

The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus



Joseph T. Lienhard

Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. 37, No. 4. (Dec., 1983), pp. 340-359.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0042-6032%28198312%2937%3A4%3C340%3ATEO1C1%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>

Vigiliae Christianae is currently published by Brill Academic Publishers.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/bap.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

**THE EXEGESIS OF 1 COR 15, 24-28
FROM MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA TO THEODORET OF CYRUS**

BY

JOSEPH T. LIENHARD

Marcellus of Ancyra's fascination with 1 Cor 15, 24-28, a difficult Pauline eschatological text, is well known. And (as Karl Holl has observed¹) Marcellus had a remarkable influence on his opponents. The full history of this influence is yet to be written; what follows makes a contribution to that history.

A recent monograph by Eckhard Schendel treats the exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 in East and West up to the end of the fourth century.² Despite this valuable monograph, however, there are several reasons for approaching this topic again. One is to bring the treatment into the fifth century. Schendel stops somewhat abruptly with Gregory of Nyssa, whereas Theodoret of Cyrus is a more satisfactory conclusion. This allows the inclusion of Didymus of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, and Severian of Gabala. A second—and more significant—reason is to distinguish more carefully between different works attributed to the same author. In the case of Marcellus of Ancyra, for example, Schendel draws indiscriminately on the extant fragments of Marcellus's work against Asterius (before 334) and the *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, which Martin Tetz has attributed to Marcellus and dated ca. 360. Moreover, Schendel does not consider the *Epistula ad Antiochenos*, which has also been attributed to Marcellus, or the work *Aduersum Arium et Sabellium*, sometimes attributed to Gregory of Nyssa.³

In what follows, only works by Greek Fathers are considered, and only those which contain more than a passing reference to 1 Cor 15, 24-28. Epiphanius of Salamis is omitted, since Schendel's treatment of him is fully adequate. The writings are considered in strict chronological order. In each case, an effort is made to find the topic or issue which the author emphasized, rather than to try to reconstruct his complete exegesis of the verses in question.

1. Marcellus of Ancyra, *Contra Asterium*

Marcellus wrote his refutation of the Arian Asterius during the time between the Council of Nicaea and his deposition in 334 (or perhaps 330-331).⁴ It is extant only in fragments, preserved mostly in the refutation composed by Eusebius of Caesarea.⁵ It was this work of Marcellus's that started the fourth-century controversy about the end of Christ's reign and his subjection to the Father.

Marcellus's text of Paul differs slightly from that of standard editions. In the extant fragments he quotes vv. 24, 25, 27a and 28b. In v. 24b, which he cites once, he inserts τοῦ διαβόλου expegetically after πᾶσαν ἀρχήν;⁶ this fits in with his view of the history of salvation, as will be seen below. In v. 25b, which he cites three times, he omits πάντας,⁷ apparently without significance. Much more significant is his consistent omission of ὁ υἱός from v. 28, which he cites three times;⁸ Marcellus preferred to reserve the title "Son" for the incarnate Christ, and (in fr. 41) says that it is precisely as Logos that he will be subjected.⁹

In Marcellus's understanding of the passage in question, the key term is βασιλεία (βασιλεύειν). Marcellus was best known as the heretic who proposed that Christ's kingdom would end;¹⁰ and he is probably the reason why the phrase "of whose kingdom there will be no end" appears in the creed of Constantinople.¹¹

Marcellus has a doctrine of two kingdoms, an eternal kingdom and a temporary kingdom. The temporary kingdom is properly the kingdom of Christ.¹² The Lord Christ has a beginning of his reign—not more than four hundred years ago, Marcellus says.¹³ It is precisely in his humanity that the incarnate Christ began to reign: Marcellus writes, for example, βασιλεύσει ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῃ σαρκί; and elsewhere, ἡ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ οἰκονομία τε καὶ βασιλεία.¹⁴ (Marcellus's peculiar use of *anthrōpos* will be treated below.) This kingdom is also partial (ἡ ἐν μέρει αὐτῆ βασιλεία).¹⁵ It will endure until Christ has destroyed every rule of the devil and authority and power.¹⁶ Then he will hand over the kingdom to God who established him as king;¹⁷ "He no longer needs this partial kingdom, since he is king of all at once, for he reigns with God the Father whose Word he was and is."¹⁸

The fragments in which Marcellus uses parts of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 also contain most of his references to the devil, and a peculiar use of the word *anthrōpos*.¹⁹ The most striking sentence is in fr. 117: "For the Word itself, in its own right, did not have a beginning of its reign. But

man, who was deceived by the devil, became king through the power of the Word in order that, when he had become king, he might conquer the devil who had earlier deceived.”²⁰ The same thought occurs in a more condensed form in fr. 113: “Man, who was earlier deceived, is established as king through the Word.”²¹ Other passages, where Marcellus does not cite 1 Cor 15, 24-28, have a similar formulation. For example: “And he deemed man, who fell through disobedience, worthy to be joined (*συναφθῆναι*) to his Word through the virgin”;²² and, “He then came down, took flesh through the virgin, and was appointed king over the Church, obviously so that man, who earlier fell from the kingdom of heaven, might be able to gain the kingdom. So God willed that this man, who earlier fell from the kingdom through disobedience, might become Lord and God, and established this dispensation.”²³

The key thought, repeated several times, is that it is precisely man—or humanity—who was deceived by the devil and fell through disobedience who became king through the Word. Marcellus identifies man deceived by the devil with the man born of Mary, or, phrased another way, emphasizes that it is precisely fallen humanity which was joined to the Word. Marcellus thinks here in startlingly concrete historical terms. Schendel touches briefly on this peculiar Christology, but does not exploit it.²⁴

Marcellus also envisages a kind of progress from the Incarnation until the end-time. This explains the peculiar phrase *ἡ ἐν μέρει αὐτῆ βασιλεία*:²⁵ Christ as king in human flesh reverses the effects of the fall and the devil’s deception. At the end-time this process will be complete; and here Marcellus emphasizes the “until” of 1 Cor 15, 25: “Therefore his incarnate existence as man and his kingdom (*ἡ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ οἰκονομία τε καὶ βασιλεία*) seem to have a limit. For the words of the Apostle, ‘Until he places his enemies as a footstool for his feet’ [1 Cor 15, 25] mean nothing but this. Therefore when he has the enemies as a footstool for his feet he no longer needs this partial kingdom, since he is king of all together.”²⁶

In the extant fragments, Marcellus uses 1 Cor 15, 24-28 principally in connection with his history of salvation, and only once in connection with his theory of the reunion of the Logos with God after the end of history,²⁷ although it is this latter doctrine that has attracted more attention.

In summary: in his exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28, Marcellus emphasizes the kingdom (of Christ and of God) rather than the subjection of the

Son. The partial or temporary kingdom of Christ has a clear and proper function in the history of salvation: the Word was joined to fallen man and established as king, and becomes Lord and God. Marcellus—deliberately, one may assume—does not distinguish clearly between the humanity of the Word and humanity in general. The Word was joined to man precisely as deceived by the devil, and the partial kingdom of Christ endures until the effects of the devil's deception are wholly overcome.

2. Eusebius of Caesarea, *De ecclesiastica theologia*

In the time between Marcellus's deposition in 334 and his own death in 338/39, Eusebius of Caesarea composed two refutations of Marcellus: *Contra Marcellum*, and *De ecclesiastica theologia*, in that order.²⁸ *De ecclesiastica theologia* 3, 13-20 contains his refutation of Marcellus's interpretation of 1 Cor 15, 24-28, and—at the same time—his own exegesis.

Eusebius's method is the use of other biblical texts to interpret the passage from 1 Corinthians. His theology is Origenist;²⁹ he insists repeatedly, for example, on the proper *hypostasis* of the Son.³⁰

Eusebius's first objection to Marcellus's exegesis is the latter's understanding of the word "until" (ἄχρι οὗ or ἕως ἄν) in v. 25. Eusebius shows that in other places in Scripture (e.g. Mt 28, 20) the word does not indicate a cessation.³¹ On the contrary, he says, the angel Gabriel, speaking to the holy virgin (Lk 1, 33), said that Christ's kingdom will have no end.³² This argument recurs regularly in later writers.

But the central point in Eusebius's exegesis is his understanding of the subjection of the Son (v. 28). The text from 1 Corinthians speaks of a double subjection: the subjection of all things to Christ and the subjection of the Son to God. Eusebius observes correctly that Marcellus has understood the subjection of the Son to the Father as the union of the Word with God in the sense of its absorption into God;³³ but, he writes, if this is the case, then by analogy the subjection of all things to Christ would mean that what was subjected to him would not retain its own existence; there would be a coalescing and mixing,³⁴ and consequently a loss of individual identity. The correct understanding, for Eusebius, of the subjection of all things to Christ is that it takes place through obedience, glory and honor freely given,³⁵ and that subjection means participation (μετέχειν); those subjected to Christ participate in him as life, wisdom, logos, anointing, light, son, justice, holiness.³⁶

More briefly, Eusebius interprets the last clause of v. 28 by means of Ez 37, 23 and Jn 10, 38, and refers it to the divine indwelling.³⁷

Finally, Eusebius understands the “handing over of the kingdom” (v. 24) as handing over to the Father his (the Son’s) subjects without his giving up his own reign.³⁸

Marcellus, who was expressing his own theological views, emphasized the kingdom or reign of Christ. Eusebius is refuting Marcellus, and fixes on a weakness in Marcellus’s theology, namely the interpretation of the double subjection in the Pauline text. Later authors, whether they are opposing Marcellus or not, frequently see “subjection” rather than “kingdom” as the crucial term in the text in question, so that Marcellus’s own views are neglected.

3. Marcellus of Ancyra, *Epistula ad Iulium papam*

In his confession of faith addressed to Julius of Rome early in 341,³⁹ Marcellus has one brief but fascinating allusion to 1 Cor 15, 24. He writes: “Following the divine Scriptures I believe that there is one God and his only-begotten Son Word, who always exists with the Father and has never had a beginning of his existence, truly existing from God himself, not created, not made, but always existing, always reigning with ‘God the Father’ [1 Cor 15, 24] ‘of whose reign,’ according to the testimony of the Apostle, ‘there will be no end’ [Lk 1, 33].”⁴⁰

The *Epistula* shows some development in Marcellus’s thought. He is sometimes accused of maliciously deceiving Julius with this confession, but this is too harsh. There is one clear concession: Marcellus accepts the title “Son” for the preëxistent Word, which he had not wanted to do five years earlier. On the other hand, Zahn is undoubtedly correct in seeing, in the end of the sentence quoted, Marcellus’s masterful use of ambiguity in order to maintain his doctrine of Christ’s temporary kingdom and God’s eternal kingdom.⁴¹ The phrase *συμβασιλεύων τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί* is taken over directly from his work against Asterius.⁴² The antecedent of the relative pronoun must be “God the Father,” not “Son Word.” Marcellus quotes Lk 1, 33, the text used repeatedly by Eusebius to show that Christ’s kingdom has no end, but applies it to the kingdom of God the Father (and the co-reign of the Word). Moreover, the phrase “according to the testimony of the Apostle” can refer only to 1 Cor 15, 24, implying that Marcellus wants Lk 1, 33 (as he understands it) to be interpreted in light of 1 Cor 15, 24. In the confession of 341,

therefore, Marcellus clings to his doctrine of the temporary kingdom of Christ: he quotes Lk 1, 33 but understands it as referring to the kingdom of God the Father, and guards his own view by a reference to 1 Cor 15, 24.

4. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* 15

In his fifteenth catechesis (probably written in 348), Cyril of Jerusalem explicitly refutes Marcellus of Ancyra (“another head of the dragon, recently sprouted in Galatia”).⁴³ Cyril accuses Marcellus of teaching two errors: that the kingdom of Christ has an end, and that the Word will be reabsorbed into the Father and no longer exist.⁴⁴ Cyril takes up three points in his refutation: the eternity of the kingdom, the meaning of “subjection,” and the meaning of “until.”

The first and third points are answered by citing other scriptural texts, exactly as Eusebius does.

On the second point, Cyril believes that Marcellus understands Paul’s *ὑποτάσσεσθαι* as *ἀναλύεσθαι* or even *ἀπόλλυσθαι*.⁴⁵ But the true meaning of “subjection,” he says, is obedience. Nevertheless, Cyril leaves his answer in an unsatisfactory state. Because he does not want to concede that Christ’s obedience to the Father will begin only in the future, he can only say lamely that Christ’s obedience will continue to be voluntary.⁴⁶ But this leaves the future tense of *ὑποταγήσεται* in v. 28 without meaning.

Cyril’s refutation of Marcellus, intended for catechumens, is like Eusebius’s in content, but much simpler in tone, and theologically uninteresting.

5. *Epistula ad Antiochenos* (*Sermo maior de fide*)

The Greek fragments of the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* cite only 1 Cor 15, 28;⁴⁷ the text is found in fr. 41, 42, 43 and 70 (but 41 is only a part of 70).⁴⁸ In the Armenian translation, fr. 70 precedes fr. 42 and 43; fr. 70 is part of the author’s principal explanation of 1 Cor 15, 28. Fr. 42 and 43 are further elucidations. F. Scheidweiler has recently attributed the *Epistula* to Marcellus of Ancyra.⁴⁹ Fr. 42 and 43 hardly show more than that the author was interested in the text from 1 Corinthians. Fr. 70 gives some understanding of his exegesis of the text.

The author’s concern is strictly with the meaning of subjection. Who, he asks, is the one who is not subjected to God before everything is subjected to him? In his answer he distinguishes *ὁ ἐκ πατρὸς λόγος* from *ὁ*

ἀναληφθεὶς ἄνθρωπος.⁵⁰ It is the latter to whom all things are not yet subjected. To explain what is meant by “subjection,” he cites 1 Cor 1, 23-24: practically, subjection means conversion to Christianity. When he comes to speak of the second subjection, that of the Son to the Father (as he writes here; he had written previously of subjection to God), he begs the question by explaining the term ὁ θεός of v. 28 as τουτέστιν πατήρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. In the final sentence of the fragment, the author insists that it is Jesus, and not the Son, who is subjected.

The exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 in the *Epistula ad Antiochenos* has little similarity with Marcellus’s and speaks against his authorship of the *Epistula*.

6. *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*

The work *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, a pseudo-Athanasian writing which Martin Tetz has recently attributed to Marcellus, contains an extended examination of 1 Cor 15, 24-28.⁵¹ While Marcellus, in the extant fragments, concentrates his attention on the meaning of “kingdom,” the author of the *De incarnatione* is also concerned with the meaning of “subjection.”

The author cites 1 Cor 15, 24-28 in full,⁵² and—passing over vv. 24-26—proceeds immediately to his interpretation of “subjection.” He explains that it refers to the subjection of the world, which is subjected in Christ’s flesh.⁵³ This is clarified a little further on, when the author understands (τὰ) πάντα of 1 Cor 15, 27-28 as πάντες. And the subjection takes place in two stages: the first is “when all of us are subjected to the Son, are recognized as his members, and become sons of God in him.”⁵⁴ The second stage is the subjection of the Son to the Father in our stead (ἀνθ’ ὑμῶν; the phrase is absent from some MSS) as the head of his own members.⁵⁵ In the following sentence, the author distinguishes the Son from the rest of mankind: “If he were one of those subjected, he would have been subjected to the Father from the beginning, and not have done this at the end.”⁵⁶ The subjection of the Son, therefore, is seen exclusively as the subjection of his members, that is, believing Christians, to God.

On the other hand, the author writes clearly, almost defiantly, of two kingdoms: the divine kingdom (ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἢ θεϊκῆ, where he alludes to Dn 7, 27 Theodotion and quotes Lk 1, 33)⁵⁷ and the human kingdom

(ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη βασιλεία); the Lord of the heavens “took the human throne of David his father according to the flesh” and, once the human kingdom has been restored, hands it over to the Father.⁵⁸ Further, this human kingdom has a beginning and an end; to show this, the author cites 1 Cor 15, 25 and Ps 109, 1.⁵⁹ The last sentence of the paragraph indicates that the reign of Christ will be in two stages, corresponding to the human and the divine kingdoms: “So that God might be all in all, reigning through him as through God the Word, after reigning through him as through a man, the Savior.”⁶⁰

Tetz dates the *De incarnatione* ca. 360—that is, at a late stage in Marcellus’s development. The *De incarnatione* contains the doctrine of two kingdoms, a (temporary) human kingdom which has a beginning and an end, and an eternal, divine kingdom. The beginning and the end of the human kingdom receive particularly strong emphasis. But (as will be seen) a form of this doctrine is also found in later authors.

The author thinks of two stages in God’s reign, in terms of a double agency: the first is δι’ ἀνθρώπου σωτήρως, the second διὰ λόγου θεοῦ—in the second stage, the title “Son” is not used. On the other hand, the identification of Christ’s human nature with fallen humanity is wholly absent; the author rather emphasizes the distinction between the head and the members.⁶¹ If the *De incarnatione* is by Marcellus, then his theology underwent considerable development in the direction of orthodoxy in the three decades after his *Contra Asterium*.

7. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 30

In the fourth of his theological orations, composed in the second half of 380, Gregory of Nazianzus discusses several texts used by the Eunomians in defense of their position.⁶² The second one is 1 Cor 15, 25, together with Acts 3, 21 and Ps 109, 1—three texts found together in one fragment of Marcellus’s work against Asterius.⁶³ Gregory refers once to “Sabellians,”⁶⁴ the usual name for Marcellians; but his discourse is directed specifically against Eunomius, and presupposes the developed Trinitarian theology of the late fourth century.

Gregory makes four points in his exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 28.

First: “until” does not imply a cessation.⁶⁵ This now-familiar argument is finished quickly, with a single quotation (Mt 28, 20).

Second: there are two senses of the word βασιλεύειν. In the first sense, the παντοκράτωρ is king of all, whether they wish it or not. In this sense

the kingdom has no end. In the second sense, the Son brings about (ἐνεργεῖν) our subjection and places us under his rule: we receive his kingship willingly. In this second sense, the kingdom has an end: it is unnecessary to bring about subjection once the subjection has taken place.⁶⁶ This somewhat strained interpretation is in a sense a revival of Marcellus's teaching: Gregory teaches a temporary and a permanent kingdom, in combination with his own clear Trinitarianism.

Third: the second ὑποταγή of 1 Cor 15, 28—that is, the subjection of the Son to the Father—is understood of the ecclesial body of Christ, with a reference to Col 1, 18: the subjection of Christ is the fulfilment of the Father's will. Gregory states that the Son cannot be subjected to God, because he is himself God.⁶⁷

Fourth: Gregory interprets the πάντα ἐν πᾶσι of v. 28 as the time of *apokatastasis*, when the multiplicity caused by motions and passions shall cease, and we shall be completely like God, wholly receptive of God alone.⁶⁸

What is peculiar and interesting in Gregory's interpretation is the particular effort he makes to speak of the two senses of "kingdom" and to say that one has an end.

8. Gregory of Nyssa, *In illud: Tunc et ipse filius*

Gregory of Nyssa wrote a short treatise on 1 Cor 15, 28, entitled *In illud: Tunc et ipse filius*.⁶⁹ Reinhard Hübner has analyzed the work at length and studied Gregory's relation to Marcellus of Ancyra.⁷⁰

Gregory's principal concern is the meaning of "subjection." It is a problem, he says, because certain "knaves" have been interpreting 1 Cor 15, 28 as if it implied some servile lowliness of the only-begotten God (which is Gregory's paraphrase of Paul's term "the Son.")⁷¹ These opponents are clearly Eunomians.

In the first major part of his treatise, Gregory examines the various senses of ὑποτάσσειν in Scripture, and finds six:

1. Slaves are subjected to their masters.
2. Irrational nature is subjected to man by God (Ps 8, 7).
3. Nations are subjected to Israel through war (Ps 46, 4).
4. Those saved by full knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) speak in God's person: "Foreigners have been subjected to me" (Ps 59, 10).
5. The verse: "Will not my soul be subjected to God?" (Ps 61, 2).
6. 1 Cor 15, 28.

None of the first four senses can apply to the Son, the only-begotten God.⁷²

Gregory considers one other, curious, possibility: the subjection of the boy Jesus to his parents (Lk 2, 51). But this subjection, he says, ended at Cana (Jn 2, 4), when Jesus rejected his mother's advice.⁷³

Gregory finds the key to his solution in the future tense of ὑποταγήσεται in 1 Cor 15, 28. The subjection is in the future. Gregory defines subjection to God as "complete separation from evil."⁷⁴ The subjection of the Son, he says, takes place through us, when we have all been separated from evil in imitation of Christ the firstfruits, and have become one body with him. Gregory interprets the subjection, therefore, in a moral-mystical sense: imitation of Christ leads to union with Christ, and perfect subjection to God exists when the subjection to evil is overcome.⁷⁵

In a second major part of his treatise, Gregory takes up the second part of 1 Cor 15, 28, "in order that God may be all in all," and interprets the phrase as the positive aspect of subjection, again in a mystical sense: God will be "in all" when no evil is found in being,⁷⁶ for God cannot be in evil. And that God will be "all things" to beings shows that the life to come will be absolutely simple (ἀπλοῦν καὶ μονοειδέεζ): there will be need of nothing but God.⁷⁷

Toward the end of the treatise Gregory again returns to Paul's peculiar use of "subjection" and says—rather lamely—that Paul sometimes uses words in an unusual sense, showing that he is still somewhat uncomfortable with the term.⁷⁸

Finally, at the very end of the treatise, Gregory deals with 1 Cor 15, 25 and its problematic "until." He understands βασιλεύειν as ἀριστεύειν, "to be the best": Christ will be the champion so long as there are enemies to conquer; when all that is opposed to the good has been done away with, there will be an end to his heroic deeds.⁷⁹ Like Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa tries to find a sense in which the reign of Christ will end. And the phrase "he hands over the kingdom to the Father" means that he leads all men to God.⁸⁰ The last sentence of Gregory's exegesis is a good summary:

Therefore when all who were ever the enemies become a footstool for God's feet by receiving the divine footprint upon themselves, and death has been destroyed (for if there are no beings who are dying, death will simply not exist), then the one who lives in us will be subjected to God, as Paul says, in the subjection of all of us, which is not understood as servile humility, but as a kingdom and incorruptibility and

blessedness. He perfects our good through himself, and establishes in us what is pleasing to himself.⁸¹

9. (Ps?) Gregory of Nyssa, *Aduersus Arium et Sabellium*

The attribution of this short treatise to Gregory of Nyssa is uncertain.⁸² In the course of a relatively standard refutation of Arianism and “Sabellianism,” the author offers an interpretation of 1 Cor 15, 24 and 28.

The author mentions only the Father and the Son, but not the Holy Spirit. He insists repeatedly on the Son’s own proper *hypostasis*, without any extensive explanation. The “Sabellians” are Marcellians; the author accuses his opponent (who is addressed in the second person singular) of saying that the Father conceded the kingdom to the Son for his use, and then took it back.⁸³ This is a caricature of Marcellus’s thought.

Positively,⁸⁴ the author approaches the subjection of the Son through scriptural texts on the true humanity of Christ and his identification with the sinful human race (citing Mt 8, 17; 2 Cor 5, 21; Gal 3, 13). The future subjection of the Son will take place when all of humanity has been subjected to the Son. What is striking here is the absence of any explicit reference to the body of Christ, or to the Church. Instead, the author applies 1 Cor 3, 23 (“You are of Christ, Christ is of God”) to the future subjection of all things to Christ: “For if all of us should be of Christ, Christ would also be of God and subjected.”⁸⁵

The kingdom, for the author, is not to be understood as the dignity of kingship (τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σαλπτορχίας)⁸⁶ but rather those who have been ruled by him as king and subjected to him.⁸⁷

The exegesis of Paul’s text here is different from that in Gregory of Nyssa’s *In illud: Tunc et ipse filius*; and the use of 1 Cor 3, 23 to explain 1 Cor 15, 28 occurs in no other text that is studied here.

10. Didymus of Alexandria

The catenae have preserved two fragments on 1 Cor 15, 24-28 attributed to Didymus of Alexandria (died 398).⁸⁸ The first fragment has an unusual interpretation of *basileia*. Didymus proposes two meanings for the word: either “those ruled over” (a common interpretation), or “his [i.e. the Son’s] own flesh.” Didymus envisions a kind of progress (προκοπή) precisely in Christ’s flesh, from a stage at which it is rul-

ed over as the “form of a slave” (Phil 2, 7) to one in which it is the flesh of the Word. In the process, “the Son handed over [his own flesh] to the Father for improvement.”⁸⁹ On another point Didymus shows advanced Trinitarian thought, and employs the unusual phrase “one king, Father and Son.” Finally, Didymus explains the subjection of the Son to the Father apologetically: it is a refutation of Greek mythology, in which gods are parricides. Didymus envisages a double subjection: first the Church, to the extent that the Son makes his own the persecutions of the Church and its sufferings and subjection, and then the Son. In general Didymus (if he is the author of the fragments) shows remarkable independence and originality in his exegesis of the passage.

11. John Chrysostom, *Homilia 39 in 1 Corinthios*

Chrysostom preached the homilies on 1 Corinthians in Antioch, and so before 397. His explanation of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 is in homily 39.⁹⁰

He finds the text difficult. V. 24, for example, must be understood not ἀνθρωπίνως but θεωπεπῶς; otherwise one would think that the Father was not king before the kingdom was handed over, nor the Son afterwards. On the same principle, he writes off the obvious meaning of “until.”⁹¹

Positively, Chrysostom introduces a curious argument from Trinitarian theology. Paul, he writes, makes the Son the subject of the actions in vv. 25-26, and does not mention the Father. But then, lest anyone think that the Son is greater than the Father, he attributes (in v. 27) the subjection of all things to the Father, in order to show that everything done for our sake is done by the Father and the Son in common.⁹² He deals with the subjection of the Son very briefly, writing: “He [Paul] shows the full concordance [of the Son] with the Father, and that the Father is the first principle of all good and the first cause, who begot the one who can do great and righteous things.”⁹³

Chrysostom also has a doctrine of two kingdoms: one according to affinity or fellowship (οἰκεῖωσις), the other by creation. By creation God is king of all: Greeks, Jews, demons and enemies; by affinity he is king of believers, of those who will it, of those who are subjected. This second kingdom is said to have a beginning, Chrysostom writes, and quotes Ps 2, 8 and Mt 28, 18.⁹⁴

Finally, he interprets the last clause of v. 28 as showing that there are not two uncaused causes or a divided kingdom. He also offers the inter-

pretation of “certain others” of this verse, namely that it means the abolition of evil.⁹⁵

12. Severian of Gabala, *In psalmum 96*

This homily, found among the ps-Chrysostomica and recently attributed to Severian of Gabala,⁹⁶ has an explanation of 1 Cor 15, 24 that is in some ways reminiscent of Marcellus’s. The author explicitly teaches a double kingdom of the Savior: one existing before the ages, and without beginning, in which the Savior is king by nature, the other having a beginning at the time of the Incarnation, in which the Savior is king according to his human *πλάσις*. Like Marcellus, he thinks in terms of the history of salvation: before the temporal kingdom of Christ began, the world was under the kingship, or rather tyranny, of demons, death and sin.⁹⁷ The author has no difficulty accepting a beginning of the temporal reign of Christ; but an end to it leads him to distinguish two meanings of the word *basileia*. He cites Lk 1, 33, and concludes that the (temporal) kingdom will have no end. If this is the case, he asks, what meaning does 1 Cor 15, 24 (which is often wrongly interpreted) have? The word *basileia*, he answers, has two meanings in Scripture: either the dignity of the rulers (*τὸ ἀξίωμα τῶν βασιλευόντων*) or the nations who are ruled (*τὰ ἔθνη τὰ βασιλευόμενα*). It is the second which is applicable, in a peculiar sense: it is not the kingdom of the Savior that will end, but the kingdom of sin and death. He writes: “Therefore the Savior hands over the kingdom—that is to say, humanity—which was once ruled by sin, once ruled by death, so that he might free it from captivity, create it anew, and present it to God the Father.”⁹⁸

13. Severian of Gabala, catena fragment

In a short passage on 1 Cor 15, 23-25 attributed to Severian of Gabala,⁹⁹ the kingdom is interpreted as that which the evil one seized when he overthrew Adam and those descended from him—i.e. the kingdom is that possessed wrongly and tyrannically by the devil. (On this point the fragment is in full accord with the homily on Ps 96 also attributed to Severian.) Once the kingdom is handed over, the Son rules with the Father. The author deals at greater length with the word “until,” and to illustrate that it does not indicate a cessation, cites Is 46, 4, a verse also cited for this purpose by Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrus.¹⁰⁰

14. Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio epistulae i ad Corinthios*

The last author to be considered is Theodoret of Cyrus (died ca. 466); his commentary on the epistles of St. Paul was probably written toward the end of his life.¹⁰¹ With Theodoret, even more than with Chrysostom, the last vestiges of controversy about 1 Cor 15, 24-28 disappear. Theodoret is aware that the partisans of Arius and Eunomius made use of the passage for their own ends,¹⁰² but has no specific information on their teaching.

His interpretation of the passage contains no surprises. "Until," he says, does not indicate a cessation, "but teaches that he will wholly subject all (ἄπαντας)." ¹⁰³ There is one eternal kingdom, just as God is eternal, and his only-begotten Son is coeternal.¹⁰⁴ On the subjection of all things, Theodoret explains that in 1 Cor 15, 27 the Father is the agent, whereas in Phil 3, 21 the Son is the agent;¹⁰⁵ this suffices to overcome any suspicion of subordinationism.

Like Chrysostom, Theodoret devotes an extensive paragraph to vv. 27-28, and like him also, discusses the two natures of Christ.¹⁰⁶ The subjection of the Son, Theodoret states (against Arius and Eunomius), does not refer to the deity of the Only-begotten.¹⁰⁷ Nor can handing over the kingdom mean that the Father does not yet possess it.¹⁰⁸ Theodoret turns to the ecclesial explanation of subjection and handing over the kingdom: as head of the body, "he makes his own what is ours"—"our present disobedience and our future subjection"—"and when we have been subjected, after being freed from corruption, he is said to be subjected."¹⁰⁹

In his interpretation of the last clause of v. 28, Theodoret introduces a new distinction. God is omnipresent *κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν* and *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν*.¹¹⁰ The first is always true, the second not yet realized. "Thus God will be all in all when all have been freed from sin, and converted to him, and do not yield to the inclination to evil."¹¹¹

15. Conclusions

1. No one of these fourteen works shows a direct verbal dependence upon any other. A study of the scriptural texts cited in these works (this study is not presented here) shows that certain texts recur often,¹¹² as might be expected, but does not suggest any direct literary dependence. Theodoret draws several ideas from Chrysostom, but this relationship has long been known.

2. In his exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28, Marcellus of Ancyra placed little emphasis on the term “subjection” (ὑποταγή). Eusebius of Caesarea understood both the subjection of all things and the subjection of the Son as an act of obedience and honor. Cyril of Jerusalem does not distinguish between the two subjections, but understands the words simply as meaning “obedience.” The *Epistula ad Antiochenos* understands the first subjection as conversion to Christianity; the author has no place for the second, since he simply equates God with Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The ecclesial interpretation of the second subjection (the Son is subjected to God at the end-time in the sense that he as head is identified with his members, the Church; it is actually the members that are subjected) is found in *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Theodoret of Cyrus. It is absent from Chrysostom and Severian of Gabala. This apparently became the standard explanation of ὑποταγή.

3. The most intriguing theme in these texts is that of the *basileia*. Marcellus of Ancyra, in his work against Asterius, made the double *basileia*—temporal and eternal—the keystone of his exegesis. Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem, who are intent on refuting Marcellus, say little or nothing about the kingdom, and concentrate instead on the meaning of “until.” The *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* has a strong, even challenging, emphasis on the double kingdom, human and divine, and stresses the teaching that the human kingdom had a beginning and an end. This concern with the double kingdom of Christ, and the beginning and end of one of the two kingdoms, reappears in four other authors: Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom and Severian of Gabala. Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa explicitly admit an end to one of the two kingdoms. John Chrysostom and Severian of Gabala claim that one of the two kingdoms has a beginning, but do not speak of, or deny, an end to it. Severian of Gabala is closest to Marcellus of Ancyra, in that he dates the beginning of the kingdom from the Incarnation. In light of this, one should not make too much of the fact that *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* has a doctrine of two kingdoms; in itself, it does not prove that Marcellus wrote the work. One may say, however, that late-fourth and early-fifth century authors were aware of the doctrine of two kingdoms, and perhaps that it was Marcellus’s doctrine. They go out of their way to speak of a double kingdom, and of a beginning or end, or both, to one of the kingdoms. But their teaching departs from Marcellus’s in

another way. For Marcellus, the temporary kingdom is Christ's and the eternal kingdom is God's. No later author preserves this distinction. In the *De incarnatione et contra Arianos*, the two kingdoms are both God's and Christ is—in both cases—the instrument through which God reigns. In Gregory of Nazianzus the eternal kingdom is Christ's, as *pan-tokratōr*, and the kingdom which will end is also the Son's. Gregory of Nyssa is unclear on this point. For John Chrysostom both kingdoms are God's while for Severian of Gabala both kingdoms are the Savior's.

In all of its various forms, this concern with the double kingdom seems to be a continuation of an exegetical tradition begun by Marcellus of Ancyra.

NOTES

¹ K. Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kapadoziern* (Tübingen/Leipzig 1904) 156: "Es lässt sich bei allen Theologen der Zeit studieren, wie sie, ohne es zu wissen und zu wollen, in der Polemik gegen die Arianer auf die Sprünge des Marcellus von Ankyra geraten."

² E. Schendel, *Herrschaft und Unterwerfung Christi. 1 Korinther 15, 24-28 in Exegese und Theologie der Väter bis zum Ausgang des 4. Jahrhunderts*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, 12 (Tübingen 1971). Older literature on the topic: G. W. H. Lampe, Some Notes on the Significance of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, βασιλεία Χριστοῦ, in the Greek Fathers, *JTS* 49 (1948) 58-73; idem, The Exegesis of Some Biblical Texts by Marcellus of Ancyra and Pseudo-Chrysostom's Homily on Ps. XCVI. 1, *ibid.* 169-175 (the homily is now identified as Severian of Gabala's; see below); M. Eckart, *Das Verständnis von 1 Kor 15, 23-28 bei Origenes* (Augsburg 1966); P. Trummer, *Anastasis. Beitrag zur Auslegung und Auslegungsgeschichte von 1 Kor. 15 in der griechischen Kirche bis Theodoret*. Dissertationen der Universität Graz, 1 (Wien 1970). (Trummer's short dissertation treats vv. 24-28 in six pages, but includes many interesting quotations; he assumes, however, that there is a single, unified patristic exegesis of the passage.)

³ On the attributions see below, and the review by P. Nautin in *RHR* 185 (1974) 217-218.

⁴ For the date see W. Schneemelcher, Zur Chronologie des arianischen Streites, *ThLZ* 79 (1954) 399.

⁵ *Eusebius Werke IV. Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcellus*, ed. by E. Klostermann. GCS, 14 (Leipzig 1906).

⁶ Fr. 113 (209, 10).

⁷ Fr. 113 (209, 11); 117 (210, 20, 22). In fr. 114 (209, 15) he includes πάντα from v. 27.

⁸ Fr. 41 (192, 5); 116 (209, 32); 121 (212, 8).

⁹ See also fr. 121.

¹⁰ Marcellus's theology in: Th. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (Gotha 1867); F. Loofs, art. Marcellus von Ancyra, *RE*³ 12 (1903) 259-265; W. Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra. Der Logos-Christologe und Biblizist. Sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie und zum Neuen Testament*. Theologische Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirche- und Geistesgeschichte, 10 (Halle 1940).

¹¹ See Lampe, 'Some Notes'; A. M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II. Ökumenischen Konzils*. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, 15 (Göttingen 1965), esp. p. 192 n. 1; and E. Molland, 'Des Reich kein Ende haben wird.' Hintergrund und Bedeutung einer dogmatischen Aussage im nicäno-constantinopolitanischen Glaubensbekenntnis, in his *Opuscula patristica*. Bibliotheca theologica Norvegica, 2 (Oslo 1970) 235-253.

¹² Fr. 113 (209, 12).

¹³ Fr. 115 (209, 17-18, 23-24).

¹⁴ Fr. 113 (209, 8); 117 (210, 21).

¹⁵ Fr. 117 (210, 24).

¹⁶ Fr. 113 (209, 10).

¹⁷ Fr. 115 (209, 25-26).

¹⁸ Fr. 117 (210, 24-25). This and all translations are the author's.

¹⁹ The most extensive treatment of the history of salvation in Marcellus remains Zahn's, *Marcellus von Ancyra* 166-185. M.-D. Chenu, art. Marcel d'Ancyre, *DTC* 9 (1927) 1993-1999 concentrates on synodal opposition to Marcellus. Gericke (*Marcell von Ancyra* 142-148), in a section on 1 Cor 15, 24ff., deals with Marcellus's sources rather than his doctrine itself. See also the good paragraph in Lampe, *The Exegesis* 170.

²⁰ Fr. 117 (210, 26-28).

²¹ Fr. 113 (209, 9). Zahn (*Marcellus von Ancyra* 173) misunderstands the first sentence in fr. 113, of which he writes: "In anderen Fällen endlich fließen beide Anschauungen dermassen in Eins zusammen, dass in einer grammatisch unzulässigen Weise an die Stelle des zuerst als Subjekt genannten Logos der durch ihn zum König erhobene Mensch tritt." But in this fragment the Logos is not the subject. Marcellus identifies the fallen man (mankind) with him who became king through the Word in human flesh.

²² Fr. 107 (208, 14-15).

²³ Fr. 111 (208, 31-209, 2).

²⁴ Schendel, *Herrschaft und Unterwerfung* 122. If the word *anthrōpos* is understood concretely as Adam, then there is an echo of "kleinasiatische Theologie" here. On Adam and Christ in Marcellus, see M. Tetz, *Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra II. Markells Lehre von der Adamsohnschaft Christi und eine pseudoklementinische Tradition über die wahren Lehrer und Propheten*, *ZKG* 79 (1968) 3-42.

²⁵ Fr. 117 (210, 24).

²⁶ Fr. 117 (210, 20-25).

²⁷ Fr. 41 (192, 1-6). See also Schendel, *Herrschaft und Unterwerfung* 127-129.

²⁸ See note 5 above.

²⁹ Schendel, *Herrschaft und Unterwerfung* 143.

³⁰ E.g. *De eccl. theol.* 3, 17 (177, 6); 19 (180, 25); 20 (181, 6, 9).

³¹ *Ibid.*, 3, 13-14 (169-171).

³² *Ibid.*, 3, 16 (174, 30-33).

³³ *Ibid.*, 3, 14 (171, 26-28); 3, 15 (172, 6-9).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 3, 15 (172, 8-14).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, (172, 17-18).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, (172, 35-173, 8).

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 16 (174, 10-21). All Old Testament references are to the LXX.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, (174, 33-175, 2; cf. 175, 6-15).

³⁹ Fr. 129 (GCS 37, 214-215). Date from Schendel, *Herrschaft und Unterwerfung* 138.

⁴⁰ Fr. 129 (215, 4-8).

⁴¹ Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra* 180-184.

⁴² Fr. 117 (210, 25).

⁴³ Text ed. by J. Rupp, *Cyrilli Opera quae supersunt* II (München 1860) 194-202; here 15, 27 (p. 194).

⁴⁴ *Catechesis* 15, 27 (194-196).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 30 (198).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Greek fragments ed. by E. Schwartz, *Der s. g. Sermo maior de fide des Athanasius*. Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jg. 1924, 6. Abhandlung (München 1925). The fuller Armenian version tr. by R. P. Casey, *The Armenian Version of the Pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes (Sermo maior de fide) and of the Expositio Fidei*. Studies and Documents, 15 (London and Philadelphia 1947). Apart from one passing reference to 1 Cor 15, 25 the Armenian version has no further treatment of the text in question.

⁴⁸ For the authenticity of these fragments see M. Richard, *Bulletin de patrologie* II, *MSR* 6 (1949) 132-133, and F. Scheidweiler, *Wer ist der Verfasser des sog. Sermo maior de fide?* *BZ* 47 (1954) 333-357, esp. 335-337. Schwartz, fr. 70, 42 and 43 = Casey, fr. 20, 22 and 23. In the English translation, the treatment of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 is found in ch. 24-25.

⁴⁹ See Scheidweiler, *Wer ist der Verfasser*. M. Tetz (*Zur Theologie des Markell von Ancyra I. Eine Markellische Schrift 'De incarnatione et contra Arianos,' ZKG* 75 [1964] 221) also accepts the attribution. But M. Simonetti (*Su alcune opere attribuite di recente a Marcello d'Ancira, Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 9 [1973] 313-329, and *idem*, *Ancore sulla paternità dello ps-atanasiano 'Sermo maior de fide,' Vetera Christianorum* 11 [1974] 333-343) rejects it.

⁵⁰ The Armenian translator misunderstood this distinction. See Casey, *The Armenian Version* 58.

⁵¹ Text in PG 26, 984-1028. Ch. 20 (1020A-1021A) deals with 1 Cor 15, 24-28. Tetz's attribution in *Zur Theologie des Markell von Ancyra I*. The attribution is rejected by M. Simonetti, *Su alcune opere*. The history of the attribution by G. M. Rapisarda, *La questione dell'autenticità de De incarnatione Dei et contra Arianos de S. Atanasio*. *Rassegna degli studi, Nuovo Didaskaleion* 23 (1973) 23-54. R. Hübner studies the exegesis of 1 Cor 15, 24-28 in *De inc. et c. Ar.* in Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ancyra, in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nyse*, ed. by M. Harl (Leiden 1971) 199-229, esp. 212-221.

⁵² PG 26, 1020A. According to Montfaucon's note there, some MSS omit the second πασαν of v. 24 and πάντας in v. 25, as Marcellus does.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 1020C.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 1020D.

⁵⁷ Αὐτοῦ refers to Christ.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 1021A.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 1020B.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 1021B.

⁶¹ Three other short works have recently been attributed to Marcellus (*De sancta ecclesia*, *Expositio fidei*, and *Contra theopaschitas*), but contain no references to 1 Cor 15,

24-28. For the attribution of *De sancta ecclesia* see M. Richard, Un opuscule méconnu du Marcel évêque d'Ancyre, *MSR* 6 (1949) 5-28; for the other two works, F. Scheidweiler, Wer ist der Verfasser. According to A. Grillmeier (*Christ in Christian Tradition I. From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon [451]* [2nd ed.; London and Oxford 1975] 275 n. 1) Tetz no longer considers the *Expositio fidei* to be one of Marcellus's works.

⁶² Text ed. by P. Gallay and M. Jourjon, Grégoire de Nazianze, *Discours* 27-31. SC 250 (Paris 1978) 230-238. For the date see *ibid.*, p. 14.

⁶³ Marcellus, fr. 117 (GCS Eusebius 4, 210-211).

⁶⁴ *Oratio* 30, 6 (SC 250, 238).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 4 (p. 232).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 5 (pp. 232-234).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 6 (p. 238).

⁶⁹ Text in PG 44, 1304-1325. Its authenticity was once doubted on doctrinal grounds ("Illa homilia quod repleta est erroribus Origenianis et ipsi Gregorio Nysseno in eius indubiis opusculis repugnat"; from the introduction, PG 44, 18); but this doubt has been overcome.

⁷⁰ R. Hübner, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa. Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der "physischen" Erlösungslehre*. Philosophia patrum, 2 (Leiden 1974); see also idem, Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ancyra. On pp. 214-222 he studies the *De inc. et c. Ar.* as the source of Gregory's *In illud: Tunc et ipse filius*, and also asserts (p. 222 n. 2) that the author of *De inc. et c. Ar.* has taken over a Gnostic system of redemption. On this treatise, see also J. Daniélou, Comble du mal et eschatologie chez Grégoire de Nysse, in *Glaube und Geschichte. Festgabe Joseph Lortz*, ed. by E. Iserloh and P. Manns (Baden-Baden 1958) II, 27-45, esp. 42-43.

⁷¹ PG 44, 1304A-B.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 1304B-1308B.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 1308B-1309A.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 1316A.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 1316A-B.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 1316C.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 1316D-1317A.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 1324B.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 1325B.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 1325C. Gregory (consciously or not) draws in the word *ὑποπόδιον* from Ps 8, 6 and so interprets it that the enemies are the footstool for God's feet, whereas Paul understands this as subjection to Christ.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² Text ed. by Fr. Müller, Gregorii Nysseni *Opera dogmatica minora* I. GNO III, I (Leiden 1958) 71-85. The authenticity was denied by K. Holl (Über die Gregor von Nyssa zugeschriebene Schrift 'Adversus Arium et Sabellium', in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* II [Darmstadt 1964] 298-309), defended by J. Daniélou (L'Adversus Arium et Sabellium de Grégoire de Nysse et l'Origénisme cappadocien, *RechScRel* 54 [1966] 61-66, esp. 65-66) and denied again by M. van Parys (Exégèse et théologie trinitaires. Prov. 8, 22 chez les pères cappadociens, *Irénikon* 43 [1970] 362-379, here 375-378) and R. Hübner (Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ancyra 211-212, and *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi* 31 n. 19). Müller (ed. cit. lxi) suggests that it is among Gregory's earliest works.

- ⁸³ *Adu. Ar. et Sab.* 79, 11-13.
- ⁸⁴ The relevant passage *ibid.*, 77, 26-79, 25.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 78, 28-79, 1.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 79, 10.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 79, 18-19.
- ⁸⁸ *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, ed. by K. Staab. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 15 (Münster 1933) 8.
- ⁸⁹ Cf. Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos* 1, 38.
- ⁹⁰ Text ed. by F. Field, Iohannis Chrysostomi *Interpretatio omnium epistularum Paulinarum* II (Oxford 1847) 486-506.
- ⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 492-493.
- ⁹² *Ibid.*, 493-494.
- ⁹³ *Ibid.*, 497. Later he interprets the subjection as obedience, with an allusion to Phil 2, 6-11.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 498.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 499. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *In illud: Tunc et ipse filius*.
- ⁹⁶ Text in PG 55, 603-612. On the attribution, see J. A. de Aldama, *Repertorium pseudochrysostomicum* (Paris 1965) no. 379, and R. Laurentin, *Bulletin sur la vierge Marie*, *RSPHTh* 52 (1968) 543. The homily has been studied by Lampe, *The Exegesis*.
- ⁹⁷ *In psalmum 96*, 1 (PG 55, 604).
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 2 (p. 605).
- ⁹⁹ Staab, *Pauluskommentare* 274.
- ¹⁰⁰ Chrysostom, *Hom. 39 in 1 Cor.*, 5 (p. 494) and Theodoret of Cyrus on 1 Cor 15, 25 (PG 82, 356C).
- ¹⁰¹ Text in PG 82, 356-361.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 356C; 357A.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 356B.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 356C.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 356D-357A.
- ¹⁰⁶ Specifically, Chrysostom distinguishes the θεότης from the οἰκονομία, whereas Theodoret, as befits his later date, explicitly mentions δύο τοῦ δεσπότης Χριστοῦ αἱ φύσεις (PG 82, 357B).
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 357B.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 360B. (Chrysostom has the same observation.)
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 360B-C.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 360C.
- ¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 360D-361A.
- ¹¹² For example: Ps 109, 1: Marcellus, fr. 117 (twice); Eusebius, *De eccl. theol.* 13, 14, 15; *De inc. et c. Ar.* 20; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 30, 4; Didymus of Alexandria, catena on 1 Cor 15, 24-26; Theodoret of Cyrus on 1 Cor 15, 25. Lk 1, 33: Marcellus, *Ep. ad Iulium*; Eusebius, *De eccl. theol.* 3, 16 (twice); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* 15, 27; *De inc. et c. Ar.* 20; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 30, 4; Severian of Gabala, *In psalmum 96*, 2. Acts 3, 21: Marcellus, fr. 117 (twice); Eusebius, *De eccl. theol.* 13 (twice), 14; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 30, 4, 6. Phil 3, 21: Eusebius, *De eccl. theol.* 3, 14, 15 (twice); Chrysostom, *Hom. 39 in 1 Cor.*, 5; Theodoret of Cyrus on 1 Cor 15, 26.