

CURRENT THEOLOGY

MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA IN MODERN RESEARCH

JOSEPH T. LIENHARD, S.J.

Marquette University

Marcellus of Ancyra—contemporary and friend of Athanasius, defender of the Nicene faith, and for Basil of Caesarea and many others a dangerous heretic—has never attracted much attention in English-language research in patristics and the history of dogma. German Protestant research, on the other hand, has long been fascinated by Marcellus. Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930) chose a text from Marcellus, along with one from Goethe, as the epigraph for his history of dogma.¹ The text reads:

For the concept “dogma” is a product of human thought and human insight. That this is the case is sufficiently demonstrated for us by the dogmatic method of the physicians; and the so-called dogmas of the philosophers also bear witness to it. And I believe that everyone knows that the decrees of the Senate are even now still called dogmas of the Senate.²

Later in his history of dogma Harnack devotes a long footnote to Marcellus, in which he calls him “a most interesting phenomenon in the history of dogma.”³ Of the other two great German historians of dogma, Reinhold Seeberg (1859–1935) calls Marcellus “one of the most individualistic theologians of the ancient Church.”⁴ But it was Friedrich Loofs (1858–1928) for whom Marcellus took on heroic stature, as one of the last defenders of the better way. Loofs will be considered at length below.

After a short sketch of Marcellus’ life, I would like to review, in summary form, the literature on him which has appeared in the last century, especially since World War II. There is a particular reason for this date. Before the war all studies of Marcellus were based exclusively on the fragments of his early writings preserved under his name by ancient authors.⁵ Beginning in 1949, however, several works previously

¹ A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 1 (5th ed., reprint of the 4th ed. of 1909; Tübingen: Mohr, 1931) 2.

² Marcellus of Ancyra, fragment 86. This and all translations (except some biblical texts from the RSV) are the author’s. The critical edition of the extant fragments of Marcellus’ writings is in *Eusebius Werke 4: Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcellus*, ed. E. Klostermann (GCS 14; Leipzig, 1906) 185–215.

³ Harnack, *Lehrbuch* 2, 242.

⁴ R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 2 (4th ed., reprint of the 3rd ed. of 1923; Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1953) 95.

⁵ Most of the extant fragments were preserved by the church historian Eusebius of Caesarea in his two works against Marcellus, written between 336 and 341: *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia* (GCS 14, 1–182). Some other fragments were preserved

considered anonymous or pseudonymous have been attributed to Marcellus and, in some cases, dated in the latter part of his life. If the attributions are correct, then material is available for a much more thorough study of Marcellus' development and influence than was previously possible, and his place in the history of theology in the fourth century needs a thorough re-evaluation. In any case, the traditional picture of Marcellus and his teaching should be questioned.

LIFE

Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra (now Ankara) in Galatia, personally witnessed most of the Arian controversy.⁶ The date of his birth is unknown; it was probably ca. 280. His name first appears in the list of participants in the Synod of Ancyra in 314,⁷ which dealt with the *lapsi* of the persecution of Diocletian; he was therefore already a bishop in that year. More significantly, he was present at the Council of Nicaea in 325, where he was among the most ardent opponents of Arius. After the council he was, along with Eustathius of Antioch, one of the earliest defenders of that council and its use of *homoousion*.⁸

by Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion* 72 (*Ancoratus und Panarion* 3, ed. K. Holl [GCS 37; Leipzig, 1933] 255-67). These fragments are collected and ordered by Klostermann in GCS 14, 185-215, as noted.

⁶ Good biographical sketches of Marcellus are found in M. D. Chenu, "Marcel d'Ancyre," *DTC* 9 (1927) 1993-98, and W. Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra: Der Logos-Christologe und Bibliolist. Sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie und zum Neuen Testament* (Theologische Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirche- und Geistesgeschichte, 10; Halle: Akademischer Verlag, 1940) 6-27. General histories of the Arian controversy are also helpful; see especially H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1900); M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum" 11; Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1975); and T. A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism* (2 vols.; Patristic Monograph Series 8; Cambridge [Mass.]: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979). E. Schwartz, "Zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts," *ZNW* 34 (1935) 129-213, reprinted in his *Gesammelte Schriften* 4: *Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und ihres Rechts* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960) 1-110, is also useful, although marked by Schwartz's conviction that Athanasius was a politician rather than a theologian. On varying interpretations of Athanasius (politician, theologian, ascetic), see M. Tetz, "Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien," *ZKG* 90 (1979) 304-38. And recently, A. M. Ritter, "Arianismus," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 3 (1978) 692-719.

⁷ C. J. Hefele and H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* 1 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1907) 298-326.

⁸ On Eustathius see especially R. V. Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch and His Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: University Press, 1928). There is a growing consensus that Athanasius began his literary activity much later than had formerly been assumed. *Contra gentes* and *De incarnatione*, his earliest writings, are now generally dated 335-37, during his exile in Trier, and not in 318, before the outbreak of the Arian controversy. See Ch. Kannengiesser, "La date de l'apologie d'Athanase 'Contre les païens' et 'Sur l'incarnation du Verbe,'" *RSR* 58 (1970) 383-428; and idem, "Le témoignage des *Lettres festales* de saint Athanase sur la date de l'apologie *Contre les païens sur*

Many Eastern bishops, however, while rejecting Arius' doctrine, saw in the Nicene *homoousion* the threat of Sabellian modalism. This faction, basically Origenist and led by Eusebius of Nicomedia, soon moved against the Nicene party. Under its influence Eustathius of Antioch was deposed in 330 (a more probable date than 326 or 331), and Athanasius in 335. In 336 a synod in Constantinople deposed Marcellus and named Basil as his successor in Ancyra.⁹

The reason for Marcellus' deposition was a book which he had written in 335 or shortly before. The book (its title is unknown and it exists only in fragments) was a refutation of a letter written by the Arian Asterius the Sophist in defense of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and in particular of a letter which Eusebius had written to Paulinus of Tyre.¹⁰ Asterius had represented a moderate Arian position. In his answer Marcellus presented a theological system which differed radically from the Origenism which was prevalent in the East. Marcellus' book (or its fragments) is the classical source, for both ancient and modern authors, of knowledge of his theology or heresy, depending on one's point of view. It is known principally through the two refutations of it which the church historian Eusebius of Caesarea wrote after Marcellus' deposition in 336 (and before his own death in 341): *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia*.¹¹

In contrast to the Arian theology of Asterius, Marcellus stressed absolute monotheism,¹² taking the Nicene *homoousion* as *tautousion*, or "numerically identical in essence." God, for Marcellus, is a Monad; in technical language, Marcellus insists on one *ousia*, one *hypostasis*, and one *prosōpon* in God. The Monad may be called "God" and "Lord," but not "Father." The Word exists eternally, as the dynamic element in the Godhead, but it is identical with the Monad; from all eternity it reposed in God, and was not spoken until creation. Marcellus understands the Trinity in a strictly economic sense. It is in connection with creation and redemption that an expansion (*platysmos*) of the Monad into a Dyad,

l'incarnation du Verbe," *RSR* 52 (1964) 91-100. J. C. M. van Winden, "On the Date of Athanasius' Apologetical Treatises," *VC* 29 (1975) 291-95, argues again for the early date. On Eustathius see also R. Lorenz, "Die Eustathius von Antiochien zugeschriebenen Schriften gegen Photin," *ZNW* 71 (1980) 109-28.

⁹ On the Synod of Constantinople, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* 1, 667-78. Basil of Ancyra was to achieve notoriety in 358-59 as the leader of the Homoiousian party. He was himself deposed by the Homoian party in 360.

¹⁰ For this detail see Simonetti, *La crisi ariana* 131, n. 102. The extant fragments of Asterius' letter (excerpted from the fragments of Marcellus' refutation) are printed by G. Bardy, *Recherches sur saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1936) 348-54. See also idem, "Astérius le Sophiste," *RHE* 22 (1926) 221-72, where he too states (238) that Marcellus was refuting Asterius' letter, not his *Syntagmation*.

¹¹ GCS 14, 1-182.

¹² References to the fragments of Marcellus would unnecessarily encumber this summary.

and then into a Triad, takes place. Marcellus seems to think in terms of three economies. The first is at the moment of creation, when the Word proceeds from the Father (here he uses the title "Father"), without becoming a distinct *hypostasis*, and creates the world. The second economy is the Incarnation: when the Word becomes flesh or man, it also becomes Son. (Marcellus never speaks of a begetting within the Godhead itself, and generally avoids the title "Son" for the pre-existent Word.) Before the Incarnation, the Word had no other name but Word; after the Incarnation, it or the Incarnate receives all the other titles of Christ: Way, Life, Resurrection, Bread, Door, and so on. The third economy is the expansion of the Godhead into a Triad, which takes place on Easter night with the sending of the Holy Spirit (Jn 20:22). It is only then that the Spirit is distinguished from the Word. Since the expansion of the Monad into a Triad exists for the economy, or the order of redemption, it is not eternal. At the end, Marcellus believed, the Word and the Spirit would return into the Godhead, and God would again be an absolute Monad. In this connection he made extensive use of 1 Cor 15:24-28, where Paul writes that at the end Christ will deliver the kingdom to God the Father, the Son will himself be subjected to Him who put all things under him, and God will be all in all.¹³

This view was a particularly effective refutation of Arianism. The Arians had used many passages from the New Testament (and the Old) to show that the Son is subordinate to the Father. For Marcellus, the title "Son" applies only to the incarnate Word, and all the difficulties with the subordinationism of the NT are solved with one stroke. But it is not primarily as a refutation of Arianism that Marcellus' thought is interesting. As will be shown below, it is his system itself and its precedents that have attracted the most attention.

Following the death of Constantine, Marcellus returned (in 337 or 338) to his see, but within a year was again deposed. In 339 he went to Rome,

They are readily available in Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra* 103-30.

¹³ The assertion that the duration of Christ's kingdom is finite is the teaching which made Marcellus notorious. The Creed of Constantinople (381) contains the clause "of whose kingdom there will be no end" in refutation of Marcellus. Marcellus drew on 1 Cor 15:24: "Then comes the end, when [Christ] delivers the kingdom to God the Father"; the bishops at Constantinople used Lk 1:33: "Of his kingdom there will be no end." See E. Molland, "Des Reich kein Ende haben wird: Hintergrund und Bedeutung einer dogmatischen Aussage im nicäno-constantinopolitanischen Glaubensbekenntnis," in his *Opuscula patristica* (Bibliotheca theologica Norvegica 2; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1970) 235-53, and G. W. H. Lampe, "Some Notes on the Significance of EASILEIA TOU THEOU, BASILEIA CHRISTOU in the Greek Fathers," *JTS* 49 (1948) 58-73. A.-M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol: Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II. ökumenischen Konzils* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 192, n. 1, lists other anti-Marcellian passages in Eastern creeds.

as did Athanasius and other deposed bishops. The Eusebian party had sent letters ahead, calling into question Marcellus' orthodoxy. Julius of Rome invited the Eusebians to participate in a synod at Rome, but they never came. Before the synod took place, Marcellus addressed a letter to Julius in which he confessed his faith in the form of the Roman baptismal creed.¹⁴ In October or November of 340, the synod took place and acquitted Marcellus and Athanasius of all charges of heresy.¹⁵

Julius informed the Eastern bishops by letter of the rehabilitation of Athanasius and Marcellus, and probably included, at Marcellus' request, the latter's confession of faith.¹⁶ The Easterners resented Julius' action and at the Dedication Council of Antioch in 341 condemned Marcellus by name in the so-called third creed.¹⁷ The division was sharpened at the Synod of Sardica (Sofia in Bulgaria) in 343 (or perhaps 342), where the Eusebians refused to tolerate the seating of Athanasius and Marcellus, as the Westerners wished. The synod split into two parts, and the Easterners, probably gathered at Philippopolis, condemned Marcellus as "haereticorum omnium execrabilior pestis."¹⁸ The Westerners again

¹⁴ The letter is printed in GCS 14, 214–15, and GCS 37, 256–59. Marcellus omitted the word "Father" in the first article and added "eternal life" in the third. The omission of "Father" can be explained by Marcellus' denial of the eternal generation of the Son.

¹⁵ The synod is sometimes dated in 341. On this synod see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* 1, 699–702.

¹⁶ Julius' letter is cited by Athanasius in his *Apologia contra Arianos* 21–35 (critical ed. by H.-G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke* 2/1 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938] 102–13). See also W. Gessel, "Das primatale Bewusstsein Julius' I. im Lichte der Interaktionen zwischen der Cathedra Petri und den zeitgenössischen Synoden," in *Konzil und Papst: Historische Beiträge zur Frage der höchsten Gewalt in der Kirche. Festgabe für Hermann Tüchle* (ed. G. Schwaiger; Munich: Schöningh, 1975) 63–74. Gessel's concern is Julius' exercise of the Petrine office. He analyzes Julius' letter to the Eusebians and, on the basis of a change in tone, suspects that he can detect an echo of an aversion toward Marcellus on Athanasius' part (73). L. W. Barnard, "Pope Julius, Marcellus of Ancyra and the Council of Sardica: A Reconsideration," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 38 (1971) 69–79, reviews the events of 340 and 343 from a Western viewpoint, with particular use of Hilary of Poitiers' *De synodis* as a source.

¹⁷ Text in *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, ed. A. Hahn (3rd ed. by G. L. Hahn; Breslau: Morgenstern, 1897) 186–87. See J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (2nd ed.; London: Longmans, 1960) 263–74. On the Dedication Council (council *en trois enkainois, in encaeniis*) summoned at Antioch to celebrate the dedication of the golden church begun by Constantine and completed by Constantius, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* 1, 702–33.

¹⁸ The text of the decree of the Eastern delegates to Sardica is extant only in Latin; it was included by Hilary of Poitiers in his *Opus historicum aduersus Valentem et Vrsacium*. This work is extant only in fragments, printed in *S. Hilarii episcopi Pictauiensis opera* 4, ed. Alfredus Feder (CSEL 65; Vienna, 1916); the decree is on pp. 48–78, the phrase cited on p. 49. The Eastern bishops also added some anti-Marcellian anathemas to the Fourth Creed of Antioch. See Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* 274–77. The full text of the creed is also in Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole* 190–91 (in Latin).

acquitted Marcellus.¹⁹

Finally, in 345, Eastern bishops gathered at the third Synod of Antioch again condemned the teaching of Marcellus (which they lumped together with that of his disciple Photinus) in the *Ekthesis makrostichos* or "Creed of the Long Lines."²⁰ A synod at Milan, presented with this formula, acquiesced in the condemnation of Photinus, but not of Marcellus.²¹ Hilary of Poitiers writes that Athanasius broke with Marcellus in 345 or 346.²² With this, Marcellus apparently vanishes from history for twenty-five years.

Around 370, however, a group of clergy from Ancyra who were loyal to Marcellus, led by the deacon Eugenius, sent a letter to Athanasius confessing their faith and asking for his recognition.²³ They accepted the title "Son" for the pre-existent Word and laid stress on the one *hypostasis* of the Godhead and on the *homoousion*. An Egyptian synod under

¹⁹ The text of the (Western) synodal letter of Sardica is found among the fragments of Hilary's *Opus historicum* (CSEL 65, 103–26). For the events at Sardica and Philippopolis, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* 1, 737–823. On the Western Creed of Sardica, called by Harnack "the most unambiguous expression of Western thought on the subject" of the Trinity (*Lehrbuch* 2, 246, n. 1), see Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* 277–79. Specifically, the Westerners insisted on one *hypostasis* in the Godhead. The text of the creed (in Greek) is in Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole* 188–90.

²⁰ Text *ibid.* 192–96; commentary in Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* 279–80. The creed avoided the phrase "three *hypostases*" in an attempt to conciliate the Westerners. See also Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* 1, 847.

²¹ Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* 280–81; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* 1, 847–48. The narrative is among the fragments of Hilary, *Opus historicum* (CSEL 65, 142–43). Photinus, Marcellus' disciple and deacon, and later Bishop of Sirmium, seems to have gone far beyond Marcellus and taught pure psilanthropism.

²² Among the fragments of Hilary's *Opus historicum* (CSEL 65, 146). The text in question reads: "But the same Athanasius separated Marcellus from communion with himself before Photinus was condemned [i.e., at Sirmium in 347]. [Marcellus] had been restored to his see by the decision of the Synod of Sardica, after he read the book which he had written and published. . . . [But Marcellus] tried to introduce some other new [doctrines] and in ambiguous sermons to follow the way of teaching into which Photinus had fallen." No other evidence suggests that Marcellus ever took up Photinus' teaching. Schwartz, "Zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts" 145–46, thinks that Athanasius dropped Marcellus in order to win permission from the emperors to return to Alexandria; this is fully in line with Schwartz's interpretation of Athanasius as a politician. Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra* 21–22, suggests that Marcellus acquiesced in Athanasius' rejection of him in order to help Athanasius return to Alexandria. He interprets the split as a temporary measure, not as a rejection on theological grounds. This interpretation seems almost too benign; but Athanasius did remain friendly to Marcellus. See Athanasius' *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* 6 (PG 25, 700C–701A), written in 358.

²³ Eugenius Diaconus, *Expositio fidei ad Athanasium pro causa Marcelli Ancyrani*; critical ed. by M. Tetz, "Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien: Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasium des Diakons Eugenios von Ankyra," *ZNW* 64 (1973) 75–121; text, 78–84.

Athanasius accepted this confession.²⁴ Marcellus died in 374, probably over the age of ninety.²⁵

Opposition to Marcellus, however, had not died out. In particular, Basil of Caesarea was strongly opposed to him, both before and after Marcellus' death.²⁶ Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, quite unlike his older brother, appears to have been sympathetic to Marcellus.²⁷ The difference may be traced to Basil's emphasis on the three *hypostases* in the Godhead in contrast to Gregory's emphasis on the one *ousia*. In the year after Marcellus' death, his disciples at Ancyra composed another confession, in which Marcellus' distinctive positions were further blurred.²⁸ The end of the Marcellian faction came with the Council of Constantinople in 381, which in its first canon condemned "Marcellians" among other heretics and in its seventh canon declared their baptism invalid.²⁹

Marcellus' biography exemplifies some of the differences between East and West. Marcellus was one of the earliest opponents of Arianism after Nicaea. He was deposed ten years after the council, and by 345 his teaching had been condemned by name by three Eastern synods. But the West remained sympathetic to him and never accepted the condemnation. This was quite in line with the long-standing Western emphasis on the divine unity and its uneasiness with expressions like "three *hypostases*." The Easterners consistently feared Sabellian modalism (although by the fourth century Sabellius' authentic teaching was practically unknown), while the Westerners suspected the East of an inclination to tritheism.

²⁴ Ibid. 118.

²⁵ The date is provided by Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72, 1.

²⁶ This is evident from Basil's letters. In *Ep.* 69 (371) he wanted Athanasius to condemn Marcellus, but apparently Athanasius never answered the letter. In *Ep.* 125 (373) he wanted Eustathius of Sebaste to subscribe to a condemnation of Marcellus. In *Ep.* 207 (375) he warned the clergy of Neocaesarea against Marcellus' errors. In *Ep.* 239 (376) he accused the West of being sympathetic to Marcellus, and in *Ep.* 263 (377), addressed to the Westerners, accused Paulinus of Antioch of sympathy for Marcellus' teachings. In *Ep.* 265 (also 377) he warned exiled Egyptian bishops not to receive Marcellus' followers into communion too easily.

²⁷ See R. Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankyra," in *Ecriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse* (ed. M. Harl; Leiden: Brill, 1971) 199–229. Hübner's hypothesis (206) is that Gregory wrote his treatise *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus* in 379 to facilitate the reconciliation of the Marcellians; Gregory is at pains to show that "three *hypostases*" is not tritheistic. Hübner also points out that between 381 and 384 Gregory wrote the tract *In illud: Tunc et ipse filius* (on 1 Cor 15:28) on Marcellus' favorite passage, using Origen and Marcellus as sources. Moreover, in *Ep.* 5, Gregory has to answer the accusation that he receives Marcellians into his church too easily.

²⁸ Preserved in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72, 11–12. Specifically, eight clerics of Ancyra wrote to eleven bishops exiled in Diocaesarea.

²⁹ Text, e.g., in *Concilioorum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. J. Alberigo et al. (3rd ed.; Bologna: Istituto per le Scienze Religiose, 1973) 31, 35.

MODERN RESEARCH

Modern historical research on Marcellus began with the rise of the historical-critical method. Nineteenth-century historians of dogma discussed his teaching and made him the subject of several monographs.³⁰ But the most significant moment in research on Marcellus was the publication of a monograph on him by Theodor Zahn (1838–1933) in 1867.³¹ Zahn set out to change the categories under which Marcellus is considered, and specifically to avoid simply labeling him heretical or orthodox—which until then had been the principal concern of those who wrote about him.³²

Positively, Zahn saw Marcellus as a “more reactionary than revolutionary phenomenon”³³—that is (for Zahn), Marcellus deliberately broke with the prevailing Origenism of the fourth century and returned to biblical norms for Christology and the doctrine of the Trinity.³⁴

To the extent that Marcellus granted that Christ was God’s Son since he—although he existed from eternity—had a beginning of human life through God’s particular action upon the Virgin Mary, he returned to the oldest forms of Christology of the postapostolic age. To the extent that he chose the name “Logos” as the most appropriate expression for the prehuman existence of the one who, as incarnate, is Christ and the Son of God, and designated that immanent activity of the divine being which creates the world as a procession of the Logos and only figuratively as its begetting, he returned to the more perfect forms of the Logos doctrine of the second-century apologists, while excluding theogonic notions found in these authors. In his total theological perspective he is a faithful disciple of Irenaeus. The development which lay between Irenaeus and himself, especially the Alexandrian theology, could only have seemed to him an aberration.³⁵

When he attempts to classify Marcellus’ theology, Zahn uses a category favored by some historians of dogma, namely, “the theology of Asia Minor” (*kleinasiatische, vorderasiatische Theologie*), in contrast to philosophical or Alexandrian theology. The “theology of Asia Minor,” as Zahn and others see it, is rooted in the Johannine writings and is in this sense biblical. This tradition lays emphasis on the historical Christ and his salvific work. While it uses the term “Logos” to designate the pre-existent Christ, it does not speculate about the origin of the pre-existent or his preincarnate functions. All of its Trinitarian speculation is economic. The theological tradition of Asia Minor is found in most of the Apostolic Fathers (particularly Ignatius of Antioch) and Melito of Sardis; it is expressed most clearly in Irenaeus and preserved, to some extent at

³⁰ The older literature on Marcellus is reviewed by Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra* 28–69.

³¹ *Marcellus von Ancyra: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1867).

³² *Ibid.* 3.

³³ *Ibid.* 217.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 7.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 216–17.

least, in Marcellus of Ancyra. The counterpart to the theology of Asia Minor, the philosophical tradition, begins with Justin Martyr, who introduces a true "doctrine" of the Logos. Justin (in Zahn's view) understands the Logos as a power which goes forth from God through a precosmic origin (emanation or begetting). The incarnation of the Logos in Jesus is preceded by a series of theophanies and angelophanies of the Logos. Jesus is called "Son of God" not because of the virgin birth but because of the precosmic generation of the Logos. This theology, for Zahn, is unbiblical and unhistorical. After Justin it is found, for example, in Origen and Arius. Zahn leaves no doubt as to his own judgment: it is Irenaeus and not Origen who is the father of a healthy theology.³⁶

As already mentioned, of the three great German historians of dogma, it was Friedrich Loofs who was particularly fascinated by Marcellus. In his earliest writings on Marcellus³⁷ he followed Zahn and concluded that the basis of Marcellus' theology is "the economic-Trinitarian monotheism of the traditions of Asia Minor."³⁸ In his later writings³⁹ Loofs replaced "Asia Minor" with a more general "Antiochene" as the designation for Marcellus' thought and lost some of his enthusiasm for Marcellus.

In a book on Paul of Samosata published in 1924, Loofs asserted that this Antiochene tradition is found in Paul of Samosata, Marcellus, and Eustathius of Antioch, as well as in Tertullian, and can be traced back to Irenaeus. It is characterized by economic Trinitarianism, an unphilosophical doctrine of the Logos, the restriction of the title "Son" to the historical Jesus, a Dyophysite Christology, and strict monotheism.⁴⁰ But in the same work Loofs stated that Marcellus departed from the economic-Trinitarian schema and called the Logos "Son" before the Incarnation. The Logos was in fact, for Marcellus (Loofs asserts), the subject of the incarnate Christ; this results in a Monophysite Christology and a tendency toward a pluralistic conception of the Trinity. Loofs attributed these foreign elements in Marcellus' Antiochene system to the influence of church orthodoxy and popular piety.⁴¹

³⁶ Ibid. 216-45.

³⁷ "Die Trinitätslehre Marcell's von Ancyra und ihr Verhältniss zur älteren Tradition," SPAW (1902) 1, 764-81; "Marcellus von Ancyra," RE (3rd ed.) 12 (1903) 259-65; *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (2 vols.; 4th ed.; Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1906).

³⁸ *Leitfaden* 245. The development of Loofs's views is presented in detail by Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra* 59-69.

³⁹ *Paulus von Samosata: Eine Untersuchung zur altkirchlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte* (TU 44, 5; Leipzig, 1924); *Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus* (TU 46, 2; Leipzig, 1930).

⁴⁰ Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata* 311-22.

⁴¹ *Gemeindeorthodoxie, Volksfrömmigkeit* (ibid. 239, 318). In *Theophilus von Antiochien* Loofs developed his thesis further: Spirit-Christology is the oldest form of the Trinitarian-Christological schema; Theophilus of Antioch is the originator of this schema; besides Spirit-Christology, this schema identifies God's revelation with the historical Jesus. Loofs

Wolfgang Gericke's important monograph on Marcellus (1940) grew out of a seminar on Friedrich Loofs and is essentially a re-examination and reconfirmation of Loofs's views: Gericke agrees with Loofs that Marcellus combined Antiochene and Alexandrian traditions, but rejects Loofs's final negative evaluation of Marcellus. Gericke believes that, through the thesis that the Logos is God's operative energy (*energeia drastikē*), Marcellus succeeded in uniting the Antiochene, economic doctrine of the Trinity with Alexandrian, henprosopic Christology.⁴²

In the early 1950's José M. Fondevila, a Roman Catholic, wrote on Marcellus' Trinitarian and Christological thought.⁴³ His small monograph concentrates on Christology, and he concluded that for Marcellus Christ is a union of flesh or humanity with the Word, or an assumption of humanity effected by the Word. The flesh or humanity always remains distinct from the Word. Marcellus accepted the *communicatio idiomatum*. The union was not merely "dynamic." The "dynamic dilation" of the Godhead at the Incarnation, of which Marcellus speaks, is meant only to exclude any substantial division of the divine being.⁴⁴ Marcellus emerges as quite orthodox. Fondevila does not come to grips with the central issues of Marcellus' theology, and his work has received little attention.

Gericke's and Fondevila's monographs are the last based exclusively on the fragments of Marcellus' writings. In the past three decades or so, work on Marcellus has taken an entirely new turn, through the attribution to Marcellus of works previously considered anonymous or pseudonymous.

found two conflicting interpretations of Phil 2:5-11 in the early Church. One understands Phil 2:6 as referring to the unified person of the historical Jesus, the other as referring to the Logos. The former is found in Tertullian (with echoes of Theophilus) and Paul of Samosata, the latter in the Alexandrian tradition, particularly Origen. In this book Loofs sees both traditions mixed in Marcellus. See also idem, "Das altkirchliche Zeugnis gegen die herrschende Auffassung der Kenosisstelle (Phil. 2, 5-11)," *TSK* 100 (1927-28) 1-102. There is an interesting presentation of Spirit Christology by P. J. Rosato, "Spirit Christology: Ambiguity and Promise," *TS* 38 (1977) 423-49.

⁴² Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra* 183, n. 13. Gericke's book includes a translation of all the fragments of Marcellus into German, the only modern translation ever done. Unfortunately, it is rife with errors, according to F. Scheidweiler, "Marcell von Ancyra," *ZNW* 46 (1955) 202-14. Scheidweiler proposes corrections of Gericke's translations, and emendations of the text of the fragments, and ends by calling Marcellus, in conscious opposition to the later Loofs, "the most interesting theologian of the fourth century" (214). Gericke's earlier publication, *Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Marcell-Forschung von Rettberg bis zur Gegenwart (1794-1930)* (Halle [Saale]: Klinckschield, 1939) is simply an excerpt from his monograph.

⁴³ J. M. Fondevila, *Ideas trinitarias y cristológicas de Marcelo de Ancyra* (Madrid: Gregoriana, 1953), an excerpt from a dissertation written at the Gregorian University, and idem, "Ideas cristológicas de Marcelo de Ancyra," *Estudios eclesiásticos* 27 (1953) 21-64.

⁴⁴ Idem, "Ideas cristológicas" 64.

Marcel Richard was the first to identify a work as Marcellus', namely, the little treatise *De sancta ecclesia* discovered and published by Cardinal Giovanni Mercati in 1905.⁴⁵ The two extant MSS attribute the work to the bishop and martyr Anthimus of Nicomedia (died 302), but this is impossible. The work is distinctly anti-Arian and criticizes in particular Asterius the Sophist and Eusebius of Nicomedia. Richard observes that Marcellus' denial (in the fragments already recognized as authentic) of the generation of the Word (or Son) before the Incarnation distinguished him from other anti-Arian writers, who admitted the personal distinction between Father and Son and the eternal generation of the Word.⁴⁶ Marcellus did not argue against Arian subordinationism, or the assertion that the Word (or Son) is a creature; he rather attacked Asterius for ditheism and objected to any division within the divine Monad.⁴⁷ The point of view of the author of *De sancta ecclesia* is identical with Marcellus'. He objects to the confession of three *hypostases* or three persons, to the idea of a generation of the Word before the ages, and to the term "unbegotten" (*agennētos*) applied to God. (He cites two passages from Plato's *Timaeus* which he claims are the source of this usage.⁴⁸)

Richard concludes that Marcellus of Ancyra is the sole author of the *De sancta ecclesia*, that he wrote it in the third quarter of the fourth century, that it was probably originally a letter, and that it proves that Marcellus remained true to his (erroneous) theses and was never converted to Athanasius' views.⁴⁹

In 1954 Felix Scheidweiler attributed a much larger work to Marcellus, the *Sermo maior de fide* (which is better called the *Epistula ad Antiochenos*).⁵⁰ Scheidweiler's attribution is based principally on points of exe-

⁴⁵ M. Richard, "Un opuscule méconnu du Marcel évêque d'Ancyre," *MScRel* 6 (1949) 5–28, reprinted in his *Opera minora* 2 (Turnhout: University Press, 1977) no. 33 (no continuous pagination). The Greek text in G. Mercati, "Anthimi Nicomediensis episcopi et martyris de sancta ecclesia," in his *Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica* (Studi e Testi 5; Rome: Vatican Press, 1905) 87–98. Richard provides a French translation.

⁴⁶ Richard, "Un opuscule méconnu" 9.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 10, 13.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 14–18, 21. Ps-Anthimus (or Marcellus) wants to prove that Asterius' and Eusebius of Caesarea's doctrine is pagan. Besides Plato, he cites Hermes Trismegistos. On the latter passage, see P. Siniscalco, "Ermete Trismegisto, profeta pagano della rivelazione cristiana: La fortuna di un passo ermetico (Asclepius 8) nell'interpretazione di scrittori cristiani," *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 101 (1966–67) 83–113.

⁴⁹ Richard, "Une opuscule méconnu" 22, 24, 27–28.

⁵⁰ F. Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser des sog. Sermo maior de fide?" *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954) 333–57. The extant Greek fragments were published by E. Schwartz, "Der s. g. Sermo maior de fide des Athanasius," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1924) 6 (Munich, 1925). R. P. Casey discovered a more complete version in Armenian and published it in English translation: *The Armenian Version of the pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes (Sermo maior de fide) and of the Expositio fidei* (SD 15; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1947).

genesis and style.⁵¹ In light of the author's opposition to radical Arians (Anomoians, Exoukontians), Scheidweiler dates the *Epistula* in 358.⁵² He presupposes, however (as Gericke also does, but Richard does not), that Marcellus gradually gave up his more radical opinions and adapted his thinking to that of Athanasius. In particular, the *Epistula* uses the important term *ho kyriakos anthrōpos* for the humanity of Christ, a term first used by Athanasius; Scheidweiler believes that Marcellus continued to study the works of his old friend and learn from them.⁵³

In the same article Scheidweiler also attributed two other works to Marcellus. The first is a confession of faith entitled *Contra Theopaschitas*, which Scheidweiler dated, on internal evidence, before 340.⁵⁴ The second is an *Expositio fidei* (*Ekthesis pisteōs*), to which he assigned a later date (358 or after).⁵⁵

It is Martin Tetz, however, who has been particularly productive in research on Marcellus. A recent series of articles has not only discussed the attribution of anonymous or pseudonymous works to Marcellus but also deepened the understanding of Marcellus' theology.

Tetz begins the first article with the interesting observation that, without knowing it, Friedrich Schleiermacher, in his understanding of the Trinity, took the side of Marcellus of Ancyra.⁵⁶

⁵¹ Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser" 348–53.

⁵² Ibid. 357.

⁵³ Ibid. 353, 357. See J. Lebon, "S. Athanase a-t-il employé l'expression *ho kyriakos anthrōpos*?" *RHE* 31 (1935) 307–29, who shows that Athanasius first used it in 356. The expression is also found in the short recension of Athanasius' *De incarnatione*; see Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser" 333. See also A. Grillmeier, "Jesus Christ, the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*," *TS* 38 (1977) 275–93, and idem, "Ho kyriakos anthrōpos: Eine Studie zu einer christologischen Bezeichnung der Väterzeit," *Traditio* 33 (1977) 1–63.

⁵⁴ Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser" 353–54. The *Contra Theopaschitas* (ps.-Athanasius, *Epistula ad Liberium*) is in PG 28, 1444–45. It was edited by H.-G. Opitz, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 23; Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1935) 211–12. Scheidweiler had earlier attributed it to Eustathius of Antioch ("Ein Glaubensbekenntnis des Eustathius von Antiochien?" *ZNW* 44 [1952–53] 237–49, where the Greek text is also reproduced). M. Richard, "Bulletin de patrologie II," *MScRel* 6 (1949) 129, suggested that the confession came from "the dissident Nicene church of Ancyra." The most recent critical edition is by M. Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra III," *ZKG* 83 (1972) 152–54.

⁵⁵ Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser" 356–57. The text is in PG 25, 200–208, and more recently in *Athanasiana: Five Homilies, Expositio fidei, Sermo maior*, ed. H. Nordberg (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes humanarum litterarum 30, 2; Helsinki, 1962) 49–56.

⁵⁶ M. Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I: Eine Markellische Schrift 'De incarnatione et contra Arianos,'" *ZKG* 75 (1964) 215–70, at 218. In 1822 Schleiermacher published the article "Über den Gegensatz der Sabellianischen und der Athanasianischen Vorstellung von der Trinität" in the *Theologische Zeitschrift* 3, 295–408, in which he made extensive use of the pseudo-Athanasian fourth oration against the Arians. Schleiermacher believed that the oration was an authentic work of Athanasius against Sabellius, and took

Tetz attributes another, lengthy writing to Marcellus, namely, the pseudo-Athanasian *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*.⁵⁷ After an examination of the relevant literature, he reaches the preliminary conclusion that the *De incarnatione* is a unified work, and not by Athanasius.⁵⁸ After reviewing the transmission of the text, Tetz compares the work with the authentic fragments of Marcellus, under several headings. There is little point in summarizing all of his highly detailed and technical arguments here, but a few theologically interesting points merit attention.

One is a peculiar formula for introducing biblical quotations, namely, *ek prosōpou tinos* with a verb of saying, as for example: "And as it says in Joel in the person of the Father, 'I will pour out from my spirit upon all flesh. . . .'"⁵⁹ The author assigns texts variously to the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, the Church, and "us"—that is, to Christians as Christ's body. The word *prosōpon* in the *De incarnatione* is not an established theological term but remains a tool for the interpretation of Scripture. The author never speaks of three *prosōpa* but only of one *prosōpon* at any time, namely, the one God who speaks.⁶⁰ As Tetz sees it, this formula tends to keep the economies distinct; and this is clearly Marcellian.

The author of the *De incarnatione* also devotes a chapter (20) to 1 Cor 15:24–28, the passage which was the basis of Marcellus' eschatology. This chapter presents a refinement of Marcellus' teaching. He had earlier taught simply that the reign of Christ would have an end and the Logos would return into God. In ch. 20 he explains that it is as the (human) head of his own members that Christ will be subjected to the Father. The Lord "received the human throne of David, his father according to the flesh, to rebuild and restore it, so that, when it was restored, we might all reign in him; he will hand over the restored human kingdom to the Father, 'so that God might be all in all' [1 Cor 15:28] and reign through him as through God the Word after He reigned through him as through a man, the Savior."⁶¹ God's kingdom exists forever; the "human king-

the position of the opponent. Athanasian authorship is now universally rejected and the opponent—if Tetz and others are correct—is not Sabellius but Marcellus of Ancyra. A critical edition of the fourth oration was published by A. Stegmann, *Die pseudoathanasianische "IVte Rede gegen die Arianer" als "kata Areianōn logos," ein Apollinarisgut* (Rottenburg: Bader, 1917).

⁵⁷ The Greek text is printed in PG 26, 984–1028. See also G. M. Rapisarda, "La questione dell'autenticità di *De incarnatione Dei et contra Arianos* de S. Atanasio: Rassegna degli studi," *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 23 (1973) 23–54.

⁵⁸ Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell I" 231.

⁵⁹ *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* 9 (PG 26, 997A–B).

⁶⁰ Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell I" 252–53. C. Andresen calls this "prosopographical exegesis" and sees in it the roots of the Trinitarian concept of "person"; see his article "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffs," *ZNW* 52 (1961) 1–39.

⁶¹ PG 26, 1020C–1021A; Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell I" 257–58. The emphasis on the human kingdom of Christ and the double instrumental reign appear to be a somewhat lame revision of Marcellus' earlier views.

dom"—Marcellus' peculiar term—passes away.

Thirdly and finally: Athanasius had applied the famous text Prov 8:22 LXX ("The Lord created me the beginning of His ways for His works") to the incarnate Christ; the author of the *De incarnatione* and Marcellus apply the verse to the Church.⁶² Tetz concludes: "Athanasius is not the author of *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*. The only one among the theologians of the fourth century who can seriously be considered as the author is Marcellus of Ancyra."⁶³ With considerable hesitation he suggests a date around 360.⁶⁴

In his second article⁶⁵ Tetz believes he can confirm Marcellus' authorship of the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* (*Sermo maior de fide*) already proposed by Scheidweiler. The principal emphasis of the article, however, lies elsewhere: on the examination of a peculiar and important role assigned to Adam in Marcellus' works and in works which Tetz attributes to Marcellus. *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* 8 (a work which Tetz believes he has established as Marcellus') speaks of Adam as "the fleshly father of the Son of God." The *Epistula ad Antiochenos* 25 traces Jesus' genealogy back to Adam, following Lk 3:38, with the explanation: "He said 'and Adam from God' in order to show both the body, which he had from Adam, and the deity, which he had from the Father."⁶⁶ Further, an anonymous document called the *De doctrina*⁶⁷ is cited by Athanasius in *De decretis Nicaenae synodi* 4-5 as "the tradition of the fathers." Tetz shows that the *De doctrina* comes from the Jewish-Christian milieu of the pseudo-Clementine writings, and even states that it is the only extant work which can be considered a source for the pseudo-Clementine writings.⁶⁸ The *De doctrina* understands Adam as the first true teacher and prophet; further, it identifies Jesus' body with Adam's body and considers Adam, as Jesus' father, to be sinless.⁶⁹ Marcellus, in Tetz's opinion, was influenced by the traditions represented in the *De doctrina* and the pseudo-Clementine writings. Specifically, Marcellus retained some of the interpretations attached to Adam in these writings but brought them more into line with orthodox teaching: Adam, for Marcellus, is the father of the human race, and thus the archetypal man who is to be redeemed;

⁶² Ibid. 258-61.

⁶³ Ibid. 270.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra II: Markells Lehre von der Adamssohnschaft Christi und eine pseudoklementinische Tradition über die wahren Lehrer und Propheten," *ZKG* 79 (1968) 3-42.

⁶⁶ Fragment 71 in Schwartz, "Der s. g. sermo maior" 28-29; in Casey's translation from the Armenian, no. 25.

⁶⁷ The document was transmitted independently and is printed in *Athanasius Werke* 2/1 (ed. Opitz) 4. Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell II" 6-7, reprints the Greek text.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 27.

⁶⁹ Ibid. 14.

Jesus' body, descended from Adam, is in this sense Adam's, and Jesus is Adam's son. The true teacher is Jesus.⁷⁰ This corresponds to a particular interest in Marcellus' theology. The emphasis on Adam and other prophets as teachers avoids the Apologists' preincarnational theophanies and Logophanies. Further, the importance of Adam-Christ typology for Irenaeus is well known,⁷¹ and Marcellus stands in this tradition.

Tetz's third article deals with the confession of faith *Contra Theopaschitas* (less correctly called the *Epistula ad Liberium*), already attributed to Marcellus by Scheidweiler and to Marcellian circles by Richard.⁷² In an extensive word-by-word commentary Tetz compares the *Contra Theopaschitas* with other Marcellian writings and reaffirms Marcellus as its author. He observes that while both Marcellus and Athanasius strongly defended the Nicene doctrine, they differed in their methods. Athanasius, with the passing decades, insisted more and more on the Creed of Nicaea as a fully adequate confession of faith, while Marcellus attempted new formulations—as for example in fragment 121, in his *Epistula ad Iulium*, and now in the *Contra Theopaschitas*. Tetz ends with a consideration of Marcellus' attitude toward the *regula fidei*.

In a fourth article⁷³ Tetz examines the *Expositio fidei ad Athanasium* of the deacon Eugenius of Ancyra. On the question of the development of Marcellus' thought, he concludes that the *Expositio* is an indirect witness to the theological thought of Marcellus at the end of his life. Marcellus respected the homoousian (Western) Synod of Sardica (343) and the Synod of Alexandria (362); the latter led to a rapprochement between Marcellus and his followers in Ancyra and the Eustathians at Antioch under Paulinus.⁷⁴ Tetz dates the *Expositio* in 372 but considers 371 and 373 also possible.⁷⁵

Most interesting is the result of Eugenius' mission to Athanasius, as Tetz sees it. Basil of Caesarea was a violent opponent of the Marcellians, as is clear from (among other places) his *Ep.* 69 to Athanasius. Tetz believes Eugenius' mission was a success: the aged Athanasius refused to condemn his old friend Marcellus and left Basil's letter unanswered.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Ibid. 38–39.

⁷¹ See especially J. T. Nielsen, *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons: An Examination of the Function of the Adam-Christ Typology in the "Adversus haereses" of Irenaeus, against the Background of the Gnosticism of His Time* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1968).

⁷² M. Tetz, "Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra III: Die pseudathanasianische *Epistula ad Liberium*, ein Markellisches Bekenntnis," *ZKG* 83 (1972) 145–94; Scheidweiler, "Wer ist der Verfasser" 353–54; Richard, "Bulletin de patrologie II" 129.

⁷³ Tetz, "Markellianer und Athanasios."

⁷⁴ Ibid. 115–16.

⁷⁵ Ibid. 119.

⁷⁶ Ibid. 121. Tetz's later article, "Über nikäische Orthodoxie: Der sog. Tomus ad Antioch-

The attributions of these works to Marcellus are not, however, unanimously accepted. In 1973 Manlio Simonetti published an evaluation of them.⁷⁷ He deals with three works: *De sancta ecclesia*, *Epistula ad Antiochenos* (*Sermo maior de fide*), and *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*. He accepts Richard's attribution of *De sancta ecclesia* to Marcellus, and Richard's dating of it. From this he concludes that Marcellus did not develop or soften his doctrine but maintained it in its early form. On this ground he concludes that the other two works are not by Marcellus. Neither, for example, speaks of one *hypostasis* in the Godhead, which in Simonetti's eyes is an essential point of Marcellus' teaching. Simonetti situates the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* in an area of Antiochene influence and dates it 440–50, and suggests that *De incarnatione* was written in an area of Athanasian influence.⁷⁸

Recent authors have also proposed that several other works come from Marcellian or anti-Marcellian circles.⁷⁹ They show at least that Marcellus and his followers attracted considerable attention.

enos des Athanasios von Alexandrien," *ZNW* 66 (1975) 194–222, deals only indirectly with Marcellus. It is an analysis of the document issued by the synod at Alexandria in 362, held under Athanasius' presidency, which for the first time made the acceptance of the Creed of Nicaea the test of orthodoxy but left the question of one *hypostasis* or three in the Godhead open. Tetz does not see an attack on Marcellus in the *Tomus* (p. 201, n. 25). The *Tomus* was later cited by Eugenius in his confession of faith addressed to Athanasius (p. 211).

⁷⁷ M. Simonetti, "Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcello d'Ancira," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 9 (1973) 313–29; idem, "Ancore sulla paternità dello ps.-atanasiano 'Sermo maior de fide,'" *Vetera christianorum* 11 (1974) 333–43.

⁷⁸ Idem, "Su alcune opere" 322, 329.

⁷⁹ F. Refoulé, "La date de la lettre à Evagre [PG. 46, 1101–1108]," *RSR* 49 (1961) 520–48, discusses a letter (*Ep.* 243) wrongly attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus and also found among the *spuria* of Gregory of Nyssa as *Epistula xxvi ad Euagrium monachum*. Refoulé believes that it is addressed to Evagrius Ponticus, who asked the author whether the *physis* of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is simple or composed. The letter is anti-Eunomian, since it denies that there is a proper name for God or for intelligible realities. The author supports modalistic theses close to Marcellus' and uses Marcellus' technical vocabulary. Refoulé concludes that the letter may come from the circle around Gregory of Nyssa; it is "in the spirit of Marcellus of Ancyra" and was written between 380 and 382. F. de P. Solá, "Texto patristico sobre la controversia cristológica [PPalau Rib. inv. 68]," *Studia papyrologica* 9 (1970) 21–33, prints a papyrus fragment of a writing against Arius and Sabellius, which he dates in the fourth century. He thinks it might be by Marcellus, but this is unlikely. M.-J. Rondeau, "Le 'Commentaire des psaumes' de Diodore de Tarse et l'exégèse antique du psaume 109/110," *RHR* 176 (1969) 5–33, 153–88; 177 [1970] 5–33), as part of a history of the patristic exegesis of this psalm, studies (Vol. 176, 161–72) Marcellus' interpretation of it. He accepts Tetz's attribution of the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* and *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* (both of which contain an exegesis of the psalm) to Marcellus. Briefly: since Marcellus rejects an eternal generation of the Word, he takes v. 3 as applying to the Nativity: "Out of [Mary's] womb before the daystar [of the Magi] I begot you [on Christmas]." And Marcellus takes the "until" of v. 1 ("The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit at my

CENTRAL PROBLEMS

From this review of literature on Marcellus it becomes clear that two problems are central: one from patristics, the other from the history of doctrine.

The problem from patristics is the accurate understanding of Marcellus himself. If the works attributed to him are in fact authentic, then he is more than a passing episode of the 340's, and a new synthesis of Marcellus' thought and its development needs to be written.

But acceptance of the attributions depends on one's views of the development of Marcellus' thought and on one's evaluation of his orthodoxy; and this is a problem for the history of dogma. Richard and Simonetti deny a development of his thought and consider Marcellus heretical. They stress Athanasius' breaking off communion with him in 345 or 346, and assume that this break was permanent. This view guards (and tends to harmonize) the orthodoxy of Athanasius and that of the Cappadocians. Tetz and the majority of Protestants are less concerned with protecting Athanasius and (far less) the Cappadocians. Tetz, in particular, has to presuppose (or prove) a development in Marcellus' thinking for his attributions to be possible. Protestant historians of dogma have tended to emphasize the disjunction between Athanasius and the Cappadocians: Athanasius (and Marcellus) preferred to speak of one

right hand until I place your enemies as a footstool under your feet") as indicating (with 1 Cor 15:25 and Acts 3:21) an end to Christ's reign. Diodore explicitly rejects this interpretation. Finally, F. J. Leroy, "Une homélie nouvelle, origéno-arienne, issue de milieux anti-marcelliens: BHG 1076z, in Lc 1, 31-44," in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (ed. J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser; Paris: Beauchesne, 1972) 343-53, has the *editio princeps* of a homily with an anti-Marcellian emphasis on Lk 1:33 ("Of his kingdom there will be no end"). Leroy guesses that the homoiousian Basil of Ancyra might be the author, but this remains pure conjecture.

For the sake of completeness, four other articles might be mentioned here. Macholz, "Der Dichter Prudentius in den Spuren Marcellus von Ancyra," *TSK* 82 (1909) 577-92, analyzes Prudentius' Trinitarian doctrine and finds that it is like Marcellus', but he does not claim that Marcellus influenced Prudentius. G. W. H. Lampe, "The Exegesis of Some Biblical Texts by Marcellus of Ancyra and Pseudo-Chrysostom's Homily on Ps XCVI," *JTS* 49 (1948) 169-75, studies the two kingdoms of Christ in this homily and in Marcellus. (The homily [PG 55, 611-16] is now attributed to Severian of Gabala; see *Clavis patrum graecorum* 2 §4190.) P. Hadot, "Typus: Stoïcisme et monarchianisme au IV^e siècle d'après Candide l'Arien et Marius Victorinus," *RTAM* 18 (1951) 177-87, discusses the expansion of the Godhead in Marcellus' thought on the basis of references to Marcellus and his disciple Photinus in these two Latin authors. He concludes that Marcellus' God is the Stoic *pneuma*. These Latin references to Marcellus are generally overlooked. And T. E. Pollard, "Marcellus of Ancyra: A Neglected Father," in *Epektasis* 187-96, offers a theological appreciation of Marcellus. He concludes that for Marcellus "God is the living, active, dynamic God of the Bible, not the abstract 'Being' of philosophical theology" (195), and draws parallels between Marcellus on the one hand and "process theology" and the thought of Teilhard de Chardin on the other.

hypostasis, as of one *ousia*, in the Godhead; Basil of Caesarea, depending in fact on the homoiousian Basil of Ancyra, preferred to speak of three *hypostases*.

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 Loofs's biblical, Antiochene theology and philosophical, Alexandrian theology, or Harnack's vision of Christianity being gradually replaced by dogmatic Catholicism until it re-emerged in the Reformation. Tetz and more recent authors no longer use these categories, although Tetz wants to see Jewish-Christian influence on Marcellus.

Epiphanius of Salamis (died 403), author of the *Panarion* or "Medicine Chest," a long and dreary book which professed to offer the cure for eighty different heresies, relates a curious anecdote from his own experience:

I myself at one time asked the blessed Pope Athanasius about this Marcellus, what his opinion of him was. He neither offered a defense nor was he angry with him, but with a smile on his face he implied that he was not far from error, but he considered him excused.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 72, 4 (GCS 37, 259).