

4R-13

# THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY

NEW SERIES

APRIL 2000

VOL. 51 PART 1

## CONTENTS

MAURICE WILES

## ARTICLES

- THE CAREER OF JOSHUA BEN SIRA. By PAUL ...  
 MICHAEL, THE RESTRAINER REMOVED (S. ...  
 THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY AT THE ...  
 MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA (PSEUDO-ANTHIMUS). ...  
 AND COMMENTARY. By THE REVD DR ALAFYAL ...  
 SHOULD HERBERT OF CHERBURY BE REGARDED AS A ...

## NOTES AND STUDIES

- THE DATE OF THE DEPOSITION OF EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH. By PROFESSOR R. W. ...  
 LEAN OF ECLANUM ON PSALM 103:2. By DR NEIL ADKIN

## REVIEWS

- Interpretation of the Bible* (ed. J. KRAJCOVIC et al.). By THE REVD PROFESSOR PAUL ELLINGWORTH 164  
*Theological Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Edward S. Childs* (ed. C. SEITZ and K. GREEN-  
 McCRAIGHT). By THE REVD RICHARD COGGINS 167  
*Speaking Her Word. Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Context* (E. S. FIORENZA). By DR  
 BARBARA SPINBLEY 169  
*Das Gesetz im alten und neuen Testament* (M. LIMBECK). By DR M. BOCKMUEHL 171  
*The Use of Arabic in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography* (J. KALTNER). By DR GEOFFREY KHAN 173  
*The Way to Canon. Creative Tradition History in the Old Testament* (M. SÆBO). By DR  
 PAUL R. NOBLE 175  
*Theology of the Old Testament* (W. BRUGGEMANN). By THE REVD PROFESSOR RONALD E.  
 CLEMENTS 178  
*Water in the Fray. A Tribute to Walter Brueggemann* (ed. T. LINAFELT and T. K. BEAL). By THE  
 REVD H. MOWLEY 180  
*The Covenant Formula* (R. RENDTORFF). By DR PAUL R. NOBLE 181  
*Tradition in Ancient Israel. Essays in Honour of J. A. Emerton* (ed. J. DAY et al.). By STUART  
 WIEBE 183  
*Die Lichtleid JHWHs. Untersuchungen zur Gestalttheologie Gottes im Alten Testament*  
 (T. PODILLA). By PROFESSOR JOHN F. HEALEY 186  
*The Text of Genesis 1-11* (R. S. HENDL). By THE REVD DR R. W. L. MOBERLY 188  
*Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context* (R. DE HOOP). By DR DEANA LIPTON 190

[continued overleaf]

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Logan 2000. PDF  
 Anth. Eccl. Fr.

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES  
 New Series  
 Vol. 51 Part 1  
 April 2000

indicate that the status of Christ's human soul was not perceived to be an issue that needed to be addressed at the Antiochene synod. As is well known, it would take the radical deficiencies of Arian and Apollinarian Christologies for the Church to become fully aware of this problem in the course of the fourth century and to develop a sufficient theological answer to it.<sup>109</sup>

U. M. LANG

<sup>109</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Mark Edwards and the Revd Dr Thomas Weinandy, OFM Cap., the convenors of the *Oxford Patristics Seminar*, at which a previous draft of this paper was read, and to Dr Johannes Zachhuber and Mr Richard Dobbins for their most exacting and helpful criticisms. This work was made possible thanks to a scholarship of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD—HSP III). The abbreviations follow those of the *Bibliographia Patristica XXXIII—XXXV*, Berlin—New York 1997, where available.

MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA  
(PSEUDO-ANTHIMUS),  
'ON THE HOLY CHURCH': TEXT,  
TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

I. INTRODUCTION

WRITING in 1898 ('Alcune note di letteratura patristica', *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* ser. 2, 31 (1898) pp. 1033–6 = *Opere Minori* II (*Studi e Testi* 77 (1937)), pp. 55–8), Giovanni Mercati discussed a fragment attributed to Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia who was martyred in the Diocletianic persecution. Entitled *On the holy Church*, it was addressed to a certain Theodore. He had found it in Codex Ambrosianus H 257 inf. of the thirteenth century, fol. 32<sup>r</sup>–33<sup>r</sup> (=A; see A. Martini & D. Bassi (eds.), *Catalogus Codicorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* 2 (Milan: U. Hoepli, 1906) no. 1041 p. 1110; Mercati wrongly refers to 32<sup>v</sup>–33<sup>v</sup>), and noted the existence of another copy in the Escorial (in MS Y.II.7 also of the thirteenth century, fol. 102<sup>r</sup>–103<sup>v</sup> =S; see G. de Andrés OSA. (ed.), *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Real Biblioteca de el Escorial* 2 (Madrid, 1965) no. 262 p. 113) from a catalogue of Greek MSS there. In a follow-up article, 'Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica. VIII. Anthimi Nicomediensis episcopi et martyris de sancta Ecclesia', *Studi e Testi* 5 (1901) pp. 87–98 (=M), Mercati, with the help of a copy of S made by Eribert Bekkers of Beuron, reproduced the Greek text collated from the two MSS, the longer and mostly superior A and the abbreviated S.

A, a collection of pieces of varying length and genre on orthodoxy and heresy from a range of fathers including Epiphanius (*Men. et pond.*, *Anakeph.*, and *Haer.*), Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Anastasius of Sinai, and John of Damascus, sandwiches the fragment between Timothy of Constantinople's *De receptione haereticorum* (MPG 86 12ff.) and an extract from a letter of Maximus the Confessor on heresarchs. S is similar, a collection of decrees, letters and excerpts from an overlapping list of fathers. Thus it includes such as John Chrysostom, Basil, Epiphanius (*Haer.*, from the Herodians and Simonians on but in a different order), Cyril, Theodoret, and Constantius of Byzantium, and Maximus (the same passage on two

natures (PG 91, 145-9) as A), sandwiching the fragment between a list of the fathers at Nicaea and the Maximus passage just mentioned (not spotted by de Andrés). As Mercati notes (art. cit. p. 92), the version in S is considerably reduced, marred by mistakes and lacks the last paragraph. It is evidently not more original than A, even though it preserves some better readings, including a list of heretics from Cerdo to the Manichees evidently omitted by A.

As regards form and content, Mercati describes it as a letter or tract (p. 87). That it has an addressee in the title ('To Theodore') and is addressed to an individual in the text (8: *ἵν' εἰδέναι ἔχουσ*), might suggest the former rather than the latter. It is a defence of the one, Catholic and apostolic Church against heresies with their limited regional extension and derivation, not from the apostles and their successors, the Catholic bishops, but from Hermes Trismegistus, Plato and Aristotle. After this general theme (1-3), there follows a catalogue of heretics arranged roughly chronologically, but, as we shall see, topically as well, from the Sadducees to the Manichees, to illustrate it (4-7). Then comes the crux of the piece: the demonstration that the Arians (including Eusebius of Caesarea as well as Asterius) derived some of their distinctive dogmas from Hermes and Plato via Valentinus, and others from Apelles, Marcion's disciple, and Dositheus, heresiarch of the Sadducees, with whom the catalogue began (8-18). The fragment concludes with a final claim that these heretics got their names from their particular heresiarchs and not from the holy, Catholic and apostolic Church, their original mother (19).

If the work is a unity, the content at once appears to rule out any ascription to Anthimus. Mercati suspected section 8-18 of being an interpolation partly because of the abrupt jump from second to fourth century heretics (p. 90), and in this he was followed by Walter Scott, *Hermetica 4: Testimonia* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1936), p. 155 n. 2, who suggested a date of around 350. Several possible hypotheses present themselves. Either (a) as A. Harnack argued (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius 2. Die Chronologie 2* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904), pp. 158-60), it is a complete fiction by a later writer attributed to Anthimus, or (b) as O. Bardenhewer suggested (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 2* 2nd edn. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1914), pp. 333-4), its kernel is a genuine letter on 'the church to Theodore by Anthimus, who is said in the martyr acts of Domna and Inde (in Simeon Metaphrastes PG 116, 1073, cf. 1076A) to have written a letter full of consolation to his church community from his hiding place in a village. Bardenhewer

suggests that a reader around the middle of the fourth century made additions to that kernel, which might have included the section on the second century heretics. A third possibility was suggested by Marcel Richard in 1949 in a seminal article ('Un opuscule méconnu de Marcel évêque d'Ancyre', *Mélanges de science religieuse* 5 (1949), pp. 5-28 = *Opera Minora* II 33 (Turnhout/Leuven: Brepols/University Press, 1977)), developed out of his examination of the fragments of Marcellus, that (c) it was a single genuine work by Marcellus (who would surely have written in his own name), later pseudepigraphically attributed to Anthimus. This is his preferred solution to the other possible alternative, involving two different texts, one by Anthimus, the other by Marcellus, combined more or less successfully by a disciple of Marcellus or by some accident of MS transcription.

Harnack, who rejected Mercati's arguments for interpolations while allowing the fragment might be part of an authentic letter to Theodore, produced the following arguments against the genuineness of the piece: (1) the citation of Eusebius of Caesarea and Asterius; (2) the naming of the Manichees and their derivation from Cerdo, Marcion, and Lucian; (3) the list climaxing with the Arians; (4) the dependence of the list on Epiphanius and even more on Filastrius, since the heretics Hermes and Seleucus are only attested in him; and (5) the statements about the Church, unheard of in the early fourth century on the part of an Easterner. Harnack concluded that the piece derived from the end of the fourth century at the earliest.

Richard argued for the unity of the piece and its Marcellan provenance first by comparing the surviving genuine Marcellan material (for him the letter to Julius and the extracts from Eusebius of Caesarea collected and ordered by Klostermann in an appendix to his edition of Eusebius' *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia* (*Eusebius Werke* 4, GCS 14 (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 184-215; rev. ed. G. C. Hansen (Akademie: Berlin, 1972)) with 8-18 of the fragment. He identifies the distinctive perspective of Marcellus over against other anti-Arians (ignoring subordination; rejecting any anthropomorphic understanding of the Word's generation before the ages as implying ditheism; attacking three hypostases), and argues that this is precisely that of Ps.-Anthimus. He also notes similar terminology, while admitting that section 18 on Arian blasphemies against the Holy Spirit suggests a much later date, the third quarter of the fourth century. Marcellus, of course, judging from Epiphanius' comment (*Haer.* 72.1: Holl 3 255.8f. and footnote), seems to have died in 374.

He then examines and 1-7 and 19, taking up Harnack's criticisms (2), (4) and (5), upholding their authentic character over against Harnack's rejection and Bardenhewer's cautious defence, with the aid of his Marcellan thesis, arguing that Marcellus wrote the whole work which was later assigned to Anthimus as a pseud-epigraph. Marcellus was surely most probably responsible for the passages on Valentinus and Apelles, and Harnack's arguments are neatly reversed: rather than Easterners borrowing from Filastrius, a reverse of the normal trend in theology at the time, the latter most likely got his information on Hermes and Seleucus—two Galatian heretics!—from Marcellus. He also demonstrates that the Arian section (16) does relate to the heresy list (4-7), while the Sadducean denial of the Holy Spirit (5) links very well with the Arians deriving their doctrine on the Spirit from Dositheus, heresiarch of the Sadducees (18).

Richard's analysis and conclusions have been generally accepted, for example by Martin Tetz, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I: Eine Markellische Schrift "De incarnatione et contra Arianos"', *ZKG* 75 (1964), p. 221, and Manlio Simonetti, 'Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcello d'Ancira', *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 9 (1973), pp. 313-6. Tetz refers in a footnote (n. 21) to the comment by G. Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätslehre* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956), p. 19 n. 3, that prayer to the Holy Spirit was the chief difficulty in ascribing the fragment to Marcellus; Tetz could find no grounds for such a difficulty in Richard's thesis. However, in 1983 Richard Hanson argued ('The Date and Authorship of Pseudo-Anthimus De Sancta Ecclesia', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 83, C, 9 (1983), pp. 251-4) that the particular type of Arianism targeted in the fragment by reference to Aristotle was Neo-Arianism (as further indicated by the appeal to the Word's origination by the will of God and the designation of the Spirit as 'servant'). This would suggest a date after 365 and thus the hypothesis of Marcellus himself as author seems 'unnecessary and fragile' (p. 253): the work derives from an author from the Eustathian and Marcellan tradition of theology in Antioch as late as the 370s and 380s (p. 254).

In an article in 1989, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and anti-Arian Polemic', E. A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica* 19 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989), pp. 189-97, I attempted to counter Hanson's case. He unfortunately had not been able to consult Richard's article, and deal with its detailed arguments for Marcellus himself as the most likely author, but both would agree on a late dating

I defended Marcellus as author on the grounds of (1) terminology (the use of distinctive terms and expressions found in Marcellus' fragments); (2) theology (the naming of Marcellus' key opponents, Asterius and Eusebius of Caesarea, characteristic of the 340s but not much later; denial of three hypostases, a position not defended by Marcellus' followers in the 370s; reference to Aristotle and to the Word's origination from the will of God by early Arians; concern with the Holy Spirit as found in Marcellus and his opponents in the 340s); and (3) the heresiological catalogue (characteristic of Marcellus as the most likely source of Filastrius' list and treatment). Marcellus' sources I posited as Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* and *Syntagma*, and Tertullian, *Praescriptio*, discovered by him during his sojourn in Rome.

Most recently Klaus Seibt in his large scale work, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 59: Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1994), pp. 64-6, has amended Richard's depiction of Marcellus' theology in the light of his own researches (Richard fails to note Marcellus' distinction between an origin and a begetting of the Word and wrongly assumes Marcellus excludes any idea of begetting, as he also wrongly claims Marcellus never polemized against the Word's creatureliness and subordination, and wrongly concludes that Eusebius of Caesarea did not calumniate Marcellus and that the letter to Julius was a false expression of the latter's belief). He also adds two more arguments for genuineness (the negative, anti-heretical use of *δόγμα* and the reference to Hermes and Seleucus as Galatian heretics—but Richard had already made that point (p. 24)!), and counters Hanson's arguments. First he echoes my argument that the early Arians already taught a derivation of the Son from the Father's will, then counters Hanson's appeal to the Aristotle reference as only relevant to the Neo-Arians, by pointing out that only the name is mentioned without any accompanying polemic. Finally he admits that only Hanson's third argument, about the Holy Spirit, has force. But in favour of dating between 340 and 350 (which would be my own choice: see below) he argues (1) Eusebius of Caesarea is spoken of as recently deceased; (2) the topic of the Holy Spirit was already in Marcellus' horizon in Eusebius' second book (a point already made by me); and (3) the topic must have been pursued by the Eusebians in the documents to which Marcellus responded with the so-called Western confession of Sardica. Seibt's final point is that dating the fragment late with Richard and Hanson does not exclude Marcellus as author. Although Seibt's renumbering

of the fragments in his edition is likely to replace Klostermann's version, for convenience I refer to the latter in the commentary while adding Seibt's numeration (= St) and the pagination (= V.) of Markus Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra: Die Fragmente, Der Brief an Julius von Rom* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1997)), who accepts Seibt's numeration almost entirely.

However, there remain one or two aspects of this rather clumsy and superficial work which might make one hesitate before definitively ascribing it to Marcellus and not to an epigone, influenced by his style and ideas. There is first, and perhaps most significantly, the tendency to speak of the Son pure and simple where one might have expected some qualifying reference to the Logos (cf. 1 (M 95.4: 'One God, one Son of God and one Holy Spirit...'); 2 (95.16: from the *prosopon* of God the Father to the Son: Isa. 49:6); 9 (96.49: Valentinus as first to invent three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Spirit). Now in the fragments Marcellus insists on speaking only of the Logos when referring to the situation prior to the incarnation, the titles 'Son' and 'Jesus Christ' only becoming valid after that event (cf. e.g. frs 42 (St 7: V. 10) and 91 (St 5: V. 46)); when such titles occur in the Old Testament they are to be understood as prophetic. However when we consider the occurrences of 'Son' in our text, we find that they either fall within this rubric (cf. 2 (95.15-18)), or echo Scripture and the general credal formulae of the Church, as in the letter to Julius (cf. 1 (95.4), 9 (96.49), 10 (96.58, quoting John 1:18), and letter to Julius (V. 126.13, 128.4, 11)). What is more, both that letter and *De sancta ecclesia* combine the titles 'Son' and 'Logos' in an odd anarthrous way which seems characteristic of Marcellus at this period (cf. letter (V. 126.9) and *De s. eccl.* 17 (98.86)).

The other problem is the howler of attributing passages of the *Timaeus* to Plato's words to Gorgias. Marcellus, it should be noted, does cite the *Gorgias* in the fragments (cf. fr. 88 (St 22: V. 22.16-19) citing *Gorg.* 454DE). However the problem, if awkward, is not entirely unanswerable. Marcellus' situation in the mid-340s, if my hypothesis is justified, was very different from that when writing his book against Asterius. Then he would have had access to the best libraries. In the mid-340s, dashing off a polemical letter perhaps from somewhere in exile, far from his books or a good library, he may have had access to a much more basic collection of philosophical sources, and/or just have been careless. His ability to quote from Hermetic tractates and works of Apelles need not be an objection—he must have made

and kept personal copies of such texts, building up his own anthology.

If then the case for Marcellan authorship holds up, there only remain the questions of the false ascription and the likely date. As regards the first, Richard is surely justified in rejecting the idea that Marcellus himself would have stooped to such a deception: he would have written in his own name. Further the pseudepigraph is too transparent and memories of the Great Persecution, particularly in Nicomedia, too fresh for contemporaries even in the 340s to have accepted Anthimus as author. However the obloquy that fell on Marcellus from 336 on must have made it increasingly difficult for anything written by him, particularly something critical of the Eusebians (cf. Sozomen, *HE* 2.33.1), to survive. Thus the most plausible hypothesis is that Marcellus wrote the letter in the 340s, probably from its tone and certain hints at the end, after his vindication by Julius and the Western Council of Sardica and in response to the breakaway Eastern Council. Then in the 370s a follower of his such as Eugenius (cf. the *Eugenii Legatio et Confessio Fidei* (PG 18, 1301-5, edited by Martin Tetz, 'Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien: Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasium des Diakons Eugenios von Ankyra', *ZNW* 64 (1973), pp. 75-121), seeking to preserve it in the face of increasing criticism of Marcellus from Basil of Caesarea (cf. *Ep.* 69.2) and others, cast about for a suitable author and lit on Anthimus. Being the first episcopal victim of imperial persecution as occupant of the church of the then capital and later see of the 'Arian' leader, Eusebius of Nicomedia, he was a most appropriate candidate. Exact memories of events of 60-70 years before would have faded—certainly the pseudepigraph, however clumsy, did evade detection till modern times. The subscript: 'To Theodore on the holy Church' might be genuine, part of a dogmatic-type letter of Marcellus written after his sojourn in Rome in the heat of the debates between East and West of the mid-340s, and while his memories of his chief opponents, Eusebius of Caesarea and Asterius, were still fresh.

Another pointer to a date in the mid-340s would be the concern with 'Arian' tenets such as three hypostases and the Son as a second God and Word, a product of the Father's will, which are reflected more in the documents of the Western and Eastern Councils of Sardica and the Eastern *Ekthesis Macrosthichos* than in Marcellus' letter to Julius or Ps.-Athanasius, *Oratio 4 contra Arianos* (if to be dated to 340 with Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV: eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ankyra & Photin von Sirmium*

(Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 36: Leiden: Brill, 1996)). In the letter to Julius the views attributed to Marcellus' opponents (the Son as not true Word etc., and as a distinct hypostasis; the Father pre-existing the Son, who is not true Son but like all things from God; 'there was when the Son was not', and thus he is a creature and work), are, as Vinzent has so persuasively argued ('Die Gegner im Schreiben Markells von Ankyra an Julius von Rom', *ZKG* 105 (1994), pp. 285-328), predominantly those of Asterius, as reconstructed from the fragments of Marcellus' book and from Athanasius, but as such they reflect earlier, slightly different concerns. Possible echoes in Cyril of Jerusalem (see commentary) may be a further pointer to a date in the mid-340s.

As regards Marcellus' heresiological sources, I would like to make a slight modification to my 1989 article. I am now of the opinion that Marcellus' primary source was the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus (which can be reconstructed from Ps.-Tertullian, *Adversus omnes haereses*, Filastrius' *Diversarum haereseon liber* and Epiphanius' *Panarion*, as well as from the fragment itself), rather than the *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, which I then also attributed to Hippolytus. I am entirely convinced by the arguments of Allen Brent, *Hippolytus & the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 31: Leiden: Brill, 1994), that only the *Syntagma* is the work of Hippolytus and that the *Refutatio* is to be attributed to an earlier author of the school of Hippolytus (henceforth referred to as Ps.-Hipp.). However elements of the latter's work, particularly the argument tracing heresy back to Greek philosophy, which although deriving from Irenaeus (who may have got it from Justin), was developed in relentless detail by the author of the *Refutatio*, may have influenced Marcellus.

The work does not perhaps add much to our knowledge of Marcellus' theology and suffers from the typical weaknesses of polemical heresiology (superficiality, inaccuracy, use of tendentious heresiological judgements and catalogues). As a polemical squib it is evidently of a much lower order of sophistication than Marcellus' treatise against Asterius, but that does not necessarily rule out his being the author. It contains terms and ideas characteristic of Marcellus and does fit the context and period suggested rather well. If indeed genuine, it fills a gap in our knowledge of Marcellus' career and of the development of his thinking, and in any case forms a vital link in the heresiological chain from Irenaeus through to Epiphanius and Filastrius, particularly in the way it connects with and further influences Western treatments

It also represents one of the earliest signs of knowledge of Hermetic literature by Eastern Christians, and perhaps hints at the existence of further and alternative anthologies of texts from pagan literature to those of Eusebius and Lactantius, produced independently of them but possibly in part to counter their appeal to pagan support for their understanding of central Christian doctrines. Thus because of this and striking similarities in terminology, it may serve to strengthen the recent claim by Christoph Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?) Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher 'Cohortatio ad Graecos'): Eine Einleitung und Kommentar* 2 vols (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 25: Basel: Reinhardt, 1994), that Marcellus was the author of Ps.-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, with its extensive citation from florilegia and original sources to illustrate pagan error about the one God, derived from unassisted reason, and pagan truth about that God, derived from Moses and other prophetic sources of divine revelation.

Finally it confirms the way key Eastern theologians like Athanasius and Marcellus built up and maintained a stereotyped and ultimately misleading and false picture of 'Arianism' as a heresy, through an obsessive dwelling on older figures like Eusebius of Caesarea and Asterius and their increasingly obsolete theological positions. This tendency is graphically illustrated by the last work which links both, the confession of orthodox faith to Athanasius by the Ancyran deacon, Eugenius, and his fellow clergy, defending their and Marcellus' orthodoxy. Tetz has convincingly demonstrated ('Markellianer') the way the confession's approach and theology is governed by the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* of Athanasius; thus it begins by anathematizing the Arian heresy and insisting on the creed of Nicaea, and proceeds to echo the rejection of the Spirit's creaturely status. But it thereby reinforces Athanasius' and Marcellus' stereotyped treatment of 'Arianism'.

## II. TEXT

32<sup>r</sup>

'Ανθίμου ἐπισκόπου Νικομηδίας καὶ μάρτυρος

102<sup>r</sup>

ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Θεόδωρον

95

περὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας

1. Ὡσπερ εἰς Θεὸς καὶ εἰς υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, οὕτως εἰς ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς κόσμος ἐγένετο, καὶ μία καθολικὴ καὶ

ἀποστολική ἐκκλησία καὶ ἐν βάπτισμα καθ' ὅλου ὑπάρχει τῶν  
κόσμου ὡς φησι Παῦλος Εἷς θεός, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα  
2. Μία τοίνυν καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἔστι<sup>2</sup> καθ'  
ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἢ τις ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραλαβοῦσα  
10 τὴν πίστιν ἄχρι νῦν<sup>4</sup> διαφυλάττει<sup>5</sup> καθολικὴ δὲ εἶρηται διότι καθ'  
ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου κεχυμένη ὑπάρχει κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον Εἷς πᾶσαι  
τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ<sup>6</sup> εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς  
οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ὅτι ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ θυμίαμα | S  
102<sup>v</sup> προσφέρεται καὶ θυσία καθαρὰ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ<sup>7</sup> ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν  
15 ἡλίου καὶ ἕως δυσμῶν τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου δεδοξασται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι  
καὶ<sup>8</sup> πάλιν ἡ προφητεία ὡς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός  
πρὸς τὸν υἱόν Ἰδοῦ, φησί, τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἰναί σε  
εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς. 3. αἱ<sup>9</sup> δὲ αἱρέσεις οὔτε ἀπὸ  
τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔλαβον οὔτε ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν  
20 τούτων διαδόχων ἐπισκόπων (ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐκαλοῦντο αἱρέσεις,  
αἱρέσεις<sup>10</sup> γὰρ κέκληται ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰρεῖσθαι τι ἴδιον καὶ τούτῳ  
ἐξακολουθεῖν), οὔτε<sup>11</sup> πάλιν πανταχοῦ εἰσι, ἀλλ'<sup>12</sup> εἰς τόπους  
σφόδρα βραχεῖς περιγεγραμμένοι,<sup>13</sup> ἔνθα ἴσχυσεν ὁ διάβολος  
πλανησαί τινας διὰ φιλαρχίας | M 96 κενῆς <καὶ> τούτους<sup>14</sup>  
25 προστάτας καταστήσαι τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κακοτεχνίας, ὅθεν οὐδὲ  
καθολικαὶ κέκληνται αἱ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαι. 4. Οὐκοῦν<sup>15</sup>  
ἀναγκαῖον εἶπεν πόθεν καὶ παρὰ τίνων τὰς ἀφορμὰς λαβόντες οἱ  
αἱρετικοὶ παρὰ αἱρετικῶν κατηνέχθησαν εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀπωλείας  
βάραθρον· ἔθος γὰρ τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς τὰ ἀλλήλων ὑφαιρεῖσθαι καὶ  
30 προσεξευρίσκειν καινότερα—αὐχοῦντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι ἀλλήλων.  
5. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν συγχωρήσει<sup>16</sup> θεοῦ Σαδδουκαῖοι ἐκ τῶν  
Ἰουδαίων ὄντες ἐκήρυξαν μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν μήτε πνεῦμα ἅγιον  
ὁμολογοῦντες μήτε ἀγγέλους μήτε προφήτας ἀφ' ὧν Κήριωθος  
μικρὰ<sup>17</sup> παραμείψας παραδίδωσι τοῖς Ἐβριωναίοις. 6. πάλιν οἱ

<sup>2</sup> ἔστι om. S.

<sup>3</sup> λ supra rasuram.

<sup>4</sup> νῦν—διότι A: τοῦ δεῦρο S.

<sup>5</sup> διαφυλάττει—διότι om. S.

<sup>6</sup> καὶ—αὐτοῦ S: καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς A.

<sup>7</sup> καὶ ἀπὸ—ἔθνεσι om. S.

<sup>8</sup> καὶ φησί A: καὶ ὁ πατήρ πρὸς τὸν υἱόν φησι διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ἰδοῦ S.

<sup>9</sup> αἱ δὲ—αἱρέσεις om. S.

<sup>10</sup> αἱρέσεις γὰρ A: αἱρεσίεις (sic!) S.

<sup>11</sup> οὔτε πάλιν A: ἀλλ' οὐδὲ S.

<sup>12</sup> ἀλλ'—κακοτεχνίας om. S.

<sup>13</sup> περιγεγραμμένοι S.

<sup>14</sup> καὶ τούτους Mercati.

<sup>15</sup> Οὐκοῦν—μὲν A: πόθεν δὲ τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἕκαστος ἔλαβον πρῶτοι S.

<sup>16</sup> Σαδδουκαῖοι συγχωρήσει θεοῦ S.

<sup>17</sup> μικρὰ παραμείψας A: τινὰ παραλείψας S.

25 ἀπὸ Σίμωνος<sup>18</sup> γνωστικοὶ λεγόμενοι<sup>19</sup> Μένανδρος καὶ Σατορνίνος  
καὶ Βασιλείδης,<sup>20</sup> Μάρκος τε καὶ Κολόρβασος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ  
καινότερα<sup>21</sup> ἀλλήλων παρεπένοσαν<sup>22</sup> τε καὶ παρέδωκαν τοῖς ὑπ'  
αὐτῶν ἠπατημένοι, ὅθεν καὶ γνωστικούς ἑαυτοὺς προσηγόρευσαν·  
30 ἐξ<sup>23</sup> ὧν ἔλαβον οἱ τε Ὀφίται καὶ Καινίται, Σηθίται<sup>24</sup> τε καὶ οἱ  
Ἐρμού καὶ Σελεύκου καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς<sup>25</sup> ὄχλος<sup>26</sup> τῶν αἱρετικῶν τῶν  
τὰ τοιαῦτα ληρούντων, ὡς ἀπὸ Νικολάου, | A 32<sup>v</sup> Καρποκράς<sup>27</sup>  
καὶ Πρόδικος καὶ Ἐπιφανῆς, οἱ καινότερα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπενόησαν.<sup>28</sup>  
ἢ ὡς ἀπὸ Κέρδωνος, Μαρκίων καὶ Λουκιανός, ἀφ' ὧν Μανιχαῖοι  
ἀφορμὰς λαβόντες καινότερα παρέδωκαν. 7. πάντες δὲ οὔτοι  
45 παρὰ Ἐρμού καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους τῶν φιλοσόφων<sup>29</sup>  
τὰς ἀφορμὰς τῆς ἀσεβείας<sup>30</sup> εἰλήφασι. 8. Τῆς δὲ ἐπιφθαρῆσης  
αἱρέσεως τῶν Ἀρειομανιτῶν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναγκαῖον  
δηλώσαι καὶ<sup>31</sup> περὶ αὐτῆς, ἵν' εἰδέναι ἔχοις ὅτι μετ' ἐντέχνου  
σοφιστείας ὑφέιλοντο τὰ δόγματα τῶν ἀρχαίων. 9. καὶ οὔτοι  
50 τοίνυν διδάσκουσι τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, ὡς Οὐαλεντίνος ὁ  
αἱρεσιάρχης<sup>32</sup> πρῶτος ἐπενόησεν ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῷ ἐπιγεγραμμένῳ  
αὐτῷ<sup>33</sup> Περὶ τῶν τριῶν φύσεων· αὐτὸς γὰρ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις καὶ  
τρια πρόσωπα πατρός καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος πρῶτος<sup>34</sup>  
ἐπενόησε, καὶ οὔτος δὲ παρὰ Ἐρμού καὶ Πλάτωνος ὑφελόμενος<sup>35</sup>  
55 εὐρίσκειται. 10. διὸ καὶ πάλιν | M 97 πρὸ αἰώνων<sup>35</sup>  
ἀναπλάττουσι δεύτερον θεὸν ὑπὸ<sup>36</sup> πατρός γεγενῆσθαι, ὡς ὁ  
πρόκριτος παρ' αὐτοῖς Ἀστέριος ἔφη διδαχθεῖς ὑπὸ Ἐρμού τοῦ

<sup>18</sup> Σίμωνος: γνωστοὶ ἢ add. S: γνωσταὶ conj. Mercati.

<sup>19</sup> λεγόμενοι om. S.

<sup>20</sup> Βασίλ—Κολορβ. A: βασιλείδης καὶ Μάρκος, Κολόρβασος τε S.

<sup>21</sup> καινότεραν S.

<sup>22</sup> παρεπένοσαν τε καὶ om. S.

<sup>23</sup> ἐξ A: ἀφ S.

<sup>24</sup> Σηθίται sic S, contra Mercati Σιθίται.

<sup>25</sup> οἱ λοιποὶ S.

<sup>26</sup> ὄχλος—ληρούντων om. S.

<sup>27</sup> Καρποκράς (i.e. Καρποκράτης)—καινότερα A: Καρποκράτους καὶ Προδίκου καὶ Ἐπιφανίου καὶ νοταρίου S.

<sup>28</sup> ἐπενόησαν: ἢ ὡς ἀπὸ Κέρδωνος, Μαρκίων καὶ Λουκιανός ἀφ' ὧν Μανιχαῖοι ἀφορμὰς λαβόντες καὶ νοταρίου (leg. καινότερα Mercati) παρέδωκαν add. S.

<sup>29</sup> τῶν φιλοσόφων om. S.

<sup>30</sup> τῆς ἀσεβείας om. S.

<sup>31</sup> καὶ—των om. S.

<sup>32</sup> ὁ αἱρεσιάρχης om. S.

<sup>33</sup> om. S.

<sup>34</sup> πρῶτος—δὲ A: παραδέδωκεν. ὅπερ S.

<sup>35</sup> πρὸ αἰώνων (viz. προαιώνιον Mercati) S.

<sup>36</sup> τοῦ add. S.

92 | S 103<sup>f</sup> ἐπικληθέντος<sup>37</sup> Τρισημέριστου φάσκει<sup>38</sup> γὰρ οὕτως<sup>39</sup> πρὸς  
 60 Ἀσκληπιὸν τὸν ἱατρὸν· Ἄκουε τοιγαροῦν, Ἀσκληπιέ.<sup>40</sup> ὁ κύριος καὶ  
 ἐποίησε θεὸν ὄρατον καὶ αἰσθητὸν· ὅθεν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ μονογενὴς  
 θεὸς παρὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἰωάννην λέγοντα υἱὸν μονογενῆ  
 65 προσεῖρη.<sup>41</sup> 11. εἶτα πάλιν ὁ Τρισημέριστός φησιν· Ἐπεὶ οὖν  
 τοῦτον ἐποίησε πρῶτον καὶ μόνον καὶ ἓνα, κάλος<sup>42</sup> δὲ αὐτῷ ἐφάνη  
 καὶ πληρέστατος πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἠγάσθη τε καὶ πάνυ  
 70 ἐφίλησεν αὐτὸν ὡς ἴδιον τόκον. 12. τοίνυν ἡ<sup>43</sup> περὶ θεοῦ πρῶτου  
 καὶ δευτέρου οἰσις ἐντεύθεν<sup>44</sup> αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἴληφε.<sup>45</sup> διὰ  
 τοῦτο καὶ ἀγέννητον Εὐσέβιος ὁ τῆς Καισαρείας γέγραφε.<sup>46</sup>  
 13. ὁ δὲ Πλάτων πρὸς Γοργίαν οὕτω φάσκει<sup>47</sup> Ταῦτα δὴ  
 70 πάντα<sup>48</sup> τότε ταύτη πεφυκῶτα ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὁ τοῦ καλλίστου καὶ  
 ἀρίστου δημιουργοῦ ἐν τοῖς γινομένοις<sup>50</sup> παρελάμβανεν, ἥνικα τε  
 καὶ<sup>51</sup> τὸν αὐτάρκη καὶ τελεώτατον υἱὸν γενῆ.<sup>52</sup> οὕτως ἐχόντων, ὁμολογητέον  
 αὐτῷ λόγῳ φησὶ· Τούτων δὴ<sup>54</sup> οὖν<sup>55</sup> οὕτως ἐχόντων, ὁμολογητέον  
 75 ἔν μὲν εἶναι τὸ κατ' αὐτῶν<sup>56</sup> εἶδος ἔχον, ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον,  
 οὔτε εἰς ἑαυτὸ εἰσδεχόμενον ἄλλο ἄλλοθεν, οὔτε αὐτὸ εἰς ἄλλα  
 80 ποιοῦν,<sup>57</sup> ἄορατον δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἀναίσθητον τοῦτο, ὁ δὲ<sup>58</sup> νοήσας  
 εἴληφεν ἐπισκοπῆν.<sup>59</sup> τὸ δὲ ὁμώνυμον ὁμοῖόν τε ἐκείνῳ δευτέρου  
 γεννητὸν, αἰσθητὸν,<sup>60</sup> πεφορημένον. | M 98 14. Ταῦτα αἰτία  
 τῆς πλάνης αὐτοῖς γέγονεν, οἱ<sup>61</sup> μὴ προσέχοντες τῆς ὁρθῆς

37 om. S.

38 λέγει S.

39 οὕτως S.

40 om. S.

41 Sic S et non conj. Merc. προσεῖρην.

42 κάλλιος δὲ A: κάλος τε S: κάλλι &lt;στ&gt;ος conj. Mercati.

43 om. S.

44 ἐντεύθεν—ἀρχὴν om. S.

45 εἴληχε (?) S.

46 ἔγραφε S.

47 οὕτω φάσκει A: λέγει S.

48 ἃ add. A.

49 Tim. leg. τε καὶ

50 Tim. leg. γινομένοις

51 Tim. leg. τε καὶ post τὸν αὐτάρκη

52 Tim. leg. θεὸν ἐγέννα

53 ἐν—λόγῳ om. S.

54 Tim. leg. δὲ

55 om. S.

56 κατ' αὐτῶν A: καθ' αὐτὸ S. Tim. leg. κατὰ ταῦτα

57 Tim. leg. ἀλλὰ ποι ἰδν.

58 Tim. leg. δὴ

59 Tim. leg. εἴληχεν ἐπισκοπεῖν

60 Tim. leg. αἰσθητὸν, γεννητὸν

61 οἱ—ἐξέπεσον om. S.

80 θεοσεβείας ἐξέπεσον. πόθεν<sup>62</sup> δὲ καὶ τὸ βουλήσει θεοῦ ὑποστήναι  
 τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον ἀπεφήναντο; οὐχὶ καὶ τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ  
 Τρισημέριστου μαθόντες;<sup>63</sup> 15. οὗτος γὰρ μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν  
 85 περὶ τοῦ δευτέρου λέγων οὕτως<sup>64</sup> ἔφη· Εἰσόμμεθα τὸν  
 προενοούμενον<sup>65</sup> θεόν, ὃς τὰ πάντα μὲν ἐκείνου ὅμοια  
 βουληθέντος ἔχει,<sup>66</sup> δυσι δὲ λείπεται τῷ εἶναι ἐν σώματι καὶ  
 ὄρατον ὑπάρχειν. 16. τούτοις προσέχοντες κακῶς ἀπεσφάλησαν  
 τῆς ἀληθοῦς γνώσεως οἱ<sup>67</sup> Ἐρμού τε καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ  
 Ἀριστοτέλους αὐχοῦντες εἶναι μαθηταὶ ἢ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν  
 90 ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ. 17. τὸ δὲ δεύτερον αἴτιον υἱὸν λόγον, ἦν<sup>68</sup>  
 καὶ δευτέραν ἀρχὴν<sup>69</sup> νενομίκασι, ἔλα- | A 33<sup>f</sup> βον παρὰ  
 Ἀπελλῆ τοῦ μαθητοῦ Μαρκίωνος, ὃς στασιάσας πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ  
 διδάσκαλον οὕτως ἔφη· Ψεύδεται Μαρκίων λέγων εἶναι<sup>70</sup> ἀρχὰς  
 95 δύο.<sup>71</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ φημι μίαν, ἥτις ἐποίησε δευτέραν ἀρχὴν.  
 18. πάλιν<sup>72</sup> δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον βλασφημοῦσι μὴ δεῖν τοῦτο  
 προσκυνεῖσθαι λέγοντες μηδὲ σέβεσθαι, δοῦλον γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ  
 100 ὑπηρέτην εἶναι<sup>73</sup> ἀποκαλοῦσι.<sup>74</sup> | S 103<sup>v</sup> καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἄθεον  
 δόγμα παρὰ Δουσιθέου τοῦ αἰρεσιάρχου τῶν Σαδδουκαίων  
 λαβόντες,<sup>75</sup> εἰς τὸν τῆς ἀθετίας βυθὸν ἀπεπνίγησαν. 19. Ἰστέον  
 δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἅμα τῷ ἀναχωρῆσαί τινας στασιάσαντας πρὸς  
 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸ ἀποστολικὸν κήρυγμα, εὐθέως οἱ πρὸς  
 αὐτῶν πλανηθέντες καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀποσχισάντος αἰρεσιάρχου  
 ἐκαρπώσαντο, ἀπολέσαντες τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ἀναθρεψαμένης αὐτοῦς  
 ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.

## III. TRANSLATION

A 32<sup>f</sup>

Anthimus, Bishop of Nicomedia and Martyr

S 102<sup>f</sup>

M 95 From what he wrote to Theodore about the holy Church.

62 πόθεν A: ὅθεν S.

63 om. S.

64 om. S.

65 προενοούμενον S.

66 ἔχει βουληθέντος S.

67 οἱ—αὐτοῦ om. S.

68 ὃν S.

69 ἀρχὴν δευτέραν S.

70 εἶναι λέγων S.

71 om. A.

72 πάλιν—προσκυνεῖσθαι A: τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα μὴ δεῖν προσκυνεῖσθαι S.

73 om. S. Contra Mercati, S. leg. ἀποκαλοῦσι.

74 καὶ—Δουσιθέου A: τοῦτο δὲ παρὰ Θεοδοσίου S.

75 ἔλα (= ἔλαβον?) S. Hinc terminat S.



1. Just as there is one God and one Son of God and one Holy Spirit, so one human being was created by God and one cosmos, and so too there exists one Catholic and apostolic Church and one baptism throughout the whole cosmos, as Paul says: 'one God, one faith, one baptism' (Eph. 4:5).

2. There is then one Catholic and apostolic Church throughout the whole world, which received the faith from the apostles and preserves it up till now. Now it is called 'catholic' because it is spread throughout the entire cosmos, as the saying goes: 'their voice went out into all the earth and their (S his) words to the ends of the world' (Ps. 18:5), and 'That in every place incense | S 102' is offered and a pure sacrifice to God, and from the rising of the sun to its setting the name of the Lord is glorified among the nations' (Mal. 1:11). And again the prophecy as from the character of God the Father to the Son: 'Behold' he says, 'I have set you as a light for the nations for you to be salvation to the end of the earth' (Isa. 49:6).

3. Now the heresies did not receive [their starting points, cf. 4] from the apostles or from their disciples or from the bishops their successors (since they would not have been called 'heresies', seeing that heresies have been so called from selecting something characteristic and following it). Nor again do they exist everywhere, but they are limited to very restricted areas where the devil prevailed in leading some astray through a vain lust for power, | M 96 [and] to establish them in command of his own evil scheming. This is the reason why their churches are not even called 'catholic'.

4. Therefore it is necessary to state from where and from whom the heretics received their starting points, [and] how they were brought down by heretics to the pit of ruin. For it is the custom among heretics to steal from one another and to discover new ideas as well—they boast that they are teachers of one another.

5. Now first of all by God's assent Sadducees deriving from the Jews proclaimed there was no resurrection, nor did they believe in a holy spirit nor in angels nor prophets. Cerinthus, after making slight alterations to their system, transmits it to the Ebionites.

6. Again those of Simon's school, called 'gnostics', Menander and Saturninus, Basilides, Marcus and Colorbasus and the rest, invented newer ideas than each other and passed them on to those taken in by them. This is why they also called themselves 'gnostics'. The Ophites and Cainites, Sethites and the followers of Hermes and Seleucus were recipients from them, and so was the rest of the mob of heretics, who babble out such stuff—for example | A 32<sup>v</sup> Carpocrates and Prodicus and Epiphanes (who also

devised new ideas of their own) from Nicolaus, or Marcion and Lucian from Cerdo. From these Manichees took their starting points and transmitted new ideas.

7. Now all these derived the starting points of their impiety from the philosophers Hermes, Plato and Aristotle.

8. Now with the heresy of the Ariomaniacs, which has corrupted the Church of God, it is necessary to clarify the matter in their case as well, that you may be able to know that by deceitful sophistry they have filched the dogmas of the ancients.

9. These then teach three hypostases, just as Valentinus the heresiarch first invented in the book entitled by him 'On the Three Natures'. For he was the first to invent three hypostases and three persons of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and he is discovered to have filched this from Hermes and Plato.

10. That is also why they again | M 97 devise a second god created by the Father before the ages, as their esteemed Asterius said, instructed by Hermes surnamed | S 103<sup>r</sup> Trismegistus (for this is how he speaks to Asclepius the physician: 'Hear then, Asclepius. The lord and maker of everything, whom we are accustomed to name God, created the second god visible and perceptible as well'). This is also where he acquired his 'only begotten god' instead of from the divine John saying 'only begotten Son' (John 1:18; 3:16, 18).

11. Then again Trismegistus says: 'When therefore he fashioned this first and sole and one being, it appeared beautiful to him and filled with all goods, he was delighted and loved it with all his heart as his own offspring.'

12. This then was the source from which their notion of a first and second god originated. It was on account of this too that Eusebius of Caesarea wrote 'unbegotten'.

13. For Plato speaks as follows to Gorgias: 'Such then being the necessary nature of all these things, the demiurge of the most beautiful and the best took them over from among things generated at the time when he also begets his self-sufficient and most perfect son (*Tim.* 68E).' And again he says in the same work: 'This being so, we must agree that the one really exists with a form after them (?), unbegotten and imperishable, neither receiving anything from elsewhere into itself nor transforming itself into other entities, not even perceptible to sight or to any other sense, of which only the person who thinks has received contemplation. But there is a second with the same name, like it, but begotten, perceptible, in motion (*Tim.* 52A).'

14. | M 98 These have been the causes of error for those who fell away from the orthodox faith by not pursuing it intently.

And what too was the source of their declaring that it was by the will of God that the Word of God subsisted? Did they not learn this too from Trismegistus?

15. For after the first god, when discussing the second, he speaks as follows: 'We shall see the preconceived god, who is like the one who was willed in every respect, but for two things: being in the body and being visible.'

16. In paying attention to these they were deprived of the true knowledge, boasting of being disciples of Hermes and Plato and Aristotle rather than of Christ and his apostles.

17. Now the second cause, Son, Word, which they are also accustomed to call second principle, they took | A 33<sup>r</sup> from Apelles, Marcion's pupil, who in a dispute with his own teacher spoke as follows: 'Marcion is wrong to speak of two principles: now I speak of one, which made a second principle.'

18. Furthermore, they blaspheme the Holy Spirit asserting that one should not venerate or revere it, for they disparage it as a slave and servant. | S 103<sup>v</sup> Deriving this impious dogma from Dositheus, heresiarch of the Sadducees, they have been suffocated in the pit of atheism.

19. One should also be aware of this, that at the same time as certain people withdrew, who were in revolt against the Church and the apostolic preaching, at that very moment those of their party who had been led astray also harvested the name of the schismatic heresiarch and lost the name of her who had nurtured them, the holy Catholic and apostolic Church.

#### IV. COMMENTARY

*Superscription:* this is in the name of Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia and martyr, from a work to Theodore, on the holy Church. Anthimus died by beheading, perhaps as one of the first martyrs of the Great Persecution under Diocletian (cf. Eusebius, *HE* 8.6.6 and 13.1-2). The dating of this is problematic. The *Chronicon Paschale* dates it to 303 in a passage Bidez has argued (Bidez-Winkelmann, *GCS Philostorgius* (Berlin Akademie, 1972), *Cliff.*) comes from an Arian historian. However the passage includes a letter from the presbyter Lucian of Antioch from prison in Nicomedia, recounting Anthimus' recent martyrdom, which, since we can date Lucian's martyrdom to 7 January 312, would appear to suggest a date of 311. This seems confirmed by a fragment from the life and martyrdom of Lucian (in Bidez-Winkelmann, 188.19-189.3), which refers to Maximin casting Anthimus into the fire as well.

Peter of Alexandria, who was martyred on 25 November 311. Certainly the Eastern Church celebrates Anthimus' martyrdom on 3 September. On the other hand, the evidence of Eusebius clearly points to decapitation, as does the passage from the Arian historian in the *Chronicon Paschale* (cf. Bidez-Winkelmann 203.17f.), which, however, is probably based on Eusebius, and in early Syrian Martyrology using a Greek source of the 360s gives the date as 24 April 303 (see F. Nau, 'Un martyrologe et douze ménologes syriaques', *Patrologia Orientalis* 10, p. 15).

*To Theodore:* as Harnack points out, *Geschichte*, 160, the name is so common as to be of no help in identification.

*On the holy Church:* this could be a genuine description of the fragment, part of a letter, rather than a book (as Scott assumes, *Hermetica* 4, p. 155 n. 2), by Marcellus himself. On the term 'holy Church' cf. his letter to Julius (Kl./H. fr. 129 215.24: V. 128.9).

*Section 1 (1-3):* Introduction to the theme: the one holy Catholic Church over against localized heresies.

*1.1. Just as there is one God:* in characteristic fashion Marcellus stresses the oneness of God as of Adam, the cosmos, the Catholic and apostolic Church and baptism, citing Eph. 4:5, but reading *θεός* rather than *κύριος*. This may be to make clear that the Father is meant rather than the Son. Cf. fr. 75 (Kl./H. 200.15-22: St 90: V. 78.5-13) which does read and interpret *κύριος* in terms of the Son, and continues with the mention of *θεός* to indicate that the Father is included. The refrain, 'One God, one Son of God, one Holy Spirit', recalls the creed of Nicaea, as does the reference to the Catholic and apostolic Church. Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.10.1/Epiphanius, *Haer.* 1.30.3-5, and also Marcellus' creed in the letter to Julius (Kl./H. 215.3, 24: V. 126.7). The references to 'Son' here (and in 2 and 9) rather than to 'Logos', the preferred term of the fragments, or even the compromise 'Son/Logos' of the letter to Julius (Kl./H. 215.5, cf. 26: V. 126.9, cf. 128.12) might suggest Marcellus' more cautious and nuanced answer to earlier criticism. We find an echo of Eph. 4:5 and this theme of faith in one God and a preference for the term 'Son' in what may have been Marcellus' last work, the confession of faith sent in 371 to Athanasius by Eugenius, a deacon of Ancyra and other clergy and laity still loyal to him. Marcellus speaks of 'one faith in the one God through the Son and in the Holy Spirit' (Tetz, 'Markellianer' p. 81. Cf. the similar language about the Catholic faith in one God, in the Son and the Holy Spirit coupled with insistence on one hypostasis in the likely Marcellan *Epistula ad Liberium* (Tetz, 'Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra III. Die pseudoathanasianische Epistula ad

Liberium, ein Markellische Bekenntnis', *ZKG* 83 (1972), p. 152). Interestingly, Marcellus appears to be the first to introduce or attest the later credal formula 'one baptism', presumably under the influence of the Ephesians text. His creed in the letter to Julius (Kl./H. 215.24; V. 128.10) has 'forgiveness of sins', while the credal statement of the Eastern Council of Sardica (Hilary, *frag. hist. Coll. Antiar. Par. Series A IV.2* (29.3); Feder CSEL 65 (Vienna/Leipzig: Tempsky/Freytag, 1916), 72.2f.) has 'holy Church, remission of sins'. Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 18.22 (one baptism for the forgiveness of sins followed by reference to the one holy Catholic Church); *Procat.* 7 (appealing to Eph. 4:5 to support the unrepeatability of baptism); Epiphanius, *Anc.* 118.12f. (one holy Catholic and apostolic Church... one baptism for the remission of sins).

2. *One catholic and apostolic Church*: his journey to and sojourn in Rome would have given Marcellus concrete evidence of the worldwide extent and universal character of the Church.

*throughout the entire world*: instead of *κόσμος* as in 1, Marcellus uses *οἰκουμένη* to refer to the inhabited world, in an unmistakable allusion to Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.10.1/Epiph. *Haer.* 31.30.3. Cf. Eusebius, *HE* 5.21.1; Marcellus (Ps.-Justin), *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 38.2 (M. Marcovich, *Pseudo-Iustinus Cohortatio ad Graecos; De Monarchia; Oratio ad Graecos* (PTS 32: Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1990), p. 78); Cyr. Jer. *Cat.* 18.23. On the term *οἰκουμένη* see G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), pp. 944f.

*which received the faith from the apostles*: here the faith is *quod creditur*. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.10.1/Epiph. *Haer.* 31.30.3 is again the evident source. Cf. letter of Eastern Council of Sardica (Hil. *frag. hist. Coll. Antiar. Par. Series A IV.1*: 49.14-21).

*and preserves it up till now*: cf. Iren. 1.10.2/Epiph. *Haer.* 31.31.1.

*Now it is called 'catholic'*: as Mercati noted (p. 90 n. 2, p. 95 1. 10 app.), this definition occurs in the Pseudo-Athanasian *Quaestiones in Novum Testamentum* 37 (PG 28, 724A: *Διὰ τί ἡ ἐκκλησία καλεῖται ἐκκλησία, καὶ διὰ τί καθολική; Ἀπόκ. Ἐκκλησία μὲν διὰ τὸ πάντα ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, καθολική δὲ διότι καθολοῦ τοῦ κόσμου κεχυμένη ὑπάρχει*) attributed there to Cyril. That the Cyril in question is he of Jerusalem, not of Alexandria, is evident from the similarity of expression in *Cat.* 18.23f.: *καθολική μὲν οὖν καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης*. The similarity might be a further pointer to a date in the early to mid-340s for the work.

*'their voice...'*: A abbreviates this citation of Ps. 18:5 LXX, while S has the masculine singular ('his voice'; 'his words'), despite the feminine subject, rather than the plurals of LXX.

*'That in every place...'*: both versions reverse the order of this citation from Mal. 1:11 LXX, probably because the references to every place and incense etc. were more apropos, read *προσφέρεται* (with e.g. Justin, *Dial.* 28.5; 41.2; 116.4; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.136.2) rather than the *προβάγεται* of LXX, and understandably omit 'to my name' and change 'my name' to 'the name of the Lord'. For a citation of the latter part cf. Cyr. Jer. *Cat.* 18.25.

*as from the character*: cf. Marc. *Cohort.* 34.1 (Marcovich p. 71); *ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ* seems to be echoed in fr. 58 (Kl./H. 195.10; St 98; V. 88.12). The same quotation formula with a variety of subjects, none of them exactly as here, is a striking feature of the pseudo-Athanasian *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* (PG 28, 984-1027), which Tetz details as part of his case for Marcellan authorship of the work (see 'Theologie I' p. 251). But Tetz is cautious about fragment 58 as representing an actual quotation formula (p. 254), and Simonetti rejects Tetz's case ('*Alcune opere*' pp. 323-9), including this argument, noting how universal such a usage was, as does Hanson, 'Date', p. 252, where he refers to the ancient and widespread use of the formula from Justin (wrongly dated to the mid-third century!) on. Cf. Justin, 1 *Apol.* 36.1-2; 37.1; 38.1; 47.1; 49.1 and 53.7; Eus. *Praep. ev.* 7.11.5, 12.6; 11.9.1; Athanasius, *C. gent.* 34; *De inc.* 3; Cyr. Jer. *Procat.* 6; *Cat.* 16.29; Epiph. *Haer.* 23.6.4; 69.51.1 etc. (However it should be pointed out that Justin always uses *ἀπό*, not the *ἐκ* of Eusebius, Marcellus, Athanasius etc.) *Prosopon* does not necessarily imply a separate hypostasis, cf. Tetz, 'Theologie I' p. 254. That three *prosopa* are added to the three hypostases of Valentinus, the alleged source of the separate hypostases of the Arians, in 9, might imply a careful distinction on Marcellus' part: while rejecting three hypostases he can accept three distinct (but not separate) *prosopa* in God. Cf. fr. 67 (Kl./H. 198.7f.; St 48; V. 44.3) where Marcellus rejects Asterius' 'two separate (*διαιρούμενα*) *prosopa*'.

*'Behold I have set you'*: Isa. 49:6 LXX. Cf. Iren. *Dem.* 49-50 which seems to allude to the idea of the Father speaking to the Son.

3. *seeing that heresies have been so called*: this is the second passage found in Ps.-Ath. *Quaest.* 38 (PG 28, 724A: *Πόθεν λέγεται αίρεσις; Ἀπόκ. Ἀπὸ τοῦ αίρεῖσθαι τί ἴδιον καὶ τοῦτο ἐξακολουθεῖν*).

*the devil prevailed*: cf. frag. 110 (Kl./H. 208.29; St 83; V. 72.10).

*churches... not even called 'catholic'*: Cyril of Jerusalem seems to echo this (*Cat.* 18.26); cf. also Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* 1.4.

*Section 2 (4-7) Catalogue of heresies from the Sadducees to the Manichees by genealogy and topic. Their origin from Greek philosophy.*

4. *the heretics received their starting points*: this is a clear echo of Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.24.1/Epiph. *Haer.* 23.1.1 on Saturninus. Cf. Iren. 1.27.1/Ps.-Hipp. *Ref. omn. haer.* 7.37.1/Theodoret, *Haer. fab. comp.* 1.24 on Cerdo.

*the pit of ruin*: cf. Eus. *HE* 4.7.2; *Vita Const.* 2.12.1.1; Ath. *Ep. ad ep. Eg. Lib.* 2; Epiph. *Haer.* 28.2.6; Greg. of Naz. *Or.* 4.56; 24.18; 28.15.

*the custom among heretics to steal from one another*: cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 31.1.4.

*and to discover new ideas*: cf. Iren. 1.28.1 (*adinventores sententiae*); 1.21.5.

*teachers of one another*: cf. Iren. 1.28.1 (*omnes velint doctores esse*).

5. *first of all ... Sadducees deriving from the Jews ... no resurrection*: cf. Ps.-Clem. *Rec.* 1.54.2f. Marcellus appears to be using Hippolytus' *Syntagma* as his main source for the catalogue. From Photius, *Bibliotheca* 121 (PG 103, 401D-403B), and from a comparison of Ps.-Tert. *Adv. omn. haer.* 1.1 (CCSL 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), p. 1401) and Filastrius, *Div. haer. lib.* 4f. (Marx CSEL 38 (Prague/Vienna/Leipzig: Tempsky/Freytag, 1898) p. 3), we gather that Hippolytus began with Jewish heretics, Dositheus as heresiarch of the Samaritans, who denied the resurrection, the Holy Spirit, angels and prophets, followed by the Sadducees. This is corroborated by 18 where Arian denial of the Holy Spirit is derived from the views of Dositheus, heresiarch of the Sadducees. Filastrius appears to have been more influenced by Marcellus here than by Epiphanius, his usual main source (cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 13.1.1 where Dositheans accept the resurrection, and 14.2.2 where the Sadducees are described as here but Filastrius does not follow suit).

*nor ... in a holy spirit, nor in angels nor prophets*: cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 14.2.2. Gregory of Nazianzus' allusion to Sadducean denial of the Holy Spirit, angels and the resurrection (*Or.* 31.5), appears more dependent on Marcellus' version than on that in Epiphanius (*ibid.*). The passage does not seem to betray real knowledge of the Sadducees, but evidently derives from their description as originating from the Samaritans, who, as only accepting the Pentateuch, were considered not to believe in the prophets (and by extension the angels and Holy Spirit announcing and instigating the incarnation).

*Cerinthus, after making slight alterations*: here Marcellus plainly departs from the Hippolytan catalogue, which, following

Irenaeus, seems to have placed Cerinthus after Carpocrates (cf. Iren. 1.26.1; Ps.-Tert. 3.2; Fil. 36). As will become clear, Marcellus has reorganized Hippolytus' list topically; he starts with Jewish heresies, Dositheans to Ebionites (1-4), then come the dualist 'gnostics', Simon to Hermes and Seleucus (5-14), then libertine 'gnostics' from them, Nicolaus to Epiphaneus (15-18), and finally the strict dualists, Cerdo to the Manichees (19-22). The Jewish colour of Cerinthus in Hippolytus' work is suggested by the way he is treated by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 27) and Filastrius (36). Athanasius' unparalleled derivation of Arian views of Christ from the Sadducees (*De decr.* 10.4), has probably been influenced by Marcellus and his catalogue, which derives the Ebionites and their views from Cerinthus and the Sadducees. This would be further evidence to support a date for *De sancta ecclesia* in the 340s rather than in the 360s or later, and to indicate the influence of Marcellus on Athanasius' attitude to Arianism. Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem's genealogy of heresy starting with Simon and ending with the Manichees in *Cat.* 6.14-20.

6. *those of Simon's school, called 'gnostics'*: the lumping together of heretics from Menander to the Valentinians as 'gnostics' deriving from Simon is the gist of Irenaeus' charge (cf. 1.23.3/Epiph. 21.4.4; 2 praef.), probably picked up by Hippolytus, and from him by Marcellus and Epiphanius (cf. Epiph. 31.1.5). Following Hippolytus' catalogue, Marcellus mentions the first few names after Simon then jumps to the last of the Valentinian group. Marcus and Colorbasus are linked exactly as here by Ps.-Hipp. *Ref.* 6.55.1-3, who speaks of those of the Valentinian school inventing novelties (*καινότερα ἐπιγινώσκτες*). What would seem to unite this group as 'gnostics' is a particular dualism involving belief in an unknown transcendent God who is not responsible for this world, which is the work of angels (or a lower demiurge) deriving from but hostile to him, and a consequent anti-cosmic view of salvation involving the soul alone through knowledge brought by a docetic Saviour.

*those taken in by them*: cf. Epiph. 21.6.3.

*The Ophites, Cainites and Sethites: ... recipients from them*: for the claim cf. Epiph. 23.2.1. The first two are derived from the 'gnostics' of Iren. 1.30-31, probably given their present identities by Hippolytus (cf. Ps.-Tert. 2; Epiph. 37.1.1f.; 38.1.1). The third is Hippolytus' addition from his own knowledge of gnostics who had reinterpreted their myth in terms of Seth (cf. Ps.-Tert. 2; Origen, *Comm Tit frag.* in Pamphilus, *Apology* 1 (PG 17, 54A: 'Tethianos'); Epiph. 39.1.1-5.3 and my book, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996),

ch. 2). Their myth is not the same as that of the Sethians of the *Refutatio*, although there may be some relation. Since Filastrius transferred the three to the beginning as most ancient, presumably because of their concern with Adam, Cain, and Seth, he has felt obliged to add a heresy of Jude (34) derived from Irenaeus' account of the Cainites (1.31.1), after Nicolaus.

*and the followers of Hermes and Seleucus*: these obscure Galatian heretics, as noted above, are only otherwise attested by Filastrius (55 and 56), and are a key factor in Richard's argument for Marcellan authorship. Their confused views do have some resemblance to the 'gnostics' of Hippolytus and Marcellus in that they teach the angelic creation of the soul, and are claimed to have undergone Platonic influence (see commentary on 7 and below).

*Carpocrates and Prodicus and Epiphanes ... from Nicolaus*: again Marcellus departs from the likely order in Hippolytus, which according to Ps.-Tert. 1, Epiph. 25 and Fil. 33, had Nicolaus and the gnostics after Basilides. Hippolytus' account is clearly independent of Iren. 1.26.3 and attested by Theodoret, *Haer.* 3.1, who records that Hippolytus, bishop and martyr, wrote against the Nicolaitans. Marcellus distinguishes this sub-group of 'gnostics' as libertines. While S reads Carpocrates, as in Iren. 1.25.1f./Ps.-Hipp. 7.32 and Ps.-Tert. 3.1, A has the form Carpocras, which is echoed in Epiph. 27.1.1 and Fil. 35. Prodicus is otherwise only attested in Tert. *Prax.* 3.6; *Scorp.* 15.6; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.15.69.6; 3.4.30.1; 7.7.41.1, and Theod. 1.6. Tertullian links Prodicus with Valentinus, but Clement is the likely source of Marcellus' information, noting (*Strom.* 3.4.30.1) that Prodicus' adherents falsely style themselves 'gnostics'. Epiphanes (S has the mistaken form Epiphanius) is attested by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 3.2.5.2 as son of Carpocrates, influenced by Plato and founder of the monadic and antinomian gnosis of the Carpocratians. Theod. 1.5, links father and son and follows their heresy with that of Prodicus (1.6), referring to Clem. *Strom.* 3. That Epiphanius, 25.2.1, includes Epiphanes' sect among the libertine followers of Nicolaus, betraying no knowledge of his relation to Carpocrates, might suggest he is dependent on the same source as Marcellus. In 25.7.2 he derives the 'gnostics' from Nicolaus and Simon Magus.

*new ideas*: Cf. Epiph. 25.2.1. S has misread *καθόρετα* to produce the unknown heretic Notarius, while the homoeoteleuton has caused A to omit the following group of heretics, Cerdo to the Manichees.

*Marcion and Lucian from Cerdo*: again Marcellus has departed from Hippolytus' order. Having moved Cerinthus and Ebion to

the Jewish heretics at the start, he now omits the Valentinians, who will feature later, and mentions Hippolytus' next group, united by the fact that they begin with the concept of two original principles or gods, one good, the other evil or imperfect. On Cerdo cf. Iren. 1.27.1; Ps.-Tert. 3; Ps.-Hipp. 7.37.1; Eus. *HE* 4.11; Epiph. 41; Fil. 44. On Marcion cf. Iren. 1.27.2f.; Ps.-Tert. 3; Ps.-Hipp. 7.37; Epiph. 42; Fil. 45. On Lucian (Lucan in Ps.-Tert. 4 and Fil. 46) cf. Epiph. 43.

*From these Manichees*: this is Marcellus' own contribution, deduced no doubt from the two-principle teaching attributed to Cerdo and Marcion. Cf. Eus. *HE* 7.31.1-2; Epiph. 66; Fil. 61; Theod. 1.26 (note his echo of Marcellus' order: Cerdo and Marcion, Apelles, Mani). On Marcion and Mani cf. Cyr. Jer. *Cat.* 18.26; Ath. *Ep. ad ep. Eg. Lib.* 4. On the Manichees as in effect teaching two gods cf. Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* 2.40-41. On their being associated with Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians, and Simon cf. Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* 1.3.

7. *All these took the starting points of their impiety from the philosophers Hermes, Plato and Aristotle*: cf. fr. 85 (Kl./H. 203. 22-24; St 118; V. 110.8-11) where he describes Eusebius of Caesarea as speaking like Valentinus and Hermes, and Narcissus of Neronias like Marcion and Plato. This theme apparently first occurs in Iren. 2.14.1f., is echoed in Tert. *Praesc.* 7.3-8, and developed into a massive thesis by the author of the *Refutatio* (cf. 1.26.4; 5.2). Cf. also Theod. 1.7. The mention of Aristotle need not suggest a date in the 360s since (a) he is not exploited as a heretical source, (b) one of Marcellus' sources, Ps.-Hippolytus, derives Basilides' ideas from Aristotle (*Ref.* 7.14, 19.9, 24.1ff. etc.), and (c) the author of the *Cohortatio*, in all likelihood Marcellus, writing, according to Riedweg in the 320s or 330s (*Ps.-Justin*, 52), refers to Aristotle's ideas (cf. 5-6, 12). However, Hermes is Marcellus' own contribution, caused no doubt by his having become aware of Hermetic treatises (or excerpts in an anthology) which seemed to be sources of Arian ideas (see below). The allusion to Hermes in his book against Asterius might suggest he already had some awareness by 335. Now there seems to be no evidence of knowledge of the Hermetic corpus, or at least no certain citation of it by Eastern Christian writers, prior to Lactantius' bringing his *Divinae institutiones* (with their Greek excerpts, cf. 1.6.2-5; 2.11.4f., 15.6-8; 4.6.3-9, 7.3, 25.10f.; 7.13.3, 18.4 etc.), probably composed in Africa around 308-9, to Nicomedia on his return (see Scott, *Hermetica* 1 77f., 94f.; T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1981),

pp. 13f.). Lactantius must have brought a collection of Hermetic texts in Greek with him to Nicomedia. Marcellus may have come across them there, or more likely may have discovered a similar collection independently, perhaps in Egypt, in his search for the roots of Arianism. The author of the *Cohortatio* claims to have visited Egypt and quotes from a Hermetic treatise on the difficulty of grasping God (38.2: Marcovich, p. 78). He gives the fuller form, as does Lactantius (*Epit.* 4.5—but in Latin!), rather than the shorter form found in Stobaeus' first fragment (2.1.26). On the dissemination of Hermetism, particularly in the East, see G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge: University Press, 1986), chs 7 and 8.

*Section 3 (8–18)* The culmination. The Arians as also inspired by Hermes and Plato etc.

8. *Ariomaniacs*: it is not clear who first coined this nickname. Eustathius of Antioch uses it in a letter (cf. Theod. *HE* 1.8.3) which Hanson ('The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch' *ZKG* 95 (1984), pp. 171–9 esp. pp. 173f.) plausibly dates before 328–9. Constantine talks in a letter to Arius and the Arians of around 333 (Ath. *De decr.* 40.18) of τὴν Ἀρείου μανίαν, and the term itself then occurs in the letter of presbyters and deacons of Alexandria to the Council of Tyre of August 335 (Ath. *Apol. sec.* 75.1f.). Cf. the letter of Egyptian bishops and others to the same Council (77.5). It then appears in Syriac in Athanasius' Festal Letters 10 and 11 of 338 and 339 (see A. Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae* 6 (Rome, 1853) pp. 93 and 107), which A. Camplani (*Le lettere Festali di Atanasio di Alessandria* (Rome, CIM, 1989), pp. 246f.) notes as the first explicit mention by name of the Arians in the works of Athanasius, correcting the false Syriac word division and dependent Latin translation ('Arius et Manes') of the term by Cureton and Mai. Then it appears in the letter of the Alexandrian synod of 340 (Ath. *Apol. sec.* 6–8), in Julius of Rome's letter to the Eusebians of 341 (Ath. *Apol. sec.* 23.3) and in the letter of the Western Council of Sardica of 343 (Ath. *Apol. sec.* 42.2/Theod. *HE* 2.8.2). Athanasius may have added it in some cases and certainly, apart from Eustathius' usage, this is one of the first occurrences independent of Athanasius' evidence (its presence in the non-Athanasian *Or. c. Ar.* 4.8, where the Eusebians are so designated, may be dated to around 340, if the case developed by Vinzent *Pseudo-Athanasius*, is accepted). If Eustathius did coin it, certainly Athanasius publicized it widely. Marcellus probably adopted it from him, in their time together in the West, rather

than from Eustathius, since there is no trace of it, direct or indirect, in the fragments of his treatise against Asterius of 335. But unlike Athanasius, who can carefully distinguish the Eusebians from the Ariomaniacs (cf. *Ep. encyc.* 2; 7), Marcellus seems to lump Eusebius of Caesarea and Asterius together under that name (cf. 10 & 12), as does the author of *Or. c. Ar.* 4 (cf. Vinzent, op. cit. p. 212). The term remained a favourite of Athanasius and was taken over by Western anti-Arians (cf. Eusebius of Vercellae, *Ep.* 2.3 (PL 12, 949D); Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trin.* 7.7 etc.). That the Arians are the real target of the climax of the heresiological catalogue demonstrates the animus of the work against the suspicions of Mercati and others.

*deceitful sophistry*: the term ἐντεχνος occurs in frs. 55 (Kl./H. 195.2: St 95: V. 84.8), 65 (197.17: St 1: V. 4.4), and 86 (203.25: St 17: V. 16.10), and, more interestingly, the author of *Ref.* 10.5 in describing heresies couples it with σοφισμα, which is echoed by Marcellus' σοφιστεία here.

*the dogmas of the ancients*: for Marcellus the term δόγμα has a pejorative, secular sense, cf. frs. 39 (Kl./H. 191.16: St 21: V. 10.9), 86 (203.30, 31, 34: St 17: V. 16.15–17, 18. 2), 121 (211.28: St 109: V. 102.5), and especially 88 (204.15: St 22: V. 22.13), where he speaks of Origen remembering the dogmas of Plato in the opening words of his *De princ.* Cf. Marc. *Cohort.* 12 (Marcovich, p. 28: philosophers); 19.1 (p. 49: Pythagoras); 17.1 (p. 55: Plato). The source here might again be *Ref.*; its author refers to the δόγματα of the ancients in 1. prol. 1; in 5.3–4 he speaks of the Naassenes dogmatizing as earlier Greek philosophers did, and in 6.3 of Valentinus dogmatizing not from scripture but from Platonic and Pythagorean δόγματα. Cf. Iren. 1.4.2.

*three hypostases*: cf. frs. 66–69 (Kl./H. 197–8: St 47–50: V. 2–44); Orig. *Commfn* 2.10; Dion. of Alex. fr. in Basil, *De spir.* 1.72; Dion. of Rome in Ath. *De decr.* 26.3; Arius *Ep. ad Alex.* in Ath. *De syn.* 16.4; Eus. *Praep. ev.* 11.16.4, 17.9, 20.1–3; doctrinal statement of the Western Council of Sardica in Theod. *HE* 2.8.38.

*Valentinus ... in the book entitled by him 'On the Three Natures'*: no such title seems to be attested elsewhere. However, in his researches Marcellus may have come across references to such a book, presumably according to its title on the three elements/natures identified by the Valentinians (pneumatic, psychic and dyonic: cf. Iren. 1.5.1, 6.1, 7.5; Clem. Alex. *Exc. ex Theod.* 54–57; Basil. *Ep. ad Flor.* in Epiph. *Haer.* 33.7.8 etc.). See on this Vinzent, *Theologie*, p. 458, who doubts any direct knowledge of

Valentinus by Marcellus. C. Marksches, *Valentinus Gnosticus: Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten* (WUNT 65; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992), pp. 269f., also doubts the existence of such a work. It is probably not to be identified with the *Tripartite Tractate* from Nag Hammadi Codex I, as I attempted to argue in 'Origen and the Development of Trinitarian Theology', in L. Lies (ed.), *Origeniana Tertia* (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1987), pp. 424-9.

he was the first to invent three hypostases and three persons: on inventing cf. fr. 65 (Kl./H. 197.19: St 1: V. 4.6). On this claim about three hypostases and persons see 'Development', where I allude to the occurrence of the term and concept of three hypostases in Origen and Plotinus and speculate about its possible first occurrence among the Valentinians. Certainly the *Tripartite Tractate* seems to be developing the basis of a trinitarian theology distinguishing Father, Son, and Church as coeternal and really existent from the beginning, in a clear attempt to converge with the theology of the 'Great Church' (cf. NHC I 56.30-59.1 and the more 'orthodox' formula of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in association with baptism in 127.25-128.19). However, the work has been associated with Heracleon and seems later than Valentinus, whose own particular views, as recoverable from Irenaeus and the fragments, do not seem to suggest an obvious triadic structure or the use of terms like hypostasis and *prosopon*. On the other hand, the *Gospel of Truth*, which some scholars would attribute to Valentinus, does appear to imply a triadic structure of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit active in salvation and revelation (cf. e.g. NHC I 29.32-30.26). As regards the terms hypostasis and *prosopon*, Marcellus' phraseology might imply that he makes a distinction between them (see commentary on 2).

he is discovered to have filched this from Hermes and Plato: a passage in the *Artemii Passio* (28: Bidez-Winkelmann, GCS Philostorgius 160.18f.), which Bidez (LI) thinks derives from a Christian apologetic collection, follows the famous Hermetic quote about the difficulty of grasping God in its shorter form by explaining 'for he is trihypostatic (τρισυπόστατος)'. This might be the source of Marcellus' claim, which Johannes Malalas seems to enlarge upon when he refers to Hermes Trismegistus as speaking of 'three great hypostases... but one godhead' (*Chronographia* II: PG 97, 92D-93A). As regards Plato, certainly Plotinus claimed support for his three hypostases concept from him and the mysterious passage in the second letter about the

second and third in particular (*Ep.* 2 312E, referred to in *Enn.* 5.1 [10] 8.1-3; cf. 6.7 [38] 42.1-15; 3.5 [50] 8.8; 1.8 [51] 2.28-31). Eusebius refers approvingly both to Plotinus (*Enn.* 5.1 'On the three primary hypostases') and Plato (*Ep.* 2 312DE) in *Praep. ev.* 11.16ff., 20.1-2. And the author of *Ref.* 6.37.1-6 suggests a Pythagorean origin for Valentinus, adding a reference to Plato (*Ep.* 2 312DE, 313A, 314AC) as the source of Valentinus' three entities, God, the *Pleroma*, and everything outside it. Marcellus seems to have combined these two pieces of information, the first perhaps from Eusebius or from a Christian anthology of passages from Greek writers enlisted in support of Christian ideas rather than direct from Plotinus. We find an extensive anthology of passages from Greek philosophers supposedly borrowed from Moses and supporting monotheism etc. in *Cohort.* 14-34, not to mention the quotation from Hermes in 38. Tertullian, *De anima* 2, has Plato as a student of Hermes, and Lactantius derives Plato's views on a first and second god from Hermes (cf. *Epit.* 37.4-6). See further below.

10. they again devise a second god created by the Father before the ages: cf. frs. 77 (Kl./H. 201.33f.: St 91: V. 80.10-12), 40 (Paulinus: 191.29-31: St 121: V. 114.1-3), 18 (Asterius: 188.5f.: St 36: V. 34.11f.), 82 (Eusebius: 203.3f.: St 117: V. 110.1f.); Eus. C. Marc. 1.4.39-55; *Ekthesis Macrostichos* 4, 8 in Ath. *De syn.* 26/Socrates, *HE* 2.19.13f., 26. Notice the careful distinction of Marcellus between *γίνεσθαι*, create, which he rejects of the Word/Son as being too anthropomorphic, and *γέννασθαι*, beget, which he accepts (cf. fr. 36: Kl./H. 190.29-34: St 66: V. 56.3-8). On the phrase 'second god' cf. Eus. *Praep. ev.* 7.13.2; *Dem. ev.* 1.5.11; 5 proem 23, 1.28, 3.9, 30.3; 6.20.2 etc. (on Eusebius' usage see T. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism* 1 (Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), p. 47); Constantine, *Oratio ad sanctos* 9 (Heikel, GCS 1 *Eusebius Werke* 1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902) 163.15-25); Hilary, *frag. hist.* in Coll. Antiar. Par. Series B II 9.6 (Feder 149.12f. = Sulpic. Sev. *Chronica* 2.35.3: Halm, CSEL 1 (Vienna: Gerold, 1866) 88.27-89.3).

Asterius said, instructed by Hermes surnamed Trismegistus: cf. fr. 18. In fr. 85 (Kl./H. 203.22-24: St 118: V. 110.8-11) Marcellus accuses Eusebius, in his language about the Word as a second (ἕτερος) god distinct from the Father in being and power (frag. 82: St 117), of echoing Valentinus and Hermes. Hermes Trismegistus was referred to by earlier fathers, cf. Athenag. *Leg.* 28.6 ('Hermes surnamed (ἐπικαλεῖσθαι) Trismegistus'); Tert. *Adv. Val.* 15.1; *De anima* 2 (of Egypt,



studied by Plato), 28, 33; Ps.-Cyprian, *Quod idola dii non sunt* 6 (Hartel, CSEL 3.1 (Vienna: Gerold, 1868) 24.3-6: who in contrast to Marcellus couples Plato and Hermes Trismegistus as teaching one god: see Scott & Ferguson, *Hermetica* 4, p. 6 n. 1).

'Hear then Asclepius...': cf. Latin *Asclepius* 8; Lact. *Div. inst.* 4.6.4 (from the *logos teleios*, with slight differences in the wording); *Epit.* 37.5; Ps.-Aug. *Adversus quinque haereses* 3 (PL 42, 1102: from the *logos teleios*, again slightly different). Since Lactantius does not include the first three words, Marcellus must have used another source, perhaps another excerpt from the kind of anthology suggested above. Note, however, that both interpret the second god of this passage, later identified as the world (Latin *Ascl.* 10), in terms of the Son.

also where he got his 'only begotten God': cf. fr. 65 (Kl./H. 197.11: St 1: V. 2.5); Asterius, *Syntagmation* in Ath. *De syn.* 18.5; Arius, *Thalia* in Ath. *ib.*, 15.2.23; Eus. *Eccl. theol.* 1.3 (Kl./H. 64.4), 9 (68.4); 3.6.3 (164.17).

instead of... John saying 'only begotten Son': it was not just Asterius who apparently read *θεός* at John 1:18; see the apparatus *ad loc.* for an impressive list including papyri and several second century figures.

11. Then again Trismegistus says: the continuation of the passage above, cf. Lact. *Inst.* 4.6.4 (reading *καλός* with S against the *κάλλιος* of A). As Seibt notes, p. 459 n. 882, Lactantius cites both pieces as one and in a longer version, so again he is not the likely source of Marcellus.

12. This then was the source from which their notion of a first and second god: cf. fr. 80 (Narcissus: Kl./H. 202.25f.: St 124: V. 116.1f.). The term 'notion' (*οἴσις*) occurs in fr. 74 (199.32: St 75: V. 66.6). On Valentinus and Hermes as the sources of the Arian teaching of two gods, principles etc., cf. fr. 85 (St 118). On Hermes and Plato teaching a first and second god cf. Lact. *Inst.* 4.6.3f.; *Epit.* 37.4f. Seibt may be right to suggest, *Theologia* pp. 458f., that Marcellus probably did not have access to the original sources here. But on the other hand the author of the *Cohortatio*, most likely Marcellus, does seem to have had direct acquaintance with some of the texts he cites, particularly the Platonic, as well as using anthologies (cf. Marcovich's ed. Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin* 1.72ff.). Since, as noted, Marcellus' source for the Hermetic material does not seem to have been Lactantius or identical with his source, it might have been either another version of the texts themselves, or a Christian florilegium of relevant extracts from pagan (including Hermetic) literature on the themes of three hypostases, two principles

gods etc., assembled, of course, not to support such doctrines, like Eusebius' *Praep. ev* and *Dem. ev.*, but to condemn them.

Eusebius of Caesarea wrote 'unbegotten': cf. *Dem. ev.* 1.5; 4.1.3; 5.1; *Ep. ad Euphratorem* 1 (Opitz, *Urk.* 1.4.6); Marc. fr. 32 (Kl./H. 190.7-9: St 123: V. 114.13-15).

13. For Plato speaks... to Gorgias: this is from *Tim.* 68E (not C as in Mercati, p. 97 app.), not from the *Gorgias*. Marcellus' error may be ascribed to his use of a secondary source, or, since he evidently knows and cites the *Gorgias* (454DE) in fr. 88 (Kl./H. 204.15-21: St 22: V. 22.12-19), perhaps to the kind of carelessness, such as we also find in *Ad Graecos* (cf. 3.2 on Heraclitus: see on this Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin* 1.163). Marcellus' quotation, which I have attempted to make intelligible, is a garbled and at times nonsensical version of the received text (see apparatus).

again... in the same work: from *Tim.* 52A (not E as in Mercati, *ibid.*), similarly garbled (see app.). Since the author of the *Cohortatio*, most likely Marcellus, knows and quotes accurately several well-known passages of the *Timaeus*, we might incline to the former explanation offered above: these quotations were taken from an anthology based on themes or catch words rather than from the original text.

14. those who fell away from the orthodox faith by not pursuing it intently: Richard, art. cit., p. 8, attaches the orthodox faith to pursuing intently, but since *πρόσεχειν* is not attested with a genitive, and takes a dative in 16, which has a similar phrase ('deprived of the true knowledge'), my version seems grammatically preferable. Cf. *Cohort.* 4 (Marcovich p. 30); 14.1 (p. 42); 21.2 (p. 51); 24 (p. 54); 31.2 (p. 68); 38.1 (p. 77). On *ἄρθη θεοσέβεια* cf. *Cohort.* 36.3 (Marcovich p. 74); 37.1 (p. 75); 38.2 (p. 78); on *θεοσέβεια* as meaning the faith, as expressed in a credal statement, cf. frs. 65 (Kl./H. 197.13 Asterius' creed; 197.15 Marcellus' use: St 2: V. 2.7, 4.2), and 83 (203.15: St 120: V. 112.21).

by the will of God that the Word of God subsisted: cf. frs. 34 (Kl./H. 190.18: St 2: V. 4.13f.) and 96 (205.30f.: St 113: 106.8f.); Arius, *Ep. ad Eus. Nic.* 4; Asterius acc. to Ath. *De syn.* 19.2f.; Arians acc. to Ath. *Ep. ad ep. Eg. Lib.* 12; *Or. c. Ar.* 1.3f. etc. Cf. letter of Council of Antioch (325), 10 (Opitz, *Urk.* 1.8.39.5). On the possible origins of the idea cf. Ammonius as in Hierocles, *On Providence*, cited by Photius, *Bibl.* 251 (103, 461B) and 214 (172A), and his pupil, Origen, in *De princ.* 1.2.6; *CommGen* fr. on Gen. 1:12 cited by Eus. *Praep.* 7.20.1f. The letter of the Eastern Council of Sardica (Hil. *hist. Coll. Antiar. Par. Ser. A* IV.2.5: Feder 73.3f., 11f.,



23, 26) and the *Ekthesis Macrostichos* (Ath. *De syn.* 26) anathematize those who reject the Son's generation by will.

*this too from Trismegistus?*: Marcellus cites from an unknown tractate (fr. 36 in Scott, *Hermetica* 1 p. 548).

15. *the preconceived god*: the term occurs in a Greek fragment in Lact. *Inst.* 4.7.3, along with another fragment which refers to the will (*βούλησις*) of god, as the Good, as producing a god. It is also found in *Abammonis ad Porphyrium responsum* 10.7 (fr. 17 in Scott, *Hermetica* 1 p. 538); Iamblichus, *De myst.* 10.7.1f. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *C. Iul.* 1 (PG 76, 553B).

16. *deprived of the true knowledge*: cf. fr. 86 (Kl./H. 203.25; St 17: V. 16.10).

*disciples of Hermes, Plato and Aristotle*: see commentary on 7. Aristotle is again mentioned in this summary, although no appeal has been made to his influence. Cf. Tert. *Praesc.* 7.6-7 and Iren. 1.25.6 and 2.14.2.

*rather than of Christ*: Eusebius of Nicomedia, *Ep. ad Paulinum* in Marius Victorinus, *Ep. Cand.* 2.2 (Henry-Hadot, SC 68 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1960) 180.14f.), insists on not teaching by *logismoi* (i.e. Aristotelian syllogisms) but from Scripture.

17. *Now the second cause, Son/Word... also second principle*: Marcellus appears to have Eusebius particularly in his sights (cf. Eus. *Praep. ev.* 7.11f.; 11.7, 14-18 (entitled 'On the second cause'); *Dem. ev.* 5 proem 1, 20, 23, although he denies two principles in *Eccl. Theol.* 2.7), but perhaps also Asterius. Thus in his letter to Julius he attacks his (unnamed) opponents for teaching 'another Word' (cf. *Ep. ad Iul.*: Kl./H. 214.28-30: V. 124.19-21). Cf. also Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* 2.37; *Ep. ad ep. Eg. Lib.* 12; *De syn.* 52; Ps.-Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* 4.1 (attacking dyarchy). On the phrase 'Son/Word' cf. *Ep. ad Iul.* (Kl./H. 215.5: V. 126.9).

*they took from Apelles, Marcion's pupil*: Marcellus makes further use of Hippolytus' list in the *Syntagma*, cf. Epiph. 44, and is followed here by Filastrius, who alone compares the Arian views to those of Apelles (*Div. her. lib.* 47).

*in a dispute with*: cf. *Cohort.* 4.2 (Marcovich p. 28); 7.2 (p. 32); 35.2 (p. 72).

*'Marcion is wrong to speak of two principles: now I speak of one, which made a second principle'*: Cf. Rhodo in Eus. *HE* 5.13.2f. Marcellus may be quoting an actual work of Apelles here, or perhaps summarizing the quote which Filastrius gives at greater length as a response made by Apelles when questioned by some people about his faith (47.1-3). This may well derive from Hippolytus, either from his *Syntagma* section on Apelles, or

from a work against Apelles, as possibly attested by Theodoret, *Haer.* 1.25. Cf. Epiph. 44.1.4-5.

18. *they blaspheme the Holy Spirit... not venerate or revere it... a slave and a servant*: Eusebius, in his attack on Marcellus, *Eccl. theol.* 1.10.5 (Kl./H. 69.17f.); 2.7.13 (105.33-35), insists that the Church has learned to honour, revere (*σέβειν*) and venerate (*προσκυνεῖσθαι*) only the Son. Fragment 14 of an Arian sermon (PL 13, 619A) insists that the Holy Spirit is not God or Lord, not creator or maker, and *non colendus neque adorandus*. This might suggest that the status of the Holy Spirit was already being debated from the 330s on. Certainly the role and status of the Holy Spirit feature in Eastern and Western credal formulae and doctrinal statements from the Council of Antioch (341) on. Markus Vinzent refers to the essential role played by the Spirit in the letter of the Western Council of Sardica (cf. Theodoret, *HE* 2.8.38f., 48: *Pseudo-Athanasius*, p. 65). Again Cyril of Jerusalem in 348 insists that the rank of the Holy Spirit is far superior to that of the angels; while they are sent to minister (cf. Heb. 1:14) he searches out the deep things of God (*Cat.* 16.23; cf. 16.4). However it is true that the titles of 'slave' and 'servant' for the Holy Spirit only make their appearance from the 370s onwards. Cf. e.g. Eunomius, *Lib. apol.* 25 (PG 30, 864D: the Paraclete as *ὑπηρέτης*); Jerome, *Adv. Lucif.* 9 (Arian belief in the Holy Spirit as the *servus* of Father and Son); Arian sermon fr. 3 (PL 13, 601A: the Spirit not God but a *δούλος*); *De spir.* 19.48, 50 (the Spirit called *δούλος*). However support for such a usage by Marcellus in the 340s might come from (1) the evidence that Gregory Thaumaturgus had used the term in NeoCaesarea in a confession of faith, denying its applicability to the Trinity (cf. Greg. Nyss. PG 45, 912f.; Tetz, 'Markellianer' p. 80 comm. on ll. 41-42, 47-49), and (2) the fact that what Eugenius (i.e. Marcellus) is conscious of and is rejecting in the 371 confession is the Pneumatomachian claim that the Spirit is created (*κτιστός*) and 'one of the creatures (*ποιήματα*)' (*Leg.* 3.1; Tetz p. 80 ll. 36f.), and not the Anomoean claim about the Spirit as a slave. In any case Marcellus may have been prompted to focus on the Spirit by his heresiological catalogue which began with Dositheus and the Sadducean denial of the Spirit.

*Deriving their impious dogma from Dositheus, heresiarch of the Sadducees*: On *δόγμα* see commentary on 8. On Dositheus as heresiarch of the Samaritans (and also of the Sadducees), in effect repudiating the Holy Spirit, see commentary on 5 and Ps.-Tert. 1; Epiph. 14.2.1f.; Fil. 4.

Section 4 (19) Conclusion. The heretics have departed from their mother, the Catholic Church.

19. *certain people withdrew ... in revolt against the Church*: could this be a veiled reference to the conduct of the Eastern bishops at the Council of Sardica? The insinuation that 'those of their party' thereby 'harvested the name of the schismatic heresiarch' (i.e. Arius) and forfeited the name of Catholic could then be very plausibly interpreted as an allusion to the Council's condemnation of Ursacius and Valens as Arians teaching three diverse hypostases (cf. doctrinal statement of Western Council of Sardica in *Ath. Apol. sec. 47.4/Theod. HE 2.8.38f.*).

*the apostolic preaching*: cf. Iren. 2.35.3; Eus. *HE* 4.8.2.

*the holy Catholic and apostolic Church*: cf. Creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople.

*the name of the schismatic heresiarch*: cf. Justin, *Dial.* 35; *Ath. Or. c. Ar.* 1.3.

ALASTAIR H. B. LOGAN

## SHOULD HERBERT OF CHERBURY BE REGARDED AS A 'DEIST'?

### I. HERBERT'S REPUTATION

In a letter to Mersenne in 1639 Descartes states that he finds in Herbert of Cherbury's *De Veritate* 'many maxims which seem to me so pious, and so much in conformity with common sense, that I hope that they may be approved by orthodox theology.'<sup>1</sup> This hope has not been fulfilled. The religious views of Edward Herbert, first Baron Herbert of Cherbury, have generally suffered from a bad press. Christian Kortholt the elder linked Herbert with Spinoza and Hobbes in his *De Tribus Impostoribus Magnis*,<sup>2</sup> a linkage followed by Michael Berns in his *Althar der Atheisten, der Heyden und der Christen ... Wider die 3 Erz-Betreiger Hobbert [sic] Hobbes und Spinoza*.<sup>3</sup> Whatever may now be our views of Hobbes and Spinoza, the combining of Herbert with them shows that he was regarded not only with hostility (cf. the terms *magnus impostor* and *Erz-Betrüger*) but also as a serious threat to authentic faith.

Earlier in England Nathanael Culverwel had rejected Herbert's view that what he had identified as the common notions of religion were the 'Foundation, upon which the Church is built'. Excepting the Bible from the 'infinite deceits, and uncertainties' that are found in historical reports, Culverwel asserts in his *Elegant and Turned Discourse of the Light of Nature* (first published in 1652) that 'the Church is built upon a surer, and higher Rock, upon a more Adamantine, and precious Foundation'. It should, however, be noted that in the same passage he nevertheless agrees with Herbert that those who use 'any Practices, or Customes, or Traditions, or Tenents to stop the passage of first Principles, and the sound Reason that flows from them ... are in this farther from a Church, than the Indians, or the Americans', for their position renders them 'not only Anti-Christian but unnatural'. The basis of his disagreement with Herbert is not the latter's preference for 'Reason a Daughter of Eternity, before Antiquity', but

<sup>1</sup> A. Kenny (editor and translator), *Descartes: Philosophical Letters* (Oxford, 1964), p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Köln, 1680.

<sup>3</sup> Hamburg, 1692.