

THE "ARIAN" CONTROVERSY: SOME CATEGORIES RECONSIDERED

JOSEPH T. LIENHARD, S.J.

Marquette University

ELEMENTARY TEXTBOOKS often paint a clear and dramatic picture of the "Arian" controversy, more or less as follows. Shortly before 318, in Alexandria, Arius began to preach that the Son of God is a creature. In 318 a synod convoked by the bishop, Alexander of Alexandria, condemned Arius' teaching. Arius then withdrew to Asia Minor, where he won many converts to his doctrines, especially from among the *Sylloukianistai*, his fellow pupils of the martyr Lucian of Antioch. In 325 the Council of Nicaea decisively rejected Arianism and proclaimed the orthodox doctrine in its creed and particularly in the renowned word *homoousion*. But the majority of Eastern bishops continued to adhere to the Arian heresy in subtler and subtler forms; and Arianizing emperors, especially Constantius, conspired with these bishops to force Arius' heresy on the whole Church. At first, resistance to Arianism came almost singlehandedly from Athanasius of Alexandria, who, despite persecution and exile, indefatigably defended Nicene orthodoxy. The year 360 marked the nadir: "The whole world groaned and marveled that it was Arian," wrote Jerome.¹ Constantius' death in 361 was a turning point. The three Cappadocian Fathers received the baton of orthodoxy from Athanasius and continued the defense of the Nicene doctrine. The ascendancy of Arianism was definitively ended by the Council of Constantinople in 381, and orthodoxy triumphed.

But in order to present so clear a picture, several problems and inconsistencies must be glossed over. It is hard, for example, to explain how Arius could have found such quick and enthusiastic acceptance in Syria and Asia Minor if his doctrine were new and strange. And then, the Eastern bishops refused, in fact, to be called "Arians" and in their creeds regularly anathematized typically "Arian" doctrines such as that the Son was created out of nothing, or that he is from a different

EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article is based on a *Habilitationsschrift* entitled *Contra Marcellum: The Influence of Marcellus of Ancyra on Fourth-Century Greek Theology* accepted by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Freiburg i. Br. in 1986. Much of the research was done in Freiburg in 1984 under a fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, Bonn.

¹ Jerome, *Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi* 19 (PL 23 [1883] 181B): "Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est."

hypostasis than the Father, or that there was a time or an age when he did not exist. And finally, for 30 or more years after 325, the Council of Nicaea is hardly mentioned and the word *homoousion* rarely used.²

Some of these problems and inconsistencies can be explained by the fact that older research depended heavily on Athanasius as its source. The 19th century lionized Athanasius and made his career appear even more glorious than it was.³ This prejudice is understandable. Athanasius' works supply the fullest documentation available for the history of the controversy but—not surprisingly—are written from his point of view. When the controversy is seen from another point of view—Marcellus of Ancyra's, for example, or that of other bishops and theologians in Asia Minor, Syria, or Palestine—a distinctly different picture develops. In particular, Athanasius characterizes almost all his opponents as "Arians." But this category may well be a poor starting point for understanding the era and the issues at stake.

The choice of categories to designate the two opposing sides in the fourth-century theological controversy is crucially important, for the categories color the whole interpretation of the controversy. Some of the categories used in the past are less than satisfactory. The pair "Arian" and "Nicene" is anachronistic, and perhaps too dogmatic. "Antiochene" and "Alexandrian" are misleading. "Eusebian" for one side is, historically, fairly accurate, but lacks a usable counterpart. After examining these categories more closely, I will suggest a pair of more strictly theological categories.

INADEQUATE CATEGORIES

Perhaps the commonest categories for the two conflicting parties in the controversy are "Arian" and "Nicene." There is hardly any other name in use for the fourth-century theological conflict than "the Arian controversy." But Adolf Martin Ritter, in a recent article on Arianism,⁴ draws some conclusions from modern studies of the early fourth century

² These points are documented below.

³ See, e.g., J. A. Möhler, *Athanasius der Grosse* (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1827), and J. H. Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century* (London: Rivington, 1833). A reaction set in in the 20th century; it is especially clear in the work of Eduard Schwartz (collected in his *Gesammelte Schriften 3: Zur Geschichte des Athanasius* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1959]), who saw Athanasius primarily as a self-interested political operative, and more recently in R. Klein (*Constantius II. und die christliche Kirche* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977]), who tried to portray Constantius II as a wise and patient monarch and Athanasius as a scoundrel.

⁴ A. M. Ritter, "Arianismus," *TRE* 3 (1978) 692-719, at 693. See also the articles and useful bibliography in R. C. Gregg, ed., *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments* (Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985), e.g. J. N. Steenson, "Basil of Ancyra on the Meaning of Homoousios," *ibid.* 267-79, esp. 277 n. 2.

and says that the theology usually called "Arian" should continue to be called that only under three conditions. One must recognize, he writes, firstly, that Arius' own role in the "Arian controversies" was comparatively small; secondly, that fourth-century polemicists made vastly excessive use of the name "Arian" without doing justice to the motives and intentions of those so labeled; and thirdly, that "Arianism" was not merely a conceptual category; it can be understood only in its historical situation.

The term "Arian" seems to have been Athanasius' own coinage and his favored appellation for his opponents (unless he could call them "Ariomaniacs"). Apparently it was only in 341, however, that the Eastern bishops learned that they were being called "Arians." In that year Julius of Rome sent the Eastern bishops a letter that is crucial for understanding how the two opposing parties were formed and defined, and for understanding that the opponents became aware of themselves as parties only around 341 and not earlier.⁵

In 340 a deputation from the East went to Rome to explain the Easterners' case against Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and others and to urge Julius to recognize Pistus as the legitimate bishop of Alexandria. Marcellus, Athanasius, and Asclepas of Gaza, all of them deposed, also traveled to Rome, presumably hoping for vindication. Julius took the occasion to summon a synod that would retry the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus and wrote to the Eastern bishops inviting them to attend. The Eastern bishops refused to come, on the ground that the decisions of one council (Tyre, in 335, which had deposed Athanasius) could not be reversed by another. Julius, however, persisted in holding a synod, which upheld the orthodoxy and innocence of Athanasius, Marcellus, and others; and Julius received them into communion. He then wrote the letter already mentioned to the Easterners to explain these actions. In the course of his letter Julius defined and clearly named two opposing parties: they were "the Eusebians" (*hoi peri Eusebion*) and "the Athanasians" (*hoi peri Athanasion*). ("Eusebius" was Eusebius of Nicomedia; Eusebius of Caesarea was already dead.) Further, Julius portentously identified the Eusebians as "Arians," and he linked Athanasius' name with Marcellus of Ancyra's, thus implying that there were two opposing parties. The source of Julius' knowledge of the Easterners' dispute was undoubtedly Athanasius and Marcellus. His reason for calling the Eastern bishops Arians, however, was not their doctrine but the fact that

⁵ Athanasius preserved the letter in his *Apologia contra Arianos* 21-35 (Engl. tr. in NPNF 2/4, 111-19). The letter describes the course of events here summarized. L. W. Barnard's analysis ("Pope Julius, Marcellus of Ancyra and the Council of Sardica: A Reconsideration," *RTAM* 38 [1971] 69-79) is unsatisfactory.

they favored Pistus, who had been excommunicated by Alexander of Alexandria and then been ordained by a bishop favorable to Arius.

The Eastern bishops reacted with shock and indignation at being called "Arians." Meeting in council in the summer of 341 for the dedication of a church in Antioch, they answered Julius' letter. The so-called "First Creed of Antioch" is an excerpt from the letter that the Eastern bishops sent to Julius as an example of the "faith handed down from the beginning." In the sentence that introduces the creed, they express their indignation:

We have not been followers of Arius. For how could we, as bishops, follow a presbyter? Nor did we receive any other faith except the one handed down from the beginning. We ourselves were the testers and examiners of his [i.e., Arius'] faith. We admitted him; we did not follow him.⁶

Julius' accusation clearly surprised the Eusebians and cut them to the quick, all the more so because they had decided in Jerusalem in 335 to receive Arius back into communion, and would have done so in Constantinople in 336 had he not died shortly before.⁷

Similarly, the theology of those who opposed the "Arians" (to retain the term for the moment) was not explicitly Nicene. The Council of Nicaea did not enjoy any unique authority until several decades after it was held. Writers in the two or three decades after Nicaea make no appeal to its creed as uniquely authoritative or to the term *homoousion* as a touchstone of orthodoxy.⁸ Its greatest influence, curiously, was apparently a negative one: more than a few creeds and authors accepted its anathemas as an adequate definition of the heresy to be rejected and

⁶ Text in A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche* (3rd ed.; Breslau: Morgenstern, 1897; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1962) #153. Eduard Schwartz recognized the provenance of the "First Creed"; see his *Gesammelte Schriften* 3, 311–12, and J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (3rd ed.; London, Longman, 1972) 264–66.

⁷ On the last days of Arius, see Athanasius, *De synodis* 21, 2–7; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 1, 28; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.* 2, 27; 13–14; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* 1, 13; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 68, 7; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 21, 13.

⁸ See H.-J. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der alten Kirche* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1979). E.g., when Athanasius mentioned the Council of Nicaea in *Orationes contra Arianos* 1, 6, which Sieben dates in 339, the Council was not, for Athanasius, an authority in the sense of a positive norm for faith (p. 29). Athanasius first defended the word *homoousion* in *De decretis* 20, composed between 345 and 355 (p. 37). In *De synodis*, written in 359, the authority is not a fixed formula but the acceptance of a tradition as such, i.e. the Fathers together (pp. 51–52). Only in the *Epistula ad Iouianum imperatorem* (363) is Nicaea correct for Athanasius not only because it is apostolic but also because it is the universal, ecumenical faith and hence the divine faith of the Church catholic (p. 53).

regularly quote them as an assurance of their own orthodoxy.⁹

Other authors have tried to explain the conflict with the categories "Alexandrian" and "Antiochene." It is true that some of the "Arians" were, or may have been, pupils of Lucian of Antioch,¹⁰ and that some of its adherents lived in Syria. But these terms risk implying an intellectual bridge between Lucian of Antioch and his disciples on the one hand, and the later Christology of Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius on the other.¹¹ The roots of dyoprosopic Christology are not in Lucian and the circle around the two Eusebii; if anything, this Christology is foreshadowed in Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra. Cyril of Alexandria, for the other side, wanted to believe that he drew his terms from Athanasius; but, as is well known, one of his key formulas came from Apollinaris of Laodicea.¹² The relationship between theological speculation in the early fourth century and the Christological controversy of the fifth century is complex and unclear; and to try to interpret the first period by later categories does neither a service.

As a historical phenomenon, it would be most accurate to call the "Arian" theology "Eusebian," understood as a way of thought shared and fostered by Eusebius of Caesarea and Eusebius of Nicomedia, among others. Marcellus of Ancyra, for example, traces his opponent Asterius' intellectual lineage through Paulinus of Tyre back to Eusebius of Nico-

⁹ See, e.g., Eusebius of Caesarea, *De ecclesiastica theologia* 1, 9, 6; the anathemas of the second and fourth creeds of Antioch (341; Hahn, *Bibliothek* #154, 156; and Kelly, *Creeds* 268–73); the *Ekthesis makrotichos* or Creed of the Long Lines (344; Hahn, *Bibliothek* #159); the first creed of Sirmium, 351 (ibid. #160, and Kelly, *Creeds* 281–82); and Ps.-Athanasius, *Fourth Oration against the Arians* 25.

¹⁰ The famous word *Sylloukianistai* is used only once, in a letter that Arius wrote to Eusebius of Nicomedia ca. 318; text in Athanasius, *Werke* 3: *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites*, 318–328, ed. H.-G. Opitz (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1935), Urkunde 1.

¹¹ Robert Grant, in a review of D. S. Wallace-Hadrill's *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge, 1982), quotes a sentence in which Wallace-Hadrill says that one of the strongest branches of Alexandrian Origenism was associated with Antioch. At that point Grant asks: "Does the traditional geographical classification need revision or even rejection?" Grant seems to think it may need rejection; "It may be," he writes, "that the basic scheme arises out of classifications helpful only to partisans, students, and teachers." The review is in *Church History* 52 (1983) 494–95. A. M. Ritter, in an excellent survey ("Dogma und Lehre in der alten Kirche," in *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte* 1: *Die Lehrentwicklung im Rahmen der Katholizität*, ed. C. Andersen et al. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982] 99–283, at 146), also rejects the categories "Alexandrian" and "Antiochene" as historically inaccurate and misleading. But Ritter uses the term "Origenist" a little too freely.

¹² The phrase is *mia physis tou theou logou sesarkōmenē*; see A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 1 (2nd ed.; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975) 473–83, especially 481–82. On dyoprosopic Christology see also A. L. Pettersen, "The Questioning Jesus in Athanasius' *Contra Arianos* 3," in Gregg, *Arianism* 243–55.

media.¹³ All of the elements of this theology are already present in Eusebius of Caesarea's two great apologetic works, the *Praeparatio euangelica* and the *Demonstratio euangelica*. The Eusebian theology has been called "Origenist." There is some truth in this, but it may obscure Origen's broad and deep influence on all of Eastern theology. Finally, there is no usable counterpart to the category "Eusebian"; "Athanasian" would be anachronistic.

TWO THEOLOGICAL TRADITIONS

The conflict in the fourth century was one between two theological traditions, both of which were well established by the beginning of the century, but neither of which proved adequate to answer the theological problems raised in the second and third decades of that century.

The crisis of 318 was part of a larger movement: a movement from the rule of faith to theology, from the language of confession to the language of reflection, from belief to speculation on what was believed. The rule of faith and the *lex orandi* were clear and accepted by all. For centuries Christians had believed in one God, the Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit. They had prayed to God the Father through His Son Jesus Christ, their Lord. And they had baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Christians of the early fourth century looked at the Christ of the Gospels and saw one who was so much more than a man, and yet not identical with God the Father. Characteristically, the Fathers of the early fourth century can readily quote credal statements, but cannot so readily explain them. Since Origen, no great theologian had come along to explain the faith in the language of reflection and speculation. Furthermore, Christians in the first two decades of the fourth century had had to concern themselves first of all with survival, in the face of what was perhaps the only systematic attempt ever, on the part of the Roman government, to destroy the Christian Church. In many ways the questions brought suddenly to the fore in 318 caught the Church unawares.

There was general agreement on some fundamental theological principles. All Christians were monotheists: there was, and could be, only one God. All Christians rejected psilanthropism: to say that Jesus the Christ was simply a human being, and only a human being, in no way adequately explained him or came close to exhausting his meaning. All Christians agreed that Christ had brought salvation to the human race,

¹³ Eusebius of Nicomedia, Marcellus says, was Paulinus of Tyre's teacher, and Paulinus was Asterius' patron. See Marcellus, frag. 87, in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcells*, ed. E. Klostermann, 2nd ed. by G. C. Hansen (GCS Eusebius 4; Berlin: Akademie, 1972).

although they hardly agreed on how that salvation had taken place. Finally, all Christians agreed on the authority of the Scriptures, which were God's word; read rightly, they revealed all that Christians needed to know about God and His relation to the world.

Disagreement came when theologians tried to express, in the language of speculation, how Christian monotheism and the doctrine of Christ's deity could be reconciled. Specifically, they had to search for a way of expressing what was singular and what was plural in God.

Greek-speaking theologians of the early fourth century had three words for something that really exists, and exists in itself, as distinguished from an accident or a quality. The words are *ousia*, *hypostasis*, and *hyparxis*; the corresponding verbs are *einai*, *hyphistasthai* and *hyparchein*. Despite the complex, later development of a distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis*, the two words were, in the early fourth century, first and foremost synonyms.¹⁴ Nevertheless, subtle distinctions began to emerge. *Hyparxis* never achieved the status of a technical term. Before 325 Eusebius of Caesarea and Narcissus of Neronias were willing to speak of two *ousiai* in the Godhead. After 325 this usage disappears. The Eusebians' most characteristic phrase for what is plural in God is "two *hypos-taseis*."

Athanasius, Marcellus, and the Westerners insisted just as vigorously that the divine *hypostasis*, the reality of God, is singular. As the fourth century progressed, *hypostasis* became, more and more, the one term that was the center of controversy. The Creed of Nicaea anathematized anyone who said that the Son of God is "of a different *hypostasis* or substance (*ousia*) than the Father." The Second Creed of Antioch, promulgated in 341 by the Easterners at the Dedication Council after they had received Julius of Rome's letter, insisted belligerently that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are "three in *hypostasis*, one in agreement (*symphōnia*)."¹⁵ The doctrinal statement of the Western Council of Sardica (342 or 343), in which Athanasius and Marcellus participated, insisted even more belligerently that "We have received and been taught, and we hold this catholic and apostolic tradition and faith and confession: there is one *hypostasis* (which is termed "essence" [*ousia*] by the heretics) of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."¹⁶ In 362 a synod that

¹⁴ See further G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (2nd ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1952) esp. 179-96.

¹⁵ Hahn, *Bibliothek* #154; Kelly, *Creeeds* 268-70.

¹⁶ Hahn, *Bibliothek* #157. See also M. Tetz, "Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis: Glaubensfragen auf der Synode von Serdika (342)," *ZNTW* 76 (1985) 243-69, who has a new critical edition of the text, and a commentary; and I. Opelt, "I dissidenti del Concilio di Serdica," *Augustinianum* 25 (1985) 783-91.

Athanasius convoked in Alexandria marked the first time that he admitted that the phrase "three *hypostaseis*" might be understood of God in an orthodox way, although he still preferred "one *hypostasis*."¹⁷ Marcellus and the clergy who remained faithful to him wrote to Athanasius ca. 371 and asked him to approve their doctrine. They had given up all of Marcellus' distinctive beliefs but held tenaciously to the doctrine of one divine *hypostasis*.¹⁸ But the Synod of Alexandria had little immediate effect. Gregory of Nazianzus could still say, ca. 380, that the Westerners suspect Arianism whenever they hear "three *hypostaseis*."¹⁹

Hence the way of using the word *hypostasis* characterized the two opposing parties for much of the fourth century; one preferred to speak of one *hypostasis* in God, the other of two (or three, if the Holy Spirit is considered). I suggest calling the two conflicting theological systems "miahypostatic" and "dyohypostatic" theology, the theology of one *hypostasis* and of two *hypostaseis* respectively. These terms signal a profound difference in theology, one that touched not only the way God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—was understood, but also the way Christ's person and saving work were described.

DYOHYPOSTATIC THEOLOGY

As a coherent system, dyohypostatic theology can be described in a typical or ideal form. No one author mentions all of the following characteristics (although Eusebius of Caesarea comes close). But it is a fair description of a type of theology found in many authors.

There is one God, who is the *archē*—the beginning, the first principle, the ultimate source, and the cause of everything else that exists. He is eternal and underived, and utterly transcendent, even unknowable, best described by the *via negativa*: as *anarchos* (without source), *agen(n)ētos* (unoriginate or unbegotten), *akatalēptos* (incomprehensible). This God, the Father, and only He, is God in the truest and fullest sense of the word.

Besides the Father, there also exists another *hypostasis*, which Scripture calls Son, Word, Image, Wisdom, Power, and "the firstborn of all creation" (Col 1:15). The Son of God holds a rank somewhere beneath

¹⁷ The *Tome to the Antiochenes* (PG 26, 796–809; Engl. tr. in NPNF 2/4, 483–86). See M. Tetz, "Über nikäische Orthodoxie: Der sog. Tomus ad Antiochenos des Athanasios von Alexandrien," *ZNTW* 66 (1975) 194–222; and L. Abramowski, "Trinitarische und christologische Hypostasenformeln," *ThPh* 54 (1979) 38–49, who also analyzes the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*.

¹⁸ Eugenius of Ancyra, *Expositio fidei ad Athanasium*, critical ed. and analysis by M. Tetz, "Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien: Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasium des Diakons Eugenius von Ankyra," *ZKG* 64 (1973) 75–121.

¹⁹ *Oration* 21, 35; Engl. tr. in NPNF 2/8, 279.

God but above all creatures, or all other creatures. This tradition does not make any clear distinction between "begetting" and "creating." The decisive point is that the Father is the source of the Son's being; the Son depends on the Father for his being. Collectively, the tradition is wary of materialistic thinking and strives to avoid language that might suggest that the Father's essence is divided to produce the Son, or that the Son is an effluence of, or an emanation from, the Father.

The Son's relationship of dependence excludes predicating "eternity" of the Son. He may be said to have been begotten "before all ages," outside of time, since time too is one of the creatures that came to be through him; but if he were truly eternal, he would be a second first principle.

The Son is naturally and obviously subordinate to the Father. Scripture affirms this when it has the Son say, "The Father is greater than I" (Jn 14:28). And reason confirms it, since a first principle or source (*archē*) is superior to what derives from it. Hence the passages of the Old and New Testaments that imply the Son's subordination to the Father pose no problem for the dyohypostatic tradition.

The Son's principal function is that of a mediator; Scripture calls him the "mediator between God and men" (1 Tim 2:5). As mediator, he is the instrument through which God created the universe: Scripture distinguishes the Father, "from whom are all things," from the Son, "through whom are all things," and says of the Son, "all things were made through him" (1 Cor 8:6; Jn 1:3).

As mediator, the Son is also revealer and teacher. The dyohypostatic tradition often attributes the Old Testament theophanies to the Son: the Son walked in the garden in the cool of the evening, wrestled with Jacob, appeared in the burning bush, gave the law to Moses, and spoke through the prophets. In particular, the Son reveals God because he is "the image of the invisible God" (Col 1:15).²⁰

The incarnate Son is Savior of the human race, principally by fully revealing God the Father, teaching the fulness of truth, and being a model of virtue. He cannot save the human race by divinizing it or uniting it to the divine nature, because he is not divine in the fullest sense of the word. At a moment in history that God determined, the Son took flesh from the Virgin Mary. But the Incarnation was not a radically new state of the Son's existence; the Son was temporarily incarnate when he wrestled with Jacob.²¹ The incarnate Christ simply continues his work as revealer, teacher, and model. His human flesh has no new personality

²⁰ See further R. P. C. Hanson, "The Arian Doctrine of the Incarnation," in Gregg, *Arianism* 181-211.

²¹ First Creed of Sirmium, anathema 16 (Hahn, *Bibliothek* #160).

or will; the Son in his human flesh continues in perfect harmony of will with the Father, just as he was before he assumed this flesh. His suffering and death on the cross are a model of patience and selflessness.

Put another way, salvation takes place in the order of will;²² it is not a new state, but an offer of knowledge. The Son reveals the truth and is a model of a God-pleasing life; Christians are saved when they accept the truth and live it. Neither the Incarnation nor the cross and resurrection brought about, of themselves, any ontological change in the human condition. There is no assumption of the human race by the Godhead, no deification of human beings without their co-operation. But with the help of the truth that Christ revealed, and by following his example, the way that leads to salvation can be freely chosen.

The dyohypostatic theology has obvious strengths and weaknesses. It easily accounts for the distinction between the Christ of the Gospels and his divine Father. Further, it offers a good explanation for the many passages in the New Testament that imply the Son's subordination to the Father. Finally, it gives full play to human freedom in the process of salvation.

But this theology also has serious shortcomings. Its chief flaw is its inability to provide a satisfactory account of monotheism. Eusebius of Caesarea's suggestion that the Son is God but not the "only true God"²³ is only the most awkward of the explanations; the others do not differ essentially from it. The dyohypostatic theology cannot avoid positing a second, lower-ranking God. Then too, this theology offers a concept of salvation that is really no more than moralism.²⁴ The help that Jesus offers is ultimately no more than his teaching and his inspiration.

These authors think habitually, or prereflectively, in terms of the Greek notion of the great chain of being, a way of thinking or conceiving all that exists by situating each existent somewhere on a scale or in an order, with God Himself at the top and brute matter at the bottom.²⁵ They do not make any clear distinction between the uncreated and the created as the two primary or ultimate categories of being.

This habitual thinking in terms of the great chain of being explains

²² Seen clearly by R. C. Gregg and D. E. Groh, *Early Arianism—A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981). See also *idem*, "The Centrality of Soteriology in Early Arianism," *ATR* 59 (1977) 260–75, and B. Studer, *Gott und unsere Erlösung im Glauben der alten Kirche* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985).

²³ Opitz, *Urkunde 3*. The phrase "true God from true God" in the Creed of Nicaea refutes this view.

²⁴ E. P. Meijering, in his review of Gregg and Groh, *Early Arianism*, asks: "Can a doctrine which advocates the imitation of the perfect creature Christ be called a doctrine of salvation? Is this not moralism?" (emphasis his). The review is in *VC* 36 (1982) 67–68.

²⁵ See A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ., 1936).

the ease with which some of the Eusebians call the Son "God," while others call him "a creature." The significant point is not the distinction between these two terms, but the fact that the Son ranks below God but above all the rest of creation.

This dyohypostatic theology has obvious similarities to Middle Platonic cosmology, especially Numenius'.²⁶ This is clear also because there is little room for the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is mentioned in the rule of faith, but hardly plays a role in reflection or speculation.

MIAHYPOSTATIC THEOLOGY

The miahypostatic tradition can also be described in a typical or ideal form. The miahypostatic theology takes strict Christian monotheism as its point of departure. There is one God. This one God is one real existent: one *hypostasis*, one *ousia*, and (in some authors) one *prosōpon*.

This one God utters a Word, or begets a Son, and sends forth His Holy Spirit. The miahypostatic tradition does not hesitate to take over these names from the rule of faith, and willingly confesses faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It does, however, at least in its earlier stages, have difficulty explaining, in speculative language, the essence or nature of the Word and the Spirit. It hesitates to assign any plurality to the Godhead, and hence insists on the expression "one *hypostasis*." In general, in speaking of God, saying "one" is always safe, whereas saying "two" is always dangerous. Plurality is rather located in the Incarnate.

The Son, for the miahypostatic tradition, is God in the same way that the Father is: *homoousion tō patri*, although its representatives seldom appeal to the Creed of Nicaea until several decades after the Council.

The Incarnation is the decisive moment in the history of salvation and marks a new stage in the history of the Logos. At the Incarnation God Himself is united with a human nature and thereby with human nature itself. This tradition conceives of human nature as a collectivity, so that, when the Word assumed *ho anthrōpos*, he also assumed—and thereby elevated—*hē anthrōpotēs*.

The miahypostatic theology applied to the incarnate Christ, or even to Christ's flesh, all the biblical texts that suggested the Son's subordination to the Father. It is the Incarnate, as man, who says, "The Father is greater than I" (Jn 14:28), or who knows neither the day nor the hour (Mk 13:32). In principle, at least, this gave these authors an opportunity

²⁶ See J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ., 1977) 361-79, and the articles of F. Ricken noted below.

to reflect on Christ's human soul or mind.²⁷

Salvation, in this tradition, is essentially a divine act by which the human race is elevated and deified. Salvation takes place in the order of being: God acts, and thereby the human race is saved. Athanasius expressed this in his famous axiom, "God became man so that man might become divine."²⁸

Marcellus of Ancyra²⁹ held a distinctive form of the miahypostatic theology, and several points distinguish his thought from the general outline just sketched. He propounded a radical monotheism. God is one *ousia*, one *hypostasis*, and one *prosōpon*. *Ousia* and *hypostasis* mean "being" or "existent." *Prosōpon* means "source of action," and especially of rational discourse. The term that Marcellus preferred for God was the third, *prosōpon*. God had to be one *prosōpon*, because Marcellus could not conceive of two "I's in the Godhead; *hypostasis* means the reality behind the *prosōpon*.

The Word, as God's *dynamis* or power, is eternal; when God speaks, then His Word became an active power. The only title that is proper to the Preincarnate is "Word"; all other titles are titles of the incarnate Christ. The Word "goes forth" from the Father; "begetting" is better reserved for the Virgin's conceiving. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives His mission through the Son.

God's activity appears to expand the *monas* or unity into a triad; but the *monas* is indivisible in *dynamis*, that is, indivisible into two or three distinct subjects; and the nature of the expansion is left unexplained, except that it is in *energeia monē*.

When Marcellus writes abstractly of Christ's humanity, he calls it *sarx*; but when he thinks of it functionally or soteriologically, he calls it *anthrōpos*.

When writing of the Savior's work (and "Savior" is the title he prefers for the Incarnate), he does not distinguish between Christ's human nature and human nature in general and thus grounds his doctrine of deification. Marcellus taught that when the Word assumed *ho anthrōpos*, it assumed not only an individual man but the whole human race, and the latter

²⁷ Marcellus of Ancyra began such reflection when he wrote that Jesus' words in the Garden of Olives indicated an *asymphōnia* between him and the Father. See below; and cf. G. C. Stead, "The Scriptures and the Soul of Christ in Athanasius," *VC* 36 (1982) 233-50, and R. Lorenz, "Die Christusseele im arianischen Streit: Nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Quellenkritik des Arius und zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Athanasius," *ZKG* 94 (1983) 1-51.

²⁸ *De inc. Verbi* 54; cf. C. R. Strange, "Athanasius on Divinization," *StPatr* 16/2 (= *TU* 129; Berlin: Akademie, 1985) 342-46.

²⁹ What follows is the result of a study of the extant fragments of Marcellus' *Contra Asterium*. See also J. T. Lienhard, "Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern Research," *TS* 43 (1982) 486-503, for a survey of the literature on Marcellus.

precisely as sinful and deceived.

Marcellus also sees the need for a human soul or mind in Christ. Asterius had explained that Jn 10:30 ("I and the Father are one") signified their "perfect harmony of will in every word and deed." But Marcellus points out that Mt 26:39 ("not as I will, but as you will") demonstrates that their wills were not always in harmony; hence Christ had a distinct center of consciousness.³⁰

With careful attention to 1 Cor 15:24–28, Marcellus teaches that Christ's partial kingdom will, at the end of time, be absorbed into God's whole kingdom.³¹ Even when he wrote the *Contra Asterium*, however, he admitted a problem with this theory, namely, his inability to explain what would happen to Christ's flesh at the consummation of time.

Manuals often take Marcellus' doctrine of God as a Monad that temporarily expands into a Triad as the most typical element of his theology. But these terms are not frequent in the extant fragments of the *Contra Asterium*. Marcellus' speculation is rather dominated by a full and emphatic account of Christian monotheism but lacks a term, or a place, for the hypostatic existence of the (preincarnate) Word and the Spirit. He can call God a Triad but cannot say what is triadic in God. On the other hand, he distinguished clearly between the preincarnate Word and the incarnate Christ, and had the rudiments of a Christology that gives an adequate place to Christ's complete human nature.

At least potentially, the miahypostatic tradition recognizes that the first and most important distinction among existents is that between the uncreated and the created. The uncreated is divine and eternal, the created is finite and temporal. No series of steps, no great chain of being, can bridge the gap between God and creatures. The only possible bridge is a free act of God's, the act of creating. Further, while both the Word and creatures have their source in God, the way they proceed from the source is radically different. The Son is begotten, that is, he comes from God's essence. Creatures are made; they come from God's will.

THE TWO TRADITIONS COMPARED

When the two traditions are compared, their strengths and weaknesses, measured against the later, orthodox resolution, become clear.

³⁰ Frag. 73. Grillmeier (*Christ in Christian Tradition* 285–86) writes: "We can hardly be wrong in seeing the assertion of 'two wills' in Christ as a contrast to the Arian doctrine of the mutable will of the Logos which marks him out as a creature. . . . This is a new step of Marcellus in Christology. . . . This already seems to introduce a Word-man Christology." See also frag. 74, in which Marcellus also attributes disharmony of will to the flesh that the Word assumed.

³¹ See J. T. Lienhard, "The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24–28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus," *VC* 37 (1983) 340–59.

Speaking of one *hypostasis* makes the defense of Christian monotheism easy, but allows little room for an explanation of the Trinity that sees plurality in the Godhead itself and not simply in God's activity or in the *oikonomia*. The language of two or three *hypostaseis* allows for a clear explanation of biblical Trinitarianism, but makes it difficult to maintain consequential monotheism and, at least in the fourth century, falls almost by necessity into the Platonic, subordinationist pattern of the great chain of being.

In Christology the dyohypostatic tradition, which already sees the Son as naturally subordinate, the lesser *hypostasis* who, as God's instrument, reveals the transcendent God and is the mediator between God and the world, sees the Son as active, in this role, from the moment of creation on through all the revelations and theophanies of the Old Testament and continuing, in a natural progression, into the Incarnation. The mediator is naturally instrument, revealer, teacher, and model. There is no need to postulate a finite, human mind in Christ; the Son is always in *sympḥōnia*, harmony of will, with the Father. The miahypostatic tradition, in contrast, sees the Incarnation as a radically new stage in the existence of the God the Logos. Because the Logos is God, the Incarnation is a profound, new mystery.

There is little speculation on Christ's human soul in the early fourth century; but what there is begins on the side of the miahypostatic tradition, particularly in Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra. It is striking that Marcellus of Ancyra accuses Eusebius of Caesarea of psilanthropism for saying that Christ is the "one mediator between God and men" (1 Tim 2:5) and Eusebius accuses Marcellus of psilanthropism for saying that Christ had a human soul or mind.³²

But the doctrine on which the two traditions may best be tested is the doctrine of salvation. In a sense, salvation is the most basic of all religious concepts. Every religious system offers some kind of salvation. Each presupposes that there is a gap or a rift between the human and the divine, and offers to close or heal it. The doctrine of salvation finally answers the simple but honest question, "What's in this for me?"

It would be simplistic and unfair to say that the dyohypostatic tradition is cosmological and the miahypostatic soteriological. Both are reflections on the saving event in Christ. Neither is adequate in itself. The two types of theology may be reducible to two ways of conceiving salvation—or

³² Marcellus, frags. 100–102; Eusebius, *De eccl. theol.* 1, 20, 43, and 45. On Eustathius see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 296–301; further R. V. Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch and His Place in the Early History of Doctrine* (Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1928); H. Chadwick, "The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch," *JTS* 49 (1948) 27–35; and R. P. C. Hanson, "The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch," *ZKG* 95 (1984) 171–79.

rather, to two different ways of interpreting what the New Testament says about Christ's saving work. Salvation has both a divine element and a human element; no Christian would deny that. It is God who offers salvation and man who in some sense co-operates with God, at least by receiving the gift of salvation. The miahypostatic theology concentrates on God's action. It interprets salvation as a gift from above, a change in the order of things effected by God's decree, or, in a classic term of Greek theology, as deification. God acts to unite humanity to Himself and thereby save it. The dyohypostatic theology concentrates on the human response. It reserves a place for man's free acceptance of God's offer of salvation and therefore for his free choice. God's offer is seen as revelation, teaching, and example.

As already stated, the dyohypostatic tradition sees salvation in the order of will: Christ is essentially a revealer and teacher. The advantage of such a view is that it better preserves human freedom; the disadvantage is that it can lapse into mere moralism. The miahypostatic tradition sees salvation in the order of being: God acts definitively in Christ to save fallen man. Such a view runs the risk of making salvation part of a process in which man is passive; but it preserves the unique moment of God's gracious and effective love of His sinful creatures.

The question of the sources of these two traditions is difficult, if not insoluble. To say that one tradition is Origenist is not particularly helpful, and might be misleading; Marcellus too can quote Origen in his own defense.³³ Friedrich Loofs tried to distinguish a theology that arose in Asia Minor or Antioch, which was biblical and historical, and found in Irenaeus of Lyons, for example, from a theology that is typical of Alexandria, and that was speculative and philosophical, and found, for example, in Justin Martyr and Origen.³⁴ But the alliance of Eusebius of Caesarea, the admirer of Origen and pupil of Pamphilus, with Arius, the pupil of Lucian of Antioch, makes these categories practically useless.

The majority of bishops in Asia Minor and Syria were sympathetic to the dyohypostatic tradition. Athanasius, Marcellus, and the Westerners represent the miahypostatic tradition. Westerners, especially Romans, are probably rightly said to have held on to the spirit of the monarchian theology of the late second and early third centuries and thereby virtually to have ignored Tertullian.

But in the last analysis the search for sources may be fruitless. Perhaps

³³ Frags. 39, 86. On Arius' relation to Origen, see R. Lorenz, *Arius Judaizans? Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

³⁴ See, e.g., his *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, ed. K. Aland (7th ed.; Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1968), and the summary in Lienhard, "Marcellus" 493-94.

these differing theological systems can best be categorized by their emphasis, in the doctrine of salvation, on divine initiative or human response. In a sense Arius, Nestorius, and Pelagius all in their own ways emphasize human response, while Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Augustine all stress the divine initiative. It is safer, perhaps, to say no more than this.

HISTORY OF THE TWO TRADITIONS

The history of the two traditions in the fourth century can only be sketched here in outline. The first period is that from the crisis Arius caused in Alexandria to the Council of Nicaea. In this period Arius' expulsion from Alexandria caused more than a few theologians in the dyohypostatic tradition to attempt to formulate their theological views. Most of these attempts were in the form of letters.

In 318 or 319 Eusebius of Caesarea wrote a letter to Euphratius of Balaneae³⁵ in which he argued that the Father must exist before or precede the Son, and is superior to the Son because He causes the Son's existence; the Son is God, but not "true God" (Jn 17:3). In 320 or 321 Eusebius of Nicomedia wrote a letter to Paulinus of Tyre (the letter that Asterius later tried to defend)³⁶ in which he aggressively rejects the assertion that the Son is of or from the Father's essence (*ek tēs ousias*); he is rather from the Father's will, a perfect creature. There is "one Unbegotten," he can write, "and one made by Him." The letter, G. C. Stead remarks, "became something of an Arian classic."³⁷ Paulinus of Tyre³⁸ wrote a letter, perhaps addressed to Alexander of Alexandria, in which he called Christ "a second God," "a more human God," and "a creature."³⁹ In 325 Narcissus of Neronias, in a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia and others, wrote of a first and second God, and of two or

³⁵ Opitz, Urkunde 3. On Eusebius's theology see below.

³⁶ Opitz, Urkunde 8. See A. Lichtenstein, *Eusebius von Nicomeden: Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Lebens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Führerschaft im arianischen Streite* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1903). There are two recent studies of the letter: G. C. Stead, "'Eusebius' and the Council of Nicaea," *JTS* 24 (1973) 85-100, and C. Luibhéad, "The Arianism of Eusebius of Nicomedia," *ITQ* 43 (1976) 3-23.

³⁷ Stead, "Eusebius" 86.

³⁸ On Paulinus see G. Bardy, "Sur Paulin de Tyr," *RevScRel* 2 (1922) 35-45. Paulinus was a close friend of Eusebius of Caesarea; Eusebius dedicated the tenth book of his *Ecclesiastical History* to him and composed his *Onomasticon* at Paulinus' request. According to T. Kopecek (*A History of Neo-Arianism* 1 [Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979] 64), the later neo-Arian Aëtius studied Scripture under Paulinus at Antioch.

³⁹ Opitz, Urkunde 9.

three divine *ousiai*.⁴⁰ But the most significant partisan was probably Asterius the Sophist.⁴¹ Before Nicaea, Asterius wrote a booklet (*syntagmation*) which became the theological manual of the Eusebian party and qualified Asterius to be the spokesman or publicist of dyohypostatic theology. In this pamphlet Asterius defined "ingenerate" precisely as "what was not made, but always is." He also speaks of a double power and a double wisdom: one natural to God and hence eternal, unoriginate, and unbegotten, and another, manifested in Christ, which is created. Asterius states more clearly than the others that Christ is the necessary, created instrument by which God created.

Arius too, far from being an original thinker, was simply one more adherent of the dyohypostatic tradition,⁴² albeit one who, in his earlier statements in Alexandria, expressed himself awkwardly or provocatively, and who, further, had the bad luck of using the language of dyohypostatic theology in an atmosphere—Alexandria—where it was unfamiliar and hence easily misunderstood.

In this early period the miahypostatic tradition is sparsely represented; dating Athanasius' *Contra gentes et de incarnatione uerbi* before 318 has been abandoned by most scholars.⁴³

The second period is that from Nicaea to the Dedication Council of Antioch. After Nicaea the language used by the representatives of the dyohypostatic tradition is more guarded; phrases like "two Gods" and "two *ousiai*" disappear. Asterius the Sophist wrote his letter⁴⁴ defending Eusebius of Nicomedia's own letter to Paulinus of Tyre during this time, probably in 327. The occasion of his writing may have been Eusebius' effort to have his deposition reversed and regain his see. Perhaps under the influence of Nicaea, Asterius took a creed (albeit a simple one) as his point of departure. From there he asserts that the triple name must refer to a triple reality. The Father and the Son are two natures, he writes, two *hypostaseis*, and two *prosopa*. The two are one, he insists, in harmony

⁴⁰ See W. Ensslin, "Narkissos, Bischof von Neronias," *RE* 16 (1935) 1733–34. Fragments of the letter: Opitz, *Urkunde* 19.

⁴¹ See G. Bardy, *Recherches sur saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1936) 316–57 (which includes an edition of the fragments of the *syntagmation*); Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 206–14; and particularly M. F. Wiles with R. C. Gregg, "Asterius: A New Chapter in the History of Arianism," in Gregg, *Arianism* 111–51.

⁴² R. D. Williams ("The Quest for the Historical Thalia," in Gregg, *Arianism* 1–35) speaks (p. 27) of Arius conscripted by the Lucianists, so that his own teaching soon became irrelevant.

⁴³ For the relevant literature, see Lienhard, "Marcellus" 487 n. 8, and F. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 68–70 and 300 n. 41, and add A. Pettersen, "A Reconsideration of the Date of the *Contra Gentes—De Incarnatione* of Athanasius of Alexandria," *StPatr* 18/3 (Oxford and New York: Pergamon, 1982) 1030–40.

⁴⁴ Fragments in Bardy, *Recherches*.

of wills. On the other hand, he virtually abandons Eusebius of Nicomedia's insistence that the Son is from the Father's will and accepts a more credal "begotten from Him."

It was Asterius' letter that provoked the first extended written work after Nicaea expressing the miahypostatic tradition, Marcellus of Ancyra's *Contra Asterium*. But Marcellus undertook a refutation not only of Asterius' letter, but of four other letters: those of Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Paulinus of Tyre, and Narcissus of Neronias, all mentioned above. Marcellus probably had a dossier of letters put together by representatives of the dyohypostatic tradition, perhaps Arius himself.⁴⁵

But the dyohypostatic tradition in the early fourth century is most clearly and fully represented by Eusebius of Caesarea. In the older literature Eusebius was treated as a historian and a compiler, but not as a theologian of any standing. Research in the past 50 years has changed that impression, and shown that Eusebius thought of himself as a theologian and that he has a theological system well worth studying.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Socrates (*Ecclesiastical History* 1, 6) records that Arius made a collection of letters favorable to himself; Marcellus probably had this collection. On theological alignments in the fourth century, see the interesting observations of C. Sansbury, "Athanasius, Marcellus, and Eusebius of Caesarea: Some Thoughts on Their Resemblances and Disagreements," in Gregg, *Arianism* 281-86.

⁴⁶ H. G. Opitz began the revision with his article "Euseb von Caesarea als Theologe: Ein Vortrag" (*ZNTW* 34 [1935] 1-19). H. Berkhof (*Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* [Amsterdam: Uitgevermaatschappij Holland, 1939]) studied Eusebius' *Praeparatio euangelica*, *Demonstratio euangelica*, and his two works against Marcellus (*Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia*). His book is an excellent guide to the many theologically interesting passages in Eusebius, although Berkhof forced Eusebius' thought into the outline of later dogmatic theology and too easily assumed direct continuity between Origen and Eusebius. He concluded (p. 39) that "Origen is not a theologian in the proper sense of the word." G. Ruhbach, in a dissertation (*Apologetik und Geschichte: Untersuchungen zur Theologie Eusebs von Caesarea* [Diss. Heidelberg 1962]), unfortunately never published, showed that Eusebius revered Origen but considered himself not a spokesman for Origen but an independent theologian. A. Weber, in a small monograph on Eusebius' Christology (*ARXH: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* [Munich: Neue Stadt, 1965]), studied Eusebius' interpretation of Prov 8. F. Ricken has investigated Eusebius' dependence on Middle Platonic thought in several articles: "Die Logoslehre des Eusebius von Caesarea und der Mittelplatonismus," *ThPh* 42 (1967) 341-58; "Nikaia als Krisis des altkirchlichen Platonismus," *ibid.* 44 (1969) 321-41; "Das Homousios von Nikaia als Krisis des altkirchlichen Platonismus," in *Zur Frühgeschichte der Christologie*, ed. B. Welte (*Quaestiones disputatae* 51; Freiburg: Herder, 1970) 74-99; and "Zur Rezeption der platonischen Ontologie bei Eusebios von Kaisareia, Areios und Athanasios," *ThPh* 53 (1978) 321-52. See also H. v. Campenhausen, "Das Bekenntnis Eusebs von Caesarea (Nicaea 325)," *ZNTW* 67 (1976) 123-39; C. Luibhéad, *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1978); J. R. Lyman, "Substance Language in Origen und Eusebius," in Gregg, *Arianism* 257-66; and Ritter, "Dogma und Lehre" 152-55.

Marcellus' *Contra Asterium* brought about a full reaction from Eusebius of Caesarea, first in his rather hasty and superficial *Contra Marcellum*, and then in his more carefully constructed and more theological *De ecclesiastica theologia*.

The third period is that from the Dedication Council to the death of Constantius. As suggested above, the year 341 marks the rise of two clearly distinguishable parties, with the majority of the Eastern bishops on one side and Athanasius, Marcellus, and most of the Westerners on the other side. Julius of Rome's vindication of Athanasius and Marcellus, recounted in his letter to the Easterners, provoked their reaction to him at the Dedication Council in 341. The Synod of Sardica (Philippopolis) (342 or 343) is the nadir of the relations between East and West. The Western statement calls the Easterners heretics, and the Eastern statement execrates Athanasius and Marcellus and calls Marcellus "omnium haereticorum execrabilior pestis."⁴⁷ Both sides probably regretted their excesses, and the Eastern *Ekthesis makrostichos* or Creed of the Long Lines (344) is deliberately conciliatory and even avoids the contested word *hypostasis* altogether.

But the dyohypostatic theology continued, apart from the formation of parties and the decrees of synods. In the two decades after the Dedication Council, this theology has two characteristics: it sees Marcellus of Ancyra, in a more and more stereotyped picture, as the opponent par excellence; and it becomes increasingly moderate and nuanced, so that one of its last forms is the homoeousian theology proposed around 358.

Eusebius of Caesarea died in 339, and Acacius succeeded him. Acacius wrote a work against Marcellus, probably soon after 341; in the extant fragments he is much concerned with the title "image" for the Son, and heavily dependent on the second creed of Antioch.⁴⁸ The sermons of Eusebius of Emesa (ca. 300–ca. 359),⁴⁹ which are preserved in a Latin

⁴⁷ Hilary of Poitiers, *Fragmenta historica* A, IV, 1, 1 (CSEL 65, 49).

⁴⁸ Epiphanius of Salamis preserves some fragments in *Panarion* 72, 6–10 (GCS Epiphanius 3, 260–64). See J.-M. Leroux, "Acace, évêque de Césarée de Palestine (341–365)," *StPatr* 8 (= TU 93; Berlin 1966) 82–85.

⁴⁹ See E. M. Buytaert, *L'Héritage littéraire d'Eusèbe d'Emèse: Etude critique et historique* (Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1949); Eusèbe d'Emèse, *Discours conservés en latin: Textes en partie inédits*, ed. E. M. Buytaert (2 vols.; Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1953, 1957); P. Smulders, "Eusèbe d'Emèse comme source du *De trinitate* d'Hilaire de Poitiers," in *Hilaire et son temps* (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1969) 175–212; and I. Berten, "Cyrille de Jérusalem, Eusèbe d'Emèse et la théologie sémi-arienne," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 52 (1968) 38–75. Smulders provides a good summary of Eusebius' theology, and shows that Hilary of Poitiers knew and used Eusebius of Emesa's sermons (in Greek). He believes that Eusebius of Emesa is a direct link between Eusebius of Caesarea and the Homoeousians on the one hand, and a source of Hilary of Poitiers'

translation, show a theology that is also a later form of the dyohypostatic theology. Eusebius insists with equal vigor both on the deity of the Son and on his subordination to the Father. Piet Smulders shows that Eusebius has the beginnings of a dyoprosopic Christology, which he is led to by his reflection on Jesus' agony in the garden and his suffering on the cross.⁵⁰ Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra had already suggested that Jesus' human will had to be considered; in Eusebius of Emesa a representative of the dyohypostatic theology comes to the same insight. The one "heretic" whom Eusebius of Emesa attacks with any emotion is Marcellus of Ancyra.⁵¹ Smulders writes of him that "the person of Eusebius leads us to the heart of the homoeousian group."⁵² Cyril of Jerusalem is another clear representative of the dyohypostatic theology.⁵³ Like Eusebius of Emesa, Cyril too attacks only one living Christian in his *Catecheses*, namely Marcellus of Ancyra.⁵⁴

In 358 the short-lived homoeousian party arose, which, if the analysis presented here is correct, is the last representative of the older dyohypostatic theology. The "Blasphemy of Sirmium" of 357 called attention to the words *ousia*, *homoousios*, and *homoiousios* by attempting to prohibit their use,⁵⁵ and, ironically, prepared the way for an ultimate solution.

During this same period the miahypostatic tradition is represented

Trinitarian theology on the other. Berten concludes that Cyril of Jerusalem depends on Eusebius of Emesa, who in turn depends on Eusebius of Caesarea.

⁵⁰ Smulders, "Eusèbe" 202, 211.

⁵¹ *Sermon* 3, 24. *Sermons* 3 and 4 in Buytaert's edition have the titles *De fide* and *Aduersus Sabellium* respectively. The latter has Marcellus in mind.

⁵² Smulders, "Eusèbe" 176.

⁵³ See E. J. Yarnold, "Cyrillus von Jerusalem," *TRE* 8 (1981) 261-66; and further J. Lebon, "La position de saint Cyrille de Jérusalem dans les luttes provoquées par l'arianisme," *RHE* 20 (1924) 181-210, 357-86; A. A. Stephenson, "St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the Alexandrian Heritage," *TS* 15 (1954) 273-93; idem, "St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the Alexandrian Christian Gnosis," *StPatr* 1 (= TU 63; Berlin 1957) 142-56; idem, "General Introduction," in *Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem* 1, tr. L. P. McCauley and A. A. Stephenson (FC 61; Washington: Catholic Univ. of America, 1969) 1-65; idem, "St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Trinitarian Theology," *StPatr* 11 (= TU 108; Berlin 1972) 234-41; H. A. Wolfson, "Philosophical Implications of the Theology of Cyril of Jerusalem," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957) 1-19; W. R. Jenkinson, "The Image and Likeness of God in Man in the Eighteen Lectures on the Credo of Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-387)," *EThLouv* 40 (1964) 48-71; I. Berten, "Cyrille de Jérusalem"; and R. C. Gregg, "Cyril of Jerusalem and the Arians," in Gregg, *Arianism*, 85-109. Much worry over St. Cyril's Nicene orthodoxy could have been avoided by recognizing that he belongs to the dyohypostatic tradition, which, when he wrote ca. 348, had theological shortcomings, just as the miahypostatic tradition did, but was not heretical.

⁵⁴ *Catechesis* 15, 27.

⁵⁵ Hahn, *Bibliothek* #161; Kelly, *Creeds* 285-88.

most fully by Athanasius.⁵⁶ Marcellus' last clearly authentic writing is a letter he addressed to Pope Julius of Rome in 341.⁵⁷ The writings that have recently been attributed—probably too hastily and too facilely—to Marcellus⁵⁸ perhaps belong rather more generally to the miahypostatic tradition of the fourth century. Once this category is established, there is no need to insist that only Marcellus could have written these works.

Besides unnuanced and increasingly stereotyped open opposition to Marcellus by Eusebius of Caesarea, Acacius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Emesa, Cyril of Jerusalem, and many of the Eastern councils and synods, another strain of opposition to Marcellus developed that was more subtle, more sophisticated, and—ultimately—theologically much more productive. This opposition is found in four writings that have several important characteristics in common. Each refers to Marcellus under the code name "Sabellius"; each uses the word *homoousios*, but only once or twice, and without making it a touchstone of orthodoxy; each is as explicitly opposed to Arius as it is to Marcellus; each accepts, at least in principle, the validity of the phrase "two *hypostaseis*" while rejecting the subordination that the dyhypostatic theology considered necessary to preserve monotheism; and each teaches the eternal generation of the Son. In other words, these writings draw elements from both the miahypostatic and

⁵⁶ On Athanasius' theology see, most recently, Ritter, "Dogma und Lehre" 178–85, and C. Kannengiesser, "The Athanasian Decade 1974–1984: A Bibliographical Report," *TS* 46 (1985) 524–41.

⁵⁷ Frag. 129. The interpretation of this letter is crucial to the understanding of Marcellus and the development of the miahypostatic tradition. Most authors have assumed that the *Contra Asterium* contains Marcellus' definitive theology, and that his letter to Julius conceals his real convictions. But it seems more probable that, just as the Eusebians corrected their vocabulary after Nicaea, Marcellus too moderated his views and made his thought more consistent between the composition of the *Contra Asterium* and his letter to Julius ten or fifteen years later. Marcellus had the chance to read Eusebius' extended criticism of his work and to talk with Athanasius in Rome for several months in 340 or 341. In his letter Marcellus gave up insisting that the Preincarnate may only be called Word and saying that Christ's reign will end, precisely in order to maintain the theological value of the title "Logos," the eternal existence of the Son-Word, and the one hypostasis of God. Marcellus also stands behind Eugenius of Ancyra's *Expositio fidei ad Athanasium* (ca. 371; see above). His followers are last heard from ca. 377 in their letter to Egyptian bishops, preserved by Epiphanius of Salamis (*Panarion* 72, 11–12).

⁵⁸ The principal writings attributed to Marcellus in recent decades, with their numbers from M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, are: Ps-Anthimus of Nicomedia, *De sancta ecclesia* (CPG 2802); *Homilia in Canticum canticorum* (CPG 2239); *Homilia de semente* (CPG 2245); *Sermo maior de fide* (CPG 2803); *Contra Theopaschitas* (CPG 2805); *Expositio fidei* (CPG 2804); *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* (CPG 2806); and *Epistula ad Euagrium monachum* (CPG 3222). For the literature on these works, see the CPG and Lienhard, "Marcellus"; and add R. P. C. Hanson, "The Date and Authorship of Pseudo-Anthimus De sancta ecclesia," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 83 (1983) 351C–354C.

the dyohypostatic traditions and point the way toward the Cappadocian resolution. The writings are not hostile to Marcellus personally, but to a caricature of his teaching; implicit in their thought is an opening through which Marcellus might join them. Theologically, it is the concept of the eternal generation of the Son that allows these authors to escape from the subordinationism of the dyohypostatic theology and its reflex thinking in the pattern of the great chain of being, and to teach the essential equality of Father and Son and thus the Son's saving work as deification.

The works are Ps.-Athanasius, *Fourth Oration against the Arians*;⁵⁹ Ps.-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos*;⁶⁰ Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*;⁶¹ and (Ps.?) Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Arium et Sabellium*.⁶² They are difficult to date, but undoubtedly fall between 340 and 380.

If this analysis is correct, then a famous thesis, proposed by Theodor Zahn in 1867, is shown to be incorrect. Zahn believed that the Council of Nicaea had, with the word *homoousion*, professed the numerical identity or unity of the divine essence, but that the Cappadocian Fathers had taken the word to mean generic identity, and thus no different in meaning from *homoios kat' ousian*.⁶³ Practically, Zahn believed, the

⁵⁹ Critical ed. by A. Stegmann, *Die pseudoathanasianische "IVte Rede gegen die Arianer" als "kata Areianôn logos": Ein Apollinarisgut* (Rottenburg a. N.: W. Bader, 1917). In chap. 13 the author addresses his opponent in the singular, and warns him that his teaching leads to Sabellius'. This shows, as clearly as any passage, that the "Sabellius" of the fourth century is not the third-century heretic; he can only be Marcellus.

⁶⁰ Text in PG 28, 96-121. See R. Hübner, "Die Hauptquelle des Epiphanius (Panarion, haer. 65) über Paulus von Samosata: Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos," *ZKG* 90 (1979) 201-20; idem, "Epiphanius, Ancoratus und Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos," *ZKG* 92 (1981) 325-33; and J. T. Lienhard, "Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos: Analysis and Comparison," *VC* 40 (1986) 365-89.

⁶¹ Text in PG 31, 600-17. See Lienhard, "Ps-Athanasius."

⁶² Ed. F. Müller, *Gregorii Nysseni opera* 3, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1958) 71-85. See also K. Holl, "Über die Gregor von Nyssa zugeschriebene Schrift 'Adversus Arium et Sabellium,'" *ZKG* 25 (1904) 380-98, reprinted in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* 2 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1928) 298-309; J. Daniélou, "L'Adversus Arium et Sabellium de Grégoire de Nysse et l'origénisme cappadocien," *RechScRel* 54 (1966) 61-66; M. van Parys, "Exégèse et théologie trinitaire: Prov 8:22 chez les Pères cappadociens," *Irénikon* 43 (1970) 362-79; 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, esp. 211 n. 1; and idem, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der "physischen" Erlösungslehre* (Leiden: Brill, 1974) esp. 31 n. 19. Holl ascribed the work to Didymus the Blind of Alexandria; Müller, its modern editor, leaned toward authenticity, and thought it might be one of Gregory's earliest works; Daniélou was convinced of its authenticity; van Parys and Hübner consider it unauthentic.

⁶³ Th. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (Gotha: Fr. A. Perthes, 1867) 87. See A. M. Ritter, "Arianismus," *TRE* 3 (1978) 706, who tries to

Cappadocians were heirs, not of Nicaea and of Athanasius, but of the Homoeousian party of Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea. But the Homoeousians represented rather the end of the dyohypostatic tradition, and the Cappadocians inherited the corrected theology of these "anti-Sabellian" writings.

After 361 the categories "miahypostatic theology" and "dyohypostatic theology" lose their relevance. Traces of the parties do remain: some Ancyran clergy remained faithful to Marcellus, and the schism in Antioch between Paulinus and Meletius corresponds to these categories.⁶⁴ But the gradual rapprochement of the two traditions was advanced by several events. The rise of the Neo-Arians is the immediate cause of the rise of the Homoeousian party:⁶⁵ the Blasphemy of Sirmium attempted to prohibit the use of the words *homoousios*, *homoiousios*, and *ousia*, and thereby drew attention to them. Athanasius, in his *Tome to the Antiochenes* of 362, admitted for the first time that besides one *ousia* and one *hypostasis*, there was also a sense in which one could rightly say "three *hypostaseis*" of the Godhead. And the rise of the Neo-Arians makes Eunomius of Cyzicus the chief opponent of Homoeousians and Cappadocians alike.

Nevertheless, the categories "miahypostatic" and "dyohypostatic" are useful for analyzing theology in the earlier part of the fourth century. They show that the "Arian" controversy was in reality a collision between two theological systems, neither of which was quite adequate; but the very collision prepared the way for a resolution.

continue Zahn's thesis that the Fathers of Nicaea intended *homoousion* to mean numerical identity, but admits that he is opposed by Ricken, Stead, Simonetti, and Grillmeier. But cf. Ritter's "Dogma und Lehre" 200 and 202, where he has given up his defense of Zahn's hypothesis.

⁶⁴ See J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975) 38 and passim, and F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IVe-Ve siècle)* (Paris: Picard, 1905).

⁶⁵ See Kopecek, *Neo-Arianism*, for the history of the movement.