation of Prov. 8:22ff. which is to be found in the fragments of his book against Asterius;

3. the division of Prov. 8:22-30 in chapter 23 of the *Sermo Maior* is not as clear as Scheidweiler believes;

4. the concept of an eternally begotten Son or Logos, found in the *Sermo Maior* (Frgs 22; 40; 54; 63; 73; Casey ch. 27) runs entirely counter to the way Marcellus characteristically reserves the term 'Son' for the incarnate one, and cannot be explained away as a concession to orthodoxy - "it would imply that Marcellus has gone over completely to the side of the Origenists".

5. the comment in the *Sermo Maior* on 1 Cor. 15:28, which says that ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, τοῦτέστιν πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἡ μία κυριότης καὶ θεότης καὶ βασιλεία (frg. 70, a reference to the continuing existence of the Trinity after the final consummation), "suggests very strongly that the writer of the *Sermo Maior* was

¹ Loc. cit..

² Ibid. p. 343.

³ Maurice J.Dowling, *Marcellus of Ancyra* (1987).

⁴ Ibid. pp. 5-16.

not Marcellus of Ancyra". This particular point is shared by Lienhard, who writes: "The exegesis of 1 Cor. 15:24-28 in the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* has little similarity with that of Marcellus and speaks against his authorship"¹.

6. the phrase ὁ κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος, frequent in the *Sermo Maior*, never occurs in the undisputed Marcellan fragments.

Dowling briefly mentions Tetz's approach, but dismisses it as useless for the question of the authorship of the *Sermo Maior*, because "whatever the merits of Tetz's case for seeing a pseudo-Clementine tradition behind the *Sermo Maior*, he has done nothing to prove that a similar tradition is reflected in the Marcellan fragments, nor that Marcellus was also responsible for the *Sermo Maior*". Dowling concludes that the authorship of the work "must remain a mystery".

One has indeed to be very careful about the ascription of the *Sermo Maior* to Marcellus of Ancyra, for two reasons. First we have no *external* evidence for a change of mind in Marcellus, which is implied in the ascription of the *Sermo Maior* to him. Second, it would clash considerably with the consistency of Marcellan thought which we find in *De Sancta Ecclesia*, especially if we follow Richard's and Scheidweiler's datings, for then both the *Sermo Maior* and *De Sancta Ecclesia* would have been written around the same time, or the *De Sancta Ecclesia* would be even younger. Thus it is highly unlikely that both works were written by the same author.

¹ In "The exegesis of 1 Cor.15:24-28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus", *Vigiliae Christianae* XXXVII (1983) pp. 340-359.

Chapter 3

Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως

Closely connected with the *Sermo Maior* is a little creed-like writing called the Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως (or in its Latin version, *Expositio Fidei*, though not to be confused with the *Expositio Fidei* of the deacon Eugenius) and ascribed to Athanasius by the MS¹. Schwartz in his edition of the *Sermo Maior* believed that the *Ekthesis Pisteos* used to be a part of the *Sermo Maior*²: at any rate, both writings have the same author³ - about this there is no doubt. Consequently, Felix Scheidweiler ascribed the *Ekthesis* to Marcellus, although he does not believe that it was actually a part of the *Sermo Maior*; he also dates it somewhat later than the *Sermo Maior*⁴. Relying on his ascription of it to Marcellus, and on the fact that the *Ekthesis* was obviously written by the same author, he does not go into great detail. The only point he makes is that the interpretation of Prov. 8:22 in the *Ekthesis*, though differing from that in the 23rd chapter of the *Sermo Maior*, is in line with frg. 27 of Marcellus' book against Asterius: here the ὄρη and βουνόι are understood to refer to the ἀπόστολοι and ἀποστόλων διάδοχοι; in the *Ekthesis* this is no more possible, but the general outline is kept by referring to rational beings: πρὸ πάσης λογικῆς καὶ νοερᾶς οὐσίας.⁵

Scheidweiler's argument for dating the *Ekthesis* later than the *Sermo Maior* is based on an additional remark found in the *Ekthesis*, at the end of chapter 3, which is not to be found in the *Sermo Maior*. The remark is intended to preclude any misunderstanding of Prov. 8:22; there, it is written that "he created me... εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ". The author of the *Ekthesis* adds: οὐ λέγει δέ, πρὸ ἔργων ἔκτισέ με, ἵνα μὴ τις εἰς τὴν θεότητα τοῦ

¹ PG 25, 200ff..

² E. Schwartz, "Der sogenannte *Sermo Maior*..." *SBAW* (1925) p. 48.

³ Loc. cit..

⁴ F. Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser...?" *BZ XLVII* (1954) p. 356.

⁵ Loc. cit..

Λόγου ἐκλάβοι τὸ ῥητόν. Scheidweiler takes this to be evidence of a continuing process of re-evaluating the theological problems of the day on the part of Marcellus: the author constantly wrestles with the theological problems he meets, and comes up with new answers and solutions as time goes by.¹

Dowling is again the critical spirit who disputes Scheidweiler's ascription. Having closely examined the work he comes to the conclusion that the *Ekthesis* cannot have been written by Marcellus, on the grounds of the following arguments:

- The author of the *Ekthesis* is very much concerned with the defence of the deity of the Son;
- No distinction is made between the Logos and the Son;
- It is said of the *Son* (mark this) that he existed before all things (2, 10-11) - would not Marcellus have used the term Logos here?
- The Son is said to be eternally begotten, and he is a distinct existence;
- Prov. 8:25 and Col 1:15 are applied to the eternal generation (3, 1-4) where Marcellus in frgs 2-6 and 27 (Klostermann) understands them strictly with respect to the Incarnation;
- In the *Ekthesis* (1, beginning) belief in a Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and a Λόγος προφορικός is explicitly denied; Marcellus, on the other hand, is attacked by Eusebius (*De Eccl. theol.* 2, ... 14-15) for writing these terms;
- Already the pre-incarnate Logos or Son is the image of the Father, while Marcellus in frgs 90-94 (Klostermann) insists that only the visible, incarnate Son can be the εἰκών of the Father;
- The eternal Son is said to be ὅμοιος τῷ πατρὶ (1, 5; 2, 19).²

¹ Loc. cit..

² Dowling, *Marcellus of Ancyra* (1987) p. 41.

It is especially the teaching on the Son that Dowling sees as an impediment to the ascription of the *Ekthesis* to Marcellus. He even goes so far as to say: "... in its teaching on the Son the *Expositio fidei* reads very much like an answer to Marcellus"¹. In any case, the *Ekthesis* holds definitive Trinitarian views, and "there is no evidence anywhere that Marcellus altered his views on crucial points to the extent of embracing the distinctive Trinitarian theology of this work."²

¹ Loc. cit..

² Ibid. p. 42.

Chapter 4

De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos

The next writing to be attributed to Marcellus was the lengthy *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*. M. Tetz in 1964 started his series of elaborate articles on the theology of Marcellus of Ancyra with a detailed analysis of this work¹.

This long work has been transmitted by the MSS under the name of Athanasius, but his authorship has been the object of discussion by a number of scholars. This is not the place to give a detailed account of the history of research about *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, but the main points will be stated here². Bernard de Montfaucon defended the authenticity of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* against the suggestion that the author was Apollinaris of Laodicea³. On the other hand, Karl Hoss observes⁴ stylistic differences between *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* and other Athanasian writings, noting that διαφέρειν τινί with the specific meaning of “to belong to” is not to be found outside *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, that the exegesis of Prov. 8:25 and Acts 2:36 differs considerably between other Athanasiana and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, that where Athanasius speaks of the Logos the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* speaks about the Church, and that Athanasius does not speak about δύο θελήματα in Christ⁵.

¹ M. Tetz, “Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I...”, ZKG LXXV (1964) pp. 217-270.

² For just such an account see Tetz (ibid.) pp. 223-231, and Giuseppe Mauro Rapisarda, “La questione dell’ authenticità...”, ND 23 (1973) pp. 23-54.

³ Cf. Tetz (1964) p. 223; Rapisarda (1973) 23f..

⁴ Karl Hoss, *Studien* (1899).

⁵ Ibid. p. 127f.; cf. Tetz (1964) p. 223f.; Rapisarda (1973) p. 25.

Albrecht Stülcken¹ entertained the same doubts as Hoss, objecting that the formula εἰς θεὸς ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν and the use of the word σαρκοφόρος² were not Athanasian. The chief difference lies in the strongly ecclesiological understanding of 1 Cor. 15:24-28, Acts 2:36 and Prov. 8:22, with the identification of ἐκκλησία with the σῶμα κυρίου. Stülcken also points to the author's eschatological interpretation of 1 Cor. 15:24ff., which appears to suggest that the Logos gives up the flesh in the end³.

Eduard Weigl⁴ defended Athanasian authorship on the grounds of the concept of the 'goodness of God alone', the general Athanasian style of writing, and expressions like δεύτερος θεὸς and θεολογεῖσθαι, and he points to the fact that Theodoret and Gelasius refer to *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* as Athanasian⁵.

J. Lebon⁶ examines the work with the help of Armenian traditions of various Athanasian writings, edited in 1899 by Isaiah Tajezi. Lebon excludes the formula ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν, the term ἄνθρωπος τέλειος, and a passage from chapter 22 which contains the antithetic formulae κατὰ πνεῦμα – κατὰ σάρκα, as interpolations into the text, thus reducing the number of points against Athanasian authorship. With Tajezi he also corrects a Marcellian-sounding passage in chapter 20: instead of βασιλεύων δι' αὐτοῦ ὡς διὰ Λόγου θεοῦ μετὰ τὸ βασιλεῦσαι αὐτὸν δι' αὐτοῦ ὡς δι' ἀνθρώπου σωτήρος, which is found in the Greek text, he reads with the Armenian text βασιλεύων δι' αὐτοῦ ὡς διὰ σωτήρος θεοῦ μετὰ τὸ βασιλεῦσαι αὐτὸν δι' αὐτοῦ ὡς δι'

¹ Albrecht Stülcken, "Athanasiana...", *TU* XIX, 4 (1899), pp. 61-66.

² Cf. Rapisarda (1973) pp. 25-29.

³ Cf. Tetz (1964) p. 226f..

⁴ Eduard Weigl, "Untersuchungen...", *Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte* XII, 4 (1914), pp. 150-158.

⁵ Cf. Rapisarda (1973) 31f.. Tetz [(1964) pp. 227f.] finds Weigl's analysis "undifferentiated and not convincing".

⁶ J. Lebon, "Pour une édition critique...", *RHE* 21 (1925), pp. 524-530.

ἀνθρώπου σωτήρος.¹ Lebon defends the authenticity of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.

Following him, B. Altaner and J. Quasten in their respective Patrologies ascribe *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* to Athanasius.²

Manlio Simonetti³ looks again at the style and the *usus scribendi* in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, and states that it is not Athanasian, especially in the use of stylistic techniques such as homoioteleuton, parallelisms, paronomasy etc.. Simonetti dismisses completely the theological contents of the work as being of no value in resolving the question of authorship, arguing instead purely with respect to the style.⁴

From this very brief account it is nevertheless clearly visible that the question of the authenticity of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* was very much an open one when Tetz came up with his ascription of the work to Marcellus. Therefore, he found it necessary to argue both against Athanasian and for Marcellan authorship. Before actually pursuing his point in detail, Tetz states that Marcellan authorship is at least not impossible; his argument rests on the assumption that *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* belonged to a collection of Athanasian and pseudo-Athanasian writings which was to be found in the library of the Eustathians in Antioch, where the community had also preserved their own anti-Arian and other polemical writings.⁵

In order to prove Marcellan authorship, Tetz compares *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* with the Marcellan fragments and various undisputed Athanasian writings⁶. Although he follows Richard and Scheidweiler in their ascriptions of *De Sancta Ecclesia*,

¹ Cf. Tetz (1964) 228f.. Tetz doubts that Tajezi found this (clearly orthodox) text in his MSS, and in any case believes that it is a later correction. Cf. Rapisarda (1973) 32f..

² B. Altaner, *Patrologie* (1960) p. 243. J. Quasten, *Patrologie* (1960) p. 28f..

³ Manlio Simonetti, "Sulla paternita...", *ND* 5 (1952) pp. 5-19.

⁴ Cf. Rapisarda (1973) pp. 34-37; cf. Tetz (1964) pp. 229-231.

⁵ Tetz (1964) pp. 226f..

⁶ The writings examined by Tetz are: *Contra Arianos* 2 and 3; *1 Epistula ad Serapionem* chapter 29; *2 Epistula ad Serapionem* chapter 19; *De Incarnatione* chapter 3; and *De Sententia Dionysii* chapter 2.

Sermo Maior, *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως*, and *Contra Theopaschitas* to Marcellus, he does not base his arguments on these writings but focusses on the fragments. Thus his way of argumentation is aimed to cut both ways: to prove that the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* cannot be Athanasius and is indeed Marcellus. The criteria according to which Tetz confronts the writings are: [Choice of] Bible passages; method of their quotation; exegesis of Bible passages; [choice of] *dicta probantia* ; peculiarities of style; theological terminology and key words.¹

1. Choice of Bible passages and manuscripts quoted.

W.Gericke in his monograph on Marcellus² had given two lists of New Testament text listed by Marcellus in his fragments, and the second list contains quotations differing from all New Testament MSS known to us. Of the thirteen passages noted by Gericke five appear in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, as follows:

Mt. 26:39 (in frg. 73, Klostermann 199.8). Marcellus' version omits ἀπ' ἐμοῦ after παρελθέτω, reading παρελάτω instead of παρελθέτω, and leaves out the ἐστὶν after δυνατόν. There is close connection made with Lk. 22:42, where Marcellus reads τὸ ἐμὸν [θέλημα] instead of θέλημά μου. *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 21 (PG 26, 1021.25-30) reads likewise, connecting Mt. 26:39 and Lk. 22:42 even more closely with each other. Athanasius (in his "Third Oration against the Arians"³) quotes Mt. 26:39 four times. He uses exactly the same text as Marcellus' fragments and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, though Lk. 22:42 is not mentioned. This is of course not sufficient, so Tetz introduces an exegetical divergence: the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* uses Lk. 22:42 as evidence for δύο θελήματα in Christ, and so does Marcellus. This notion is not found in Athanasius.⁴

¹ The following discussion follows step by step the argument in Tetz (1964) p. 248-270.

² W.Gericke, "Markell von Ankyra" (1940) pp. 171ff..

³ PG 26, 337.30-31; 396.25-26; 441.23-24; 444.18-19.

⁴ Tetz (1964) pp. 248f..

Mt. 16:23 (in frg. 1, Klostermann 185.14-15; not in fact on Gericke's list). Marcellus reads ἄπελθε ὀπίσω μου instead of ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου. *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 21 (PG 26, 1021.35-36) reads likewise. Athanasius, Tetz observes, does not quote the text anywhere.

Jn 6:63 (Mt. 27:24?; frgs 117 and 118, Klostermann 210.10-11 and 211.14). Marcellus reads τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, ἡ σὰρξ οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ. *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* (PG 26, 1008) reads τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν τὸ ζωοποιῶν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδὲν correctly with John, but continues with a quotation of 2 Cor. 3:6: πρὸς δὲ Κορινθίους γράφει Παῦλος τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ. This text, however, is not to be found in the edition of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* but in the MSS SHG, the two Armenian versions and the Syriac version of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*. Tetz follows these versions and reads against the main MSS and the Latin version. Athanasius quotes Jn 6:63 only once, in the fourth letter to Serapion chapter 19, and all MSS follow the correct New Testament text.

Jn 14:9 (frg. 129, Klostermann 215.33: this is the *Epistula ad Iulium*). Marcellus reads ὁ ἐμὲ ἐωρακῶς ἐώρακε τὸν πατέρα. *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 4 (PG 26, 989) reads ὁ ἐωρακῶς ἐμὲ ἐώρακε τὸν πατέρα against Marcellus. Athanasius reads in fourteen out of twenty-two cases like Marcellus. So do the authors of the Fourth Oration against the Arians, the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* and the *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως*. In view of this situation Tetz (p. 250) dares not draw a conclusion.

1 Cor. 15:24 (frg. 113, Klostermann 209.10). Marcellus quotes Paul rather freely: βασιλεύς τε καταστάς διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ὁ ἀπατηθεὶς πρότερον ἄνθρωπος πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν καταργήσει. *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 20 (PG 26, 1020.4-6) reads: ...ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν. Athanasius never quotes the text at all. If a comparison of Marcellus and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* is at all worth considering here, the only point that could be made is that both omit the second πᾶσαν which occurs in Paul (who has “πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν”), but Tetz is very reserved about that. He can only emphasise the tremendous importance of 1 Cor. 15:24ff. to Marcellus.

Heb. 1:2 is listed by Gericke but is not quoted by Marcellus in frg. 20 (Klostermann 188.16) so this is of no use for the comparison.

Tetz concludes that these comparisons do not tell us much about the authorship of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*. Only the first two indicate a close relation between Marcellus and the author of that work, a relation “in which Athanasius has no part”¹.

2. Method of Quotation.

The most significant characteristic feature in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* is the connection of ἐκ προσώπου τινός with λέγειν or λαλεῖν when quoting from Scripture. The formula appears in chapters 2, 9, 12 and 18.² The author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* uses the citation formula referring to Father, Son, Holy Spirit, Church or ourselves in order to clarify the economies. Outside the citation formula πρόσωπον appears only in quotations from or references to passages in the Bible.³ The author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* uses this formula only to specify the economies: he never speaks of τρία πρόσωπα but strictly limits the use of πρόσωπον to the exegesis of Scripture. In the works of Athanasius, the formula appears three times⁴, but only in *De Sententia Dionysii* is it used in the same sense as in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*⁵. The formula is also to be found in the *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως* chapter 3, and in the *Sermo Maior* frgs 3 and 14.⁶ However, ἐκ προσώπου τινός λέγειν appears nowhere in the

¹ Tetz (1964) p. 251.

² Migne references: chapter 2, PG 26, 988.6-9 and 988.29-34; chapter 9, PG 26, 997.15-20 and 992.34-42; chapter 12, PG 26, 1004.42-45; chapter 18, PG 26, 1013.27-37; 1013.37-42; 1013.42-1016.3 .

³ Tetz (1964) p. 252 gives the following examples:
Chapter 13 (PG 26, 1005.9-10) quotes Psalm 103:30.
Chapter 15 (PG 26, 1009.20-23) mentions the “face” of Moses.
Chapter 19 (PG 26, 1016.35-1017.5) gives an exegesis of Psalm 138:7-8.
Chapter 22 (PG 26, 1025.27) quotes Isaiah 53:3.
Chapter 10 (PG 26, 1000.34) quotes Isaiah 6:2.

⁴ In *De Incarnatione* 3 (Robertson 5.30-31); *Contra Gentes* 34 (Robertson 68.45-47); *De Sententia Dionysii* 2 (Opitz II 46.22-47.2.).

⁵ Tetz (1964) p. 253.

⁶ As in the Greek text of Casey (p. 48 and p. 55). Schwartz numbers them frg. 56 and frg. 65.

fragments of Marcellus' book. Tetz nevertheless claims it to be a Marcellan formula on the grounds that it is found in chapter 1 of *De Sancta Ecclesia* (and in ch. 8 τρία πρόσωπα and τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις are rejected as heretical). In addition Tetz mentions Baruch 3:36-38, quoted both in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 22 (PG 26, 1024.32-37) and by Marcellus frg. 79 (Klostermann 202.22-25) under the name of Jeremiah. Athanasius does not quote this particular passage and never mistakes Baruch for Jeremiah.

3. Choice of dicta probantia.

De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos is characterised by a frequent use of Scripture. Tetz examines passages which are, according to the *Lexicon Athanasianum*, nowhere quoted by Athanasius, and examines their theological impact. Baruch 3:36-38 has already been mentioned. According to Tetz, the author quotes it¹ in order to show that Christ is not only man and mediator but also God. Mt. 6:11, Jn 6:51 and 3:16 constitute for this author² evidence for an "economy scheme" not shared by Athanasius. Lk. 11:20 and 12:28 are the source³ for one of the important theological keywords, ἀπαρχή Lk. 22:42, Jn 5:30 indicate δύο θελήματα⁴ in Christ.

Lk. 23:46, Gal. 3:28 show⁵ the specific connection of Christological and pneumatological/ecclesiological statements made by the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.

Jn 7:39, Acts 2:3 are again evidence for the author's specific theological concept of the economy of salvation⁶.

¹ *De Inc.*, PG 26, 1024.32-37.

² *De Inc.*, PG 26, 1012.25-34.

³ *De Inc.*, PG 26, 1017.42ff..

⁴ *De Inc.*, PG 26, 1021.26-27.

⁵ *De Inc.*, PG 26, 992.25-32.

⁶ *De Inc.*, PG 26, 989.18-25.

1 Cor. 15:23 is quoted¹ because of the central term ἀπαρχή which appears to be of great importance to the author.

1 Cor. 15:24-28 is the most important passage, and all of chapter 20 is devoted to its explanation, dealing explicitly with the question of the subjection of Christ. Tetz points out that it was this text that formed the basis for Marcellus' teaching on this matter, which proved to be his most notorious doctrine and which was violently rejected in the East. Tetz, naturally, puts the rhetorical question: "Which theologian of the fourth Century apart from Marcellus could have had such interest in this particular passage of the New Testament?"²

4. Exegesis.

Tetz examines three central passages of Scripture, comparing Athanasian understanding to the exegesis found in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.

First is Prov.8:22-25³. For Athanasius⁴ this passage refers to the incarnate Logos. In *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* the passage is understood ecclesiologically, and Tetz claims to find a similar ecclesiological tendency in some Marcellan fragments⁵. He also sees here an economic doctrine of the Trinity, which brings Marcellus and the author of this work closer together.

Next is Isaiah 6:3. Tetz finds two characteristics in this text quoted by the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* which are shared by Marcellus, namely the technique of summing up texts of the Bible relating to a specific dogmatic or doctrinal matter, the so-called "Konkordanzverfahren" ('technique of concordance'), and an economical

¹ *De Inc.*, PG 26, 1004.19ff..

² Tetz (1964) p. 258.

³ *De Inc.*, PG 26, 1004.42 to 1005.2; PG 26, 992.35-39.

⁴ *Second Oration Against the Arians* chapter 60. Cf. *Lexicon Athanasianum* 1641.

⁵ Tetz (1964) p. 260; frgs 14, 17, 19-24, 27.

monotheistic doctrine of the Trinity¹. The author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* here parallels the Trisagion of Isaiah 6:3 with the baptismal formula: καὶ ὅτε δοξολογοῦσιν τὰ χερουβὶμ τρίτον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντα: ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος Σαβαώθ, πατέρα καὶ υἰὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα δοξολογοῦσιν. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὡσπερ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ βαπτίζομεθα, οὕτως καὶ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος... and goes on to identify the Lord of Glory with the crucified Christ: ὁ δὲ κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, ὡς ὁ Δαβὶδ εἶπε. κύριος δὲ τῆς δόξης ἐστιν ὁ ἐσταυρωμένος Χριστὸς... . In insisting on the unity of God in this way, he might have made himself liable to the accusation that he reduced the Triad to mere names, and this accusation was, as Tetz points out, a typical feature of the polemic against Marcellus in the fourth century. Tetz also believes that the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* was the first theologian to prove the divinity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit from Isaiah 6, Jn 12:41 and Acts 28:25ff., and that the argument was brought into the discussions of the late fourth century by him.

Finally, there is 1 Cor. 15:24-28, the subject of chapter 20 of this anonymous work. Long before Tetz, A. Stülcken had noticed² that the exegesis of the passage of Scripture resembles the position of Marcellus. Later, J. Lebon wished to exclude the particularly Marcellan-sounding bits from the text as interpolations³ because he found them compromising and not in line with Athanasian thought. Tetz need not add much more, since Marcellus' special interest in 1 Cor. 15:24ff. is sufficiently known. Here we have indeed Tetz's strongest point.

¹ The latter point rests on J. Lebon's exclusion of the phrase ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσει as an interpolation. Lebon (1925) pp. 524-530.

² Stülcken (1899) p. 65.

³ Lebon (1925) pp. 524-530.

5. Peculiarities of style.

First, under the aspect of phraseology, a peculiar use of the verb διαφέρειν in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* is to be noticed: it always appears in connection with a dative - διαφέρειν τινί - and is used in the sense of “relate to”, “refer to”, “belong to”. We find it, for example, in chapter 7 (PG 26, 993.20-21): οὐ γὰρ διαφέρει ἀνθρωπίνη φύσει τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ μόγιαι chapter 7 (ibid.993.20-29): διὰ τοῦτο (Mk. 10:18-21) οὖν ἔδειξεν ὅτι καὶ αὐτῷ (sc. Christ) διαφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν; and in chapter 8 (ibid. 996.1-4): ὅσα οὖν εὐτελεῖ ῥήματα ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου εἴρηται, τῇ πτωχείᾳ αὐτοῦ διαφέρει, ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτοῖς πλουτήσωμεν, οὐχ ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς βλασφημήσωμεν κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Athanasius never uses this phrase. Marcellus appears to like it; we find it in frg.10 (Klostermann 187.3), frg. 66 (197.25-26), frg. 70 (198.17), frg. 74 (200.9), frg. 120 (211.24). Twice, in frg. 91 (204.27-31), does Marcellus use διαφέρειν with the genitive, but here he is characterising the teaching of his opponent Asterios.

Tetz also points out that διαφέρειν τινί appears in the Creed of Sardica in a sentence which F. Loofs identified as Marcellan¹. He concludes that it is an unmistakably Marcellan phrase.

The second peculiarity is one of structure. Already Manlio Simonetti in his article about the authorship of this work had remarked² that despite the author’s apparent skill in the use of stylistic elements like the homoioteleuton, paronomasy etc. the whole work lacks structure - is repetitive, incoherent and altogether chaotic. Tetz explains this as a result not of lack of skill but as the author’s ‘biblicism’, his principle of securing every theological statement with a passage of Scripture. In Marcellus he finds the same principle which he calls “Konkordanzverfahren”.

¹ F. Loofs, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis...* (1909) pp. 9, 35, 26ff.. Cf. Tetz (1964) p. 264.

² Manlio Simonetti, “Su alcune opere...”, *RSLR IX* (1973). He wrote: “Tutto l’andamento dell’ opera mostra una linea di sviluppo caotica e desultaria con continue ripetizioni e con collegamenti piuttosto difettosi fra un argomento e l’altro...”

For Tetz, the style of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* has theological implications as well. With special regard to the Marcellan Fragment 70 (Klostermann 198.17) he sees the style of the work as the key to its soteriological understanding of Christology.

6. *Terminology.* Tetz looks at theological key-words and terms which are characteristic of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*. θεολογῆν and θεολογεῖσθαι are found in chapters 3 and 19. Chapter 3 has: ... οὐχ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ χάριν ἔλαβε τὸ καλεῖσθαι θεός, ἀλλ' ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐθεολογήθη [...] καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θωμᾶς ψηλαφήσας τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ ἀνεβόησεν. Chapter 19 reads: οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ δεύτερος θεὸς ὁ υἱός, ἀλλὰ Λόγος τοῦ ἐνὸς καὶ μόνου θεοῦ θεολογούμενος ἐν πατρὶ. In both cases θεολογεῖσθαι refers to the Logos incarnate. Athanasius rejects the use of the term θεολογεῖσθαι in his *Epistula ad Serapionem* 1.28.¹ According to Tetz (p. 266), Athanasius would use θεοποιεῖν where the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, who never uses that word, speaks of θεολογῆν.

The word θεολογῆν is not to be found in the Marcellan fragments, but Tetz claims that Eusebius, in his *Contra Marcellum* II. 2 (Klostermann 43.21-27) and II. 3 (44.26-33) attacks exactly this concept of calling the Logos God (θεολογῆν) although the word itself is not explicitly used by Marcellus.

The second terminological peculiarity is the anti-thesis between the σὰρξ and πνεῦμα in Christ (instead of e.g. σὰρξ and θεότης). A. Stülcken had been the first to make this point, and Tetz agrees with him². The distinction appears three times in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, in chapters 8, 11, and 22:

Chapter 8: [...] ὅθεν καὶ θάνατον κατὰ σάρκα γεύεται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὸν σαρκικὸν πατέρα, ἵνα οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ μεταλάβωσι διὰ τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα πατέρα αὐτῶν θεόν.

¹ Migne PG 26, 596.3-7.

² A. Stülcken (1899) p. 66; Tetz (1964) p. 267.

Chapter 11: [...] κατὰ σάρκα λέγομεν, ὅτι καὶ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐτάφη καὶ ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν· κατὰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἦν καὶ πανταχοῦ.

Chapter 22: [...] τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι· καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλεν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἠνωμένον πατρὶ κατὰ πνεῦμα, ἡμῖν δὲ κατὰ σάρκα, καὶ οὕτως μεσιτεύσαντα θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων.

Athanasius never speaks of the πνεῦμα in similar contexts, whereas Marcellus writes in frg. 70 (Klostermann 198.17-18): τὴν μὲν κατὰ σάρκα οἰκονομίαν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ διαφέρειν γινώσκομεν, τὴν δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα αἰδιότητα ἠνώσθαι τῷ πατρὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν. From this similarity Tetz concludes that both the underlying theology and the author of both works are identical.

Tetz also mentions, without examining them in detail, the terms ἀπαρχή, κεφαλή, and κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος. He notes that they appear also in the *Sermo Maior* and the *Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως* and suggests that these together with *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* were all written by the same author¹.

1 Cor. 15:24-28 itself constitutes a ‘key-term’ for the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, since the author’s interpretation throws some light on his concept of the Trinity. Tetz quotes the final sentence of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 19², ὅτε γάρ ἡ γραφή τὸν υἱὸν βραχίονα ὀνομάζει τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα δάκτυλον θεοῦ καλεῖ· καὶ ὅτε δὲ τὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ Λόγον ὀνομάζει, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐμφύσημα τοῦ θεοῦ λέγει, and compares it with Marcellus’ frg. 68 (Klostermann 198.12-14): εἰ δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὅτι ἐμφυσήσας τοῖς μαθηταῖς λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔφησεν, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐξῆλθεν. πῶς οὖν, εἰ ἐκ τοῦ Λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα προῆλθεν, πάλιν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, finding in both texts an

¹ Tetz (1964) p. 268 fn. 191.

² In Migne PG 26, 1020.1-2.

economic-monotheistic doctrine of the Trinity and a strictly soteriological understanding of Christology, which implies a strongly developed pneumatology and ecclesiology.

Finally, Tetz names theological key-terms which appear frequently in Athanasian writings but never in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, viz. εἰκόν and its synonyms; λογισμός, λογικός, λογίζομαι and cognates; φρόνημα, φρόνησις, φρονέω, and φρόνιμος. The author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* also appears to be reluctant to use the verb γεννᾶσθαι when referring to the Logos, and to prefer the use of a terminology of 'coming' and 'going' - another point which Tetz sees as being common to both this writer and Marcellus.

Accordingly, Martin Tetz's conclusion from his detailed examinations, comparisons and other interpretative techniques is that Athanasius cannot be the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, and that the only fourth Century theologian who could have been is Marcellus, to whom Tetz ascribes the full authorship of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.¹

Again, Manlio Simonetti was the first to question critically the ascription of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* to Marcellus.² After a brief summary of Tetz's arguments in favour of Marcellan authorship (pp. 322-324), Simonetti makes several points against it. He begins by saying that Tetz's methodological assumption that an argument against Athanasian authorship is in itself an argument in favour of Marcellus is wrong: for example, the interpretation of 1 Cor. 15:24-28 in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* speaks against Athanasius as its author, but this does not automatically imply an argument in favour of Marcellan authorship, especially since there are certain discrepancies between the interpretation of this passage in the undisputed fragments and that in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.³ Likewise, ἐκ προσώπου τινὸς λέγειν and διαφέρειν τινί are most

¹ Tetz (1964) p. 270.

² Manlio Simonetti (1973) pp. 322-329. As with Tetz, our discussion will follow Simonetti's step by step.

³ See below.

common formulae and not specifically Marcellan, so again this is at most a point against Athanasian authorship but not one in favour of Marcellus; similarly, θεολογεῖν has no claim to be a characteristically Marcellan term because Eusebius does not refer to it in direct quotation. The confusion of Baruch and Jeremiah is also quite common in the ancient Church¹ and only speaks against Athanasian authorship.

By the same token, Simonetti regards several other points as rendering the ascription of this work to Marcellus less conclusive than Tetz claims. *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 20 and Marcellus do differ slightly in their respective interpretations of 1 Cor. 15:24-28. If one assumes change and development in Marcellus' theology these differences can be explained as the result of this, and cannot therefore serve as an argument *against* Marcellan authorship - but most certainly they cannot be used as an argument *in favour* of it either. Moreover, this passage was of interest not exclusively to Marcellus; for example, it was adopted on the Arian side to support their doctrine of Christ's subordination. The distinction between σάρξ and πνεῦμα originates with Paul and is well represented throughout Christianity from the second Century up to the fourth, and is therefore not characteristic of Marcellus only. Tetz's citation in this dispute of the reference to Isaiah 6:3 is misplaced, since it is quoted in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* not so much in order to explain an economic doctrine of the Trinity but rather in order to secure the divinity of the Holy Spirit (a point actually quite characteristic of Athanasius), which is the most prominent problem of the 60 s and 70 s of the fourth Century. Simonetti also observes that the point about Marcellus and the unknown author reading the same text against the New Testament is not valid because our knowledge of the transmission of the New Testament is incomplete, so we cannot know the precise reasons for these textual agreements.

In addition to the inconclusiveness of these arguments, Simonetti also draws our attention to points which seem indeed to contradict Marcellan authorship. Prov. 8:22-25 is interpreted by Marcellus as referring to the incarnation of the Logos, whereas the

¹ Clement of Alexandria, for example, quotes Baruch as Jeremiah.

author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* understands it ecclesiologically, that is, as referring to the Church. In chapter 8 we also read that the Logos was *begotten* of the Father, the verb γεννᾶν being used with reference both to the Logos and to the man Jesus. In chapter 4 the author speaks of the Logos being *generate* from the οὐσία of the Father. Both terms, in fact both concepts, run entirely counter to the theology of the Fragments. Lastly, neither in the *Sermo Maior* nor in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* do we find an emphasis on the one divine hypostasis or the rejection of three hypostases. Both points, however, are characteristic of Marcellus' anti-Arian polemic and fundamental for his theology. Simonetti concludes "with certainty" that Marcellus of Ancyra was not the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*. Without naming an author, he believes this work to have been written in an area of Athanasian influence at a time when the doctrine of the three hypostases had acquired some general acceptance.

M. J. Dowling in his work on Marcellus in 1987 examined the work and Tetz's article in detail.¹ He came to the same conclusion as Simonetti but brought up a number of new arguments against Marcellan authorship not seen by Simonetti. I shall give only Dowling's original points since he agrees with Simonetti's, which we need not repeat. According to Dowling, the textual agreement on Mt. 26:39 could be sheer coincidence, and the conflation of Mt. 26:39 and Lk. 22:42 "is not so unexpected that it is unlikely to occur in different authors", and ἐμός instead of μου was so common as to be hardly worth a mention. Again, ἄπελθε instead of ὑπάγε (Mt. 16:23) can have occurred because both writers were quoting freely from memory, since both verbs were very common and meant virtually the same, so the coincidence would not be very great.

Like Simonetti, Dowling also notes points which go against Marcellan authorship. The use of the πρόσωπον formula can also be seen as a means for the author of "drawing attention to the distinctions between the Three in a way that is uncharacteristic of the undisputed fragments of Marcellus". They serve to draw out the distinctions between Father, Son and Holy Spirit which are found in Scripture and to whose reality Scripture

¹ Dowling, *Marcellus of Ancyra...* (1987) pp.18ff..

testifies, and *not* in order “to obliterate the distinctions between the Three in a Sabellianising manner”. In the same way, the concern about the divinity of the Holy Spirit “gives a much more Trinitarian picture of God than we find in Marcellus” who is preoccupied with the Logos. Finally, Tetz’s assumption “that ἐκ προσώπου τινός had become a key phrase in the Arian controversy, and that when writing *De Sententia Dionysii* Athanasius was deliberately using the phrase as found in Marcellus (i.e. pseudo-Athanasius), a phrase to which Marcellus’ opponents allegedly took great exception”, is motivated by the need to find a difference in the usage of the πρόσωπον formula in Athanasius and the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.

The two main differences between the theology of the Marcellan fragments and that of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, namely the interpretation of Prov. 8:22-25 and of 1 Cor. 15:24-28, are of course discussed by Dowling too (pp. 33f., 30f. respectively). He comes to the same conclusions as Simonetti: Marcellus cannot be the author of this work on account of the stated differences between it and the Marcellan Fragments - unless one assumes a very drastic change of mind, theological conception and terminology for which we have no evidence. In view of the above presented arguments it is highly unlikely that Marcellus is the author. It should not be forgotten, however, that there are certain theological and terminological resemblances between the *Sermo Maior*, the Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.¹ Tetz has used the *Sermo Maior* and the Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως, on the assumption that their author is Marcellus, to strengthen his arguments in favour of Marcellan authorship of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*. Although he has not managed to prove his point here it is still possible that all these three works were written by the same author. This is not the place to go into details, but if Marcellus did not write any of the three works, which at the moment appears to be the case, then everybody who attempts to ascribe one of the works to another author will

¹ For example, the concept of the Trinity, κυριακός ἄνθρωπος (in all three writings!), ἐκ προσώπου τινός λέγειν, concern about the divinity of the Holy Spirit, interchangeable use of Logos and Son, insistence on his γεννᾶσθαι from the Father, et. al..

probably have to deal with the other two writings as well. This opens up a most interesting field for future research.

Chapter 5

Contra Theopaschitas

The last work to be dealt with is a small writing that has come to us under the name of Athanasius, and with two differing titles: *Contra Theopaschitas* or *Epistula Ad Liberium*. The title “Contra Theopaschitas” is attached to the text transmitted in the Antiochene Codex Ambrosianus D 51 (235)f. 221a-222b. The same text has been edited in the Athanasius editions under the title “Epistula Ad Liberium”, together with a pseudo-Liberian letter to Athanasius.

Both titles are with some certainty incorrect; the title *Contra Theopaschitas*, however, was presumably given to the work on account of its contents. Since this title does not imply the danger of confusing the work with the undisputed *Epistula ad Iulium*, it shall be used, even if only for practical reasons.

The genuineness of the alleged correspondance between Pope Liberius of Rome and Athanasius had been doubted already by B. de Montfaucon in his edition of the Athanasiana, observing that both writings have the same author, that the Trinitarian formulae are not Athanasian, that the troubled circumstances of Liberius’ time are not mentioned, that the *Epistula ad Athanasium* has no beginning, and that the *Epistula ad Liberium* has the form of a creed, not a letter.

Other arguments against both the Athanasian and the Liberian authorship have been stated by P. Coustant¹. He finds it suspicious that the titles do not resemble the actual contents of the text, with the theme of the titles pointing to the discussion about Apollinarianism, which occurred at the time of Pope Damasus; and even if the discussion about the τέλειος ἄνθρωπος is older than this, there is no reason to put the question to Athanasius, who was never suspected of the Apollinarian heresy. And anyway, Liberius never doubted Athanasius’

¹ P. Coustant, “Monitum in Epistolas Amoebeas Liberii et Athanasii” (1721), Migne PL 8, 1395-1396.

orthodoxy. Furthermore, Coustant held that Liberius did not emphasize the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Following these two scholars it was generally agreed that the author of this work cannot be Athanasius; it was therefore counted among the large number of pseudo-Athanasian works, under which it was forgotten.

Apparently even H. G. Opitz did not remember this compromise when he published the little writing under the title *Contra Theopaschitas* in 1935¹. Opitz did not examine it in detail, but found "at first glance" (p. 210) that it was of Nestorian character and therefore thought the authorship of either Nestorius or Etherios of Tyana equally possible. M. Richard in 1949 disputed Opitz' ascription. He made two observations of interest to us: twice in the document the unity of the hypostases is stated, which leads to a dating of the work in the fourth century; and it precedes immediately the *Expositio Fidei* of the Marcellian deacon Eugenius in the manuscript.²

Richard concluded that the work originates with certainty from the dissident Nicene Church of Ancyra, but admits that the personal involvement of Marcellus is very difficult to prove.

Independently of Richard, F. Scheidweiler disputed Opitz' ascription in 1954³, remarking (on p. 240) that οὐσία and ὑπόστασις are used synonymously in *Contra Theopaschitas*; that the Christology is of the type Logos-Sarx, and that certain resemblances with the Creed of Sardica can be seen. He did not yet, however, ascribe this work to Marcellus, because in his opinion Marcellus would not call the Logos υἱὸς πρωτότοκος, because the Sardican Creed (whose theology, we are to recall, closely associates with Marcellus) prefers a Logos-

¹ H. G. Opitz, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius von Alexandrien* (1935) pp. 210-212.

² Richard, "Bulletin de patrologie (II)", *MSR* 6 (1949), p. 129.

³ F. Scheidweiler, "Ein Glaubensbekenntnis des Eustathius von Antiochien?", *ZNTW* 44 (1952/53), pp. 237-249.

Anthropos Christology, and because the transmission of the text in an Antiochene Athanasius-corpus together with its sharp distinction between the two natures in Christ suggest an origin in the Antiochene school. In consequence Scheidweiler ascribed *Contra Theopaschitas* to Eustathius of Antioch, partly with reference to the *Sermo Maior de Fide* and the *Ekthesis Pisteos*, which E. Schwartz had ascribed to Eustathius in 1924.

After the publication of his views Scheidweiler learned of Richard's opinion in the matter, and in the course of his article¹ on the *Sermo Maior de Fide* he now ascribed *Contra Theopaschitas* to Marcellus, on the grounds that unlike Eustathius' other works, the *hiatus* is not avoided and that, concerning the Logos, it only says that *καλεῖται υἱὸς πρωτότοκος*; moreover, he felt that the polemic against Paul of Samosata and Sabellianism to be found there should be understood as an answer to accusations of Sabellianism levelled against Marcellus.

The most detailed analysis of the work, however, has been undertaken by M. Tetz in 1972.² Because of the double transmission of the text, Tetz produces a new edition of it which he uses as the basis for his argument. As a means of comparison he treats the Fragments, the *Epistula ad Julium*, *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* and, with some reservation, the *Sermo Maior de Fide* as Marcelliana. As an additional source of dogmatic positions close to those of Marcellus he uses the Creed of Sardica. For convenience Tetz divides *Contra Theopaschitas* into thirteen paragraphs, and the analysis follows paragraph by paragraph, comparing it in detail with the Marcelliana he has admitted.

Tetz first of all examines the title, which we have already mentioned in passing: on the one hand he states that the title *Contra Theopaschitas* is certainly spurious, but on the other is prepared to accept the superscription *πρὸς Λιβέριον ἐπίσκοπον Ῥώμης* should Marcellus indeed prove to be the author, since Pope Liberius' pontificate lasted from 352 to 366 (which

¹ F. Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser...?", *BZ* XLVII (1954) p. 353.

² "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra III...", *ZKG* 83 (1972) pp. 145-195.

was in Marcellus' literary lifetime) and it is not impossible that Marcellus would wish to communicate with the West during the early years of this Pope's reign. The description of this work as an ἀντίγραφον of Athanasius, and the short summary of the contents ὅτι τέλειον ἄνθρωπον ἀνέλαβεν ὁ θεὸς Λόγος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας need detailed analyses not yet possible; but Tetz is convinced that neither of the given titles is original. Although the text has the form of a creed and not of a letter it is at least possible that it is the fragment of a letter (p. 155).

The most distinctive contribution which Tetz's study of the actual text offers is a lengthy catalogue of parallels between the *Contra Theopaschitas* and Tetz's Marcelliana: if one arranges these according to the 'Marcelliana' noted by Tetz, one immediately sees that the parallels drawn by him are truly impressive.

The Fragments

Beginning with paragraphs 1 and 2 of this work, Tetz draws our attention first to Fragment 121, a passage with which there are several consistencies in these opening paragraphs. Here, we find that Marcellus insists that νυνὶ δὲ πιστεύω ταῖς θεαῖς γραφαῖς, ὅτι εἷς θεός, καὶ ὁ τούτου Λόγος προῆλθεν μὲν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἵνα πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γένηται, in the context of a discussion of the immortality of the flesh, which is a dominant theme in the *Contra Theopaschitas* and which posed questions which Marcellus felt unable to answer clearly. Tetz (pp. 157f.) returns to this point in observing that Marcellus' interest in the soteriological implications of a doctrine of the immortality of the flesh is mirrored in the use of the word ἀθάνατος in these opening paragraphs of the *Contra Theopaschitas* - compare this part of the *Contra Theopaschitas* with, for example, Fragments 120 and 127. Tetz (p. 160) additionally quotes *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 5 as showing that same tendency: οὐ... ἑαυτὸν ἦλθε σῶσαι ὁ ἀθάνατος θεὸς ἀλλὰ ἡμᾶς θανατωθέντας... καὶ ὁ θάνατος αὐτοῦ ἡμῶν ἀθανασία ἐστί.

In paragraph 13 the author calls the process of the resurrection of the flesh μεταβάλλεσθαι· τουτέστιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν... μεταβαλλομένου, a phrase which appears to draw on Rom. 8:23. Tetz finds a similar concept in frg. 117, where Marcellus speculates about the future of the flesh after the resurrection of all; he uses the term μεταβληθήσεσθαι to describe it, and it is here also that Marcellus' most notorious notion of the final rendering of the βασιλεία to the Father is to be found. Tetz states that this eschatological concept is presupposed in paragraph 13 of the *Contra Theopaschitas*.¹

Tetz observes that the phrase ἵνα πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γένηται in frg. 121 is echoed in paragraph 12 of the *Contra Theopaschitas* in an unusual context: ὁμοούσιος is applied to Father, Son and Spirit δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο by the ταῦτα at the beginning of the paragraph, and points back to the εἷς θεὸς παντοκράτωρ of paragraph 10. Once more, Tetz believes a soteriological interest to be the reason for this: when the Triune God creates, then the New Creation (i.e. redemption) is implied - if not the ultimate goal - and the unity of creator and redeemer is presupposed in the definition of redemption as New Creation. This concept is in line with the notion of the Λόγος συνεργός. Tetz again cites *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 14 in support: ἅπερ ἐστὶν ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς, ταῦτα λέγει ἡ γραφή τοῦ υἱοῦ εἶναι καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Tetz sees the same conception of the unity of God in *Contra Theopaschitas* 12, and points out that this notion of the Trinity made the author liable to accusations of Sabellianism.

Unusual too is the *dictum probans* for all its preceding epithets “πνεῦμα γὰρ ὁ θεός” (John 4:24), one of Marcellus' favourites quotations, found here in the *Contra Theopaschitas* and also in frgs 54, 57, 66 and 77. For him it is evidence that What came down to us in the Incarnation had been Spirit before.² Equally unusual is the term υἱὸς πρωτότοκος (one would normally have expected μονογενής) which occurs in frg. 96 as well as in the *Contra*

¹ Cf. Tetz pp. 185ff..

² Tetz p. 162.

Theopaschitas, where it is introduced awkwardly by τούτου καλεῖται. Tetz assumes polemical motives to lie behind the use of this word: Asterius (quoted in frg. 96 by Marcellus) used πρωτότοκος in order to distinguish between Father and Logos; in *Contra Theopaschitas* it stresses the unity between God and his Incarnate Logos while the introductory formula secures its application to the Incarnate only¹.

In frgs 48-49 Marcellus runs through various deeds of the Logos: there, he explicitly speaks only of the Logos before the Incarnation, and in paragraph 3 of the *Contra Theopaschitas* too the author lists various deeds of the Logos in a fashion suggesting that the stated deeds were performed by the Logos alone, although this is not emphasized - and the same phenomenon is to be found in the *Epistula ad Iulium*. So the author of the *Contra Theopaschitas* shares the view of Marcelliana, although he is less explicit about it.²

Again like Marcellus in the Fragments (frg. 43), the author of *Contra Theopaschitas* speaks of ὁ μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν σάρκα Ἰησοῦς κληθείς, indicating that the name 'Jesus' is applied to the Logos only after the Incarnation, a view shared by the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*. The first name, which must never be forgotten, is 'Logos'. That which the Logos assumed in the Incarnation is called σὰρξ and ἄνθρωπος by Marcellus without distinction; he can speak both of the assumption of the flesh and of the man (in frg. 108 even in consecutive sentences) without making any distinction. Tetz sees the same identification in *Contra Theopaschitas* paragraph 8, "τουτέστιν ἀνέλαβεν ἄνθρωπον", and believes that the author of this passage must share a Logos-Anthropos Christology with Marcellus as the author of, for example, frgs 74, 108, and 117, with which Tetz compares the thought of this paragraph (p. 175).

The similarities continue into Marcellus' discussion in the Fragments (frgs 70, 71, 52, 61) of the distinction in the Son between the κατὰ σάρκα οἰκονομία which relates to man

¹ Tetz pp. 164f..

² Tetz p. 169.

and, of more interest to us at the moment, the κατὰ πνεῦμα αἰδιότης in which the Son is one with the Father as Spirit - the Godhead expands ἐνεργεία but δυνάμει it remains undivided. As Tetz asserts, an interest in ontological unity between Father and Logos also forms the framework for the whole of paragraph 7 of the *Contra Theopaschitas*; and more specifically, we also find here in paragraph 7 a reference to John 10:38 (loosely quoted as ἐν τούτῳ τὸν πατέρα νοοῦμεν, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν υἱὸν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ) which Marcellus uses in frgs 52, 73, 75, 129 to argue in favour of actual ontological oneness, unity of the Father with his Logos (as opposed to mere agreement of will such as Asterius teaches). Moreover, in frg. 61 Marcellus explicitly says that the Logos of man is “ἐν καὶ ταυτό” with him, a notion and indeed formula of unity which Tetz (p. 174) finds repeated in paragraphs 7 and 12 of the *Contra Theopaschitas*. In chapter 12, we even find the words ἐνότης, which occurs so strikingly in frg. 66 (ἐνότη γὰρ ὁ Λόγος καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ θεῷ διαφέρει μόνα), δύνάμις which Tetz compares with frg. 77 (δυνάμει ἀδιαίρετον τὴν μονάδα εἶναι), and ὑπόστασις¹ which is to be found most notably in frg. 77 and also in frg. 61, where Marcellus defends the notion of the one hypostasis against Arian opponents who want to separate God and the Logos ὑποστάσει καὶ δυνάμει. He uses an anthropological analogy: a man’s logos is not to be separated from him, so neither is God’s Logos separable from him. The author of the *Contra Theopaschitas* endorses this conclusion in paragraph 9, writing that τοῦτον ἔχομεν οὐ διακεχωρισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in order to emphasize the inseparability of the Logos from the Father and indeed from the Holy Spirit too². Tetz believes that this author must, therefore, also have had an opponent like Asterius in mind who, according to frg. 63, spoke of two hypostases, separating the Son from the

¹ The subsequent occurrence of οὐσία Tetz compares with the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, not the *Fragments*, and so is assessed further on in this chapter.

² Tetz quotes *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 13 (PG 26, 10005.22-25) as a passage from the *Marcelliana* also mentioning the Spirit in this context: ὡςπερ οὖν τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας οὐ κεχώριται, οὕτω καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλότριον.

Father like a human son is separated from his father. In the case of Marcellus, this prompted him to reject the doctrine of three hypostases in frg. 66: ἀδύνατον γὰρ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις οὕσας ἐνοῦσθαι μονάδι, εἰ μὴ πρότερον ἢ τριάς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ μονάδος ἔχει and it is, significantly, of ὑπόστασις and not of ὑποστάσεις that the author of *Contra Theopaschitas* speaks in paragraph 12.¹

Finally, for Marcellus it is only the incarnate (and therefore visible) Logos who can be called the image of the invisible God (e.g. frgs 92-94). Once more, Tetz believes, this view is presupposed and fully represented in the *Contra Theopaschitas*, in whose early sentences the description ἀόρατος does indeed occur. For Marcellus, an image (εἰκὼν) is per definitionem visible. The Logos became the image of the invisible God when he assumed the flesh; the assumed flesh is actually called εἰκὼν by Marcellus. In frg. 94 he concludes: οὔτε γὰρ τὸν Λόγον οὔτε τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Λόγου χωρὶς τῆς εἰκόνοσ ταύτης γνῶναί τινα δυνατόν. Tetz now states that if the εἰκὼν is the flesh/man which was assumed by the Logos, then the μία εἰκὼν is to be understood as equivalent to the ἴδιον σῶμα of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 12 (PG 26, 1004.27) and the κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος of the *Sermo Maior de Fide*. The phrase used by the author of the *Contra Theopaschitas* in paragraph 12 is μία εἰκὼν τῆς τριάδος, which has no parallel in any of the works ascribed to Marcellus; but Tetz attempts to explain this difficult sentence on the grounds of this Marcellan εἰκὼν-conception, as found in frg. 94. Tetz is unconcerned by the reference to τῆς τριάδος in view of the strongly emphasized unity of God, especially since both God and his Logos have been described as ἀόρατος before.²

¹ Cf. Tetz p. 177.

² Tetz pp. 183f..

The ‘*Epistula ad Iulium*’

The *Epistula ad Iulium* has at the beginning of Marcellus’ Creed the same outline as in the *Contra Theopaschitas* and Fragment 121, though modified in that here the everlasting βασιλεία is emphasized. Stylistic parallels are to be seen in the use of the anaphora and the frequency of Logos predications.¹ Paragraph 2 of the *Contra Theopaschitas* also sees an identification of Logos and Sophia, and Marcellus does the same in the *Epistula ad Iulium*, where he refers to opponents who teach another Logos and another Sophia, whereas he insists on the unity of the one hypostasis.²

In the *Epistula* Marcellus avoids an identification of παντοκράτωρ with the Father for fear of the Arian misunderstanding that the Son is to be counted among the πάντα. The author of the *Contra Theopaschitas* also gives the impression that the traditional formula is not sufficient for his apologetic, for he wants to make quite clear that the παντοκράτωρ is the Father in his unity with the Logos and Spirit, not just the Father.

‘*De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*’

In Chapter 3 of the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*³ we read: ...οὐκ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ χάριν ἔλαβε τὸ καλεῖσθαι Θεός, ἀλλ’ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐθεολογήθη... φανερόν οὖν ἐστίν, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ Λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐψηλαφήθη, καὶ τὸ συναμφοτέρον λόγον ζωῆς ἢ θεία γραφὴ παραδέδωκε ψηλαφηθέντα. This word ἐψηλαφήθη recurs in *Contra Theopaschitas*, which agrees that only the incarnate Logos is touchable, but the problem is tackled in a more differentiated way in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*.

¹ Tetz p. 158.

² Tetz p. 164.

³ PG 26, 989.3-5, 15-18.

In paragraph 4 of the *Contra Theopaschitas* the author introduces some new epithets for the flesh of the Incarnate Logos: the divinity of the Logos is contrasted with the mortal, visible flesh but the flesh is also dubbed “ἀσθενής”, an adjective derived from Mt. 26:39 and of particular interest for Marcellus’ Christology. In frg. 73, the notion of the two wills in Christ is implicitly there, but Tetz (p. 170) quotes *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 21, where it is explicit:

... ὅταν λέγῃ· πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο· πλὴν μὴ τὸ ἔμὸν θέλημα γένηται, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής, δύο θελήματα ἐνταῦθα δείκνυσι· τὸ μὲν ἀνθρώπινον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῆς σαρκός, τὸ δὲ θεϊκόν. τὸ γὰρ ἀνθρώπινον διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός παραιτεῖται τὸ πάθος· τὸ δὲ θεϊκόν αὐτοῦ πρόθυμον.

Tetz believes that a similar Christological interest led the author of *Contra Theopaschitas* to add ἀσθενής to the other adjectives, and states that the concept of the two wills in Christ belongs to the Logos-Anthropos scheme.

Paragraph 5 also provides a sharp distinction between σὰρξ and Λόγος, in which however σὰρξ and ἄνθρωπος are identified. The Logos is still δύναμις θεοῦ, τουτέστι θεός, a view compared by Tetz with the Creed of Sardica’s characterization of the “Arians” doctrines, which portrays them as stating that the Logos and the Spirit, being divided from and other than the Father in hypostasis, suffered fleshly passions in themselves:

καὶ ὅτι ὁ Λόγος καὶ ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ ἐτρώθη καὶ ἐσφάγη καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ... διαφόρους εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἶναι κεχωρισμένας.

In Tetz’ opinion, the author of the tract *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* also takes issue with this doctrine: in chapter 1 we are warned that though they come in the guise of men seeking the proper exactness of the Christian Faith, the Arians’ only real desire is to pervert the human language of the poverty of the Son of God in order to confirm their own blasphemy, and score cheap debating points:

οὐ κακοτέχνως τὰς θείας γραφὰς βουλόμενοι νοεῖν, τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ῥήματα τῆς πτωχείας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ παράγειν βούλονται πρὸς τὸ συστήσαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν βλασφημίαν. πᾶσα δὲ ἀκρίβεια Χριστιανισμοῦ ἐν τοῖς εὐτελέσι ῥήμασιν εὐρίσκεται¹.

In chapter 8, the author re-emphasizes his point from another angle: ὅσα οὖν εὐτελῆ ῥήματα ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου εἴρηται, τῇ πτωχείᾳ αὐτοῦ διαφέρει, ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτοῖς πλουτήσωμεν, οὐχ ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς βλασφημήσωμεν κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.² Tetz (p. 171) understands from this that both this author (who is, in his view, Marcellus himself) and the author of the *Contra Theopaschitas* are combatting the Arians' "perversions" with a Logos-Anthropos Christology, a theme common to both works.

Paragraph 6 of the *Contra Theopaschitas* speaks of the Logos who ἀνέβη ὅθεν καὶ κατέβη: noting the central importance of this formula to the *Contra Theopaschitas*, Tetz directs that it is to be understood under the aspect of the unity of God - it is the Logos who came down to save the people of the Old Testament (paragraph 3), and the selfsame Logos who came down from heaven in the Incarnation, descended into Hades, and is now the Ascended One (paragraph 6). Tetz (pp. 172f.) draws parallels with the *De Incarnatione* here as well:

Καὶ ὁ θεὸς μὲν ἐστὶν ὁ περιέχων καὶ πληρῶν τὰ πάντα, ὡς καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγει, Τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐγὼ πληρῶ, λέγει κύριος. Ὁμοίως καὶ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ γράφει ὁ Παῦλος· Ὁ καταβάς αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα. τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος Δαβὶδ λέγει· Ποῦ πορευθῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός σου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ποῦ φύγω; τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν

¹ PG 26, 984.4-985. 4.

² PG 26, 996.1-4.

αυτόν, Ποῦ πορευθῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός σου, ἔδειξεν ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα εἶναι τὸ τὰ πάντα πληροῦν.

Καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ποῦ φύγω; ἔὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, σὺ ἐκεῖ εἶ, ἔὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ἄδην, πάρει. Τίς δὲ παραγέγονε εἰς τὸν ἄδην, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάς;¹

Contra Theopaschitas then introduces the related idea of the eschatological rendering of redeemed mankind by the Son to the Father after the universal resurrection of the dead, which is, of course, one of the most characteristic features of Marcellan theology. Tetz notes later on in his analysis that the author of the *Contra Theopaschitas* bases his theology of the βασιλεία, contained in paragraph 12, on 1 Cor. 15:24-28 just as the author of the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* does in chapter 20, though Tetz does not go into detail about it. Here in his discussion of paragraph 6 Tetz does give us an illustration of the parallels between the *Contra Theopaschitas* and the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* on this point, comparing *Contra Theopaschitas* paragraph 6 with chapter 5 of the *De Incarnatione*, in which Luke 23:46 is interpreted as follows:

πάντας ἀνθρώπους παρατίθεται τῷ πατρὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ, τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ ζωοποιουμένους,

and also from chapter 12:

καὶ ὅτε παρατίθεται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ εἰς χεῖρας τοῦ πατρός, ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν παρατίθεται τῷ θεῷ, ἵνα πάντας ἀνθρώπους παραθῆται τῷ θεῷ.

With F. Scheidweiler, Tetz (p. 174) additionally points to a parallel in the Creed of Sardica, 11:

ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἀνέστη, ὄντινα καὶ προσήνεγκε τῷ πατρὶ ἑαυτοῦ δῶρον, ὃν ἠλευθέρωσεν.

¹ *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, Chapter 19 (PG 26, 1016.29-1017.5).

Reaching further forward in Tetz' analysis of the *Contra Theopaschitas* to his discussion of paragraph 8, our attention is drawn first of all to the words ἐν ἑαυτῷ, which Tetz suggests be compared with this passage from the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 12:

Πρῶτον... τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἤγειρεν ὁ κύριος ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὑψωσεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ¹,

and then to the phrase ἐν ᾧ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος οἰκεῖ σωματικῶς which Tetz sets side-by-side with another extract from the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, chapter 9:

ἐν ἡμῖν μὲν... ἀπαρχὴ καὶ ἀρραβῶν θεότητος κατοικεῖ, ἐν Χριστῷ δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος. καὶ μὴ τις νομίση, ὅτι μὴ ἔχων αὐτὸ [sc. τὸ πνεῦμα] ἐλάμβανεν· αὐτὸς γὰρ αὐτὸ ἄνωθεν ἔπεμπεν ὡς θεὸς, καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτὸ κάτω ὑπέδεχeto ὡς ἄνθρωπος. ἐξ αὐτοῦ οὖν εἰς αὐτὸν κατήει, ἐκ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτοῦ².

Tetz understands this passage to indicate the difference between the presence of the Spirit in Christ and in us; the same difference is to be found in the *Contra Theopaschitas* chapter 8: the author uses the (free) citation of Col. 2:9 in order to distinguish the man Jesus from “our body” which is referred to in paragraph 13.³

We have already mentioned parallels between the Fragments and *Contra Theopaschitas* in paragraph 12, where the words ἐνότης, δύναμις, and ὑπόστασις were all picked out by Tetz for comment. This same section provides us with further reminders of Marcellus' thinking, this time in the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*: θεότης, οὐσία, κυριότης and δοξολογία. The author's use of οὐσία, Tetz suggests, should be compared with *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* chapter 19, where we read that οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν [sc. Christ] καὶ

¹ *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* Chapter 12 (PG 26, 1004.26-28).

² *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* Chapter 9 (PG 26, 997.28-34).

³ Tetz p. 176.

τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τῆς αὐτῆς τῷ πατρὶ οὐσίας καὶ πλὴν αὐτοῦ μὴ εἶναι θεόν *age against Christ*; and that one *δοξολογία* and one *κυριότης* indicate one *θεότης* is deduced by the author of *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* as well. Tetz gives two examples, both from chapter 10.

According to the first:

πατήρ... καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα κύριος Σαβαώθ ἐστι. μία γὰρ ἡ θεότης ὡς θεός. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἅπερ εἶπεν ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς εἶπεν· ἐν δὲ ταῖς Πράξεσιν ὁ Παῦλος φησιν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἶπε.¹

The second comes from a little earlier in the same chapter:

καὶ ὅτε δοξολογοῦσι τὰ χερουβὶμ τρίτον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντα· Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος Σαβαώθ, πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα δοξολογοῦσι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὡσπερ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ βαπτίζομεθα, οὕτως καὶ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ γινόμεθα υἱοὶ θεοῦ, οὐ θεῶν. πατήρ γὰρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα κύριος Σαβαώθ ἐστι μία γὰρ ἡ θεότης καὶ εἷς θεός.²

In addition, Tetz cites (pp. 180ff.) from the *Sermo Maior de Fide*, chapter 25: ...ἵνα ἡ ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, τουτέστιν πατήρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἡ μία κυριότης καὶ θεότης καὶ βασιλεία.

General Impressions

A few of Tetz' 'parallels' are general impressions of a similarity of emphasis between the author of the *Contra Theopaschitas* and the *Marcelliana*. We find the theme of the unity of God - for which Marcellus was of course notorious - throughout the whole of the *Contra Theopaschitas*, and the term *εἷς θεός* itself is, significantly, to be found in the opening

¹ PG 26, 1000.23-28.

² PG 26, 1000.17-25.

paragraphs; and, pursuing his policy of comparing Marcellus' known works with *Contra Theopaschitas* but now in relation to the general 'ambience' of the Marcellan controversies, Tetz points to Eusebius' *De Eccl. Theol.* (prooemium) where Eusebius comments on this apologetic of Marcellus'. Likewise, although the term ἄναρχος does not appear in the Marcelliana, Tetz matches its appearance in the *Contra Theopaschitas* with another citation from Eusebius' *De Eccl. Theol.*, where Eusebius attacks Marcellus for failing to restrict the use of ἄναρχος to descriptions of the Father alone, and notes (p. 166) that the author of *Contra Theopaschitas* does not refer to the Father exclusively, either.

Again, Hebrews 7:3, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμέρων ἔχων μήτε τέλος ζωῆς προσδοκῶν, appears nowhere in the Marcelliana, but Tetz concludes from Acacius of Caesarea's polemic against Marcellus, which is preserved by Epiphanius in his *Panarion*, that Marcellus used this passage in the context of his argument about the βασιλεία.

... βασιλέα γεγέννηκεν ὁ πατήρ, τῆς Βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὔτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν οὔτε ζωῆς τέλος ἐχούσας.¹

That Acacius should make the logical mistake of confusing βασιλεύς with βασιλεία indicates for Tetz that he had found the passage in Marcellus' argument and used it rather mechanically. By quoting Hebrews 7:3 without any explanation concerning the βασιλεία, the author of *Contra Theopaschitas* shows some restraint in the matter but appears to share the views of Marcellus.²

From his detailed word-by-word analysis Tetz concludes that the original features of the little creed can only be explained in view of the Marcelliana. Consequently, he ascribes the *Contra Theopaschitas* to Marcellus, an ascription which has met with virtually no challenge.

¹ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72, 7.7.

² Tetz pp. 166f..

Manlio Simonetti in 1975¹ mentions this work very briefly, and remarks only that the writing is too short to provide us with evidence that would make a secure ascription possible, although he admits that it is “attribuibile ad ambiente marcelliano” (p. 45). Maurice James Dowling comes to much the same conclusion. He believes that “this work could certainly have been written by Marcellus of Ancyra, for there is nothing in it which conflicts with what we know of his theology from the fragments preserved by Eusebius and Epiphanius”. He finds there “a strong idea of the one God whose Word and Spirit are inseparable from him”, “a note of economic trinitarianism with only the briefest of mentions to the Spirit” and “a very prominent concept of the Logos”², all of which move him to look favourably on Tetz’ proposal. In view of the fact that the work is indeed very brief, Dowling finds it “difficult to be dogmatic” about attributing it to Marcellus, and in any case, it would not add anything new to our knowledge of Marcellus’ theology³.

To these opinions we ought, perhaps, to add a few extra remarks of our own. As was not the case when we examined the *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*, the *Sermo Maior de Fide* and the *Ekthesis Pisteos*, this time we have seen no great differences between the Marcellan fragments and the *Contra Theopaschitas*. Although it does not contain Marcellus’ notorious term “monad”, its language is exaggeratedly monotheistic, and the author is concerned with the Logos more than with (the divinity of) the Spirit. But a word must be said about the problems of Christology which we have encountered. The distinctions between the so-called “Logos-Sarx” and “Logos-Anthropos” types have proved to be of no help in the question of authorship. Marcellus in his fragments uses σάρξ and ἄνθρωπος interchangeably with no apparent distinction or different theological impact whatsoever; in the *Sermo Maior* and in the *Ekthesis Pisteos* we find terms like κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος and κυριακὸν σῶμα side by side

¹ M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (1975).

² Dowling *Marcellus of Ancyra* (1987) pp. 36-37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

with σάρξ, also without specific theological implications to either of them; and in the *Contra Theopaschitas* no distinction between σάρξ and ἄνθρωπος is made; and the *De Sancta Ecclesia* is chiefly concerned with heresiology and less with Christology anyway. Only in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* could we claim to find a “Logos-Sarx” Christology. Alleged Christological concepts, therefore, are no safe criteria for the ascription of certain works to certain people, for obviously terms like σάρξ, σῶμα and ἄνθρωπος were used with less care and distinction than we could wish for in order to identify clear-cut differences or even opposing Christological concepts based on the use of certain terms. Manlio Simonetti is right when he says that it is much more important to look at the general theological, cultural and doctrinal “ambience” of a work.

So far, nothing has been said about J. T. Lienhard’s position in the matter. The reason for this is that his approach (in his *Contra Marcellum* of 1986) differs methodologically from that of the scholars mentioned above. Their approach (including that of M. J. Dowling) is more of a “conservative” type: Marcellus is seen as a prominent individual whose theological views can be found in the fragments of his *Contra Asterium*. Whether they developed and became more moderate in the course of his life (Gericke, Tetz) or remained essentially the same (Richard, Simonetti, Dowling) is a matter of dispute, and the attribution or otherwise of these anonymous writings to Marcellus are mostly the consequence of one’s position in this discussion. Lienhard’s thesis, however, releases some of the tension by placing Marcellus in the midst of a larger tradition, the “mihypostatic tradition”. Since he believes that “Marcellus did give up many of his peculiar doctrines, and gave them up quickly”, the theology of the Fragments cannot be taken as the only criterion for attributing other works to Marcellus, especially since “after 341 Marcellus’ doctrine is not easily distinguished from the doctrine of others in his circle... Affinity with Marcellus’ thought is not proof of Marcellan authorship”.¹ Consequently, Lienhard does not exclude the newly attributed works in his study because to

¹ Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum* (1986) p. 183.

him the scholars so far have not been able to prove that any of them were indeed written by Marcellus.

PART III

Translations

Translations

These translations are mine, but those of the *Epistula ad Iulium* and the *De Sancta Ecclesia* have been compared with (and at times improved on the basis of) Dowling's translations.

1. *Epistula Ad Iulium*

To his most blessed fellow-servant Julius, Marcellus sends greetings in Christ.

Since some of those who have been condemned before for heretical beliefs, whom I refuted completely in the synod of Nicaea, have dared to write to your reverence, alleging that I believe what is neither true nor approved by the Church, and eagerly trying to transfer accusations against themselves to me; because of this I found it necessary, having come to Rome, to suggest to you that you summon those who have written against me, in order that, when they are here, they might be accused by me on two accounts: [namely] that what they have written against me is in fact false, and that they, now as then, remain in their former error, and dared to stand up against the churches of God and against us, their leaders. Since they did not want to come after you had sent presbyters to them, and I have been busy with these matters for fifteen full months now, I felt it necessary, because I am about to depart from here, to present to you in writing my faith in all truth with my own hand, which I have learned, which I was taught from the sacred Scriptures, and to remind you of the things which have been falsely said by them, in order that you may know with what words they deceive their hearers and want to hide the truth.

For they say that the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is not the own and true Logos of the almighty God, but that there is a different Logos, and a different wisdom and power. This, made by him [sc. God] they call Logos and wisdom and power. And because they think this way, they say that there is another hypostasis, distinct from the Father. Furthermore, they

express the opinion in their writings that the Father existed before the Son, that he is not truly Son “from” the Father; but when they say “from” God, they say this as about everything. They also dare to say: “There was once when he was not”; and that he is a creature or something made, dividing him from the Father. I firmly believe that those who say such things are strangers to the Catholic Church.

I believe, following the sacred Scriptures, that there is one God, and that his only-begotten Son and Logos, who always existed with the Father and never had a beginning to his being, is truly from God, not created, not made, but eternally being, eternally reigning with God the Father, *of whose kingdom*, according to the testimony of the Apostle, *there will be no end*¹. He is Son, he is power, he is wisdom, he is the real and true Logos of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, inseparable power of God, through whom all created things were created, as the Gospel testifies, saying: *In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God. All things were made through him, and without him nothing was made*². He is the Logos, of whom Luke the Evangelist bears witness, saying: *As those who were from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Logos to us*³. And David said of him: *My heart has poured forth a good Logos*⁴. Thus also our Lord Jesus Christ teaches us in the Gospel, saying: *I came forth from the Father, and have come*⁵.

He, coming down in the last days for our salvation, and being born of the Virgin Mary, assumed man.

Therefore I believe in God Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was begotten of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary, was crucified under

¹ Lk. 1:33.

² Jn 1:1-3.

³ Lk. 1:2.

⁴ Ps. 45 (44):1.

⁵ Jn 8:42.

Pontius Pilate, and buried, rose on the third day from the dead, ascended into the heavens and sits at the right hand of the Father, from where he shall come to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Church, forgiveness of sins, resurrection of the flesh, and eternal life.

That the Godhead of the Father and the Son is indivisible we have learned from the sacred Scriptures. For if anyone divides the Son, that is the Logos, from the almighty God, he must either believe that there are two Gods, which is held to be alien to the divine teachings, or confess that the Son is not God, which is obviously also alien to the right faith, since the Evangelist says: *And the Logos was God*¹. I have exactly learned that the Son as a power is inseparable from the Father. For the Saviour himself, our Lord Jesus Christ, says: *In me is the Father, and I am in the Father*²; and *I and the Father are one*³; and *He who has seen me has seen the Father*⁴.

Having received this faith from the sacred Scriptures, and having been taught by predecessors in God, I preach in the Church of God, and have now written to you, keeping a copy of this myself. And I think it right to include a copy of this in the letter to the Bishops, in order that those who do not know us well and pay attention to what they have written may not be led astray. Farewell.

¹ Jn 1:1.

² Jn 10:38.

³ Jn 10:30.

⁴ Jn 14:9.

2. *De Sancta Ecclesia*

By Bishop Anthimus of Nicomedia, from his writings to Theodor about the Holy Church.

¶ 1. As there is one God, and one Son of God and one Holy Spirit, so one humanity and one world were created by God, and there is one Catholic and Apostolic Church and one Baptism in the whole world, as Paul says: *One God, one Faith, one Baptism*¹.

¶ 2. Now, there is one Catholic and Apostolic Church throughout the whole inhabited world, which, having received the faith handed down from the apostles, keeps it guarded to the present day; she is called catholic because she is spread all over the whole world, according to what is said: *Their voice is gone into all the earth*² and so on following; and *For in every place incense and a pure sacrifice are offered to God, and from the rising of the sun to its setting the name of the Lord is glorified among the gentiles*³; and again, the prophecy from the position of God the Father to the Son: *Behold, he says, I have appointed you to be a light to the Gentiles, to be a way of salvation until the end of the earth*⁴.

¶ 3. But the heresies have received nothing from the apostles, nor from their disciples, nor from their successors the bishops (were this not so they would not be called heresies; but they are called heresies because they take up one single point and follow this through), nor are they found everywhere, but are scattered into limited areas, where the devil has succeeded in deceiving them through worthless ambition and put them as leaders of his own evil doing, which is why their churches are not called catholic.

¹ Eph. 4:5-6.

² Ps. 19 (18):4 [LXX].

³ Mal. 1:11.

⁴ Is. 49:6.

¶ 4. Therefore it is necessary to say from where and from whom the heretics have received their principles so that they were led by heretics into the pit of destruction; for it is the custom among heretics to steal from one another and to devise further novelties - for they are proud of being each other's disciples.

¶ 5. First, the Saducees^d of the Jews, permitted by God, preached that there was no resurrection neither Holy Spirit, confessing neither angels nor prophets; with small alterations Cerinthus handed this down from them to the Ebionites.

¶ 6. And the followers of Simon, called gnostics, Menander^e and Saturninus and Basilides, Marcus and Colobasus and the rest, invented variations on one another's themes and handed them on to those who were led astray by them, which is why they also refer to themselves as gnostics; from these the Ophites and Cainites and Sethites and the followers of Hermes and Seleucos and the rest of the crowd of heretics received the same wrong teaching, like from Nicolaus, Carpocrates and Prodicus and Epiphanes, who in their turn devised certain novelties^f.

¶ 7. But all of these have taken the principle of their error from the philosophers Hermes and Plato and Aristotle.

¶ 8. Concerning the heresy of the Ariomaniacs, which has eaten away the Church of God, it is necessary to discuss them openly as well, in order that you know how they, with false wisdom, pilfered from the teaching of the ancients.

¶ 9. And these indeed teach three hypostases, as Valentinus, the arch-heretic first invented in the book to which he gave the title *On the Three Natures*, for he was the first to teach three hypostases and three persons of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and he can be found to have pilfered from Hermes and Plato.

^f Dowling includes Mercati's footnote ((1987) p. 96, fn. 40): ... (ἐπενόησαν). ἢ ὡς ἀπὸ Κέρδωνος Μαρκίων καὶ Λουκιανός, ἀφ' ὧν Μανιχαῖοι ἀφορμὰς λαβόντες καὶ νοταρίοι παρέδωκαν. Cf. Dowling, *op. cit.* p. 359.

¶ 10. Furthermore, this is why they made up a second God, brought into being by the Father before all ages, as their chosen leader Asterius says, [who was] taught by Hermes, who is also called Trismegistus (for thus he says to Asclepius the doctor: *Listen now Asclepius. The lord and maker of all things, whom it is our custom to call God, then made a second God, visible and tangible*); from this he derived the *only-begotten God* instead of the *only-begotten Son*¹, about which the divine John speaks.

¶ 11. Then again the Trismegistus says: *When, therefore, he had made the first and only and single one, he appeared to him most beautiful and endowed with all good things, and he took great delight in him and loved him as his own child.*

¶ 12. Therefore, their idea about *a first and a second God* took for them its origin from here; which is why Eusebius of Caesarea has written *un-begotten*.

¶ 13. But Plato speaks to Gorgias in this manner:

*All these things were so constituted out of necessity, and the maker of the most beautiful and best took them into the things which change, when he begat the self-sufficient and perfect son; and again, in the same work, he says: That being the case, we must acknowledge that there is one unchanging form, unbegotten and indestructible, which does not receive into itself any other element from another source, nor does it change itself into other forms it is invisible and also otherwise intangible, but the intelligent thinker is capable of perceiving it; but the other one, which has the same name, is begotten, visible and subject to change*².

¶ 14. These have become the reasons for their error, who, not holding on to the right piety, have fallen out. From where do they derive that “God wanted the Logos of God to be”? Have they not learned this also from Trismegistus?

¹ Jn 1:18.

² According to Richard (“Un Opuscule méconnu de Marcel évêque d’Ancyre”, *MSR* VI (1949) p. 8, fn. 2), this is not a quotation from the “Gorgias” but indeed from the *Timaeus* (68 E and 51E-52A), differing in a number of points from the standard text. Cf. Dowling, *Marcellus* (1987) p. 361, fn. 14.

¶ 15. For he, after the first God speaking about the second, says: *We will see the God whom we know already, who according to his will has everything similarly, except for these two things: that he exists in a body and is visible*¹.

¶ 16. By holding fast to these things, those who boast about being disciples of Hermes and Plato and Aristotle instead of Christ's and his apostles' have gone badly astray.

¶ 17. But the *second cause*, the Son Logos, which they also think of as *the second principle*, they received from Appelles, the disciple of Marcion, who against his own teacher says: *Marcion was wrong in saying that there are two principles; but I say there is one, which has made a second principle*².

¶ 18. Again, they blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, saying that he does not have to be worshipped neither paid homage to, for they call him a slave and a servant; and having received this godless dogma from Dositheas, the arch-heretic of the Sadducees, they have been swallowed up in the pit of atheism.

¶ 19. This may also be known, that when some separate themselves, standing up against the Church and the apostolic kerygma, immediately those of their party who have been deceived have made use of the name of the arch-heretic who created the schism, and have lost the name of the one who brought them up, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

3. *Ekthesis Pisteos*

Of our father among the Saints, Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, the Exposition of Faith.

¹ According to Dowling (ibid. p. 362, fn. 15) the origin of this quote is unknown.

² According to Dowling (ibid. p. 367 fn. 16) "this quotation is not found in any other early Christian source".

[1] We believe in one unbegotten God, Father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible, who has his being out of himself, and in one unbegotten Logos, Wisdom, Son, from the Father without beginning, eternally begotten, a Logos not spoken, not innate, not an emanation of the Perfect One, not a cutting of the impassible nature, nor a projection, but a self-sufficient Son, both living and active, the true image of the Father, of equal honour and glory; for this is, it says, the will of the Father, so that as they honour the Father they may also honour the Son¹. True God from true God, as John says in the Catholic Epistles, the [verse] *We are in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. He is the true God and the eternal life*²; almighty from the almighty; for over all, over which the Father rules and has dominion, the Son rules and has dominion too; whole from the whole, being like the Father, as the Lord says: *Who has seen me has seen the Father*³.

He was indeed born ineffably and incomprehensibly; *For who shall tell of his generation?*⁴ instead of none; who for the completion of the ages coming down from the bosom of the Father took up, from the undefiled Virgin Mary, our man[hood], Christ Jesus, whom he delivered to suffer for us by his own free-will, as the Lord says: *No one takes my soul from me; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again*⁵. In which man[hood], having been crucified and died for us, he rose from the dead and was taken up into the heavens. Being created for us as the beginning of ways⁶ while he was on the earth, he showed us light from darkness, salvation from deceit, life from the dead, entrance into the paradise from which Adam was expelled, into which he entered again through the thief, as

¹ 1 Jn 5:23.

² 1 Jn 5:20.

³ Jn 14:9.

⁴ Is. 53:8.

⁵ Jn 10:18.

⁶ Prov. 8:22.

the Lord said: *This day you will be with me in the paradise*¹, into which Paul also went, and ascension into heaven, where the lordly man [ὁ κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος] entered as a forerunner for us, in whom he shall judge both living and dead.

[2] We also believe similarly in the Holy Spirit who searches all things and the depths of God², anathematizing the teachings which believe against this. For we neither believe in him as a son-father [υἱοπάτωρ] as the Sabellians who say monoousios and not homoousios, and thereby deny that there is a Son; nor do we attribute to the Father the passible body, which he put on for the salvation of the whole world; nor is it allowed to hold three individually separated hypostases, as in the case of human beings naturally endowed with bodies, so that we may believe in polytheism like the nations; but [rather] like a river which, springing forth from a source, is not divided, although there are two shapes and two names. For neither is the Father a Son, nor is the Son a Father, for the Father is the Father of the Son, and the Son is the Son of the Father. For just as the source is not a river, nor the river a source, but both are one and the same water which is being transmitted from the source into the river, likewise the Godhead from the Father comes in the Son without running off and without being divided. For the Lord says: *From the Father I came out and have come*³. He is always with the Father who is at the Father's bosom, for the bosom of the Father was never emptied of the Godhead of the Son, for he says: *I was with him, arranging [all]*⁴.

We do not believe in a creature or a thing made, or that he is out of nothing, who is God the Creator of all, the Son of God, one who is from the one who is, the only one from the only one, as the same glory and power generated eternally from the Father without

¹ Lk. 22:43.

² Cf. 1 Cor. 2:10.

³ Jn 16:28.

⁴ Prov. 8:30.

separation; for who has seen the Son has seen the Father¹. That is to say everything was created through the Son; but he is not a creature, as Paul says about the Lord: *For in him all things were created, and he is before all*². He does not say that he was created before all, but that he is before all; so to be created applies to all; and to be before all is fitting only to the Son.

[3] He is, then, an offspring by nature, perfect from perfect, begotten before all hills, that is, before all rational and mind-endowed being, as Paul also speaks of him in another place: *Firstborn of all creation*³. But by saying 'firstborn', he indicates that he is not a creature, but an offspring of the Father; for it is alien to his Godhead to be called a creature. For all things were created by the Father, through the Son; whereas the Son alone was eternally begotten from the Father; hence God the Logos is the firstborn of all creation, immutable from immutable. The body, on the other hand, which he put on for our sake is a creature, about which Jeremiah says according to the rendering of the seventy interpreters: *The Lord created for us a new salvation as a rich plantation, into which salvation human beings shall come*⁴. According to Aquila¹, there is the following concerning the same verse: The Lord created something new in the female. As for the salvation which was created for us as a rich plantation, it is new and not old, it is for us and not before us, it is Jesus, the man who came to be according to the Saviour, who is interpreted sometimes as salvation, sometimes as Saviour. Indeed, salvation is from the Saviour, in the same way as the enlightenment is from the light. The new salvation, then, that was created from the Saviour, as Jeremiah says, created a salvation for us, and as Aquila¹ says: The Lord created something new in the female, that is, in Mary. For nothing new has been created in the female except the lordly body

¹ Cf. Jn 14:9.

² Col. 1:16-17.

³ Col. 1:15.

⁴ Jer. 31:22.

[κυριακὸν σῶμα] that was born from the Virgin Mary without sexual intercourse, as it is also said in the Proverbs from the viewpoint of Jesus: *The Lord created me a beginning of his ways for his works*¹. He does not say, 'He created me before his works', in order that nobody understands the saying as referring to the Godhead of the Logos.

[4] Thus, both sayings about the creature are written with reference to Jesus bodily: for it was the bodily man who was created as beginning of ways, whom he revealed to us as salvation. *For it is through him that we have access to the Father*²; for he is the Way which takes us up to the Father. As for the Way, it is a corporeal sight, which is the lordly man.

All things, then, were created by the Logos of God, who is not a creature but an offspring. For none of the created things created anything that is equal or the same with itself. For it befits a father to beget, and a craftsman to create. Therefore it is the body by which the Lord put on form that is a thing made and a creature, *which was born for us*, as Paul says, *wisdom and sanctification and righteousness and redemption from God*³, although the Logos was before us and all creation the Wisdom of the Father, and [still] is.

As for the Holy Spirit, who is a [being] proceeding from the Father, he is always in the hands of the Father who sends him and of the Son who bears him, through whom he fulfilled all things. The Father, possessing being out of himself, begat the Son, as we have said, and did not create him, as a river from a source and as an offshoot from a root, and as a radiance from a light, which nature knows to be undivided; through whom let there be glory, dominion, greatness to the Father, before all ages and into all the ages of ages. Amen.

¹ Prov. 8:22.

² Eph. 2:18.

³ 1 Cor. 1:30.

4. *Contra Theopascitas*

A copy of what our father among the Saints, Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, wrote to Liberius, Archbishop of Rome, that God the Logos assumed a complete man for our salvation.

¶ 1. There is one God, immortal, invisible, untouchable: “for God is Spirit”¹, he is spaceless, having no place where he is not.

¶ 2. His Logos is immortal, incorruptible Wisdom, invisible, called his firstborn son, co-operator, without beginning, “who has no beginning of days nor expecting an end of life”². Through him all things were made, and not even one thing was made without him.”³

¶ 3. He is the creator of man; he is the one who showed the ark, how it should be made; he is the one who gave the promise to Abraham; he is the one who came down to save the people; who gave the law to Moses.

¶ 4. He is “the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob”⁴, “who spoke through the prophets”⁵, who delivered the Old and the New Covenant; the one who “at the end of days” took mortal flesh from the Virgin, though he is one who is not mortal himself, weak flesh without being weak himself, flesh which was due to death though he was not due, visible flesh without being visible himself.

¶ 5. It was this [flesh] that was crucified and not he, this that was buried and not he, this that endured all the human suffering like a man, not he; whereas he is the power of God, that is, God.

¹ Jn 4:24.

² Hebr. 7:3.

³ John 1:3.

⁴ Exod. 3:6.

⁵ Lk 20:37.

¶ 6. Who, having loosed the indissoluble bonds of Hades and having destroyed the might of the devil, arose from there and descended; having raised that which was buried he offered it to the Father, having liberated it from the one who had taken hold of it, death.

¶ 7. In him we perceive the Father - for there is one and the same [thing] in divinity, power, being/substance¹, hypostasis, glory and name of God - and this very Son in the Father.

¶ 8. He is the one who, after having taken the flesh was called Jesus, inasmuch as he was also man, that is, he assumed man in himself, "in whom the whole fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily"².

¶ 9. We hold him not to be separated from the Father or the Holy Spirit, neither saying that it was the Father who descended and came to be in man.

¶ 10. So one God Almighty is believed by us.

¶ 11. And for this [reason] our Faith is in one God, Father Almighty, and in his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit;

¶ 12. these are so from the unity of one Godhead, one power, one hypostasis, one being/substance³, one doxology, one lordship, one kingdom, one image of the triad, homoousion, "through whom all things were made"⁴.

¶ 13. So we believe also in a resurrection of the flesh, that is "of our body"⁵ according to the holy Scriptures, when this corruptible and mortal [body] is changed into incorruptibility and immortality by God. Amen.

¹ οὐσία.

² Col. 2:9.

³ οὐσία.

⁴ 1 Cor. 8:6.

⁵ Rom. 8:23.

Epilogue

The aim of this thesis was to give an overview of modern research on Marcellus of Ancyra. From what has been said, it is clear that the questions and problems about this interesting man have not yet been resolved - in fact, diametrical views are held even by scholars belonging to one generation and using the same sources and materials. I have deliberately *not* included a section of 'conclusions', but have tried to show what *implications* certain conclusions (e. g., concerning the ascription of certain writings to Marcellus) might have, at the end of each chapter. My own positions are included there as well, but they do not claim to be final. A new assessment of Marcellus of Ancyra is needed, but it can be done only when the history of the fourth century is re-evaluated in the light of the new results of modern research, and when the criteria and paradigms according to which this history has been interpreted so far have been reflected on (and maybe changed).

For the time being, however, what we have achieved in this brief investigation is to establish with a relatively high degree of certainty that Tetz' valiant attempts have not been as final as one might have desired, and therefore that the only additional writings which can be ascribed to Marcellus are the *De Sancta Ecclesia* and the *Contra Theopaschitas*. As regards the question of Marcellus' orthodoxy, whether his 'final' theology is to be found in the Fragments of the *Contra Asterium* or not remains an open question for scholarship, a question which cannot with any degree of certainty be answered at present.

Bibliography

Titles of books and monographs are given in italics; titles of articles in a periodical and of works published as part of a series of monographs under the auspices of a single body are both given in quotation marks, with the periodical or parent Society in italics. Relevant page numbers are also given where helpful.

To assist in identifying books to which references are made in this thesis, this Bibliography states author and date of publication first, following the method used in the footnotes (the "Harvard System"), and then gives the Title and the full Bibliographical details of each work afterwards.

Andresen, C. (1961). "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes", *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 52 (1961), pp. 1-39.

Barnard, Leslie W. (1971). "Pope Julius, Marcellus of Ancyra and the Council of Sardica. A reconsideration" in *Recherches de Theologie ancienne et Médiévale* XXXVIII (1971), pp. 69-79.

Barnard, Leslie W. (1983). *The Council of Serdica, 343 A. D.*, Sofia 1983.

Beyschlag, Karlmann (1982). *Grundriß der Dogmengeschichte Bd I: Gott und Welt*, Darmstadt 1982.

Brennecke, H. C. (1983). *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Constantius II, Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des "arianischen Streites" (337-361)*, Berlin 1983.

Casey, R. P. (1931). "Armenian Manuscripts of S. Athanasius of Alexandria" in *Harvard Theological Review* XXIV (1931), 43-59.

Casey, R. P (1947). Contribution in *The Armenian version of the pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes (Sermo Maior de Fide) and of the Expositio Fidei* (1947).

Caspari, Carl Paul (1866-1875). *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, herausgegeben und in Abhandlungen erläutert von Dr. C. P. Caspari*. 3 vols, vol. III (Christiania), 1866-1875, pp 28-161.

Chenu, M. D. (1927). "Marcel d'Ancyre" in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* vol. 9 (1927), pp. 1993-1999.

Christie-Murray, David (1989). *A History of Heresy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 1989.

Clercq, V. C. de (1967). Article "Marcellus" in *New Catholic Encyclopaedia IX*, Washington 1967.

Daniélou, Jean (1955). Bulletin, *Histoire de la Christologie*, Recherches de Science Religieuse 43 (1955) pp. 589ff.

Daniélou, Jean (1966). Bulletin, *Histoire de la Christologie*, Recherches de Science Religieuse 54 (1966) pp. 306ff.

Daniélou, Jean (1966). Bulletin, *Histoire de la Christologie*, Recherches de Science Religieuse 54 (1966) pp. 309ff..

Dorner, Isaac August (1839). *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die neuesten*, Stuttgart 1839.

Dorner, Isaac August (1859). *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. Division First, the First Four Centuries. Translated by W. L. Alexander and D. W. Simon, Edinburgh 1859.

Dowling, M. J. (1987). *Marcellus of Ancyra: Problems of Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Ph.D. for Queen's University Belfast, 1987.

Duchesne, Mgr Louis (1957). *Early History of the Christian Church*, Murray, London 1917. Repr. 1957.



- Feige, G.** (1987). *Die Lehre Markells von Ankyra in der Darstellung seiner Gegner*. Theologische Dissertation, Erfurt 1987.
- Fondevilla, J.** (1953). "Ideas cristológicas de Marcelo de Ancyra", *Estudios Eclesiásticos* XXVII, Madrid 1953, pp. 21-64.
- Gericke, W.** (1940). "Marcell von Ancyra. Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist. Sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie und zum Neuen Testament". *Theologische Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte*. Halle 1940.
- Gessel, W.** (1975). "Das primatiale Bewußtsein Julius' I im Lichte der Interaktion zwischen der Cathedra Petri und den zeitgenössischen Synoden" in *Festgabe H. Tuechle 'Konzil und Papst'*, *Historische Beiträge zur Frage der höchsten Gewalt in der Kirche*. Hrsg. G. Schwiger, München 1975.
- Grillmeier, Aloys** (1977). "Ὁ κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος. Eine Studie zu einer christologischen Bezeichnung der Väterzeit" in *Traditio* XXXIII (1977), pp. 1-63.
- Gwatkin, Henry Melvill** (1900). *Studies of Arianism, chiefly referring to the character and chronology of the reaction which followed the Council of Nicaea*. Bell & Co. (Cambridge) 1900.
- Hall, S. G.** (1987). "The Creed of Sardica" in *Studia Patristica* XIX (1987) pp. 173-184.
- Hanson, R. P. C.** (1983) "The date and authorship of Pseudo-Anthimus' *De sancta ecclesia*" in *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* LXXXIII (1983), pp. 251-254.
- Hanson, R. P. C.** (1987). "The Transformation of Images in the Trinitarian Theology of the Fourth Century" in *Studia Patristica* XVII/I (1987), pp. 97-119.
- Hanson, R. P. C.** (1988a). "The Source and Significance of the Fourth 'Oratio contra Arianos' Attributed to Athanasius" in *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 no. 3 (1988), pp. 257-266.
- Hanson, R. P. C.** (1988b). *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988. Especially pp. 217-238 on the Arian Controversy.

Harnack, Adolf von (1931). *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 3 volumes, vol. 2. Berlin 1931.

Hefele, C. J. and **Leclerq**, H (1907). *Histoire des conciles 1*, Paris 1907.

Hess, Hamilton (1958). *The Canons of the Council of Sardica AD 343, a Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law*, Oxford 1958.

↙ **Molland**, E. (1970). “‘Des Reich kein Ende haben wird’. Hintergrund und Bedeutung einer dogmatischen Aussage in nicäno-constantinopolitanischen Glaubensbekenntnis”, *Opuscula Patristica, Bibliotheca theologica Norvegica 2*, Oslo 1970.

Hoss, K. (1899). *Studien über das Schrifttum und die Theologie des Athanasius*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1899.

Hübner, Reinhard M. (1971). “Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankyra” in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Gregoire de Nyssa: Actes du colloque du Chevetogne (22-26 septembre 1969) organisé par le Centre de Recherches sur l'Hellénisme tardif de la Sorbonne*, ed. par M. Harl. E. J. Brill, Leiden 1971.

Hübner, Reinhard M. (1974) “Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankyra”, *Philosophia Patrum 2*, Leiden 1974.

Hübner, Reinhard M. (1989) “Die Schrift des Apollinaris von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea”, *Patristische Texte und Studien Bd 30*, Berlin 1989.

Kannengiesser, Ch. (1984). Article “Marcello di Ancira” in *Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane diretto da Angelo di Berfardino* vol. II, pp. 2089-2091, Casale Monferrato 1984.

Kelly, J. N. D. (1977). *Early Christian Doctrines*, A. & C. Black, London 1958. Revised Edition (1977) pp. 240-243.

Kelly, J. N. D. (1950). *Early Christian Creeds*, London 1950.

- Klostermann, E.** (1906). "Eusebius Werke IV. Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcells", *GCS [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte]* 14, Leipzig 1906.
- Kretschmar, G.** (1956). *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen 1956.
- Lampe, G. W. H.** (1948a). "Some notes on the significance of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ in the Greek Fathers" in *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1948), pp. 58ff..
- Lampe, G. W. H.** (1948b). "The exegesis of some Biblical Texts by Marcellus of Ancyra and Pseudochrysostom's Homily on Ps 96" in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 49 (1948), pp. 169-175.
- Lienhard, Joseph T.** (1982). "Marcellus of Ancyra in modern research" in *Theological Studies* XLIII (1982), pp. 466-503.
- Lienhard, Joseph T.** (1983). "The exegesis of 1 Cor. 15:24-28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus" in *Vigiliae Christianae* XXXVII (1983), pp. 340-359.
- Lienhard, Joseph T.** (1986a). *Contra Marcellum. The influence of Marcellus of Ancyra on fourth-century Greek theology*, Kath-theol. Habilitations-schrift, Freiburg 1986.
- Lienhard, Joseph T.** (1986b). "Ps. Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomeos: Analogies and Comparison" in *Vigiliae Christianae* 40 (1986), pp. 365-389.
- Lienhard, Joseph T.** (1987) "Acacius of Caesarea's 'Contra Marcellum': Its Place in Theology and Controversy" in *Studia Patristica* XIX (1987), pp. 185-188.
- Lienhard, Joseph T.** (1989a). "Acacius of Caesarea: 'Contra Marcellum'. Historical and Theological Considerations" in *Christianesimo nella Storia* 10/1 (1989), pp. 1-22.
- Lienhard, Joseph T.** (1989b). "Basil of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra and 'Sabellius'" in *Church History USA* 58 (1989), pp. 157-167.

- Logan**, Alastair H. B. (1987). "Marcellus of Ancyra and anti-Arian Polemic" in *Studia Patristica* XIX (1987), pp. 189-197.
- Lohse**, Bernhard (1963). *Epochen der Dogmengeschichte*, Stuttgart 1963.
- Loofs**, Friedrich (1902). "Die Trinitätslehre von Marcellus von Ancyra" in *Sitzungsberichte der Preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaft*, Berlin 1902.
- Loofs**, Friedrich (1903). "Marcellus von Ancyra" in *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3 Auflage, Bd. XII (1903), pp. 259-265.
- Loofs**, Friedrich (1924). *Paulus von Samosata* (Leipzig 1924)
- Loofs**, Friedrich (1930). *Theophilus von Antiochien, Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus* (Leipzig 1930)
- Loofs**, Friedrich (1909). *Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Homoousianer von Sardica*, Berlin 1909.
- Mercati**, G. (1905). *Anthimi Nicomediensis episcopi et martyris de santa Ecclesia*, Città del Vaticano 1905, pp. 87-98.
- Neander**, A. (1857). *Dr A. Neanders Christliche Dogmengeschichte*. Hrsg von J. L. Jacobi. Teil I, 1857.
- Newman**, John Henry (1842-4). *Select Treatises of St Athanasius in controversy with the Arians, translated, with notes and indices*, 2 vols, Oxford 1842-1844.
- Nikolopoulos**, Pan. G. (1966). Article "Μάρκελλος" in *θρησκευτική και Ηθική Έγκυκλοπαίδεια* 8^{ος} Τομος. Athens 1966, pp. 738-739.
- Nitzsch**, Friedrich August Berthold (1870). *Grundriss der Christlichen Dogmen-geschichte. Th. 1: Die patristische Periode*, Berlin 1870
- Nordberg**, H. (1962). "Athanasiana" Part I, 196 [pp. 49-62], *Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* XXX, 2, Helsinki 1962.
- Opitz**, H. G. (1935). *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius von Alexandrien*, Berlin 1935.

- Perler**, Dr Othmar (1968). Article "Marcellus" in *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche* BD VII pp. 4-5. Herausgegeben von Joseph Höfer, Rom und Karl Rahner, Innsbruck. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage, Freiburg 1968.
- Pietri**, Ch. (1974). "La question d'Athanase vue de Rome (338-360)" in *Politique et théologie chez Athanasie d'Alexandrie* éd. Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris 1974, pp. 93-126.
- Pollard**, T. E. (1958-9). "The exegesis of Scripture and the Arian controversy", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XLI (1958-1959), pp. 414-429.
- Pollard**, T. E. (1970). *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*, Cambridge 1970.
- Pollard**, T. E. (1972). "Marcellus of Ancyra, a neglected Father" in *Epektasis*, Essays in memory of Daniélou, Paris 1972, pp. 187-196.
- Prestige**, G. L. (1981). *God in Patristic Thought*, SPCK London 1981 (first published 1952), pp. 212-213.
- Quasten**, Johannes (1960). "Discourses against the Arians", in *Patrology* Vol 3 pp. 26-28, Utrecht/Maryland 1960.
- Rapisarda**, G. M. (1973). "La questione dell' autenticità del *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi et Contra Arianos*" in *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 23 (1973), pp. 5-54.
- Rettberg**, ^{Christian} Heinrich Georg (1794). *Marcelliana: collected fragments. Accedit Eunanii Έκθεσις Πίστεως emendatior. Edidit et animadversionibus instruxit Christ. Hein. Georg. Rettberg*, Göttingen 1794.
- Richard**, Marcel (1945). "L'Introduction du mot 'hypostase' dans la theologie de l'Incarnation" in *Mélanges de Sciences Religieuses* 2 (1945), pp. 5-32, 243-270.
- Richard**, Marcel (1947). "Saint Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens" in *Mélanges de Sciences Religieuses* 4 (1947), pp. 5-54.
- Richard**, Marcel (1949a). "Un opuscule méconnu de Marcel évêque d'Ancyre" in *Mélanges de Sciences Religieuses* 6 (1949), pp. 5-28.

- Richard**, Marcel (1949b). "Bulletin de Patrologie" in *Mélanges de Science. Religieuse* 6 (1949), pp. 117-133.
- Riggi**, C. (1984). "La dialogue des Marcelliens dans le Panarion 72" in *Studia Patristica* XVI (1984), pp. 368-373.
- Ritter**, Adolf Martin (1965). "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II Ökumenischen Konzils". *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmen-geschichte* 15, Göttingen 1965.
- Rondeau**, M. J. (1969). "La commentaire de Psaumes de Diodore de Tarse et l'exégèse antique du Psaume 109/110" in *Revue de l'Histoire de Religions* CLXXVI (1969), pp. 5-31 and 153-188.
- Sansbury**, C. J. (1983). "Athanasius, Marcellus and Eusebius; some thoughts on their resemblances and disagreements" in *Arianism*, Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford 1983, pp. 281-286.
- Scheidweiler**, Felix (1952/3). "Ein Glaubensbekenntnis des Eustathius von Antiochien?" in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44 (1952/3), pp. 237-249.
- Scheidweiler**, Felix (1954). "Wer ist der Verfasser des sog. *Sermo Maior der Fide*?", in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* XLVII (1954), pp. 333-357.
- Scheidweiler**, Felix (1955). "Marcell von Ancyra", in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46 (1955), pp. 202-214.
- Schendel**, E. (1971). "Herrschaft und Unterwerfung Christi. 1 Korinther 15:24-28 in Exegese und Theologie der Väter bis zum Ausgang des 4. Jh." in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese* 12, Tübingen 1971.
- Schleiermacher**, F. D. E. (1822). "Über den Gegensatz der Sabellianischen und der Athanasianischen Vorstellung von der Trinität" in *Theologische Zeitschrift* 3, pp. 295-408, Berlin 1822.

- Schneemelcher, W.** (1954). "Zur Chronologie des arianischen Streites" in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 79 (1954), pp. 393-400.
- Schneemelcher, W.** (1960). "Marcellus", *RGG³* IV, Tübingen 1960.
- Schneemelcher, W.** (1977). "Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien 341" in *Bonner Festgabe Johannes Strauß*, Bonn 1977.
- Schwartz, E.** (1925). "Der sogenannte Sermo Maior de Fide des Athanasius" in *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jg 1924, München 1925.
- Simonetti, Manlio** (1953-5). "Sulla Paternità del 'De Incarnatione Dei Verbi et Contra Arianos'", *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 5 (1953-55), pp. 5-19.
- Simonetti, Manlio** (1974). "Ancora sulla paternità dello ps. atanasiano *Sermo Maior de Fide*" in *Vetera Christianorum* 11/2, 1974, pp. 333-343.
- Simonetti, Manlio** (1975). "La crisi ariana nel IV secolo". *Studia Ephemerides "Augustinianum"* 11, Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum", Rome 1975.
- Stevenson, J.** (1989) [ed.] *Creeds, Councils and Controversies. Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church AD 337-461*, SPCK (Revised Edition) 1989, with additional footnotes by W. H. C. Frend.
- Stülcken, Albrecht** (1899). "Athanasiana. Literar- und dogmen-geschichtliche Untersuchungen" in *Texte und Untersuchungen* XIX.4, pp. 61-66, Leipzig 1899.
- Tetz, Martin** (1955/6). "Zur Edition der dogmatischen Schriften des Athanasius von Alexandrien" in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 67 (1955/56).
- Tetz, Martin** (1964). "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I: Eine Markellische Schrift *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*" in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* LXXV (1964), pp. 217-270.
- Tetz, Martin** (1968). "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra II. Markells Lehre von der Adamssohnschaft Christi und eine pseudoklementinische Tradition über die wahren Lehrer von Propheten" in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* LXXIX (1968), pp. 3-42.

- Tetz, Martin** (1972). "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra III: Die pseudoathanasianische Epistula ad Liberium, ein Markellisches Bekenntnis" in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* LXXXIII (1972), pp. 145-195.
- Tetz, Martin** (1973). "Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien. Die markellianische "Expositio fidei ad Athanasium" des Diakonos Eugenios von Ankyra" in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 64 (1973), pp. 75-121.
- Tetz, Martin** (1984). "Zum altrömischen Bekenntnis. Ein Beitrag des Marcellus von Ancyra" in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75 (1984), pp. 107-127.
- Tetz, Martin** (1989). "Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien (341) und Marcellus von Ancyra. Zu der Glaubenserklärung des Theophronius von Tyana und ihren Folgen" in *Oecumenica et Patristica, Festschrift für W. Schneemelcher*, Geneva 1989.
- Trummer, B.** (1970). *Anastasis. Beitrag zur Auslegung und Auslegungsgeschichte von 1 Kor. 15 in der griechische Kirche bis Theodoret*. Dissertationen der Universität Graz 1, Wien 1970.
- Ussher, J.** (1647). *De Romanae Ecclesiae Symbolo Apostolico Vetere* (1647).
- Weber, A.** (1965). *APXH. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, Neustadt 1965.
- Weigl, Eduard** (1914). "Untersuchungen zur Christologie des hl. Athanasius", *Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengechichte* XII, 4 (1914), pp. 150-158.
- Zahn, Theodor** (1867). *Marcellus von Ancyra, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie*, Gotha 1867.

Addenda

- ALTANER, B., Patrology, 1961.
- QUASTEN, J., Patrology, vol. iii (1966), pp. 197-201.
- MERCATI, G., Studi e testi, 5.
- MERCATI, G., "Alcune note de letteratura patristica", Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Milan, Serie 2.31 (1898), 1033-1036.
- SCHWARTZ, E., "Zur Geschichte des Athanasius", Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 3 (1902), pp. 230-8, 272-9, 292-307, 310-24.

Works not Published under an Author's or Editor's Name

“Εὐσέβιος Καισαρείας – Μάρκελλος Ἀγκύρας – Βασίλειος Ἀγκύρας” in Βιβλιοθήκη Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων καὶ Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Συγγραφέων 29. Published by the Ἀποστολική Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Athens 1962.

