

Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution

RICHARD PAUL VAGGIONE, OHC

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP
Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogotá Buenos Aires Calcutta
Cape Town Chennai Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul
Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai
Nairobi Paris São Paulo Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw

and associated companies in Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Richard Paul Vaggione, O.H.C. 2000

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2000

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data applied for

ISBN 0-19-814678-7

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Typeset in Imprint
by Regent Typesetting, London
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
T. J. International Ltd., Padstow

PREFACE

In 1925 that indefatigable American collector, William Randolph Hearst, returned from Europe with a characteristic trophy: portions of a complete twelfth-century abbey stored in boxes and numbered for easy reassembly. Unfortunately, in passing through customs these boxes became disarranged, and what had been an abbey church was instantly transformed into an unusable pile of stones. Hearst placed them all in storage, and that is where they still were when their owner died in 1953. They were then purchased by a private company which undertook to reassemble them, and which, after a considerable effort, managed to do so. The abbey today is a parish church on the outskirts of Miami. No one who has studied the so-called 'Arian' controversy can contemplate so unguided a success without sympathy, for the two enterprises are in many ways similar—with this exception, that those who were reconstructing the abbey knew they had all the parts!

The same cannot be said of those studying Arius or his successors. In the century and a half separating us from Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century* there has been an enormous revival of interest in Arius and 'Arianism';¹ but one that has been more notable for its volume than its unity. It is not quite true to say (to paraphrase an eighteenth-century author) that there are *tot fere theoriae, quot sunt auctores*,² but even when there is agreement as to the identity of the 'stones', there is very often none as to where we should put them. It is this sense of lacking a map that lies behind the present study—not exactly Omar Khayyam's sense that he always left by the same door he came in, but rather frustration that visits to 'Doctor and Saint' should be so consistently inconclusive. The only way forward that really seemed open was the original

¹ For recent works relating to Arius and his followers see below chap. 3, nn. 31–2.

² J. Garnier *et al.* (eds.), Basil, *Eun.* 1 (*PG* 29. 497, n. 51): '[There are] almost as many theories as writers'.

sources themselves. So, without quite realizing what was involved, I decided to read as many of them as possible with as fresh an eye as possible. I was particularly determined to try to read the losers as thinkers in their own right, and not just as foils for their opponents. Whether I was successful or not, I will leave for the reader to judge, but I did find myself repeatedly brought up against the same two questions: who were these people talking to, and why did they think it was all so immensely important?

It is easier to pose such questions than to answer them, especially as we are so much better informed about the later stages of the controversy than the earlier. When Italian mountaineers are confronted with a particularly difficult peak, they are said to call the foothold from which they approach it as their *pou sto*—almost literally their ‘stand-point’—a secure place from which to approach an otherwise insurmountable task. It seemed clear that to try to approach these questions fruitfully we needed a *pou sto*, a fixed point from which to approach the whole. For, while the controversy sparked by Arius ultimately did come to embrace almost the entire Mediterranean world, it started as a clash of individuals. The best place to look for a *pou sto*, then, seemed to be with a single individual, and *not* with one of the victors. That considerably narrowed the field, but of all who might have been considered, one of the most attractive was Eunomius, the former bishop of Cyzicus. Not only do his works survive in comparative abundance, but he was attacked with almost equal vehemence by both sides, which makes him valuable from either point of view. The study which follows, then, is devoted to Eunomius of Cyzicus, but with at least one eye cocked to those parts of the mountain visible from this particular *pou sto*.

Since, then, this work is structured around a life, it is written as a continuous narrative, with theoretical details and wider currents of thought added as they occur. The original sources underlying it are indicated as fully as possible in the notes, which thereby form a kind of ‘under-book’. My goal throughout was to try to read these sources as attentively and without presupposition as possible. Clearly, I have not always succeeded, but to the extent that I have, I can hope to have made the slopes of the mountain a little less formidable to those

who approach them, and perhaps a little more comprehensible as well.

No study of this kind is undertaken without the encouragement and help of others. Any complete list would add to an already unwieldy text, but some at least must be given special mention. In particular I would like to thank Prof. Maurice Wiles for his kind encouragement over many years of composition, and my own monastic community for their patience in support of an enterprise which has had to be sandwiched in amongst much other work. I hope the reader will find it useful to read; there is no doubt that the author found it instructive to write.

R.P.V.

Incarnation Priory, Berkeley

CONTENTS

<i>Abbreviations</i>	x
1. Gentleman	i
2. Craftsman of Words	12
3. Ariomaniac	30
4. Logic Chopper	79
5. Courtier	148
6. Prelate	201
7. Exile	267
8. Troglodyte	312
Conclusion: Heretic	364
<i>Appendix</i>	383
<i>Index</i>	397

ABBREVIATIONS

A. ANCIENT AUTHORS AND WORKS

* = Works that are certainly or probably spurious.

Acac. Caes., <i>Fr. Marcell.</i>	Acacius of Caesarea, <i>Fragmenta contra Marcellum</i>
<i>Fr. Rom.</i>	<i>Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos: Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche</i> , ed. Karl Staab (Münster: Aschendorff, 1933)
Adamantius, <i>Dial.</i>	Adamantius, <i>Dialogus de Recta in Deum Fide</i>
Aetius, <i>Ep. Mazona</i>	Aetius Antiochenus, <i>Epistula ad Mazona Tribunalum</i>
<i>Exp.</i>	<i>Expositio Patricii et Aetii</i>
<i>Fr.</i>	<i>Fragmenta Epistularum</i>
<i>Synt.</i>	<i>Syntagmation</i>
Alex. Al., <i>Ep. Alex.</i>	Alexander of Alexandria, <i>Epistula ad Alexandrum Constantinopolitanum</i>
<i>Ep. encycl.</i>	<i>Epistula Encyclica</i>
Ambrose, <i>Auxent.</i>	Ambrose, <i>Sermo contra Auxentium de Basilicis tradendis</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Fid.</i>	<i>De Fide ad Gratianum Augustum</i>
Anast. S., <i>Monoph.</i>	Anastasius Sinaita, <i>Contra Monophysitas testimonia</i>
Ar. Ign.	Arianus Ignotus, an anonymus 'Arian'
<i>Anunt.</i>	<i>Homilia in Annuntiationem BVM</i>
<i>C. Orth. et Maced.</i>	<i>Contra Orthodoxos et Macedonianos</i>
<i>Comm. in Lc.</i>	<i>Commentarii in Lucam</i>
<i>Fid.</i>	<i>Instructio Verae Fidei</i>
<i>Fr. Theol.</i>	<i>Fragmenta Theologica</i>
<i>Haer.</i>	<i>Contra Hereticos</i>
<i>Hom. Sollemn.</i>	<i>Homiliae de Sollemnitatibus</i>
<i>Job</i>	<i>Commentarii in Job</i>
<i>Jud.</i>	<i>Contra Iudaeos</i>
<i>Lect.</i>	<i>De Lectionibus Sanctorum Evangeliorum</i>

<i>Pag.</i>	<i>Contra paganos</i>
<i>Sermo</i>	<i>Sermo Arianorum</i>
Aristotle, <i>Cat.</i>	Aristotle, <i>Categoriae</i>
Arius, <i>Ep. Alex.</i>	Arius, <i>Epistula ad Alexandrum Alexandrinum</i>
<i>Ep. Const.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Constantinum</i>
<i>Ep. Eug.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Eusebium Nicomediensem</i>
*Ast. Soph., <i>Ps.</i>	(Ps.-)Asterius Sophista, <i>Commentariorum in psalmos quae supersunt: Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in psalmos quae supersunt</i> , ed. Marcel Richard (Oslo: A. W. Brøgger, 1956).
Ath.	Athanasius: <i>Athanasius' Werke</i> , ed. H.-G. Opitz (Berline and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1935 ff.), ii. and iii.
<i>Apol. Const.</i>	<i>Apologia ad Constantium</i>
<i>Apol. Sec.</i>	<i>Apologia Secunda contra Arianos</i>
* <i>Apoll.</i>	<i>De Incarnatione contra Apollinarem</i>
<i>Ar.</i>	<i>Orationes adversus Arianos</i>
<i>Decr.</i>	<i>De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi</i>
* <i>Dial. Trin.</i>	<i>De Trinitate Dialogi</i>
<i>Dion.</i>	<i>De Sententia Dionysii</i>
* <i>Disp.</i>	<i>Disputatio cum Ario in Synodo</i>
<i>Ep. Adolph.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Adelphium</i>
<i>Ep. Aeg. Lib.</i>	<i>Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae</i>
<i>Ep. Afr.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Afros Episcopos</i>
<i>Ep. Encycl.</i>	<i>Epistula Encyclica</i>
<i>Ep. Fest.</i>	<i>Epistulae Festivales</i>
<i>Ep. Jov.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Jovianum</i>
<i>Ep. Mon.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Monachos</i>
<i>Ep. Mort. Ar.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Serapionem de Morte Arianorum</i>
<i>Ep. Serap.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Serapionem</i>
<i>Fr.</i>	<i>Fragmenta varia</i>
<i>Fug.</i>	<i>Apologia de Fuga Sua</i>
<i>Gent.</i>	<i>Contra Gentes: Athanasius, Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione</i> , ed. R. W. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
<i>H. Ar.</i>	<i>Historia Arianorum ad Monachos</i>
<i>Hom. in Mt. 11: 27</i>	<i>Homilia in illud, 'Omnia mihi tradita sunt'</i>
<i>Inc.</i>	<i>De Incarnatione: Athanasius, Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione</i> , ed. R. W.

- Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
Inc. et c. Ar. *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos*
Index Fest. *Index Epistularum Festivalium*
**Serm. Fid.* *Sermo Major de Fide*
Syn. *De Synodis*
Tom. *Tomus ad Antiochenos*
**Trin. et Spir.* *De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto*
V. Anton. *Vita Antonii*
 Ath. Anazarbenus, *Ep.* Athanasius of Anazarbus, *Fragmentum Epistulae ad Alexandrum Alexandrinum*
Fr. *Fragmentum Epistulae*
 Athenag., *Leg.* Athenagoras, *Legatio*: ed. W. R. Schoedel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
Res. *De Resurrectione*: ed. W. R. Schoedel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
 Aug., *Civ.* Augustine, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*
Coll. Max. *Collatio cum Maximino*
Conf. *Confessionum Libri*
Trin. *De Trinitate*
 Auxentius, *Exp. Fid.* Auxentius of Milan, *Expositio Fidei*
 Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* Auxentius of Dorostorum, *Epistula*
 Basil, *Ep.* Basil the Great, *Epistulae: Lettres*, ed. Yves Courtonne (Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les belles lettres', 1957), 3 vols.
Hex. *Homiliae in Hexaëmeron*
Eun. *Adversus Eunomium*
Spir. *Liber de Spiritu Sancto*
**Virg.* *De Virginitate*
 Basil Anc., *Virg.* Basil of Ancyra, *De Virginitate*
Cat. Gen. *Catena in Genesim*
CAP *Collectanea Antiariana Parisina*
Chron. Pasch. *Chronicon Paschale*
 Chrys., *Anom.* John Chrysostom, *Contra Anomoeos*
**BVM* *Contra Haereticos et in Virginem Deiparem*
**Hom. Anom.* *Homiliae Anomoeanae*
Hom. Div. *Homiliae Diversae*
Hom. in Heb. *Homiliae in Epistula ad Hebraeos*
Hom. in Mt. *Homiliae in Evangelio Secundum*

<i>Incomprehens.</i>	<i>Matthaeum</i>
<i>Job</i>	<i>De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura</i>
<i>Oppugn.</i>	<i>Commentarii in Job</i>
	<i>Adversus Oppugnatores Vitae Monasticae</i>
<i>*Opus Imperf.</i>	<i>Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum</i>
<i>Virg.</i>	<i>De Virginitate</i>
<i>Clement, Strom.</i>	Clement of Alexandria, <i>Stromateis</i>
<i>Cod. Theod.</i>	Codex Theodosianus: <i>Theodosiani Libri XVI</i> , ed. Th. Mommsen and P. Myer (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), 2 vols.
<i>Const., Ep. Alexand.</i>	Constantine, <i>Epistula ad Alexandrinos</i>
<i>Ep. Alex. et Ar.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Alexandrum et Arium</i>
<i>Ep. Ar.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Arium et socios eius</i>
<i>Ep. Nicom.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Nicomedienses</i>
<i>Const. App.</i>	<i>Constitutiones Apostolorum: Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum</i> , ed. F.-X. Funk (Paderborn, 1905), 2 vols.
<i>Concilia</i>	Councils
<i>C. Anc. (358)</i>	Council of Ancyra (358)
<i>Ep. Syn.</i>	<i>Epistula synodica</i>
<i>C. Ant. (325)</i>	Council of Antioch (325)
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistula</i>
<i>C. Ant. (341)</i>	Council of Antioch (341)
<i>Can.</i>	<i>Canones</i>
<i>C. Aquileia</i>	Council of Aquileia (381)
<i>Gesta</i>	<i>Gesta Episcoporum Aquileia adversum Haereticos Arrianos</i>
<i>C. Arim.</i>	Council of Ariminum
<i>Decr.</i>	<i>Decretum</i>
<i>Ep. Syn.</i>	<i>Epistula Synodica Anti-Nicena</i>
<i>CCP (381)</i>	Council of Constantinople (381)
<i>Can.</i>	<i>Canones</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistula</i>
<i>C. Gangr.</i>	Council of Gangra
<i>Can.</i>	<i>Canones</i>
<i>Ep. Syn.</i>	<i>Epistula Synodica</i>
<i>C. Nic.</i>	Council of Nicaea
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistula</i>
<i>C. Sel.</i>	Council of Seleucia (359)
<i>Ep. Legat.</i>	<i>Epistula Legatorum</i>
<i>C. Serd.</i>	Council of Serdica (Philippopolis)
<i>Ep. Alex.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Alexandrinos</i>

<i>Ep. Cath.</i>	<i>Epistula Catholica</i>
<i>Ep. Const.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Constantium Imperatorem</i>
<i>Ep. Iul.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Iulium Papam</i>
<i>Ep. Syn. Orient.</i>	<i>Epistula Synodica Orientalium</i>
Cyril, <i>Dial. Trin.</i>	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>De Trinitate Dialogi</i>
<i>Thes.</i>	<i>Thesaurus de Trinitate</i>
Cyril H.	Cyril of Jerusalem: <i>S. Patris Nostri Cyrilli Hierosolymorum Archiepiscopi Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia</i> , ed. G. C. Reischel and J. Rupp (Munich: Sumtibus Librariae Lentnerianae, 1848), 2 vols.
<i>Catech.</i>	<i>Catecheses Illuminandorum</i>
<i>Procatech.</i>	<i>Procatechesis</i>
Damasc., <i>Artem.</i>	John of Damascus, <i>Vita Artemii</i>
<i>Haer.</i>	<i>Liber de Haeresibus</i>
Damasus, <i>Ep.</i>	Damasus of Rome, <i>Epistulae</i>
Didymus, <i>Spir.</i>	Didymus of Alexandria, <i>De Spiritu Sancto</i>
<i>* Trin.</i>	<i>De Trinitate</i>
Dio Chrysostom, <i>Or.</i>	Dio Chrysostom, <i>Orationes</i>
DL	Diogenes Laertius, <i>De Clarorum Philosophorum Vitis</i>
<i>Doct. Patr.</i>	<i>Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi</i>
Epiph., <i>Anc.</i>	Epiphanius, <i>Ancoratus</i>
<i>Haer.</i>	<i>Adversus Haereses</i>
<i>Mens.</i>	<i>De Mensuris et Ponderibus</i>
Ephraim, <i>Nis.</i>	Ephraim Syrus, <i>Carmina Nisibena</i>
Eunapius, <i>VS</i>	Eunapius, <i>Vitae Sophistarum</i>
Eun., <i>Apol.</i>	Eunomius, <i>Liber Apologeticus</i>
<i>AA</i>	<i>Apologia Apologiae</i>
<i>EF</i>	<i>Expositio Fidei</i>
<i>Fr.</i>	<i>Fragmenta</i>
Eus., <i>Chron.</i>	Eusebius of Caesarea, <i>Chronicon</i>
<i>DE</i>	<i>Demonstratio Evangelica</i>
<i>E.Th.</i>	<i>De Ecclesiastica Theologia</i>
<i>Ep. Alex.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Alexandrum Episcopum Alexandriae</i>
<i>Ep. Caes.</i>	<i>Epistula ad Caesarienses</i>
<i>HE</i>	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
<i>Is.</i>	<i>Commentarius in Isaiam</i>
<i>Marcell.</i>	<i>Contra Marcellum</i>

PE	<i>Praeparatio Evangelica</i>
VC	<i>De Vita Constantini</i>
Eus. Nic., <i>Ep. Paulin.</i>	Eusebius of Nicomedia, <i>Epistula ad Paulinum Tyrium</i>
Libell.	<i>Libellus Poenitentiae</i>
Eustathius, <i>Fr. in Prov. 8: 22</i>	Eustathius of Antioch, <i>Fragmenta in illud, 'Dominus Creavit me'</i>
Evagrius, <i>HE</i>	Evagrius Scholasticus, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
Faustinus, <i>Trin.</i>	Faustinus, <i>De Trinitate</i>
Gennadius, <i>Vir. Inlus.</i>	Gennadius, <i>De Viris Inlustribus</i>
George Alex., <i>Ep. Alex.</i>	George of Alexandria (Cappadocia), <i>Epistula ad Alexandrinus</i>
Geo. Laod. <i>Ep. Alex.</i>	George of Laodicaea <i>Fragmentum Epistulae ad Alexandrum Alexandrinum</i>
<i>Ep. Dogm.</i>	<i>Epistula Dogmatica</i>
Geo. Mon., <i>Chron.</i>	Georgius Monachus (Hamartolus), <i>Chronographia</i>
Germinius, <i>Ep. Ruf.</i>	Germinius of Sirmium, <i>Epistula ad Rufianum</i>
Grg. Naz., <i>Carm.</i>	Gregory of Nazianzus, <i>Carminum libri duo</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae: Lettres</i> , ed. Paul Gallay (Paris: Société d'Édition 'les belles lettres', 1967), 2 vols.
Or.	<i>Orationes</i>
Grg. Nyss.	Gregory of Nyssa: W. Jaeger, <i>Gregorii Nysseni Opera</i> (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1921 ff.).
Apoll.	<i>Adversus Apollinarem</i>
Cant.	<i>Homiliae in Canticum Canticorum</i>
Conf.	<i>Refutatio Confessionis Eunomii</i> (= <i>Eun.</i> , vulg. II)
Deit.	<i>De Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti</i>
Ep.	<i>Epistulae</i>
Eun.	<i>Contra Eunomium</i> : all references are to the 2nd edn. (1960) = <i>J</i>
Fid.	<i>De Fide ad Simplicium</i>
Flacill.	<i>Oratio funebris in Flacillam Imperatricem</i>
Hom. Opif.	<i>De Hominis Opificio</i>
Laud. Bas.	<i>In Laudem Basilii fratris</i>

<i>Maced.</i>	<i>De Spiritu Sancto contra Macedonianos</i>
<i>Or. Catech.</i>	<i>Oratio Catechetica Magna</i>
<i>Paup.</i> 1, 2	<i>De Pauperis Amandis</i>
<i>Trin.</i>	<i>Ad Eustathium de Sancta Trinitate</i>
<i>Usur.</i>	<i>Contra Usurarios</i>
<i>V. Macr.</i>	<i>De Vita Macrinae</i>
<i>V. Mos.</i>	<i>De Vita Mosis</i>
<i>Heracl.</i>	<i>Altercatio Heracliani</i>
<i>Hieron., Chron.</i>	<i>Jerome, Chronicon</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Jo. Hier.</i>	<i>Contra Iohannem Hierosolymitanum</i>
<i>Lucif.</i>	<i>Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi</i>
<i>Vig.</i>	<i>Contra Vigilantium</i>
<i>Vir. Inlus.</i>	<i>De Viris Inlustribus</i>
<i>Hilary, Auxent.</i>	<i>Hilary, Contra Auxentium</i>
<i>Const.</i>	<i>In Constantium</i>
<i>Fr. Hist.</i>	<i>Fragmenta Historica</i>
<i>Lib. Const.</i>	<i>Liber II Ad Constantium</i>
<i>Syn.</i>	<i>De Synodis</i>
<i>Trin.</i>	<i>De Trinitate</i>
<i>Hist. Aceph.</i>	<i>Historia Acephala</i>
<i>Hom. Clem.</i>	<i>The Clementine Homilies</i>
<i>Iamblichus, Myst.</i>	<i>Iamblichus, De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum:</i> <i>Les Mystères d'Égypte</i> , ed. Édouard des Places, SJ (Paris: Société d'Édition 'les belles lettres', 1966).
<i>Ignat., (Ps.-).</i>	<i>Pseudo-Ignatius: The Apostolic Fathers</i> , 2nd edn., ed. J. B. Lightfoot (London, 1889-90), 5 vols.
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Ad Antiochenos</i>
<i>Eph.</i>	<i>Ad Ephesios</i>
<i>Her.</i>	<i>Ad Heronem</i>
<i>Magn.</i>	<i>Ad Magnesios</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Ad Philippenses</i>
<i>Philad.</i>	<i>Ad Philadelphios</i>
<i>Polyc.</i>	<i>Ad Polycarpum</i>
<i>Smyrn.</i>	<i>Ad Smyrnaeos</i>
<i>Trall.</i>	<i>Ad Trallianos</i>
<i>Isidore, Ep.</i>	<i>Isidore of Pelusium, Epistulae</i>
<i>Jo. Mal., Chron.</i>	<i>Joannes Malalas, Chronographia</i>
<i>Julian Imp., Ath.</i>	<i>The Emperor Julian, Epistula ad</i> <i>Athenienses</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>

<i>Gal.</i>	<i>Contra Galilaeos</i>
<i>Mis.</i>	<i>Misopogon</i>
<i>Or.</i>	<i>Orationes</i>
Julian, <i>Job</i>	Julian the 'Arian', <i>Commentarii in Job: Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian</i> , ed. Dieter Hagedorn (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1973).
Justin, <i>Apol.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Apologia</i> : G. Krüger, <i>Die Apologien Justins des Märtyrers</i> , 3rd edn. (Tübingen and Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1904).
<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogus cum Tryphonem: Die Ältesten Apologeten</i> , ed. Edgar J. Goodspeed (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914).
Libanius,	Libanius: <i>Libanii Opera</i> , ed. R. Foerster (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1903-22), 12 vols.
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Or.</i>	<i>Orationes</i>
Marcellus, <i>Fr.</i>	Marcellus of Ancyra, <i>Fragmenta</i>
Marius V., <i>Ep. Cand.</i>	Marius Victorinus, <i>Candidi Arriani Epistulae</i>
Maximinus, <i>Comment.</i>	Maximinus, <i>Commentarii in Acta Concilii Aquileiae (Dissertatio contra Ambrosium)</i>
Nemesius, <i>Nat. Hom.</i>	Nemesius of Emessa, <i>De Natura Hominis</i> : ed. Moreno Morani (Leipzig: Teubner, 1987).
Nicetas, <i>Thes.</i>	Nicetas Acominatus, <i>Thesaurus Orthodoxiae</i>
Olympiodorus, <i>Job</i>	Olympiodorus, <i>Commentarii in Job: Olympiodor, Diakon von Alexandria, Kommentar zu Hiob.</i> ed. Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984).
Or., <i>Cels.</i>	Origen, <i>Contra Celsum</i>
<i>Comm. in Mt.</i>	<i>Commentariorum in Matthaeum Libri</i>
<i>Hom. in Jer.</i>	<i>Homiliae in Jeremiam</i>
<i>Jo.</i>	<i>Commentarii in Joannem</i>
<i>Philoc.</i>	<i>Philocalia seu Ecloga de Operibus Origenis: The Philocalia of Origen</i> , ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge:

- Princ.*
Pacatus
Cambridge University Press, 1893).
De Principiis
Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, *Panegyricus Theodosio Augusto Dictus: XII Panegyrici Latini*, ed. G. Baehrens (Leipzig: Teubner, 1911).
- Pall., *V. Chrys.*
H. Laus.
Palladius Monachus, *Dialogus de Vita Joannis Chrysostomi*
Historia Monachorum in Aegypto: Palladio, *La Storia Lausiaca*, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink et al. (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1974).
- Palladius, *Apol.*
Ep.
Palladius of Ratiaria (?), *Apologia Epistula de Vita Sancti Ufila*
- Paulin. T., *Ep.*
Paulinus of Tyre, *Fragmentum Epistulae*
- Pausanias
Pausanias, *Periegeta*
- Philo
Philo Judaeus: *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt*, ed. L. Cohn and P. Wendland (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1962-3), 7 vols. 1-8.
Quod Deus sit immutabilis
De Fuga et Inventione
Legum Allegoriarum
De Opificio Mundi
De Somniis
- Deus*
Fug.
LA
Op.
Somn.
Philost., *HE*
Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*
- Philostratus, *VA*
Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*
- VS*
Vitae Sophistarum
- Phoebad., *Ar.*
Phoebadius Aginnensis, *Liber Contra Arianos*
- Plato, *Cra.*
Plato, *Cratylus*
- Rep.*
Tim.
Respublica
Timaeus
- Porph., *Abst.*
Porphyry, *De Abstinentia: Porphyrii Philosophi Platonici Opuscula selecta*, ed. Augustus Nauch (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1886).
- Cat.*
Parm.
In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium
In Platonis Parmenidem Commentarii: Porforio, *Commentario al Parmenide di Platone*, ed. Pierre Hadot (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1993).

<i>Plot.</i>	<i>Vita Plotini</i>
<i>Sent.</i>	<i>Sententiae ad Intelligibilia Ducentes</i> : ed. E. Lamberz (Leipzig: Teubner, 1975).
Proclus, <i>Parm.</i>	Proclus, <i>In Platonis Parmenidem Commentarii</i> : Procli Philosophi Platonici <i>Opera Inedita</i> , ed. V. Cousin (Paris: Aug. Durand, 1864).
<i>Recogn. Clem.</i>	<i>The Clementine Recognitions</i>
Ruf., <i>HE</i>	Rufinus, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
Sev. Gab. <i>Abr.</i>	Severian of Gabala <i>In Abrahae dictum</i> , <i>Gen. 24: 2</i>
Sextus, <i>Sent.</i>	Sextus Pythagoreus, <i>Sententiae: Sexti Empirici Opera</i> , ed. H. Mutschmann (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914), 4 vols.
Soc., <i>HE</i>	Socrates <i>Scholasticus</i> , <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
Soz., <i>HE</i>	Sozomen, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
Sulp. Sev., <i>Chron.</i>	Sulpicius Severus, <i>Chronica (Sacra Historia)</i>
<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogus</i>
<i>Mart.</i>	<i>Vita Sancti Martini</i>
Symbola	Creeds
<i>Symb. Ant. (341) 1-4</i>	<i>Symbola Synodi Antiochenae anno 341</i>
<i>Symb. Ant. (345)</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Antiochenae anno 345</i> 'macrostichum' dictum
<i>Symb. CP (360)</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Constantinopolitani anno 360</i>
<i>Symb. Nic. (325)</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Nicaenae anno 325</i>
<i>Symb. Nic. (359)</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Nicaenae Thraciae anno 359</i>
<i>Symb. Sel.</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Seleucensis anno 359</i>
<i>Symb. Serd. Orient.</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Serdicensis Orientalium</i>
<i>Symb. Sirm. 1 anath.</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Sirmiensis anno 351, anathemata</i>
<i>Symb. Sirm. 2</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Sirmiensis anno 357, 'blasphemum' dictum</i>
<i>Symb. Sirm. 3</i>	<i>Symbolum Synodi Sirmiensis anno 359</i>
Symeon M., <i>V. Amph.</i>	Symeon Metaphrastes, <i>Vita Amphiloohii Iconiensis</i>
Themistius, <i>Or.</i>	Themistius, <i>Orationes: Themistii Orationes quae supersunt</i> , ed. H. Schenkl and G. Downey (Leipzig: Teubner,

	1965-74), 3 vols.
Thdr. Mops., <i>Catech.</i>	Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Catechesis</i>
<i>Eun.</i>	<i>Contra Eunomium</i>
<i>Jo.</i>	<i>Commentarii in Joannem</i>
Thdt., <i>Ep.</i>	Theodoret, <i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Eran.</i>	<i>Eranistes</i> : Theodoret of Cyrus, <i>Eranistes</i> , ed. Gerard H. Ettlinger (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).
<i>HE</i>	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
<i>H. Rel.</i>	<i>Historia Religiosa</i>
<i>Haer.</i>	<i>Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium</i>
<i>Trin.</i>	<i>De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate</i>
Theognius Nicaenus, <i>Fr.</i>	Theognius of Nicaea, <i>Fragmentum Epistulae</i>
Thphl. Ant., <i>Autol.</i>	Theophilus of Antioch, <i>Ad Autolycum</i> : ed. Robert M. Grant (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).
Tim. CP, <i>Haer.</i>	Timothy of Constantinople, <i>De Receptione Haereticorum</i>
Vigilius, <i>Ar. Dial.</i>	Vigilius Tapsensis, <i>Contra Arianos Dialogus</i>
<i>Ar. Sabel. Dial.</i>	<i>Contra Arianos, Sabellianos, etc., Dialogus</i>
<i>Felic.</i>	<i>Contra Felicianum Arianum</i>
<i>Mariv.</i>	<i>Contra Marivadum Arianum Diaconum</i>
Vitae Sanctorum	Lives of the Saints (Anonymous)
Anonymae	
<i>V. Agapet.</i>	<i>Vita Agapeti Episcopi Synadae</i>
<i>V. Ant. Amph.</i>	<i>Vita Antiqua Amphilochei Iconiensis</i>
<i>V. Pach.</i>	<i>Vita Pachomii</i>
Wulfila, <i>Symb.</i>	Wulfila, <i>Symbolum Fidei</i>

B. OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ACO	E. Schwartz, <i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i> (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1914-84).
Adler	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> , ed. A. Adler (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1928-38), 5 vols.
BHP	<u>Βιβλιοθήκη Ελλήνων Πατέρων και</u> <u>Εκκλησιαστικῶν Συγγραφέων</u> (Ἀθήναι· ἔκδοσις

	τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).
Bardy, <i>Recherches</i>	G. Bardy, <i>Recherches sur saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école</i> (Paris: Beauchesne, 1936).
Barnes, <i>Athanasius</i>	T. D. Barnes, <i>Athanasius and Constantius</i> (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993).
Barnes and Williams	Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (eds.), <i>Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts</i> (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993).
CAG	<i>Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca</i> , edita . . . auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae borussicae (Berlin: G. Reimeri, 1882–1909), 23 vols.
CCG	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca</i>
CCL	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</i>
CSCO	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
CSHB	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae</i>
DCB	<i>Dictionary of Christian Biography</i> , ed. W. Smith and H. Wace (London, 1877–87), 4 vols.
DHG	<i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique</i> , ed. A. Baudrillart (Paris: Letonzey et Ané, 1912 ff.).
Diekamp	<i>Doctrina patrum de incarnatione verbi, ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts</i> , 2nd edn., ed. Franz Diekamp and Basileios Phanourgakis (Münster: Aschendorff, 1981).
Ep(p).	<i>Epistula(e)</i>
Festa	<i>Iamblichī De Communi Mathematica Sententia Liber</i> , ed. Nicolaus Festa (Leipzig: Teubner, 1891).
FPG	<i>Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum</i> , ed. F. W. A. Mullach (Paris: Firmin-Didot et Socii, 1881), 3 vols.
Friedlein	<i>Procli Diadochi In primum Euclidis Elemen-</i>

- torum Librum Commentarii*, ed. G. Friedlein (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1873).
- Garzya *Synesii Cyrenensis epistolae*, ed. Antonius Garzya (Rome: Typis Officinae Polygraphicae, 1979).
- Geltzer Heinrich Geltzer *et al.*, *Patrum nicaenorum nomina Latine, Graece, Coptice, Syriace, Arabice, Armeniace* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1898).
- GCS *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*
- GRBS *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
- Gregg, *Arianism* Robert C. Gregg, (ed.), *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985).
- Gwatkin H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co., 1882).
- Hahn A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, 3rd edn. (Breslau: Verlag E. Morgenster, 1897).
- Hanson, *Search* R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988).
- Henry and Schwyzer *Plotini Opera*, ed. P. Henry and H. R. Schwyzer (Paris and Brussels: Desclée de Brouwer, 1951–73), 3 vols.
- J W. Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1921 ff.). All references to the *Contra Eunomium* are to the 2nd edn. (1960).
- Jones, *LRE* A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1986), 2 vols.
- JTS *Journal of Theological Studies*
- Kannengiesser, *Crisis* Charles Kannengiesser, *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis* (The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, colloquy 41, Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1982).
- Kopecek Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-*

- Arianism* (Patristic Monograph Series, 8; Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 2 vols.
- Kühn Galen, *Opera Omnia*, ed. C. G. Kühn (Leipzig, 1821-33), 20 vols.
- Leroy, *Epektasis* François J. Leroy, 'Une homélie nouvelle, origéno-arienne, issue de milieux antimarcelliens', J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser (eds.), in *Epektasis, Mélanges offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 343-53.
- Liebeschuetz J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch, City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
- Lim Richard Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1995).
- LNPF *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Ph. Schaff and H. Wace (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952 ff.).
- Lorenz R. Lorenz, *Arius judaizans? Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmen-geschichte, 31; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
- Louis Albinus, *Epitome*, ed. Pierre Louise (Paris: Société d'éditions 'Les belles lettres', 1945).
- Manitius *Procli Diadochi Hypotyposis Astronomi-carum Positionum*, ed. C. Manitius (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1909).
- Mansi *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, ed. J. D. Mansi (Florence: expensis Antonii Zatta Veneti, 1758-98), 31 vols.
- Mommsen, *Chronica* T. Mommsen (ed.), *Chronica Minora*, i = Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi, 9; (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892).
- Opitz *Athanasius' Werke*, ed. H.-G. Opitz (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1935 ff.), ii and iii.
- PG *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, accurate J.-P. Migne, Series Graeca

xxiv	<i>Eunomius of Cyzicus</i>
PL	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus</i> , accurate J.-P. Migne, Series Latina
PLS	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus</i> , accurate J.-P. Migne, Series Latina, supplementum
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>
PTS	<i>Patristische Texte und Studien</i>
P-W	<i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , ed. A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, et al. (1895 ff.)
RB	<i>Revue Bénédictine</i>
REG	<i>Revue des Études grecques</i>
RHE	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
SC	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i>
Simonetti	M. Simonetti, <i>La crisi Ariana nel iv secolo</i> (Rome: Institutum Patristicum 'Augustinianum', 1975).
Spanneut	M. Spanneut, <i>Recherches sur les Écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche</i> (Lille: Facultés Catholiques, 1948).
SP	<i>Studia Patristica</i> , Acts of the International Patristics Conference (Oxford).
ST	<i>Studi e Testi</i> (Rome, 1900 ff.)
SVF	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , ed. H. F. A. von Arnim (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1903-24), 4 vols.
TU	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i>
Vaggione	<i>Eunomius, The Extant Works</i> , ed. R. P. Vaggione (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).
Vaggione, <i>Fragments</i>	R. P. Vaggione, 'Some Neglected Fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia's <i>Contra Eunomium</i> ,' <i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> , NS 31 (1980), 403-70.
Vaggione, <i>Monks</i>	R. P. Vaggione, 'Of Monks and Lounge Lizards: "Arians", Polemics and Asceticism in the Roman East', in Barnes and Williams, 181-214.
Vaggione, <i>Arius</i>	R. P. Vaggione, '"Arius, Heresy and Tradition," by Rowan Williams: A Review Article', <i>The Toronto Journal of Theology</i> , 5 (1989), 63-87.
VGS	<i>Varia Graeca Sacra</i> , ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, editionem phototypicam (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen

- Weber Demokratischen Republik, 1975).
Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, ed.
 R. Weber *et al.* (Stuttgart: Württem-
 bergische Bibelanstalt, 1969), 2 vols.
- Williams, *Arius* Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and
 Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman, &
 Todd, 1987).
- ZKG *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*
- ZNTW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissen-
 schaft*

Gentleman

The central Anatolian plateau is not a hospitable place. Not only does Basil the Great complain of being buried under snow for months on end,¹ but Gregory Nazianzen could regard even his friend's removal to Pontus as an escape from the Cappadocian mud and cold.² At an average elevation of two to four thousand feet and sealed off from the sea by mountains, Cappadocia exhibits all the extremes of climate. Largely treeless,³ in ancient times the country was divided into landed estates, imperial, senatorial, or priestly, and given over to pasturage and some farming.⁴

The Cappadocian city of Tyana is described by Philostratus as 'a Greek city in the midst of a population of Cappadocians';⁵ the same could have been said as easily of the only other large city in the province, Caesarea-Mazaca. Outside these two centres of urban culture the bulk of the population persisted in the use of its ancient language and calendar⁶ and remained largely untouched by the intellectual life of the towns. The majority of Cappadocians lived in small villages, most little better than 'the meeting place of three roads' described by Gregory Nazianzen⁷ and almost wholly cut off from the world.⁸

¹ Basil, *Ep.* 48. 4-6 (Courtonne i. 128), cf. (Ps.-?) Basil, *Ep.* 350. 4-11 (Courtonne iii. 215).

² Grg. Naz., *Ep.* 2. 1 (Gallay i. 1-2).

³ Cf. Grg. Nyss., *Ep.* 25. 11 (J VIII. ii. 81. 20-2) and Strabo 12. 2. 7.

⁴ On the climate and products of Cappadocia in general, see 'Kappadokia' in P-W X. ii. 1910-18.

⁵ Philostratus, *VA* 1. 4.

⁶ Cf. Basil, *Spir.* 74. 50-5 (*SC* 17bis. 514), Grg. Naz., *Ep.* 122. 1 (Gallay ii. 13-14).

⁷ Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 439-48 (*PG* 37. 1059-60).

⁸ Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), i. 257-8, 346.

In one such, toward the middle of the second decade of the fourth century,⁹ Eunomius of Cyzicus was born.

His birthplace, Oltiseris,¹⁰ was located in the extreme north-west of the province, one of the villages of the border district of Corniaspa.¹¹ Indeed, it was so close to the Galatian frontier that Basil the Great made a point of describing his opponent as that 'Galatian',¹² only to receive a vigorous denial for his pains.¹³ But though isolated, Oltiseris was not cut off: 20 miles to the east lay Aquae Saravenae, an imperial spa,¹⁴ and another 20 to the

⁹ The date of Eunomius' birth is deduced from incidents in his life and from the statements of his near contemporaries. He is known to have been in Antioch as a student in 345 or 346 (see below Ch. 2, pp. 26-7); assuming he was then in his late teens or early twenties this would place his birth sometime between 324 and 328. This accords well with the evidence of other contemporaries: Jerome, writing in the 390s, describes him as then still living, *Vir. Inlus.* 120 (*TU* 14. 1. 52. 28-9), whereas Theodore of Mopsuestia, writing some years later (between 400 and 410), implies that he was dead, *Jo.*, praefatio (*CSCO* 115. 3. 7-13; trans. *CSCO* 116. 1). This fits with other information suggesting he died at the beginning of Arcadius' reign (see Ch. 8, pp. 358-9 below). In another work Theodore describes meeting Eunomius personally at a time when, he says, 'I was a boy and he with the height of a man full-grown . . .' (Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. 5: Vaggione, *Fragments*, 426). Assuming this encounter took place (as seems most likely) during Eunomius' time on the staff of Eudoxius of Antioch (358-60), Theodore would have been about 10. If Eunomius was then in his early thirties ('full-grown' but young enough to be eyed critically by a 10 year old), a birth-date in the mid-320s would fit admirably.

¹⁰ So Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 34, 105 (J i. 33. 17, 57. 21-58. 1), 3. 10. 50 (J ii. 309. 15). The claim in Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 1 (*GCS* 324. 21-325. 1) that Eunomius' πατρὶς was Dakora near Caesarea is deduced from the fact that in later life he had an estate there.

¹¹ For the location, see W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London: John Murray, 1890), 264. Oltiseris is approximately 5 miles north of the modern Turkish town of Konakli, where the Konak Çay meets the Karasu river.

¹² Basil, *Eun.* 1. 1. 32-3 (*SC* 290. 144). Gregory of Nyssa, *Eun.* 1. 105 (J i. 58. 1-3) claims not to have found this phrase in his copy, and it is indeed missing from some MSS (see apparatus ad loc.), but expressions of Cappadocian chauvinism were by no means limited to the bishop of Caesarea; Gregory Nazianzen could sneer at George of Cappadocia for hailing 'from the furthest borders of our country' (*Or.* 21. 16 (*PG* 35. 1097C)), while Gregory of Nyssa linked him with Eunomius as a fellow native of 'Canaan', *Eun.* 1. 48 (J i. 38. 17-19).

¹³ *Eun.*, *AA* 1 (J i. 57. 20-1).

¹⁴ For the status of Aquae Saravenae or Therma, see A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 185-6; the spa appears to have been on an imperial estate.

north-west the Galatian city of Tavium.¹⁵ Significantly—and despite its small size—Tavium was not without literary pretensions: at one time it had been an important religious centre with a famous statue of Zeus.¹⁶

Moreover Eunomius' family, though humble, was certainly of some local importance. They were *not* (as claimed by Theodore of Mopsuestia) freedmen of the family of Basil the Great,¹⁷ but it is possible they were Cappadocian speaking.¹⁸ As an adult Eunomius had a pronounced lisp,¹⁹ and this may be a sign, not of a speech defect, but of a residual Cappadocian accent.²⁰ But whatever the truth of that, Eunomius' father, at least, was partially literate in Greek; for Gregory of Nyssa tells us that, though a farmer, he added to his winter income by giving lessons to children.²¹ Of the rest of the family we know

¹⁵ A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 118.

¹⁶ On Tavium, see *ibid.* and W. M. Ramsay, *The Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1941), 91–101; for the mid-4th-cent. presence of a philosophic pagan trained in the (Alexandrine?) museum, see *ibid.*, 97–8.

¹⁷ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, gr. 1–3, syr. 16–22 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 420). In this case the 'argument from silence' seems decisive, for Basil never mentions it, and in view of his obvious polemical zeal, it is difficult to believe he would not have used it if he had really been able to do so.

¹⁸ i.e. on the basis of their class and place of origin.

¹⁹ Philost., *HE* 10. 7 (*GCS* 128. 14–17).

²⁰ Philostratus, for instance (*VS* 2. 13. 594, cf. *VA* 1. 7), mentions one Pausanias, a Cappadocian from Caesarea-Mazaca, whose rhetorical training had been unable to eradicate a heavy Cappadocian accent, while in sophisticated Constantinople even Gregory Nazianzen could be accused of speaking like a countryman (*Grg. Naz.*, *Or.* 33. 8 (*PG* 36. 224D)); indeed, Eunomius himself seems to have levelled a similar charge against Gregory of Nyssa (cf. *Grg. Nyss.*, *Eun.* 3. 10. 54 (*J* ii. 310. 25–8)).

²¹ *Grg. Nyss.*, *Eun.* 1. 49 (*J* i. 39. 8–13), and in particular the operative phrase, τὰ πρῶτα στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰς συλλαβὰς τοῖς παιδίοις ὑποχαράσσω ἐμμηχάνως. Whatever he was doing, it was in Greek, for despite one allusion to written Cappadocian (Philostratus, *VA* 3. 41, 4. 19), it was not a literary tongue, cf. W. M. Ramsay, 'Life in the Days of St Basil the Great', in *Pauline and Other Studies* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1906), 373. But what was he doing? The connection with elementary instruction is clear enough, but because of ὑποχαράσσω ἐμμηχάνως the translators of *LNPF*, 2nd series, 5. 40a rendered it 'to carve out neatly the letters of the alphabet for boys to form syllables with'. But as J.-A. Röder *Gregor von Nyssa, Contra Eunomium I. 1–146* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 1993), 201–3, points out, the reference is not to alphabet blocks but to tracing out the letters (on a wax tablet?) for children to learn.

very little, but we are told that a sister, later married, bore a son with the name of the martyr Lucian.²² References to more distant relatives are still less informative, for the little we know about them does not even include their names.²³

On the other hand, the one relative whose name we do know does much to make up for our ignorance of the others. This is Priscus, Eunomius' grandfather.²⁴ Eunomius' enemies loved to poke fun at the poverty of his peasant youth,²⁵ and since Eunomius himself was clearly sensitive about the subject²⁶ it is easy to take what they say at face value. Yet Eunomius' inheritance from Priscus tells a different story. For Eunomius is said to have received from his grandfather leather goods and a mill house as well as the slaves to run it.²⁷ Then as now, the mill owner was a substantial figure in Anatolian society.²⁸ Eunomius may not have been on the level of a Basil or a Gregory, but he

²² Philost., *HE* 12. 11 (*GCS* 148. 1–3). Since this sister is not mentioned at the time of their parents' death, it may be that her dowry had already been paid (note the attention paid to this by Antony in *Ath.*, *V. Anton.* 2. 24–6 (*SC* 400. 134)). If that is the case she was probably older than Eunomius. For the career of her son (Eunomius' nephew), see Ch. 7, p. 286 below.

²³ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 50 (*J* i. 39. 17–19). For what we do know, see p. 7 below.

²⁴ It may or may not be significant that he bore a Roman name. The ambitious had been adopting the names of their conquerors for centuries ('Priscus', for instance, was the name of Justin Martyr's father, *Apol.* 1. 1. 1 (Krüger 1. 6)). It is just possible this name indicates a patron/client relationship or a grant of Roman citizenship prior to the extension of the franchise to the whole empire.

²⁵ e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 49–50 (*J* i. 39. 3–16), Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, syr. 16–26 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 420). This was a common polemical theme; cf. the similar (though mutually contradictory) descriptions of George of Cappadocia in Grg. Naz., *Or.* 21. 16 (*PG* 35. 1097C–1100B), and Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 11. 4, and Jerome's sneering reference to Macedonius as an ex-plumber in *Chron.* ad annum 342 (*GCS* VII. i. 235. 21–2). For the more full-blown developments, see Ch. 5, pp. 184–6 below.

²⁶ Cf. *Eun.*, *Apol.* 2. 3–4, 6–8, 27. 31–6 (Vaggione 36, 72). As Lim notes (pp. 141–3), Eunomius himself was to some extent prepared to play along.

²⁷ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 34 (*J* i. 33. 17–34. 1). Kopecek i. 146 takes this to mean that Priscus was a slave in the mill, but Gregory specifically says it is a κληρονομία, and slaves appear only by implication in the phrase τὸ οἰκετικὸν αὐτηρέσιον.

²⁸ On the importance of the mill owner in Anatolian society, cf. Mahmut Makal, *A Village in Anatolia* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., 1954), 21–2.

was by no means at the bottom of the social pyramid. Within the context of his own rural society he occupied a not unimportant place, one that would eventually allow him to think of something better.

Eunomius' background was a Christian one. Theodore of Mopsuestia portrays the community of his birth as a small village centred around its church and priest with an as yet unbaptized Eunomius²⁹ as a student in his school.³⁰ The priest is said to have been an 'excellent man' in his own way,³¹ but since like most village clergy he was probably a part-time farmer,³² his instruction cannot have been too sophisticated.³³ The society in which he imparted it, however, was one that was already profoundly Christian. In the third century we still hear of pagan pilgrimages and visits to shrines,³⁴ but by the fourth century pagans had become fewer.³⁵ The Church in Cappadocia had been severely persecuted, had weathered the trial well, and was now in its self-confidence prepared to claim an almost apostolic origin.³⁶ Prosperity, however, was no guarantee of uniformity. There is nothing to show that Eunomius was ever a

²⁹ Theodore makes no mention of baptism one way or the other, but this is almost certainly correct. Apart from the general custom of the age, there is a possible allusion to Eunomius' own baptism as an adult in Eun., *AA* I (J i. 40. 16-21), Ch. 2 n. 88 below.

³⁰ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, syr. 1-15, 27-36 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 419-20, 421). Theodore does not mention the name of the village, but the story may be based on something in the work being refuted, the *Apologia Apologiae* of Eunomius. There is no need to reject the picture as a whole merely because the author uses the common topos of a malignant dream preceding the heretic's birth. For an example in a pagan context, see the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Commodus Antoninus 1. 3.

³¹ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, syr. 7 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 420).

³² Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 198. 21-6 (Courtonne ii. 153).

³³ On the level of sophistication in Cappadocian country churches, note Gregory Nazianzen's description of his mother as a paragon of ecclesiastical decorum only because she didn't talk in church, never turned her back on the altar, and refrained from spitting on the floor (!), *Or.* 18. 10 (*PG* 35. 996C).

³⁴ (Ps.-?) Lucian, *De Syria Dea* 10; *Or.*, *Cels.* 6. 22 (*GCS* ii. 93. 10-11).

³⁵ Julian, *Ep.* 35. 375C.

³⁶ Cf. e.g. Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam* 3. 5. 22-30 (*CSEL* 76. 12), and the experience of Basil's parents, *Grg. Naz.*, *Or.* 43. 5-6 (*PG* 36. 500B-501B); not everyone, of course, was so steadfast, cf. Basil, *Ep.* 217. 81. 1-16 (Courtonne ii. 215). According to *Grg. Nyss.*, *Ep.* 17. 15 (J VIII. ii. 55. 2-6), the apostle of Cappadocia was the centurion who stood by the cross.

member of any but the Great Church,³⁷ but he cannot have been unaware of the many Christian or near-Christian sects with which his province abounded.³⁸ It may be that a later aversion to monastic asceticism was in part based on an early acquaintance with the encratite movements of his native province.³⁹

Eunomius' parents were ambitious for their son. They sent him—probably to Tavium—to receive training in the difficult art of shorthand, thus practically ensuring him a profitable career.⁴⁰ Gregory of Nyssa echoes one of Basil's complaints⁴¹ in lamenting a local dearth of writers: 'Just as we poor Cappadocians lack almost everything else that makes their possessors happy, so above all we are poor in those who know how to write.'⁴² A shorthand writer, moreover, might aspire to more than just private or ecclesiastical employment;⁴³ shorthand was

³⁷ His adversaries would not have let him forget it if he had!

³⁸ In spite of Gregory Nazianzen's descriptions of his homeland as a bastion of unsurpassed fidelity (*Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 259–60, 12. 93–4 (*PG* 37. 1047, 1173)), Cappadocian Christianity was in fact quite diverse. Gregory's own father was originally a member of the sect of the Hypsistarians (*Grg. Naz., Or.* 18. 5 (*PG* 35. 989D–992A), cf. *Grg. Nyss., Conf.* 38 (J ii. 327. 13–21)), while Basil e.g. mentions the Persianizing sect of the Magusacans (*Ep.* 258. 4. 1–18 (Courtonne iii. 103–4)), etc.

³⁹ Cf. *Epiph., Haer.* 47. 1. 1–3 (*GCS* ii. 215. 5–13), Basil, *Ep.* 188. 1. 1–5 (Courtonne ii. 121), 199. 47. 1–5 (Courtonne ii. 163). For the exotic practices associated with one of Eunomius' *bêtes noires*, Eustathius of Sebaste, see Ch. 5, pp. 189–90 below.

⁴⁰ *Grg. Nyss., Eun.* 1. 50 (J i. 39. 13–18) *Thdr. Mops., Eun.*, fr. 4, gr. 4–7, syr. 23–6 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 420). The eagerness of Eunomius' parents to have their son taught shorthand is itself a gauge of their prosperity. Instruction in shorthand was a lengthy and expensive process; in 2nd-cent. Egypt it required two years and the payment of 120 silver drachmae to become a writer of shorthand (σμητογράφω), *P. Oxy.* 724, B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, *et al.*, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London: The Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904), iv. 204–5.

⁴¹ Basil, *Ep.* 134. 15–19, 135. 2. 21–5 (Courtonne ii. 48, 51); for a similar complaint from the preceding century, see *Porph., Plot.* 19. 15–19 (Henry and Schwyzer i. 25).

⁴² *Grg. Nyss., Ep.* 15. 1 (J VIII. ii. 48. 21–3).

⁴³ e.g. Basil, *Ep.* 223. 5. 7–9 (Courtonne iii. 14), *Soz., HE* 4. 22. 28 (*GCS* 176. 12–13). Cf. also Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 97. 339^r. 7–17 (*SC* 267. 282), who speaks of 'clericos uestros notarum peritos' brought in to produce the semblance of an official proceeding, whose mere presence ensured that Ambrose might 'ad instar publicae auctoritatis censorio extorques terrore.' A notary was also present during the public debate of the

useful even in the imperial civil service. Under Constantius several officials are known to have begun their careers just this way.⁴⁴

But while shorthand might be useful in starting a career, it could not take it much further. To do that advanced training was required. Gregory Nazianzen's nephew Nicobulus is a case in point. Gregory could think of no better way to begin his nephew's education than with shorthand;⁴⁵ but thereafter he was sent to a grammarian for literary polish, and then to more advanced tutors for rhetoric and training in the Attic dialect.⁴⁶ Shorthand itself, after all, was only a τέχνη or craft.⁴⁷ It could lay the foundation for a secretarial or bureaucratic career, but it gave no real entrée to the prestigious world of rhetoric and classical culture—for that higher education was required.⁴⁸

Eunomius therefore began his career by working for relatives.⁴⁹ That information, which was probably not too satisfying to him, is useful for us, because it confirms our picture of his family's social status. It tells us that at least some of its members pursued an occupation complex enough to require secretarial help. Moreover, Eunomius served as pedagogue to the family's children.⁵⁰ This was natural enough, given his father's background as elementary educator, but he was still not 'Arian' bishop Maximinus with Augustine in 427 or 428, Aug., *Coll. Max.* 10 (*PL* 42. 713).

⁴⁴ Cf. e.g. Ammianus Marcellinus 20. 9. 5, 28. 1. 12, 2. 5.

⁴⁵ Grg. Naz., *Ep.* 157. 2 (Gallay ii. 48). Even Athanasius is said to have been instructed in this profitable art: Ruf., *HE* 1. 14 (*GCS* II. ii. 981. 18–9): 'cum a notario integre et a grammatico sufficienter . . . instructus'.

⁴⁶ Grg. Naz., *Epp.* 167, 174–7, 188 (Gallay ii. 58, 63–6, 78–9).

⁴⁷ e.g. Libanius, *Or.* 18. 131 (Foerster ii. 292. 6).

⁴⁸ Synesius gives us a good example both of the possibilities and of the limitations of shorthand as a career. The imperial notary (ταχὺγράφος) Asterius had hinted that the fine Egyptian tapestry Synesius used as a blanket would make an excellent 'gift'. Synesius needed it to keep warm in the Thracian winter, but as soon as he returned home he was at pains to forward it. His nervousness and precise instructions about rendering an apology demonstrate both Asterius' power and Synesius' anxiety. Yet it is clear that Asterius (a 'narrow-faced Syrian') is nevertheless only a notary of the second or third rank, living in frequently changed rooms, and similar to many others. In other words, shorthand offered Eunomius everything except what he most wanted! Synesius, *Ep.* 61 (Garzya 100. 5–102. 14).

⁴⁹ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 50 (J i. 39. 17–19).

⁵⁰ Ibid. (J i. 39. 19–21).

in an enviable position: he had already been educated beyond the level of his own rural society but did not possess the qualifications to enter any other. His experience was doubtless much like that of a modern young man from the same region:

They look at me with an expression that suggests that if I were to study for a hundred years, I should still not be a gentleman. This hurts me . . . 'Now that you've studied,' they told me, 'you must go and be Governor of a Province or a District. What future is there for you if you stay with us and waste your time in the village?'⁵¹

It was at this point that Eunomius began to acquire a taste for rhetoric,⁵² though there was not much opportunity to pursue it prior to the death of his parents.⁵³ Then, with nothing further to tie him to Oltiseris,⁵⁴ he was free to look elsewhere. Significantly (and in spite of its reputation for rhetoric⁵⁵) he did not join his fellow Cappadocians at the provincial capital at Caesarea;⁵⁶ instead he turned some 300 miles to the north-west, to the rising young city on the Bosphorus, Constantinople.

Founded barely a quarter of a century before, Constantinople in the early 340s was already a sizeable metropolis. Constructed at a speed which gave parts of it a jerry-built appearance,⁵⁷ the very spontaneity of its birth made it all the more attractive to the ambitious. Since there is nothing to show that Eunomius' interests at this point were anything but secular, the imperial capital was an obvious choice. It lacked a university but already had a reputation for learning;⁵⁸ given Eunomius' need for both an education *and* employment, this only increased its attraction. More to the point, even in the

⁵¹ Makal, *Village in Anatolia*, 31.

⁵² Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 50 (J i. 39. 20-21).

⁵³ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, gr. 8-9, syr. 37-9 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 421).

⁵⁴ See n. 22 above. An income from the mill may have made this easier to contemplate.

⁵⁵ Libanius, *Or.* 16. 14 (Foerster ii. 165. 9-13).

⁵⁶ Basil the Great among them, Grg. Naz., *Or.* 43. 13 (PG 36. 512A-B). Later, of course, Basil also studied at Constantinople, *Or.* 43. 14 (PG 36. 513A).

⁵⁷ Zosimus 2. 32, cf. 35 (CSHB 47. 98. 6-8, cf. 101. 14-20), Themistius, *Or.* 3. 47C (Schenkl i. 66. 28-67. 5), Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1332-3 (PG 37. 1120-1), and Julian, *Or.* I. 41A.

⁵⁸ The city is said even then to have been 'distinguished for the eminence of its rhetorical and philosophical teachers', Grg. Naz., *Or.* 43. 14 (PG 36. 513A).

absence of the emperor,⁵⁹ the presence of a large civil bureaucracy held out the hope of employment.⁶⁰

Theodore of Mopsuestia tells us that once Eunomius arrived he did manage to find work as a pedagogue, this time in a noble house. This provided for both his educational as well as his financial needs since, being required to accompany his pupils to school each day, he could share in their education.⁶¹ We are not told the length of his stay, but as he was in Antioch by 346, he is unlikely to have been in the capital longer than two years. Theodore (echoing a story also told of Libanius⁶²) claims that he was caught in a compromising situation with his pupils and summarily dismissed.⁶³ But while there is no need to believe all Theodore's dark insinuations, there must have been at least something to it since, thirty years later, addressing a largely Constantinopolitan audience, Eunomius took pains to correct the record.⁶⁴

For whatever reason, Eunomius' secular hopes had been dashed; yet his stay in the capital was not without consequence. Here he touched directly for the first time the edge of a controversy that dominated the rest of his life, the controversy associated with Arius. The latter, a distinguished Alexandrine presbyter, had been dead for a decade, but the political and theological consequences of his teaching were, if anything, becoming daily more pronounced. Even in Cappadocia Eunomius must have heard something,⁶⁵ but what was there a distant storm was at Constantinople a flood in full spate. Quiescent under Constantine, the controversy had revived with

⁵⁹ Resident, during most of this period, at Antioch.

⁶⁰ The principal officers of state would have been with the *comitatus* at Antioch, but the capital's senatorial and civil administration would still have been formidable.

⁶¹ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, gr. 10-17, syr. 39-52 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 421-2).

⁶² Eunapius, *VS* 495.

⁶³ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, gr. 17-28, syr. 53-63 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 422), cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 50, 102 (*Ji* 39. 21-3, 56. 20-4).

⁶⁴ The accounts of both Theodore and Gregory (see preceding note) are clearly responses to something now lost in the underlying text of Eunomius.

⁶⁵ According to Soc., *HE* 1. 6. 2 (*GCS* 6. 5-10) and Thdt., *HE* 1. 6. 9-10 (*GCS* 29. 31-30. 4) it was widely discussed on the popular level, at least in the 'East' (Constantinople, Antioch, and the Aegean littoral); yet even further inland there must have been some discussion.

his death,⁶⁶ and at Constantinople had sprung into new and riotous life. Macedonius, the current bishop, had managed to triumph over the exiled Paul and seize the throne of Arius' friend and protector, Eusebius, but in the ensuing riots thousands lost their lives, and a general sent to restore order was murdered.⁶⁷ The physical results must have been visible when Eunomius arrived, even if he had not personally witnessed the riots. In later history this struggle was a straightforward one between a 'Nicene' Paul and an 'Arian' Macedonius, but the reality was more complex. Paul was indeed supported by such Nicene stalwarts as Julius of Rome and Athanasius of Alexandria while Macedonius could count on the (tepid) support of the Emperor Constantius, but neither started with a strong doctrinal identity.⁶⁸ Indeed, Eusebius' own predecessor, the allegedly Nicene Alexander, had been able to commend the one for sanctity and the other for administrative skill without feeling the need to distinguish between them doctrinally.⁶⁹ But while in the end there can be no doubt that Macedonius represented the greater continuity with Eusebius and therefore also with Arius, in the 340s this would have been far from obvious. In the ambiguous present the 'great Church' at Constantinople was officially, if not hostile, at least indifferent to the doctrinal solutions of Nicaea.

Still, there is no reason to think that Eunomius himself was actively partisan. Indeed, what evidence there is suggests that Cappadocian popular teaching could provide a platform for either side.⁷⁰ The mere fact that Dianius of Caesarea could be the baptizer of Basil the Great *and* the patron of one of Arius'

⁶⁶ See Ch. 3, pp. 67–8 below.

⁶⁷ Soc., *HE* 2. 12. 1–13. 3 (*GCS* 103. 8–104. 12) cf. C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 20. 3, 27. 2, 4, 7 (*CSEL* 65. 61. 23–30, 66. 4–5, 10–11, 67. 2–5).

⁶⁸ Note that in Ath., *H. Ar.* 7. 1–2 (Opitz ii. 186. 11–16), cf. *Hist. Aceph.* 1. 2. 8–3. 17 (*SC* 317. 138) even Athanasius fails to underscore the doctrinal division.

⁶⁹ Soz., *HE* 3. 3. 2 (*GCS* 104. 9–14); for a more jaundiced description, cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 6. 3 (*GCS* 96. 8–14).

⁷⁰ Ambrose's predecessor in the see of Milan for instance (Auxentius) was both a Cappadocian and non-Nicene; yet he insisted that what he taught was the faith he learnt as a child: 'nunquam scivi Arium, non vidi oculis, non cognovi ejus doctrinam, sed ex infantia, quemadmodum doctus sum, sicut accepi de sanctis scripturis, credidi et credo in unum solum verum Deum Patrem omnipotentem', etc. Auxentius, *Exp. Fid.* (Hahn, § 134, pp. 148–9).

closest friends (Asterius) says as much. Yet whatever his personal stance, there can be little doubt that a stay at Constantinople forced Eunomius to confront in a concrete way the progressive polarization that was forcing everyone to make a choice. He may have remained convinced that the faith of his childhood and that of the imperial city were the same, but he did so in an atmosphere its opponents would have considered 'Arian'. It was a transition that was soon to have significant consequences.

We do not know when Eunomius left the city or why he chose to do so, but whatever the reason he had to decide what to do next. His first instinct seems to have been to return home,⁷¹ but the reasons that caused him to leave it in the first place were still operative. Having failed to succeed in one place, he would have to try again in another. It was almost inevitable that the next attempt would take him to one of the East's greatest cities: Antioch-on-the-Orontes.

⁷¹ That is, if we take seriously what Philostorgius says in *HE* 3. 20 (*GCS* 48. 19-20) that Eunomius came into Antioch 'out of Cappadocia'.

Craftsman of Words

In the later fourth century, Antioch was already reckoned along with Rome, Alexandria, and Constantinople as the empire's fourth largest city.¹ With a population approaching 200,000 and as capital of the civil diocese of Oriens,² it was an obvious choice for anyone seeking a governmental or administrative career, especially as at this time Antioch was frequently the residence of the emperor.³ In choosing Antioch, therefore, Eunomius was joining a continuous stream of job-seekers converging on the former Seleucid capital.

His immediate goal, however, was an education. In Cappadocia he had been trained in the 'technical' art of shorthand, and at Constantinople had obtained a basic literary education; but to get any further he needed to crown them both with a 'higher' education in speech and rhetoric. According to Theodore of Mopsuestia he was too poor to pay the usual fees, and so had to go to a beginner who was trying to build up a 'practice' by paying his students himself. When this man felt confident enough to ask them to pay him, Eunomius had to go elsewhere.⁴

Yet his interest in rhetoric already tells us something about him. For in the 340s and 350s under Constantius, shorthand and Roman law were the twin guarantees of an administrative career—rhetoric was comparatively neglected. Libanius, the foremost rhetor of his day, complains bitterly about the number

¹ Ausonius, *Ordo nobilium urbium* 21. 4, 5. 1–2 [15–16], cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 9. 14: 'Antiochiam orientis apicem pulcrum'.

² On the population, see Liebeschuetz, pp. 92–6, on the *Comes Orientis*, pp. 110–11.

³ In recognition of which the current emperor (Constantius) had undertaken a considerable building programme and had begun the construction of a new harbour, Julian Imp., *Or.* 1. 40D–41A. See below, Ch. 5 n. 2.

⁴ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, syr. 64–83 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 422–3).

of students drawn away from rhetoric to study shorthand or law in the schools at Beirut.⁵ And yet, perhaps for that very reason, rhetoric retained an enormous prestige. If the pomp and flourish of its second-century heyday were things of the past, the memory of them had not perished. Eloquence was still 'the most sought after pursuit of all'⁶ and schoolboys still dreamed of becoming 'a new Cicero or Demosthenes'.⁷ Rhetoric, then, might be a *τέχνη* or craft, but its practitioner was 'a craftsman of words',⁸ and—for Eunomius, perhaps crucially—unlike the writer of shorthand, indubitably a gentleman.

The polarity of Constantinople and Antioch was to mark Eunomius for the rest of his life. But in moving from one to the other, he had shifted religious as well as educational environments. Religiously, the city in which Eunomius now found himself was far more deeply divided than Constantinople. The decline of paganism had certainly not ended discord among the Christians, and at Antioch it had, if anything, increased it. We have no information about Eunomius' own orientation, but as at Constantinople, the official Church was deeply suspicious of Nicaea and hostile to its advocate Athanasius.⁹ Indeed, at the dedication of the sumptuous cathedral a few years before there had been a successful, if ambiguous effort to unseat the troublesome Alexandrian bishop.¹⁰ He was now back in his see, but he still had supporters at Antioch, though they were confined to the single church conceded them by Constantius.¹¹ The majority Church was no more tranquil; indeed, the suppression

⁵ Libanius, *Epp.* 1375. 5–6, 1431. 6 (Foerster xi. 2. 420. 20–421. 6, 470. 21–4), etc., *Or.* 31. 28, 33 (Foerster iii. 138. 8–14, 140. 11–18).

⁶ Basil, *Ep.* 277. 24–6 (Courtoune iii. 150).

⁷ Juvenal, *Satyra* 10. 114–17.

⁸ Julian Imp., *Mis.* 354C: *λόγων ἀγαθὸς δημιουργός*.

⁹ This in spite of joining a few years before in a brisk repudiation of ever having been 'followers' of Arius, *Symb. Ant.* (341) 1 (Hahn, § 153, p. 183).

¹⁰ On this council and its ambiguities, see below, Ch. 3, pp. 69–70.

¹¹ Granted in 346, *Soz.*, *HE* 3. 20. 4–7 (*GCS* 134. 11–135. 5), *Thdt.*, *HE* 2. 12. 1–3 (*GCS* 122. 12–123. 4); this account seems more likely than the parallel passage in Socrates, *HE* 2. 23. 33–8 (*GCS* 128. 24–129. 14), where the request (denied) is for a church in every city, not just at Antioch. The Nicene faction at Antioch was no more unified than the rest of the city, but the adherents of Athanasius were mostly supporters of the late pro-Nicene bishop Eustathius, deposed in 326 (for the date, see n. 32 below); they are said by Sozomen (*HE* 3.20. 7), to have been 'numerous'.

of one group only increased the venom of rest. Leontius, the city's bishop since the deposition of Stephanus in 344, presided over assemblies so divided that he was obliged to sing the doctrinally sensitive *Gloria Patri* in an undertone lest anyone hear whether he was singing 'Glory to the Father *through* the Son' or 'Glory to the Father and the Son'.¹² A retainer in his household was about to change Eunomius' life for ever—this was Aetius, called 'godless' by his enemies,¹³ but already a notable figure in the city's life.

It is possible that Aetius was Cilician by origin, but if so he was raised at Antioch.¹⁴ That apart, we know very little about his antecedents. Basil, it is clear, knew nothing about them at all,¹⁵ while Theodore of Mopsuestia makes him the son of a wandering tinker;¹⁶ Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, claims he was an ex-slave, formerly owned by a woman named Ampelis.¹⁷ All agree that his origins were lowly.

As with Eunomius, this needs to be taken with a grain of salt. That Aetius' background was humble we need not doubt, but it is equally clear that he was not the miscast ploughboy or wandering craftsman his opponents make him.¹⁸ Philostorgius,

¹² Thdt., *HE* 2. 24. 3–4 (*GCS* 153. 8–19), cf. Soz., *HE* 3. 20. 9 (*GCS* 135. 11–19). Eunomius' own followers are later said to have used the first of these, (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 34, cf. 32 (*PG* 39. 436B–C, cf. 428B). On the use and significance of these refrains see below, Ch. 5, pp. 153–5.

¹³ Soc., *HE* 2. 35. 1, 4. 7. 4 (*GCS* 150. 7, 233. 27), Soz., *HE* 3. 15. 7 (*GCS* 126. 27).

¹⁴ He is said to have been a Cilician in the summary of book 6 in Epiph., *Haer.* (*GCS* 3. 231. 20); if true, this may explain his choice of Cilicia as a place of refuge later (see below). Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 44. 8, 28–9), describes him variously as from 'Coele-Syria' or 'from Antioch'; cf. also Soc., *HE* 2. 35. 1 (*GCS* 150. 6–7), Soz., *HE* 3. 15. 8 (*GCS* 126. 27–8). There is no doubt he was brought up at Antioch; if he came from elsewhere, it must have been when very young.

¹⁵ Basil, *Ep.* 223. 5. 30–2 (Courttonne iii. 15), but cf. Basil, *Eun.* i. 1. 26–31 (*SC* 299. 144).

¹⁶ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. i, gr. 1–17, syr. 1–5, 11–24 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 408–9).

¹⁷ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 38 (J i. 35. 10–13). Gregory's information is at best third hand; he got it from George of Laodicea via Athanasius of Ancyra (*Eun.* 1. 37–8; J i. 35. 3–10). No one knows where George got it.

¹⁸ Cf. the remarks of W. M. Ramsay in his 'Life in the Days of St Basil the Great', in *Pauline and Other Studies* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1906), 373.

a disciple of Eunomius well (if selectively) informed about his master's teacher, tells us that Aetius' father was a petty supplier for the Roman army. He must have had enough wealth to be worth coveting, for at his early death (possibly in the 290s during a crackdown ordered by Diocletian) it was confiscated and Aetius was thrown out into the world with his mother.¹⁹

In order to support his mother and himself Aetius is said to have learnt the trade of a goldsmith.²⁰ He must have acquired at least some measure of skill, for he was able to follow this trade in later life and could support his studies by this means.²¹ Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia accuse him of shady practices and tell what is effectively the same story about a fraudulently repaired necklace.²² We need not take this too seriously.²³ If Aetius was really the kind of petty, jobbing con-man they describe, he could never have acquired the education he obviously possessed—only a few years later he began the study of Aristotle, one of the most advanced subjects in the ancient curriculum. Thus while there is no need to doubt that Aetius was a goldsmith and practised a trade, at some point he must also have had the leisure to acquire an education very much above the social level on which Gregory and Theodore try to place him.

¹⁹ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 44. 8–13, 23–6, 28–45. 1). According to Jo. Mal., *Chron.* 12. 132D (*CSHB* 38. 307) Diocletian was forced to take account of the rapaciousness of Antioch's military suppliers in the 290s, so it may be that Aetius' father was just short of well-to-do. If there is anything to Gregory's story that he had once been a slave, it is just possible that he was sold to cover his father's debts, an event which Philostorgius is unlikely to have discussed.

²⁰ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 44. 12–13, 23–6). It would be interesting to know just where Aetius got his training. It is possible this happened in connection with his entrance into the Christian Church (see n. 29 below), but there is an intriguing reference in Julian to a runaway Cappadocian brought up licentiously in Antioch 'at the goldsmith's'. This is certainly not Aetius, but the reference is obviously to a person and a place everybody could be expected to recognize, *Mis.* 359D.

²¹ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 45. 13–14, 47. 14–18); cf. also the remark of Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 40 (*J* i. 36. 11–13).

²² Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 40–1 (*J* i. 36. 3–20), cf. Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. i, syr. 38–58 (*Vaggione, Fragments*, 410–11).

²³ It makes use of a number of pre-existing themes, see W. Burkert, 'Craft Versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans', in B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; 1982), iii. 3–12.

Presumably, then, if Aetius acquired his 'technical' training in order to make a living, he must have been at least 10 years old at the time;²⁴ in other words, he must already have possessed a basic elementary education and enough of a knowledge of literature to explain his later academic interests. For as we have already noticed, he very early began to turn his attention to logic.²⁵ This would almost certainly have involved the reading of Aristotle's *Categories* (which, along with Porphyry's *Isagoge*, was the ancient world's standard on the subject), so Aetius' first academic subject was an advanced one. Somewhat later St Augustine recounts the awe with which his own teachers regarded this work and the ease with which he understood it himself!²⁶ Aetius seems to have been equally precocious; without the usual intermediate steps he had gone on to an advanced discipline. Significantly, his choice was logic.

Aetius' instructor in this difficult art was the sometime bishop of Tyre, Paulinus, later bishop of Antioch.²⁷ While Eunomius was brought up a Christian, there is good reason to think that Aetius was originally a pagan. Philostorgius tells us nothing at all about his religious background, but according to Theodore of Mopsuestia he was drawn to the Church by its

²⁴ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 44. 11) tells us only that he was 'young' at the time (*véov*). Kopecek i. 66 makes him 'about thirteen' a few years later when he first started to take part in public disputations, presumably on the grounds that he had not yet studied grammar—but that tells us more about the point at which his education was interrupted than about when it was resumed. Lim. p. 113 n. 22, points out that this was not an impossibly young age to become a 'darling of the masses', but it does rather suggest that Aetius was older at the time.

²⁵ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 45. 1–2, 27–8). Undertaking a course of philosophical study usually implied some literary background; note e.g. Lucian's insistence that the philosopher Demonax had not rushed into philosophical studies before he had been 'brought up on the poets and knew most of them by heart', Lucian, *Demonax* 4.

²⁶ Augustine, *Conf.* 4. 16 (*CSEL* 33. 85. 17–86. 12); cf. also Jerome's remarks on his own instruction (at Antioch?) using Porphyry's *Isagoge* and the commentaries of Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Ep.* 50. 1 (*CSEL* 54. 388. 13–389. 6).

²⁷ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 45. 1–3, 28–9); for Paulinus, see the discussion below.

abundant charity.²⁸ That is quite likely,²⁹ for in spite of Theodore's dark insinuations Aetius was only one among many (as the Emperor Julian later bitterly complained³⁰). Conversion, therefore, is not unlikely in itself, and fits with our other information about Aetius. There were certainly Christians in the army, for instance, but if Aetius' father was really a military supplier, we would surely have heard if he had been a martyr. A pagan background, then, seems the more likely. Moreover, if the father's goods were in fact forfeit, it would explain how he came to avail himself of the Church's charity and how he came to know Paulinus. Coming to Christianity from the outside, catechetical instruction alone would guarantee his meeting someone of that sort, and Aetius' own thirst for knowledge would explain the rest. It was an encounter which was to be of importance to them both.

Originally, Paulinus had been a presbyter of Antioch, but some time prior to 321 he was elected bishop of Tyre.³¹ He

²⁸ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. i, gr. 29-39, syr. 25-39 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 409-10).

²⁹ Indeed, it is even possible that it was by this means that he became a goldsmith. One part of the Church's aid to orphans was instruction in a trade so they could earn a living, *Const. App.* 4. 2. 2. 6-14 (*SC* 329. 172).

³⁰ Julian Imp., *Fragmentum Epistolae* 305B-D, cf. Eusebius, *VC* 4. 54 (*GCS* i. 139. 25-140. 2).

³¹ Eusebius, *Marcell.* 1. 4 (*GCS* 4. 18. 2-5). Eusebius' statement, though confirmed by Philostorgius, is itself not without problems. According to Philost., *HE* 1. 8a (*GCS* 9. 16), Paulinus of Tyre was one of the bishops who (along with Athanasius of Anazarbus, another of Aetius' teachers) was sympathetic to Arius at the Council of Nicaea. According to the surviving episcopal lists of the council, however, the bishop of Tyre present there was named Zeno (Geltzer, pp. 12, 13, 63, 73, 82, 100, 123, 166, 190). This is corroborated by a statement of Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69. 4. 3 (*GCS* 3. 155. 30-1), who mentions that among the recipients of Alexander of Alexandria's encyclical (AD 319?) was 'a certain Zeno in Tyre', described as ἀρχαῖος. It would be tempting to take this referring to a 'senior' or 'former bishop' replaced by Paulinus, but it seems more likely that the adjective was intended to distinguish him from one of Epiphanius' own contemporaries, another Zeno of Tyre (fl. c.365-72). Moreover, since Paulinus is mentioned in one of Arius' letters about the same time (Opitz iii. 2. 4), and shortly after received another from Eusebius of Nicomedia (Opitz iii. 15-16), he must have been a bishop before the beginning of the Arian controversy. With the present evidence, then, a definitive solution is not possible. It may be that Epiphanius was simply mistaken, or that there were two rival bishops of Tyre and that the *epigoni* of each have placed them both at the famous council. In any case, there does not seem to be any question

must have remained in contact with his (native?) city, for he was ultimately translated back there as bishop, possibly about 328.³² In any case, Eusebius of Caesarea describes him in glowing terms as 'that man of God, the truly thrice-blessed Paulinus',³³ and dedicates the tenth book of his *Ecclesiastical History* to him.³⁴ Significantly, he mentions him in the company of Asterius the Sophist and Eusebius of Nicomedia, two of Arius' earliest supporters,³⁵ while Arius himself numbers him among those implicitly condemned by Alexander of Alexandria for teaching that 'God had an existence prior to his Son's'.³⁶ That

that Paulinus was a bishop of Tyre during this period, however he relates to the problematic Zeno.

³² Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 45. 2-3, 9-12, 28-9), cf. *HE* 2. 7b (*GCS* 19. 27-9). The episcopal list of Antioch at this period is notoriously difficult to unravel. Our Paulinus is said by Philostorgius to have been the successor of Eustathius and the predecessor of Eulalius (*HE* 2. 7b, 3. 15 (*GCS* 19. 23-30, 45. 10-11)). In Hieron., *Chron.* ad annum 328 (*GCS* VII. i. 232. 9-10) Jerome makes him the predecessor of Eustathius, who is then followed by Eulalius. It has been suggested that there were two Paulini, one before and one after Eustathius, as in *DCB* iv. 231-2, but this is based in part on a textual confusion with Paulinus 'of Dacia' (var., 'of Antioch') in *CAP* iv. 1. 27. 6 (*CSEL* 65. 66. 20-5). Theodoret tells us that the bishop of Antioch present at Nicaea was Eustathius and that he was the successor of Philogonius (Thdt., *HE* 1. 7. 10 (*GCS* 32. 3-9)); if Paulinus was present there as bishop of Tyre (see n. 31), he cannot have been Eustathius' predecessor at Antioch. It is possible, of course, that Philostorgius is simply mistaken, but since Eusebius confirms Paulinus' translation to Antioch (*Marcell.* 1. 4 (*GCS* iv. 18. 3-5)), placing him before Eustathius would put his death in 323 or 324, too early to have had anything to do with Nicaea, whether from Tyre or Antioch. Considering the brevity of his reign (six months), therefore, it seems best to place him after Eustathius, perhaps as administrator rather than bishop of the see during the troubles prior to the election of Eulalius (Thdt., *HE* 1. 22. 1 (*GCS* 72. 4-8); Soc., *HE* 1. 24. 5 (*GCS* 71. 3-9), cf. L. Duchesne, *History of the Early Christian Church* (London: John Murray, 1912), ii. 130, Sellers, op. cit., p. 49). Aetius would thus have known him about 327 or 328 (accepting the date proposed by H. Chadwick, 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS* 49 (1948), 27-35; T. D. Barnes, 'Emperors and Bishops, A. D. 324-344: Some Problems', *American Journal of Ancient History*, 3 (1978), 60, places it one year later).

³³ Eus., *Marcell.* 1. 4 (*GCS* iv. 18. 1-2).

³⁴ Eus., *HE* 10. 1. 2 (*GCS* II. ii. 856. 7). He also quotes at length a panegyric preached by himself at the dedication of Paulinus' new cathedral in Tyre, comparing his host with Bezaleel, Solomon, and Zerubabel, Eus., *HE* 10. 4. 2-72 (*GCS* II. ii. 862. 14-883. 19).

³⁵ Eus., *Marcell.* 1. 4 (*GCS* iv. 18. 10-11, 30-2).

³⁶ Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 3 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 2. 44-8). In some ways Arius was

was optimistic. Paulinus may have been moved by Arius' plight, but he still had to be chided by Eusebius of Nicomedia to write in his support. Eusebius told him that it 'ill became a wise man to hold contrary opinions and remain silent about the truth'.³⁷ In the end he must have given in, for we have an excerpt from one of his epistles, but it is clear that he never became a wholehearted supporter. In the excerpt (based, we are told, on the works of Origen³⁸) Paulinus insisted that the identities of Father and Son are distinct and claimed that any attempt to make the divine begetting an emanation would undermine that, since it would make it comparable to that of animals.³⁹ He was prepared to describe the Son as 'creature' (*κτίσμα*) and, like his friend Eusebius of Caesarea,⁴⁰ to speak of him as a 'secondary God' (*δεύτερος θεός*).⁴¹ Given the bishop of Caesarea's obvious veneration, we can assume that Paulinus' theology was basically like his own, if possibly somewhat further to the 'left'. Aetius' first religious teacher, then, was someone others would identify as 'Arian'.

If as we suppose Paulinus became bishop in 327 or 328, he inherited a troubled throne.⁴² Its previous occupant Eustathius had been deposed, ostensibly for reasons of personal morality, but at least partly on theological grounds (he was usually reckoned a staunch Nicene). The newly vacant see was then offered to the comparatively moderate Paulinus, who was perhaps unwise to accept it, for in this highly charged atmosphere he survived only six months, to be succeeded in turn (apparently) by the equally short-lived Eulalius.⁴³ The throne was then offered to one of Paulinus' great admirers, the as guilty as Athanasius of labelling as 'Arian' those who supported only part of his position.

³⁷ Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 2 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 15. 5-6).

³⁸ Paulin. T., *Ep.* 1 (Urkunde 9, Opitz iii. 17. 3-4).

³⁹ Ibid. (Opitz iii. 17. 6-18. 3).

⁴⁰ Eus., *DE* 5. 4 (*GCS* vi. 225. 8-14).

⁴¹ Paulin. T., *Ep.* 2 (Urkunde 9, Opitz iii. 18. 5-6).

⁴² See note 32 above.

⁴³ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 45. 9-12). Socrates, *HE* 1. 24. 5-8 (*GCS* 71. 3-19), and Sozomen, *HE* 2. 19. 1-7 (*GCS* 74. 25-76. 10, note the mention of Paulinus 'of Tyre' at 74. 27), describe the confused situation at Antioch very vividly, but Socrates' statement that there was an eight year vacancy in the see must be mistaken. Both make Euphronius the immediate successor of Eustathius.

historian Eusebius of Caesarea, who with greater wisdom declined it, leaving it to still another short-lived successor, Euphronius.⁴⁴ Thus while during Paulinus' lifetime Aetius could expect his tutor's favour and (equally) the hostility of his enemies, Paulinus dead left him vulnerable. He was obliged to seek safety elsewhere, and fled some one hundred miles to the north-west, to the Cilician city of Anazarbus.⁴⁵

Anazarbus, like its twin and rival Tarsus, was 'no mean city'. Laid out around an imposing acropolis, with a large amphitheatre surrounded by columned thoroughfares, Anazarbus had been metropolis of Cilicia Secunda since the time of Diocletian.⁴⁶ But if Aetius was Cilician by birth, by the time of his arrival in 328 or 329 the connection had lapsed, for he knew no one personally and had to support himself by his trade.⁴⁷ Still, he landed on his feet. Within a relatively short period of time he managed to resume his literary studies by a characteristic means. Aetius had long been convinced of his own prowess as a debater, but one day while so engaged he seemed impressive enough to a local grammarian for the latter to give him a home in return for work, and to agree to teach him the fundamentals of grammar. This did not last long. In a scene all too frequently repeated, the tactless Aetius bested his host in a discussion of scripture and was summarily evicted. By that time, however, he had acquired contacts of his own, and we soon find him the student and guest of the city's bishop, Athanasius.

There was not much chance anyone would mistake this Athanasius for his namesake at Alexandria. Though like Paulinus he was numbered among Arius' early supporters,⁴⁸ no one was required to chide *him* for tepid support. We know very little about his theology, but in the one clearly identified surviving fragment he describes the Son as a 'creature' (κτίσμα)

⁴⁴ i.e. following Thdt., *HE* 1. 22. 1 (*GCS* 72. 4-8), who places Eulalius before the offer to Eusebius of Caesarea though there is no mention of Paulinus.

⁴⁵ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 45. 9-13).

⁴⁶ For a general description of the city and its remains, see R. Sitwell (ed.), *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 53-4.

⁴⁷ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 45. 13-15); the following account of Aetius' stay in Anazarbus is based on this (*GCS* 45. 15-46. 5).

⁴⁸ Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 3 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 2. 5).

and was at least tolerant of the assertion that he was 'made from nothing'. He was also prepared to use the Parable of the Lost Sheep⁴⁹ to show the Son's premundane solidarity with the rest of intelligible creation.⁵⁰ Aetius was thus once again in the company of a supporter of Arius. What makes this interesting is the fact that our non-Nicene chronicler did not think that worth mentioning; what interested him was Athanasius' exegetical background. For the bishop of Anazarbus (perhaps like Arius himself) was a disciple of the martyred Antiochene exegete Lucian. When he discussed the meaning of the Gospels with Aetius, what Philostorgius wants us to know is that his source was Lucian.⁵¹

Upon completing this first stage of his scriptural studies, Aetius moved some 75 miles to the south-west to Anazarbus' 'twin', Tarsus. There, in the homeland of their author, he studied the Pauline epistles, this time under the direction of another of Lucian's disciples, the presbyter Antony.⁵² But regrettably, from Aetius' point of view, Antony was eventually elected bishop and no longer had leisure to teach; Aetius was obliged to return to Antioch. When he arrived there, some time in the middle of the 330s,⁵³ he found a new bishop,

⁴⁹ Matt. 18: 10-14, Luke 15: 4-7.

⁵⁰ Ath. Anazarbenus, *Ep.* (Urkunde 11, Opitz iii. 18). Presumably, as for Maximinus in Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 9 (*PL* 42. 727), the lost sheep is the human race and all the rest are angels. Two other fragments have been ascribed to this bishop (though the 'Athanasius' in question is not actually said to be the bishop of Anazarbus). These are published in Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.* fr. 4 (*CCL* 86 i. 235-6), cf. D. De Bruyne, OSB, 'Deux lettres inconnues de Theognius l'évêque arien de Nicée', *ZNTW* 27 (1928), 106-10. In addition an allegedly non- (or pre-) Nicene anti-pagan homily found among the spuria of St Athanasius has been ascribed to his namesake at Anazarbus: M. Tetz, 'Eine arianische Homilie unter dem Namen des Athanasius von Alexandrien', *ZKG* 64 (1952/3), 304, discussing the text published in F. Scheidweiler, 'Eine arianische Predigt über den Teufel', *ZKG* 67 (1955/6), 132-40. Its identification as 'Arian', however, depends on the concluding doxology and its interpretation. The original editor, R. P. Casey, 'An Early Homily on the Devil ascribed to Athanasius of Alexandria', *JTS* 36 (1935), 1-10, did not consider it 'Arian'. J. Paramelle may also have had his doubts, cf. M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974 ff.), ii. 11, no. 2080. There is nothing in any of these fragments which goes beyond the general teachings of the school.

⁵¹ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 46. 1-4).

⁵² For this and the following, see Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 46. 4-9).

⁵³ Allowing a year or more at Anazarbus and several others at Tarsus.

Flacillus.⁵⁴ Theodoret sees him as of a piece with his 'Arian' successors,⁵⁵ but less partisan contemporaries accorded him greater stature. Like Paulinus, Eusebius of Caesarea honoured him with a book dedication,⁵⁶ which tells us that his theological orientation cannot have been too far from Eusebius' own. In any event, for whatever reason he allowed Aetius to remain.

Politically, at least, this was a move that had consequences. For it was during this period that Aetius came to know the presbyter Leontius. Leontius was another of Lucian's disciples, and eventually became bishop of Antioch; it was during his episcopate Eunomius first arrived in the city.⁵⁷ Under his direction Aetius undertook the final stage in his scriptural education, the reading of the prophets with special attention to the book of Ezekiel.⁵⁸ Leontius was the final link in Aetius' 'Lucianic' succession,⁵⁹ but later, as bishop, he was to influence both Aetius and Eunomius. He was a native of Phrygia,⁶⁰ but he had been accused some years earlier of a meretricious relationship with a consecrated virgin, Eustolium.⁶¹ Since it was not uncommon in the hinterland for male and female ascetics to live together, it may be that Leontius' relationship was rustic rather than immoral. In any event, he decided to put an end to the rumours by castrating himself and thus provoked his own deposition.⁶² He was not strongly partisan, for while he was

⁵⁴ This is the form of his name given by Athanasius, *Apol. Sec.* 81 (Opitz ii. 161. 6) and Eusebius, *E.Th.*, praef. (GCS iv. 60. 1); Jerome, in his version of Eus., *Chron.* (GCS VII. i. 232. 13) has Placillus, as do some MSS of Soc., *HE* 2. 8. 5 (GCS 98. 1) At Soc., *HE* 2. 26. 10 (GCS 136. 12), however, and Soz., *HE* 3. 6. 2, 20. 4 (GCS 107. 23, 134. 15) we find Placitus or Placetus, as does (Ps.-?)Ath., *Fr.* (PG 26. 1293C), while Thdt., *HE* 1. 22. 1, 2. 24. 1, 11, 13 (GCS 72. 9, 152. 21, 155. 4, 13) has Flacitus.

⁵⁵ Thdt., *HE* 2. 24. 13 (GCS 155. 12-15).

⁵⁶ Eus., *E.Th.*, epistula ad Flacillum (GCS iv. 60. 1-21).

⁵⁷ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (GCS 46. 7-12).

⁵⁸ Ezekiel, with its visions of God and the divine chariot, was regarded as the culmination of the prophetic mysteries; cf. the Jewish restrictions on its study in the Babylonian Talmud, *Hagigah* 13a.

⁵⁹ On Aetius and the connection of non-Nicenes generally with Lucian, see below, Ch. 3, pp. 44-7.

⁶⁰ Thdt., *HE* 2. 10. 2 (GCS 121. 24).

⁶¹ She may herself have been a disciple of Lucian, if she is the same as the 'Eustolium' mentioned in the *Vita Luciani* 10 in Philost., *HE*, Anhang vi (GCS 192. 18-20); cf. Bardy, *Recherches*, 16.

⁶² Ath., *Fug.* 26 (Opitz ii. 85. 27-86. 3), repeated by Soc., *HE* 2. 26. 9 (GCS

willing to accept pupils from someone like Athanasius of Anazarbus, he was careful to avoid the appearance of commitment himself. He was endowed with much humour⁶³ as well as political skill, as his public mumbling illustrates. His tolerant ambiguity allowed him to remain the friend and patron of Aetius and Eunomius for many years to come.

Patronage in the future, however, was of little help in the present. Not only was Leontius himself not in power, but the combination of an unsettled religious situation with Aetius' inability to hold his tongue made it difficult for him to exercise the little authority he had. Aetius, therefore, was obliged to return to Cilicia, presumably to enjoy the renewed patronage of Antony and Athanasius.⁶⁴ Unfortunately, the pugnacious nature that had already twice driven him from Antioch followed him to Cilicia; there the unfortunate Aetius was defeated and publicly humiliated by a member of the Gnostic sect of the Borborians. Hitherto he had prided himself on being ἀμικτος, 'undefeated'; now he had been defeated by someone whose heresy was so patent as to scarcely require refutation. The result was a depression bordering on suicidal, which none the less led to a new sense of resolution. Deep in its depths, Aetius received what he believed was a divine confirmation of his mission and a promise of future invincibility.⁶⁵ Its vehicle was a waking vision.⁶⁶ Such an experience tells us almost as

136. 5-10) and Thdt., *HE* 2. 24. 1-2 (*GCS* 152. 23-153. 5). In fact the Phrygian Leontius seems to have been an exponent of ascetical practices (including castration) well known in the non-Greek-speaking hinterland of Antioch, cf. A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, *CSCO*, subsidia 14, vol. 184, pp. 79, 273-4; *CSCO*, subsidia 17, pp. 134, 257.

⁶³ See Ch. 5 n. 294 below.

⁶⁴ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 46. 13-16).

⁶⁵ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 46. 16-23). Aetius was not, of course, the only one who found this kind of defeat troubling; cf. the assurance in *Hom. Clem.* 1. 20. 5-7 (*GCS* i. 33. 23-34. 3), *Recogn. Clem.* 1. 17. 5-7 (*GCS* ii. 16. 27-17. 10), that even when overcome in debate one should not fear; the 'friends of truth' will recognize her power even in the midst of sophistical arguments (cf. Eunomius, *Apol.* 2. 10-11 (Vaggione 36)).

⁶⁶ It is described as an *ὁρασία* expressing itself in symbols, Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (*GCS* 46. 19-21). Presumably, then, it was similar to Peter's vision in Acts 10: 9-17, described as an *ὁρασία* by Origen (*Cels.* 2. 1 (*GCS* i. 127. 18-20); the Bible (ad loc.) refers to it as an *ἐκστασις* and a *ὄραμα*). Eunomius appears to have had a similar experience, but in his case it is said to have been in the form

much about his past as about his future, for such a reaction is only comprehensible in one already deeply committed to the defence of divine truth. The pugnacity and general combativeness which were so much a part of Aetius' own character were now combined with a purpose transcending personal and professional ambition.

Unlike Eunomius, then, who had an ordinary, if somewhat patchy secular education, Aetius' training was religious. The teaching and example of his Lucianic teachers had already prepared him to understand his mission in religious terms. Now with the confirmation of a divine vision he could pursue that course with confidence. Thereafter he would not be merely a rhetorician or philosopher, but a holy man with a mission from God.

Naturally enough, he was eager to put his new vocation to the test. Returning to Antioch he happened to hear of the renowned Manichaean leader, Aphthonius,⁶⁷ then living at Alexandria. He immediately journeyed to Egypt and there, according to Philostorgius, so confounded the unfortunate Aphthonius that he died within a week.⁶⁸ Aetius had arrived at a propitious time. Athanasius, the city's Nicene bishop, was once again in exile and a non-Nicene, Gregory of Cappadocia, was the bishop.⁶⁹

of a dream, *Eun.*, AA 1 (J I. 29. 24–30. 2). There is nothing to show when this occurred, but since the account is near the beginning of Eunomius' second apology and connected with its title, it probably had something to do with divine encouragement in rebuttal.

⁶⁷ According to Photius, *C. Manichaeos* 1. 14 (PG 102. 41B), Aphthonius was one of the twelve main disciples of Mani. If this is meant literally (and refers to the same man) Photius' information is just on the borders of possibility. To have remembered Mani (d. c.276), Aphthonius would have to have been well into his eighties. But while there were indeed people still living who claimed to remember him (Cyril H., *Catech.* 6. 20 (Reischl i. 182)), Photius may have inferred this information from the existence of (extant?) 'explanations . . . and commentaries' ascribed to him. On the importance of disputation among Manichaeans in general, see Lim, pp. 70–108.

⁶⁸ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (GCS 46. 23–47. 9). Lim, p. 88, is right to point out that Aetius defeats Aphthonius by argument rather than by other (presumably miraculous) means (cf. Lim, pp. 82–7). Still, it is worth pointing out that Aetius' ability to do so was the result of a divine gift.

⁶⁹ Aetius must have arrived at some point not too long after 340; Philostorgius says that his stay coincided with the arrival of Theophilus the Indian at Antioch (*HE* 3. 15 (GCS 47. 18–20)), but unfortunately we are not told exactly when that was. A *terminus ante quem* is provided by Aetius' return to

Aetius therefore remained in Alexandria and took up the study of medicine, placing himself under the direction of one Sopolis and supporting himself by his trade.⁷⁰ Philostorgius tells us that, like the martyr Lucian before him,⁷¹ his goal was to be able to minister to people's bodies as well as their souls.⁷² It is easy to assume that, as for a modern physician, this study was primarily practical, but in fact medicine was as strongly theoretical as all other Greek science and was closely related to philosophy and rhetoric. Indeed, to some extent it allowed entry into these professions through 'the back door'; Galen had already complained in the previous century that dyers and tinkers were crowding into medicine after only six months' instruction.⁷³ According to Gregory of Nyssa Aetius was just such a medical parvenu.⁷⁴ It is worth noting, however, that Caesarius, one of Gregory's own associates and the brother of Gregory Nazianzen, could think of no better crown for his own career than the study of medicine at Alexandria.⁷⁵ The pages of Eunapius record more than one sophist who also practised medicine, and included one at Alexandria whose instruction consisted of a combination Aetius must have found irresistible: medicine, Aristotle, and rhetoric.⁷⁶

Our sources present Aetius as the successor and imitator of Lucian, but there is another at least *prima-facie* possibility which we need to mention in passing. This is the possibility of a

Antioch after Leontius' election in 344 (see below), so, since Gregory replaced Athanasius in March 339 (Ath., *Index Fest.* 134-46 (SC 317. 236-8), and we need to allow time for Aetius' education, the early 340s seems about right.

⁷⁰ Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (GCS 47. 10-20).

⁷¹ Cf. *ibid.*, Anhang VI. 3 (GCS 186. 16-19).

⁷² *Ibid.* 3. 15 (GCS 47. 10-11).

⁷³ Galen, *Methodi Medendi Liber* 1. 1 (Kühn x. 5-6).

⁷⁴ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 42-4 (J i. 36. 20-37. 11); according to Gregory, Aetius learnt his medicine as assistant to an unnamed physician and became personal physician to the gullible Armenius, thus becoming rich, cf. Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. III, syr. 3-7 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 414).

⁷⁵ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 7. 7 (PG 35. 761C-D); he also studied geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and logic; cf. the comment of Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 16. 18: 'pro omni tamen experimento sufficiat medico ad commendam artis auctoritatem, Alexandriae si se dixerit eruditum'.

⁷⁶ i.e. Magnus of Nisibis, Eunapius, *VS* 497-8; other such figures include Magnus' teacher, Zeno of Cyprus (*VS* 497), and Zeno's other pupils, Oribasius, Ionicus, and Theon (*VS* 498-9).

connection with Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste. Unlike his namesake at Antioch, this colourful bishop was better known for ascetic zeal than consistency in doctrine. In the course of a busy life he managed to be a disciple of Arius,⁷⁷ a mentor of Basil the Great,⁷⁸ and—at least allegedly—an instructor of Aetius. That is what we are told by Basil the Great, who was certainly in a position to know. In a letter dated to 376, he claims that Aetius was Eustathius' 'disciple' (τοῦ ἰδίου ἐαυτοῦ μαθητοῦ).⁷⁹ Since later the two men were bitter enemies, that seems unlikely, but it is also too improbable to have been readily invented. If it refers to anything real, it must be to another, later episode in what was clearly a long and complex relationship.⁸⁰ In any event, there is no reason to think that the right word to describe it would ever have been (on either side) 'disciple'.

Beginning in the spring of 344 three successive events changed Aetius' situation dramatically: Leontius was elected bishop of Antioch, Gregory of Cappadocia died, and Athanasius returned to Alexandria.⁸¹ Word of Leontius' election naturally caused Aetius to hasten home, where he could count on a warm welcome. Leontius' public stance was one of neutrality, but in the eyes of the Nicenes, his special favour was reserved for 'Arians'.⁸² Whether that was the case or not, Aetius was soon

⁷⁷ So Basil, *Epp.* 244. 3. 17–19, 263. 3. 3–6 (Courtonne iii. 77, 123).

⁷⁸ See Basil, *Ep.* 244. 1. 7–10 (Courtonne iii. 74), where Basil describes himself as 'a perfect slave' to Eustathius in his youth (ὁ τοιῷσδε δουλεύσας ἐκ παιδὸς τῷ δεῖνι). Sozomen even goes so far as to say that some people considered Eustathius the author of Basil's ascetical works, *HE* 3. 14. 31 (*GCS* 123. 15–16).

⁷⁹ Basil, *Ep.* 244. 3. 19 (Courtonne iii. 77). Eunomius too seems to have mentioned an 'Armenian' with whom Aetius was intimate and later quarrelled, and whose ἥθους were similar to Aetius' own, *AA* 1 (J i. 30. 17). Since the parallel between someone from Armenia and someone else living on the Euxine is found in another passage, *Grg. Nyss., Eun.* 1. 55 (J i. 41. 7–10), and the reference there is clearly to Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius, the identification is all the more likely. Presumably, then, if there is anything to it at all, Philostorgius passed over the matter because of their later enmity.

⁸⁰ See below Ch. 5, pp. 158–60.

⁸¹ Leontius was made bishop of Antioch at the third Synod of Antioch in the spring of 344, Gregory died on 26 June 345, and Athanasius returned to Alexandria on 21 Oct. 346 (*Ath., Index Fest.* 229–36 (*SC* 317. 246)).

⁸² *Thdt., HE* 2. 24. 5 (*GCS* 153. 19–24).

ordained to the diaconate and invited to preach.⁸³ He provoked so violent a protest that in the end Leontius, though still determined to show him favour, was forced to suspend him and send him back to Alexandria.⁸⁴ It says something about the situation at Antioch that Aetius found an Alexandria ruled by Athanasius more comfortable than a continued residence in the Syrian capital!⁸⁵

Aetius was not without friends even there, of course, and about this time was nominated to the episcopate by two doughty fighters in Arius' cause, the Libyans Secundus of Ptolemais and Serras of Paraetonium.⁸⁶ It is symbolic of Aetius' attachment to purity of doctrine as well as of the ambiguity of the times that he turned down this honour on the grounds that his sponsors were in communion with homoousians! Since he was also able to reconcile himself to the wafflings of a Leontius, he may have been moved more by a sense of the political realities than by any feeling of *nolo episcopari*. His refusal did not diminish the enthusiasm of the bishops—they remained supporters for many years—and when, a short time later, Eunomius was looking for both a teacher and employment, Secundus sent him to Aetius.⁸⁷

This suggests that Eunomius had begun to change. For if at

⁸³ Philost., *HE* 3. 17 (*GCS* 47. 25–48. 3), Soc., *HE* 2. 35. 5–6 (*GCS* 150. 14–20), Thdt., *HE* 2. 24. 6 (*GCS* 153. 25–154. 2). In the summary of Epiphanius' book vi, *Haer.* (*GCS* iii. 231. 20–3) he is said to have been ordained to the diaconate by 'George . . . of Alexandria', presumably on the basis of the much less definite statement in *Haer.* 76. 1. 1 (*GCS* iii. 340. 15–17). Kopecek i. 96 n. 1 dates this, not implausibly, early in 346.

⁸⁴ Thdt., *HE* 2. 24. 7–8 (*GCS* 154. 2–11) and perhaps Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. ii, gr. 7–12 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 413, cf. discussion pp. 450–1); this seems to mean that he was suspended from liturgical functions, not formally deposed.

⁸⁵ Athanasius was in any case not in a position to be severe with his enemies at this time, cf. the remarks of H. I. Bell in *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1924), 54.

⁸⁶ Philost., *HE* 3. 19 (*GCS* 48. 15–18). Secundus was among those who refused to sign the Nicene decrees, Philost., *HE* 1. 8a (*GCS* 9. 13), Soc., *HE* 1. 8. 31, 9.4 (*GCS* 22. 21–2, 28. 22), Thdt., *HE* 1. 7. 14, 8. 18 (*GCS* 33. 4, 37. 19–38. 1); Soz., *HE* 1. 21. 2 (*GCS* 42. 7–9) lists him as a signer, but an *ὄν* appears to have dropped out. According to Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iv, syr. 78–88 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 423), Eunomius was recommended to Aetius by Leontius' successor Eudoxius, the bishop who ordained him; but this is undoubtedly wrong.

⁸⁷ Philost., *HE* 3. 20 (*GCS* 48. 19–23).

Constantinople he had touched the edge of religious controversy, at Antioch he was exposed to its full vigour. His acquaintance with Secundus tells us that he had begun to move in religious circles, and that inevitably—given the time, place, and milieu—those circles were non-Nicene. It is possible too that this is the point at which he was baptized,⁸⁸ and if so his religious opinions were presumably no more settled than those of the ‘hierophant’ (Leontius) who initiated him. Certainly there is nothing to suggest any attachment to Arius as an individual. Everything that Eunomius had so far experienced would predispose him to regard the churches of Constantinople and Antioch as simply local representatives of the Great Church. It was they who were the representatives of ‘orthodoxy’ and the Nicenes who were the deviant minority. If they were ‘Arian’, then so too was Eunomius, but with no more than the beginnings of the strong partisan identity of later years. Eunomius must naturally have known of Aetius’ reputation, but the chance of a job, instruction, and a visit to Alexandria more than account for his acceptance without presupposing any particular ideological commitment. Still, whatever his motives, and however small his awareness, this was to prove one of the defining moments of his life.

⁸⁸ Another possibility would be some years later under Gallus (taking seriously the fact that *J* i. 40. 1–4 precedes *J* i. 40. 16–21). The officiant in either case would have been Leontius. There is a possible reference to Eunomius’ own baptism in *Eun.*, *AA* 1 (*J* i. 40. 16–21), cf. Vaggione, p. 100 n. 13. This has been denied by J.-A. Röder, *Gregor von Nyssa, Contra Eunomium I. 1–146* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1993), 206, on the grounds that Gregory refers in his quotation to βαπτισμῶν τε τρόπον in the plural. However, the word is βαπτισμῶν, not βαπτισμάτων. The words are often interchangeable, but here, as in Heb. 6: 2, 9: 10, cf. Mark 7: 4 (all in the plural), the reference is clearly to the physical act of dipping (for βαπτισμάτων in a parallel sense, see Ch. 8, pp. 341–2 below). Since Eunomius was alleged to have changed just this practice (discussed below, Ch. 8, pp. 332–44), the plural is interesting. In any event, whether the reference is to Eunomius’ own baptism or not, the ‘hierophant’ (*J* i. 40. 19–20) cannot be Eunomius himself, as suggested by Röder, ad loc. The only time Eunomius functioned in such a role was during his (very brief) reign as bishop of Cyzicus; once he left, he never celebrated the Eucharist again (an integral part of the rite), Philost., *HE* 9. 4 (*GCS* 117. 11–14). On the other hand, if the reference is more general and refers to someone other than a bishop, it may refer to Aetius as Eunomius’ theological initiator, continuing the mystery language of *J* i. 40. 5, 14, 15–16. The liturgical explanation, however, seems by far the more straightforward.

Eunomius was still quite young, perhaps only in his early twenties, when he went to Alexandria—his employer was at least twenty years older. Beginning as Aetius' secretary,⁸⁹ he became not only his devoted follower but in the end buried him and ensured the survival of his movement.⁹⁰ In many ways Aetius is an enigma: intellectually brilliant, yet not above cavilling or quibbling; desperately eager to be accepted in the world of higher culture, yet never able to transcend his rough and tumble youth; deeply convinced of the religious reality of his mission, yet possessed of an eye for the main chance. The devotion of Eunomius and so many others in the midst of such contradictions points to an attractive power beyond the unflattering portraits of his enemies. If it was the disciple who in the end outstripped the master, the fact remains that even after twenty years the disciple was still prepared to risk death or exile in the master's service and insist that he was 'a man of God'.⁹¹ There are not many, perhaps, of whom so much could be said.

⁸⁹ Soc., *HE* 2. 35. 14 (*ταχυγράφος*), 4. 7. 4 (*ταχυγραφέως*) (*GCS* 151. 16, 233. 27).

⁹⁰ As seen by Basil nearly twenty years later, though there was but 'one evil between them' Eunomius first received and then 'perfected' the teaching of his Master, *Eun.* 1. 1. 31–3, 41 (*SC* 199. 144, 146).

⁹¹ Thdt., *HE* 2. 29. 1 (*GCS* 165. 9–10, repeated with a malicious twist at 2. 29. 12 (167. 14–16)).

Ariomaniac

Located in what could then be reckoned the centre of the inhabited world and regarded by many as the most populous city of all,¹ Alexandria in the second quarter of the fourth century could still provide its visitors with abundant justification for the superlatives of previous centuries:² 'world's greatest emporium',³ 'cross-roads of the world',⁴ 'all-nurturing city inhabited by every kind of human being'.⁵ For while it had suffered heavily in the troubles of the previous century, and under Aurelian had lost not only the glittering palace quarter of the Ptolemies but the original site of the Great Library,⁶ it was still arguably the empire's greatest city, outranked in political importance only by Rome, and, in the east, by the upstart new capital on the Bosphorus.⁷

¹ Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32. 47; cf. *ibid.* 32. 35, where it is reckoned second among all cities under the sun. In the 1st cent. BC it was said to have had a population of over 300,000 (Diodorus Siculus 17. 52. 6), and despite an apparently diminished population (Dionysius Alexandrinus apud Eus., *HE* 7. 21. 9 (*GCS* ii. 678. 8–16)) could still, in the 5th cent. AD, be described as πόλις . . . μεγίστη καὶ πολυάνθρωπος, Thdt., *HE* 1. 2. 8 (*GCS* 6. 7).

² Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 16. 7 ff.: 'Alexandria enim uertex omnium est ciuitatum . . .'. For a more negative view, see Gregory Nazianzen, *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 576–7 (*PG* 37. 1069), where Alexandria is τὸ κοῦφον ἄστὺ καὶ πλήρες κακῶν πάντων.

³ Strabo 17. 1. 13.

⁴ Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32. 36.

⁵ P. Oxy. 2332, ll. 61–2, B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, *et al.*, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London: The Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898 ff.), xxii. 96.

⁶ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 16. 15; Eusebius, *HE* 7. 32. 7–11 (*GCS* ii. 718. 21–722. 5), gives a circumstantial account of some episodes of the siege; cf. Epiph., *Mens.* 9 (*PG* 43. 249C–252A), where this quarter is described as being in his day 'deserted' (ἐρημον).

⁷ Some idea of the city's size can be derived from what appears to be an early 4th-cent. description preserved in Syriac; this description lists the five sur-

The almost quarter century since the newly Christian Constantine had acquired the empire of the East had been a period of phenomenal growth for the Church in Egypt; indeed, the very years of Eunomius' residence there appear to have been among the high points in Egypt's conversion to the new faith.⁸ Yet if by the end of the century this process could be regarded as virtually complete, in its middle years a vigorous and still large pagan minority was staunchly contesting its progress, leaving the city frequently convulsed by riots.⁹ The Jewish population was no less prominent. Though the large and influential Jewish community of the first century had been dispersed in the troubles of the second, by the fourth it was once again a notable presence.¹⁰ None of these communities was living quarters (the palace quarter is not mentioned) as containing 2,478 shrines or temples, 6,152 courts, 24,296 houses, 1,561 baths, 845 taverns, and 456 porticoes, excluding the suburbs. See P. M. Fraser, 'A Syriac *Notitia Urbis Alexandrinae*', *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 37 (1951), 103-8. Even if the actual figures are untrustworthy (the ancient totals have not been added up correctly), the general impression reflects reality.

⁸ The rate of Christianity's growth in Egypt is naturally very difficult to determine, but a statistical study of proper names by Roger S. Bagnall, 'Religious Conversion and Onomastic Change in Early Byzantine Egypt', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*, 19 (1982), 105-24, has produced some interesting results. While Bagnall's conclusions are naturally to be received with caution (particularly for Alexandria), the evidence seems to suggest that, in spite of the many strong pagan survivals, the maximum period of growth was between AD 310 and 360, with the 50% point being reached not long after 318. Note too the author's interesting comments on the relationship between this point and the beginning of religious strife, *ibid.* 121-3.

⁹ e.g. the riots of December 361 which preceded the brutal murders of George, the intruded non-Nicene bishop, Dracontius, the Christian director of the mint, and a certain Count Diodorus. Not only had George severely persecuted the pagans (the immediate provocation is variously reported), he had attempted to turn an unused Mithraeum (under the Caesareum?) into a church, parading its sacred contents through the streets, *Soc., HE* 3. 2. 1-10, cf. 3. 10-12 (*GCS* 193. 9-194. 7, cf. 195. 4-12), *Soz., HE* 4. 30. 2, 5. 7. 2-7 (*GCS* 187. 12-16, 202. 5-203. 3); cf., however, *Hist. Aceph.* 2. 8-10 (37-55) (*SC* 317. 148), Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 11. 7-10. NB, according to the latter (22. 11. 10), the Christians could easily have rescued the victims but they had been so alienated by George that they refused to try.

¹⁰ When expelled by Cyril early in the next century they are said to have formed a not insignificant portion of the city, *Soc., HE* 7. 13. 18 (*GCS* 359. 13-14). According to Socrates, however, *HE* 7. 13. 4, 8 (*GCS* 357. 27, 358. 10-12), they were not particularly observant, and passed their Sabbaths in the theatres rather than the synagogues.

uniform and relations among them were correspondingly complex, but throughout the period we find them all perennially involved in one another's affairs.¹¹

The bishop who presided over this cosmopolitan mix was among the most important personages in the Eastern Empire, one whose opinions, whether religious or political, were of considerable interest to the emperors. There were several reasons for this. For one thing, in an age which had elected to solve some of its political problems by an increasingly minute division of the power-base,¹² the bishop of Alexandria was one of the very few whose jurisdiction extended over the whole of Egypt.¹³ With nearly a hundred bishops at his command,¹⁴ his was a formidable presence indeed. The prefect of Egypt might be reckoned a 'king' even by emperors,¹⁵ but in the bishop of his capital city he was confronted by a 'pharaoh' whose sway was nearly as great as his own.¹⁶

Jurisdiction, however, does not explain his pre-eminence—there were, after all, powerful bishops elsewhere in the Roman world. No, if the position of the bishop of Alexandria was

¹¹ Both Gregory and George, the intruded Arian bishops of Alexandria, are portrayed as making common cause with pagan mobs against the supporters of Athanasius, *Ath., Apol. Sec.* 30. 3 (Opitz ii. 109. 23–30), *H. Ar.* 55. 1–57. 4 (Opitz ii. 214. 13–215. 26), assisted in the former case, at least, by the Jews as well, *Ath., Ep. Encycl.* 3. 3–4. 4 (Opitz ii. 172. 4–173. 20). Athanasius himself was accused of collusion with the pagans in the synodical letter issued by the Oriental bishops at Serdica (Philippopolis), *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 8. 3 (*CSEL* 65. 55. 7–9). The confused accounts of the murder of George cited in n. 9 make it clear that the various communities could co-operate when sufficiently aroused.

¹² Shortly after its reconquest in 297 Diocletian had divided Egypt into the provinces of Augustamnica, Arcadia, and the Thebaïd.

¹³ The jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria is described as embracing the Pentapolis, lower Libya, Ammoniaca, the larger and smaller oases, Egypt, Augustamnica, the seven nomes, and the upper and middle Thebaïd, *Index Fest.* 9–15 (*SC* 317. 224).

¹⁴ *Ath., Apol. Sec.* 71. 4 (Opitz ii. 149. 7–8).

¹⁵ By Julian (ironic?), *Soc., HE* 3. 3. 10 (*GCS* 105. 6–7) = Julian, *Ep.* 21 (379A/B); there, however, the reading is, *στρατηγός*, not *βασιλεὺς τῆς Αἰγύπτου*.

¹⁶ The 'Arian' bishop George is said by Julian to have kept a watch on the governor lest he 'behave too moderately', leaving the governor more afraid of the bishop than of Constantius, *Ep.* 21 (379B/C) = *Soc., HE* 3. 3. 12 (*GCS* 195. 10). The epithet 'pharaoh' comes from the next century (cf. e.g. Isidore, *Ep.* 1. 152 (*PG* 78. 285A)), as does the Prefect Orestes' complaint about τὴν *δυναστείαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων*, *Soc., HE* 7. 13. 9 (*GCS* 358. 13), but the pattern was already well established when Eunomius arrived in Egypt.

unique, it was because geography had made it so. Alexandria was the port through which the prodigal riches of Egypt's granaries passed to feed the restless proletariats of Rome and Constantinople. With an exportable harvest variously reckoned at between four and a half and eight and a half million bushels,¹⁷ the political stability of both capitals not infrequently depended on the arrival of Alexandria's grain fleet. The bishops of Alexandria were in a position to influence that event significantly, and the interest of the emperor increased accordingly. They had long been engaged in trade themselves (even before the 'peace of the Church'),¹⁸ and in later centuries controlled their own fleets,¹⁹ but by the mid-fourth century they could demand obedience from ships' captains and expect them to carry letters of authorization.²⁰ Inevitably, they were rumoured

¹⁷ In the reign of Augustus the amount sent to Rome was 20 million modii (approximately 4.77 million bushels), Sextus Aurelius Victor, *Epitome* 1. 6; in the time of Justinian, however, Constantinople received 8 million units of grain (presumably artabs, approximately 8.81 million bushels), *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, ed. R. Schoell and G. Kroll (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895), appendix, edict 13. 8, vol. 3. 783. 9-10. Jerome, however, in *Danielem* 3. 11. 5b. 920-2 (CCL 75A. 902), describes the grain store of Ptolemy Philadelphus as being only 1. 5 million artabs (perhaps 1. 65 million bushels; he defines an artab as 3.3 modii, suggesting that either his modius was larger or his artab smaller than the usual reckoning). Socrates, *HE* 2. 13. 5 (GCS 104. 18-105. 1), speaks of 80,000 units of grain being distributed at Constantinople, but the unit intended is unclear (Valesius is probably right in suggesting 'loaves' ad loc., Soc. *HE* 2. 13, note 6, PG 67. 209C-210C).

¹⁸ Pope Maximus, bishop of Alexandria 264-82, is shown by a papyrus letter to have had some kind of involvement in trade with Rome, Mario Naldini, *Il Cristianesimo in Egitto* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1968), 79-85 (Letter 6, iii. 5, 9, p. 83). The efforts of the 'Arian' bishop George to maintain a monopoly in nitre, papyrus, reeds, and salt appear to have been the continuation of an already established tradition, Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 1. 5 (GCS 3. 341. 12-15).

¹⁹ Cf. George R. Monks, 'The Church of Alexandria and the City's Economic Life in the Sixth Century', *Speculum*, 28 (1953), 349-62, esp. pp. 355-9.

²⁰ Gregory, one of the bishops intruded by Constantius, is said to have tried to force the obedience of ship's captains loyal to Athanasius and to make them receive letters from him, Ath., *Ep. Encycl.* 5. 5 (Opitz ii. 174. 15-18). Indeed, though the reference may only be to style (cf. Grg. Nyss., *Enn.* 3. 5. 23 (J ii. 168. 9)), this may be what is meant when some of Arius' songs are said to have been ᾠματα ναυτικά, Philost., *HE* 2. 2 (GCS 13. 6-7, 28). At a later period, note the prominence of Alexandrian sailors in the attempt to enthrone Maximus the Cynic as bishop of Constantinople, Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 889-97 (PG 37. 1090-1).

to be (and doubtless were) fantastically wealthy.²¹ No emperor could tolerate a politically unreliable person in such a position,²² as one of the immediate preludes to Eunomius' arrival in the city made clear. In October of 346 the city's bishop, Athanasius, returned from what proved to be the second of three exiles. *Bête noire* of successive rulers and standard bearer of the Nicene party, he was welcomed back with all the pomp of a returning emperor.²³ But the pomp of his return, perhaps, is not half so significant as the means used to achieve his downfall—for while some of his enemies' goals were religious, their means were secular. Under Constantine they accused him of interfering with the grain fleet,²⁴ under Constantius of promoting civil strife.²⁵ As a result, by the end of his reign,

²¹ Athanasius was described by his enemies as *πλούσιον καὶ δυνατὸν καὶ ἱκανὸν πρὸς πάντα*, Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 9. 4 (Opitz ii. 95. 16–17). On the general wealth of later bishops, cf. Monks, 'Church of Alexandria', p. 351. The generous gifts of Constantine and later emperors provided Church leaders at Alexandria with abundant opportunities for personal enrichment—not to mention embezzlement!—cf. Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 18. 2 (Opitz ii. 100. 27–32). The well-known description of the wealth of the bishops of Rome in Ammianus Marcellinus 27. 3. 14 could have been applied as readily to their colleagues at Alexandria, as we can see from Cyril's offer of nearly 1500 pounds of gold to an imperial official a generation later! Epiphanius syncellus Alexandriae, *Ep. ad Maximianum Episcopum Constantinopolim*, apud Rusticus Diaconus, *Collectio Casinensis*, pars altera 293. 6 (ACO I. iv. 223. 28–33).

²² The emperors were not inclined to make a sharp distinction between religious and political opposition and found it easy to interpret the one in terms of the other. When condemning Eusebius of Nicomedia's opposition to the Nicene decrees, for instance, the Emperor Constantine found it very easy to speak of his 'tyranny' in terms usually reserved for imperial usurpers, *Ep. Nicom.* 9–10 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 60. 4–10).

²³ *Index Fest.* 230–4 (SC 317. 246), cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 21. 27–8 (PG 35. 1113B–1116B) for the description of a similarly enthusiastic greeting (note the comment of the Prefect Philagrius, *Or.* 21. 28 (PG 35. 1116A) that not even Constantius was received with so much pomp).

²⁴ Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 9. 3, 87. 1 (Opitz ii. 95. 10–13, 166. 2–4), cf. Soc., *HE* 1. 35. 2–3 (GCS 85. 9–16), Thdt., *HE* 1. 31. 5 (GCS 88. 16–18). Note the very similar accusation said to have been made against the Sophist Sopater in Eunapius, *VS* 462–3; though the means alleged were different (in this case, magic), the accusation itself was enough to get Sopater executed! Athanasius was also accused of trying to impose a tax on linen tunics, Soz., *HE* 2. 22. 7 (GCS 79. 22–6), cf. Thdt., *HE* 1. 26. 4 (GCS 81. 15–17). Obviously the events behind these exiles were much more complex than I am able to indicate here.

²⁵ Soc., *HE* 2. 8. 7 (GCS 98. 5–7), Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 3 (GCS 106. 4–6), cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 3. 8 (GCS 97. 11–18). The other charge raised against him was

Constantius had come to regard a victory over this one bishop as more significant than any of his other triumphs.²⁶

Little of this, of course, is likely to have occupied Eunomius' mind as he came to take up his new position. His major goal, after all, was presumably, like that of so many before him, an education. What is interesting is that we are not told much about it. Eunomius' followers record Aetius' studies in detail, but tell us almost nothing about those of their own master. The reason, presumably, is that his primary instructor was his employer, and that Aetius' education was a legitimizing link to the generation of Lucian and his disciples.²⁷ Since there is no mention of medical or other studies Eunomius' principal focus was probably religious,²⁸ doubtless in the Lucianic mould so strongly emphasized by Philostorgius. Still, it is difficult to believe that Eunomius failed to profit by the resources of Alexandria itself, and it may be that the allusions to such Alexandrine authors as Origen, Philo, and Theognostus in his own works are a reflection of a stay in their city.²⁹

strictly ecclesiastical, that of reoccupying his see without synodical permission, Soc., *HE* 2. 3. 6, 8. 6 (*GCS* 95. 16–18, 98. 2–5), Soz., *HE* 3. 2. 8, 5. 3 (*GCS* 103. 14–16, 106. 2–4).

²⁶ Thdt., *HE* 2. 16. 21 (*GCS* 134. 24–135. 3); cf. also Hilary's comment that Constantius had waged a longer war against Alexandria than against the Persians, only 'ne ab Athanasio Christus praedicaretur', *Const.* 11. 8–13 (*SC* 334. 188).

²⁷ See above, Ch. 2, pp. 16–23. Assuming that in his epitome Photius has preserved the proportions if not always the content of Philostorgius' work, the great disparity between the detailed account of Aetius' education and the very scanty record of Eunomius' must be deliberate. Since Philostorgius would have had no reason to disparage his own master's education, we must assume his emphasis was on Aetius' link to Lucian.

²⁸ Philost., *HE* 3. 20 (*GCS* 48. 21–3).

²⁹ There are fairly clear allusions to Origen in *Apol.* 17. 1–3 and 19. 3–4 (Vaggione 54, 56; *Apol.* 25. 27–8 [68], is not properly an allusion), and allusions to both Philo and Theognostus are said by Gregory of Nyssa to have been found in the *Apologia Apologiae*, Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 5. 24, 7. 8 (J ii. 168. 15–18, 217. 19–23) (Philo), 3. 2. 121 (J ii. 92. 8–12) (Theognostus). It would be very interesting to know what other studies Eunomius pursued, given the rich opportunities provided by Alexandria. For a discussion of Alexandrian philosophical education at this period, see H. Marrou, 'Synesius of Cyrene and Alexandrian Neoplatonism', in A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 131–41.

Travel is usually reckoned one of the ornaments of an education, but its value is not limited to a change of classrooms. Almost as important as the purely educational side of Eunomius' stay in Alexandria, then, was the change in religious environment. As we have already seen, at Constantinople and Antioch the 'great Church' was, if not 'Arian', at least non-Athanasian. Eunomius' previous experience of Christianity, therefore, would have been as a member of the majority. In Alexandria he was part of an embattled minority, with all the sectarian connotations that suggests.³⁰ In effect he had entered the very heart of a religious controversy which had begun in the decade before his birth and which was to form the background of almost all the rest of his life—the controversy associated with the name of Arius.

The Alexandrian presbyter in question had died an exile nearly a decade before, but the controversy associated with his name had, if anything, grown more virulent. From its inception as an internal quarrel of the Egyptian Church it had come to involve not only the bishops of the major sees, but the imperial government as well—indeed, it was becoming the occasion of an increasing number of sharp divisions throughout the Christian world. If Constantinople had suggested that Arius' cause might be viewed with sympathy, and at Antioch the Church was already partly committed, association with Aetius at Alexandria could only make Eunomius a partisan. And yet, though *ex officio* he might now be a member of the deposed presbyter's party, what that might mean remains as

³⁰ 'Many' are said to have been excommunicated with Arius, Epiph., *Haer.* 68. 4. 3 (GCS iii. 144. 13–16), cf. 69. 3. 2, 7 (GCS iii. 154. 17–21, 155. 16–17), so his original following must have been a significant one. However, despite the presence of a continuing 'Arian' community at a later period, Soc., *HE* 2. 3. 5–6, 11. 1 (GCS 95. 13–15, 102. 7–8), it is clear that it had begun to diminish fairly early, Soz., *HE* 2. 21. 3 (GCS 77. 10–12). Gwatkin, p. 19, regards Athanasius' return in 346 as the end of real 'Arian' influence in Egypt. It would be interesting to know just where the 'Arians' worshipped in Alexandria at this period, as Athanasius was apparently unprepared to provide a church for their use, Soc., *HE* 2. 23. 34–8 (GCS 129. 2–14), Soz., *HE* 3. 20. 5–7 (GCS 134. 18–135. 5), Thdt., *HE* 2. 12. 1–3 (GCS 134. 11–135. 5). Doubtless like the Eustathians at Antioch they assembled in private houses, Soz., *HE* 3. 20. 4 (GCS 134. 17–18), cf. Thdt., *H. Rel.* 2. 15. 11–20 (SC 234. 228), 8. 5. 17–21, 6. 8–11, 22–6, 8. 1–6 (SC 234. 384, 386, 388–90), Synesius, *Ep.* 66 [67] (Garzya 112. 13–21).

problematic as it is crucial. For however important it might be to establish Eunomius' relationship to this very powerful movement, there are few issues less easily resolved.

The fault does not lie wholly with Eunomius. The nature of the movement occasioned by Arius is nearly as mysterious as its relationship to its 'founder'. We know little about Arius as an individual, though we do know something about the content of his theology. Unfortunately, often we can only guess at its context. A long-continued effort to supply that context has generated a multitude of scholarly portraits, some brilliant and all different,³¹ but none claiming universal assent.³² In the next chapter I will try to address some of these issues, but for the moment it seems better to start with the self-understanding of those actually involved. We need to understand how Eunomius and his coreligionists understood their own relationship to Arius. We cannot do that, however, without first looking at how it was understood by the Nicene authors whose writings underlie most of the accounts.

These authors are almost unanimous. In their eyes Eunomius was quite simply the successor of Arius, the representative of a new and more virulent form of the 'poison' originally concocted by the Alexandrian presbyter.³³ In other words, Arius sowed the seeds, and Aetius and Eunomius were the fruit.³⁴ 'Arius and Eunomius' could thus become the standard heresiological shorthand for the movement as a whole.³⁵ This usage could become commonplace,³⁶ however, because its assumptions were

³¹ There are substantial bibliographies dealing with Arius and his followers in Gregg, *Arianism*, 371-80; Lorenz, 16-21, 30-1, nn. 61-3; Williams, *Arius*, 329-41; and Hanson, *Search*, 886-99.

³² Cf. the excellent discussion of the difficulties experienced by earlier scholars in Williams, *Arius*, 1-25. For a discussion of some of the reasons for this lack of unanimity in a number of specific cases, including Williams's own, see Vaggione, *Arius*, 63-87.

³³ Cf. Athanasius' comments on Arian lack of originality, and the taunt that even Aetius had been unable to come up with anything new but had tamely followed Arius, *Syn.* 6. 1-2 (Opitz ii. 234. 14-25).

³⁴ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 45, cf. 46 (J i. 37. 15-17, cf. 37. 19-22).

³⁵ e.g. Thdt., *Ep.* 21 (SC 98. 76. 22), 104 (SC 111. 26. 4, 28. 2), 113 (SC 111. 62. 24), 116 (SC 111. 70. 25-6), 146 (SC 111. 176. 18-19, 25, 180. 25-6, 182. 16), etc. A similar process was at work with other figures, notably Aetius; see below n. 40.

³⁶ e.g. Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia Dogmatica* 11 (PG 130. 500A, 447B,

already deeply rooted. The decades surrounding Eunomius' arrival in Alexandria saw the appearance of a series of works in which Arius' teaching was portrayed as above all a *καινοτομία*,³⁷ an innovation without root in the Christian past. To the extent, then, that its antecedents could be traced any nearer than the Father of Lies,³⁸ they were to be sought in the sinister figures of Ebion, Marcion, and Paul of Samosata, or, darker still, Valentinus, Basilides, and Mani.³⁹ From this perspective support for Arius was quite simply rejection of the Christian tradition as a whole, the rejection of an otherwise universally acknowledged truth by a wilful and recalcitrant minority. Even when its members disagreed with one another, it could still be assumed that they represented an infection whose source was Arius himself.⁴⁰ All who came to his aid or supported some aspect of his teaching had to be classed as his disciples. As a result it was possible to describe so eminent (and independent) a figure as Eusebius of Nicomedia as 'a leader of the Arian 600B), Nicetas, *Thes.* 5. 40, 41, 43, 53 (PG 139. 1401A, B, C, 1403B, 1417B), cf. 5. 22 (PG 139. 1380B/C), etc.

³⁷ e.g. Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 21 (PG 25. 588C), *Ep. Encycl.* 6. 4 (Opitz ii. 175. 22-176. 1), cf. *Ar.* 1. 8 (PG 26. 28B/C), etc.

³⁸ e.g. Ath., *Deer.* 5. 7 (Opitz ii. 5. 21-2), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 4 (PG 25. 545C-548A), *Ar.* 1. 8 (PG 26. 25C-28A), etc.

³⁹ In spite of an explicit condemnation of Valentinus, Mani, Sabellius, and Hieracas (Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 3 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 10-13. 1)), Alexander of Alexandria could only see his errant presbyter as a scion of Ebion, Artemas, and Paul of Samosata, *Alex. Al.*, *Ep. Alex.* 35 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 25. 10-12). Athanasius was less restrained, providing him with an extensive heretical pedigree: Valentinus and Carpocrates, Ath., *Ar.* 1. 56 (PG 26. 129C); Valentinus, Marcion, and Basilides, Ath., *Ar.* 2. 21 (PG 26. 192A/B); Valentinus and Ptolemy, Ath., *Ar.* 3. 60, 64, 65, 66, 67 (PG 26. 448C-449A, 547C, 460B/C, 464A, 464C); Valentinians, *Ep. Serap.* 1. 11 (PG 26. 537B); Valens, Marcion, and Mani, *Ep. Adelph.* 2 (PG 26. 1073B), cf. Ath., *Ar.* 1. 2 (PG 26. 16A). On this issue in general, see R. Lyman, 'A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism', Barnes and Williams, pp. 45-62.

⁴⁰ Cf. Ath., *Ep. Serap.* 4. 5 (PG 26. 644D-645A), where Eunomians, Eudoxians, and Eusebians are said to have all fallen alike into 'the Arian heresy', and the letter of the Italian bishops to those of Illyricum where Ursacius and Valens are described as 'auctores autem heresis Arrianae uel Aecianae', *Ep.* 3 (CSEL 65. 158. 24-5). Hilary could speak of an 'Arii spiritus ex angelo diaboli in lucis angelum transfiguratus' whose current progeny were Valens, Ursacius, Auxentius, Germinius, and Gaius, *Auxent.* 5 (PL 10. 612A).

heresy',⁴¹ while his followers become 'disciples of [Arius]' heresy'⁴² and 'leaders and sharers in the same heresy as the Ariomaniacs'.⁴³ In the highly charged context of the original controversy, this was perhaps understandable, but unfortunately until very recently the same assumptions have governed almost all modern discussions of the subject.⁴⁴ That makes it all the more important to determine how the original participants understood their relationship to their own past and in particular Arius' place within it.

Given the paucity of evidence, it is perhaps only mildly surprising that the name of the great heretic is rare in the writings of the first 'Arian' generation,⁴⁵ but the same is not true of later ones. Locked in bitter conflict with an increasingly aggressive Nicene majority, these later authors were required to respond to allegations about their antecedents directly. The most fully represented are the western descendants of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Wulfila. They were forced to define their identity, not merely to justify their right to the Christian name,⁴⁶ but to

⁴¹ Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 59. 4 (Opitz ii. 139. 18); cf. however, Basil, *Ep.* 244. 9. 12-14 (Courtonne iii. 82), where even Eusebius' own followers are said to have described him as a κορυφαῖον τοῦ κατὰ Ἀρειον κύκλου.

⁴² Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 6. 1 (Opitz ii. 91. 33-92. 1).

⁴³ Ath., *Ep. Encycl.* 2. 3 (Opitz ii. 171. 5-6). In specific historical contexts, of course, a clearer distinction had to be made, as in Ath., *Syn.* 5. 1 (Opitz ii. 234. 1-3).

⁴⁴ A notable exception is Rowan Williams's *Arius*.

⁴⁵ In large part because very few such documents survive from that period. Of the thirty-five primary documents collected by Opitz (counting Urkunden 4a and 4b separately), only twelve derive from Arius' earliest supporters (Urkunden 2-3, 7-9, 11-13, 19, 21-2, 31, depending a bit on the definition of 'supporter'); of these only two mention Arius personally, and even they refer to him only in virtue of his symbolic role as leader of a party: Ath. Anazarbenus, *Ep.* 1, 2 (Urkunde 11. 2, 7, Opitz iii. 18), Geo. Laod., *Ep. Alex.* (Urkunde 12. 3, Opitz iii. 19).

⁴⁶ Nicene authors had long been prepared to speak of their opponents as 'Arians rather than Christians' (cf. Ath., *Ep. Afr.* 4 (PG 26. 1036C), *V. Anton.* 86. 1. 2-3, 2. 7-8 (SC 400. 356)), but by the latter part of the 4th cent. this had become a settled conviction, cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 1, 10, 22, 27, 2. 23 (PG 28. 1116A-1117A, 1133A, 1149B, 1157A-B, 1192D), Basil, *Eun.* 1. 1. 10-11 (SC 299. 142), 2. 19. 18-19, 22. 25-7 (SC 305. 76, 90), Ambrose, *Fid.* 5. 10. 1-2 (CSEL 78. 261), etc. As a result, the western opponents of Nicaea were at pains to assert that they came to their Nicene opponents as 'Cristiani ad cristianos', C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 12 (SC 267. 336), and Maximinus, *Comment.* 25.

establish their roots in the Christian past. It is obvious, then, that these authors (perhaps in contrast to Arius himself,⁴⁷) placed a strong emphasis on continuity in the Christian tradition and their own place within it. Bitterly resenting the name 'Arian',⁴⁸ they insisted, in terms already venerable,⁴⁹ that theirs

302'. 35-302'. 1 (SC 267. 224), cf. Ar. ign., *Sermo* 34 (PL 42. 682): 'nos vero Christiani' in contrast to the heretical 'Homousiani'. Eunomius too could speak of those who, unlike his opponents, were concerned 'to be' as well as 'to seem' Christians (*Apol.* 6. 1-2 (Vaggione 38)), while the non-Nicene author of an anonymous commentary on Job speaks of those who call themselves 'Christians' while possessing only a 'specimen pietatis' (*Job* 1 (PG 17. 427C)).

⁴⁷ It is difficult to know the extent to which Arius saw himself as an innovator. He certainly claimed to be persecuted for his loyalty to τὴν πάντα νικῶσαν ἀλήθειαν (Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 1 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 1. 2)) and to be the defender of a catholic faith learnt ἐκ προγόνων (Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 3), cf. *Ep. Const.* 4 (Urkunde 30, Opitz iii. 64. 15-16), Ath., *Ep. mort. Ar.* 2. 1 (Opitz ii. 179. 2-5)), but these προγόνου may have been representatives of a self-consciously esoteric tradition, for he speaks of them (perhaps conventionally) as inspired by the Holy Spirit and, like St Antony, θεοδιδάκτοι (Ath., *Ar.* 1. 5 (PG 26. 20C-21A), cf. Ath., *V. Anton.* 66. 2. 4-5 (SC 400. 308)); his own followers are said to have described his teaching as a σοφίαν καὶ νῆν, Ath., *Ar.* 1. 4 (PG 26. 20A). In this context, cf. the interesting, if somewhat problematic, suggestion by Rowan Williams that Arius was at once theologically conservative and philosophically radical, *Arius*, 175-8, 230-2, etc.

⁴⁸ e.g., Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 6. 5 277. 4-7 (CCL 87/i. 237): 'Nos uero cristiani, quibus inpositum est falsum nomen arrianos . . .'; cf. Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 88. 337'. 50-1 (SC 267. 274): 'Dic, quaeso, certe Palladium, Demofilum, et Auxentium quod diuersa tibi sentirent et quibus respondere promiseras, arrianos esse dixisti. . .'; Ambrose, *Fid.* 4. 9. 10-11 (CSEL 78. 191): 'Et Arrianos se negare consuerunt, qui proponunt Arri quæstiones!'; etc.

⁴⁹ The claim to be authentic representatives of Christian tradition had long been a theme of the opposition to Nicaea: e.g. *Symb. Ant.* (341) 1 (Hahn, § 153, p. 183); *Symb. Ant.* (341) 2 (Hahn, § 154, p. 184), etc. The anti-Nicene remnant at Ariminum also claimed to hold the 'ueritatem catholicam' found among their Oriental brethren, *Ep. Syn.* 2. 1 (CSEL 65. 87. 21-5), and this was likewise claimed by Valens, Ursacius, and Paulus in their *Ep. ad Germinium* 1. 1, 1. 2, 1. 3 (CSEL 65. 159. 10, 18-21, 21-3). Germinius himself insisted that his teaching was 'a patribus traditum . . . et diuinis scripturis', *Ep. Ruf.* 1. 2 (CSEL 65. 161. 4-6). The diverse senses in which 'tradition' could be used, however, is shown by the Oriental delegates to the Council of Serdica (= Philippopolis), who in their synodical letter, *Ep. Syn.* 1 (CSEL 65. 49. 14-21), say that their aim is to preserve the 'parentum traditio', and that the 'euangelica atque sancta praecepta et quae sanctis et beatissimis apostolis iussa sunt et maioribus nostris atque a nobis ipsis . . . seruata sunt et seruantur'. In many cases, however, it is clear they mean canonical rather than theological

was the faith of apostles, the teaching of early bishops and pontiffs,⁵⁰ and the heritage of a past symbolically represented in the person of the martyred bishop, Cyprian.⁵¹ That the long dead Arius⁵² should be part of that past could hardly be denied; that he might be central to its meaning could scarcely be admitted. Yet efforts to define his role more closely tended to end in ambiguity; a definitive assessment seemed to elude his ancient followers as often as ourselves.

One reason for this is clear: they were not entirely prepared to drop Arius. As convinced as any Nicene that their opponents' inspiration was diabolic,⁵³ and just as prepared to give them a sinister pedigree,⁵⁴ they none the less could not reject the tradition, *ibid.* 23. 4, cf. 12. 2, 17. 1 (*CSEL* 65. 63. 17-19, cf. 57. 12-13, 59. 10-15). Cf. also the texts cited below in Ch. 4 n. 265.

⁵⁰ Cf. e.g. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 44. 304^v. 38-40 (*SC* 267. 236) who portrays Wulfila as teaching 'secundum traditionem et auctoritatem diuinarum scripturarum', and as 'de diuinis scripturis caute instructus et in multis consiliis sanctorum episcoporum diligenter confirmatus', *ibid.* 46. 305^t. 19-25 (*SC* 267. 238). Cf. also Ar. ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 1. 2. 3^t. 16-22 (*CCL* 87/i. 199), where the sources of Luke's gospel are described as, 'SICUT TRADIDERUNT NOBIS priores et praecessores apostoli, guuermatores fidei et rectores, uetusti antistites et pontifices. . .'. Considerable emphasis is also laid on fidelity to the barque of Peter, *ibid.* 5: 3. 157^t. 10-23 (*CCL* 87/i. 214-15), though both Maximinus and Palladius, on the other hand, are at pains to point out that this means fidelity to Peter's faith, not necessarily to his successor, Maximinus, *Comment.* 78. 31^t. 3-17 (*SC* 267. 260-2), Palladius, *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 123. 344^t. 15-42 (*SC* 267. 306).

⁵¹ The works of many authors can be discerned behind the writings of this school, but 'sanctus Cyprianus' is cited most frequently by name, e.g. Maximinus, *Comment.* 13. 299^t. 1-300^t. 29 (*SC* 267. 210-14); Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 3. 4. 47^t. 14-20 (*CCL* 87/i. 58); Ar. ign., *Pag.* 3. 5. 104^t. 23-104^t. 3. 4. 9. 107^t. 20-1, 7. 1. 110^t. 4-9 (*CCL* 87/i. 124, 128, 131-2).

⁵² Cf. Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 90. 337^t. 45 (*SC* 267. 276): 'Arri olim mortui'; also C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 66 (*SC* 267. 376), where Secundianus demands to speak 'uiuius ad uiuum'.

⁵³ e.g. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 45. 305^t. 3-5 (*SC* 267. 238), and the Anomoean interpolation in *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 3. 9 (*GCS* ii. 97. 14-16).

⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. C. Serd. (Philippopolis), *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 2. 4. 2 (*CSEL* 65. 50. 10-14, cf. 52. 11-14), where the teaching of Marcellus is said to be a combination of the heresies of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, and Montanus. If largely conventional, such accusations need not always have been without foundation; cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 67 (*PL* 10. 525A), where he warns the Gallic bishops that 'multi ex nobis' hold the Sabellian position.

heresiarch outright. This left them perpetually vulnerable.⁵⁵ A specific encounter is a case in point. Toward the controversy's close two Illyrian 'Arians', Palladius and Secundianus, were haled before St Ambrose. The great doctor could find no more fruitful strategy than to confront them with a letter of Arius.⁵⁶ Under the circumstances the bishops claimed never to have heard of it,⁵⁷ and successfully avoided either condemnation or support,⁵⁸ but their less embattled colleagues were able to be more frank. Rejecting all non-episcopal tradition, these claimed that Arius' teaching was to be accepted only in so far as it was consistent with the tradition represented by St Cyprian.⁵⁹ Arius, in other words, was to be seen as a witness to, not a source of, tradition. In some contexts it was possible to speak of a Christian profession to which a 'diuinum magisterium Arri' bore witness, just as did that of Theognus of Nicaea, Eusebius of Caesarea, or other departed episcopal luminaries,⁶⁰ but the 'sanctus' accorded such venerable figures as Cyprian, Palladius, or Demophilus is conspicuously denied him.⁶¹ Arius was indeed

⁵⁵ Cf. e.g. C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 13 (SC 267. 338): 'Negauit Arrius, hunc sequitur Palladius, qui non uult condemnare Arrium'.

⁵⁶ C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 12, cf. Maximinus, *Comment.* 25. 302'. 1-3 (SC 267. 338, cf. 224); the letter in question, quoted in part by Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 98. 339'. 38-46 (SC 267. 284), is Arius' *Ep. Alex.* (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12-13), available in a translation by Hilary.

⁵⁷ C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 14, 25, 31, cf. Maximinus, *Comment.* 27. 303'. 2 (SC 267. 338, 348, 352, cf. 226). This need not seem incredible when we consider that before Hilary went to the East he had never seen a copy of the Nicene Creed (*Syn.* 91 (PL 10. 545A)) and that before his composition of the *De Synodis* the Gallic bishops had been in blissful ignorance of any of the synodical creeds, *Syn.* 63 (PL 10. 523B-C).

⁵⁸ Cf. C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 11-54, esp. 28-34 (SC 267. 336-70, esp. 352-4). One is compelled to admire the coolness of these bishops amid a chorus of shouted anathemas; the less scrupulous Ursacius and Valens, for instance, in C. Serd., *Ep. Iul.* 2 (CSEL 65. 144. 6-13), had no hesitation in anathematizing Arius for saying that 'there was when he was not', that he was 'ex nihilo' and did not exist 'ante saecula'. Auxentius of Milan was more ambiguous, but he too claimed to be ignorant of Arius, *Ep.* apud Hilary, *Auxent.* 14, cf. 8 (PL 10. 617B, cf. 614B).

⁵⁹ Maximinus, *Comment.* 14. 300'. 3-14 (SC 267. 216); an insistence on episcopal tradition was already ancient, cf. *Symb. Ant.* (341) 1 (Hahn, § 153, p. 183).

⁶⁰ Maximinus, *Comment.* 40. 304'. 38-40 (SC 267. 234).

⁶¹ Cf. e.g. Maximinus, *Comment.* 14. 300'. 2-14 (Palladius and Cyprian), (SC 267. 216), and Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 249'. 1-2

to be seen as a persecuted champion of all-conquering truth,⁶² a theologian whose arguments were to be treated with undoubted respect, but one whose *ipse dixit* possessed no more authority than the faith to which it bore such outstanding witness.

Thus, by the end of our period the 'Arian controversy' had become in some respects a battle over rival visions of the past,⁶³ but we must still ask the extent to which that concern would have been shared by Aetius and Eunomius. They would undoubtedly have considered the westerners heirs of a common faith,⁶⁴ but they were under no obligation to share their opinion of Arius. What they certainly did do was share their conviction that Arius was not the author of that faith. Aetius and Eunomius, like their western colleagues, were convinced that theirs was the original form of the Christian faith,⁶⁵ the teaching of Bartholomew and the other apostles,⁶⁶ the contemporary representative of a revelation once received by Peter from the mouth of the Lord.⁶⁷ Yet to make such a claim is to recognize

(SC 267. 324): 'sancto et omni reverentia digno ac fidelissimo doctore Demofilo'. Not everyone, of course, was so niggardly, and it is possible that Arius was commemorated in at least one calendar of saints. In a Syriac martyrology apparently based on that of the church in Nicomedia prior to 360 we find listed on 6 June (July?): 'At Alexandria, the presbyter Arius'. It is not impossible that this is the heresiarch (PO x. 17. 11); Eusebius of Caesarea is commemorated in the same martyrology on 30 May (x. 17. 6-7).

⁶² Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 1 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 1. 1-2).

⁶³ And not just the recent past! The two sides were in fact engaged in an extensive battle over the total meaning of the past which involved extensive efforts to 'capture' the Old Testament theophanies for their own point of view. The battle over the immediate past was a particular instance of a much wider struggle. See below, Ch. 4, pp. 127-40.

⁶⁴ Cf. Philost., *HE* 2. 5 (GCS 18. 12-14).

⁶⁵ Cf. e.g. *Eun., Apol.* 2. 6-8, 27. 29-31 (Vaggione 36, 72); cf. also *AA* 2 (J i. 392. 18-19), 3 (J ii. 6. 9-11).

⁶⁶ Philost., *HE* 2. 6. 3. 5 (GCS 18. 15-19, 35. 9-11), where considerable emphasis is placed on the fact that the doctrine of the *ἐτεροούσιον* had originally been conveyed to the 'Indians' by St Bartholomew, who was also claimed for the Nicenes: Ruf., *HE* 10. 9-10 (GCS II. ii. 971. 24-973. 22), Soc., *HE* 1. 19. 2 (GCS 60. 25-61. 1), cf. Soz., *HE* 2. 24. 1 (GCS 82. 3-9), all based ultimately on Eusebius, *HE* 5. 10. 3 (GCS II. i. 450. 25-452. 2). Other appeals to the apostles include (St John) *Eun., Apol.* 15. 12, 26. 18 (Vaggione 52, 70), *AA* 3 (J ii. 116. 10-12, 299. 26-8), and (St Paul) *Eun., Apol.* 19. 6-7, 24. 5-6, 15-16, 27. 13 (Vaggione 56, 64, 64-5, 70), *AA* 3 (J ii. 116. 13, 297. 7-8).

⁶⁷ *Eun., Apol.* 26. 12-14 (Vaggione 70), and *AA* 3 (J ii. 114. 4-5, 115. 2-3, 7-8), cf. n. 50 above.

intervening stages—allegiance to a ‘pious and ruling tradition’⁶⁸ is acknowledgement of a debt to those who transmitted it. That is particularly true when, as here, there is a keen awareness of minority status.⁶⁹ Some of these mediating figures we have met already: Paulinus and Leontius of Antioch, Antony of Tarsus, and Athanasius of Anazarbus, Aetius’ teachers.⁷⁰ To these we must add Eusebius ‘the great’, bishop of Nicomedia and later of Constantinople, who like them was an ‘eyewitness’ and disciple of their common master, the Antiochene presbyter Lucian.⁷¹ Like Cyprian in the West this martyred theologian and exegete was perceived by those who succeeded him both as a source of identity and a legitimizing link with the Christian past. Arius, indeed, valued this so much that he was eager to identify himself as a ‘fellow Lucianist’ (συλλουκιανιστά)⁷² in spite of a conspicuous absence from lists of the master’s disciples.⁷³ The only two non-Lucianists who are known to us are Arius’ fellow

⁶⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 4. 6–7 (Vaggione 36–8).

⁶⁹ At least, that seems to be the import of Philostorgius’ portrayal of the Maccabees as an ultimately victorious minority in *HE* 1. 1 (*GCS* 5. 1–7). This stands in notable contrast to a western writer’s more serene portrayal of the Church as a waxing and waning moon which, having grown small, will one day revive, *Ar. ign., Jud.* 9. 3. 90^r. 1–14 (*CCL* 87/i. 107).

⁷⁰ See above, Ch. 2, pp. 16–24. It is worth noting that of the four teachers of Aetius, two, Paulinus and Athanasius of Anazarbus, are included in a list of those *περὶ Εὐσέβιον*; the others are Narcissus, Patrophilus, Maris, and Theodotus, *Ath., Syn.* 17. 1 (Opitz ii. 244. 22–4).

⁷¹ Philost., *HE* 1. 8a, cf. 9, 9b (*GCS* 9. 20–3, cf. 10. 3, 33–4). Eusebius was apparently not, however, an ‘eyewitness’ of the martyrdom, which took place at Nicomedia in 311 or 312 (cf. Eus., *HE* 8. 13. 2, 9. 6. 3 (*GCS* II. ii. 772. 2–6, 812. 10–15)). Citing one of Lucian’s own letters, the surviving *Lives* identify Antony of Tarsus as the martyr’s ‘best disciple’ and the companion of his sufferings, Philost., *HE*, Anhang VI. 10, 14 (*GCS* 192. 15–18, 196. 16–17).

⁷² Along with Eusebius of Nicomedia, Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 5 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 3. 7). If a connection with Lucian was the source of Eusebius’ title ‘the great’ (see n. 71), one wonders if he did not find Arius’ efforts to ingratiate himself a bit presumptuous.

⁷³ Prepared by one of Eunomius’ disciples, cf. Philost., *HE* 2. 14 (*GCS* 25. 10–15); this omission is sufficient to show the attitude of Eunomius’ descendants, but not the status of Arius, for the list is clearly not exhaustive; Athanasius of Anazarbus is omitted, for instance, while Lucian is said to have had πολλοὺς μὲν καὶ ἄλλους μαθήτας, *HE* 2. 14 (*GCS* 25. 10). Arius, however, is unique among them in one respect, for as noted by Bardy, *Recherches*, pp. v–vi, in the midst of a host of Syrians and Cappadocians, he is the only Libyan or Alexandrian.

countrymen, the Libyan bishops Theonas and Secundus. Though certainly willing to support their compatriot,⁷⁴ they were also willing to criticize him.⁷⁵ As we have seen, Secundus was responsible for bringing Aetius and Eunomius together in the first place.⁷⁶

Lucian was undoubtedly a crucial link, but the penchant for critical acceptance represented by Secundus and Theonas is also significant. For while the continuity so prized by Wulfila's descendants was equally important to Aetius and Eunomius, the nature of that continuity was different. Palladius and Secundianus, after all, were 'westerners', the colleagues as well as the rivals of Ambrose and Augustine.⁷⁷ The kind of continuity they envisaged, therefore, was an ecclesiastical one, a succession of bishops fittingly symbolized by St Cyprian, himself both martyr and bishop. Lucian, on the other hand, the corresponding figure for Aetius and Eunomius, while undoubtedly a 'hooly blisful martir', was also a presbyter whose extraordinary authority derived not from his ecclesiastical position, but from his skill as a theologian and exegete.⁷⁸ The succession envisaged by Aetius and Eunomius, in other words,

⁷⁴ Cf. Alex., *Ep. Encycl.* 6 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 7. 16–17) and n. 73 above.

⁷⁵ Cf. e.g. Philost., *HE* 2. 3 (GCS 14. 5–9), where Secundus and Theonas are praised along with Leontius, Antony of Tarsus, and Eusebius of Nicomedia as being almost alone in rejecting an *ἀπορίαν* of Arius.

⁷⁶ See Ch. 2 n. 87 above.

⁷⁷ The presence of excerpts from the writings of Augustine and Jerome in an otherwise solidly 'Arian' MS (Verona Ms. Bibl. Capit. LI [49]), and the presence of both Nicene and non-Nicene authors in a collection of homilies in the same volume (*De Lectionibus Sanctorum Euangeliorum*) show that neither party lived in a sealed world; they held many assumptions in common. Compare the comments of R. Gryson in *CCL* 87/i, pp. xviii–xx; the various fragments are listed, *ibid.* 46.

⁷⁸ This accords well with the presentation of Lucian in the anomoean commentary on Job by Julian, where he is not only τοῦ φιλοχρίστου μάρτυρος, but also, and perhaps primarily, ὁ θεοφιλὴς ἐξηγούμενος, Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 30. 22–31. 1). Cf. also the Life of Lucian by Symeon Metaphrastes, Philost., *HE*, Anhang VI. 18 (GCS 199. 10–13), where Symeon sees divine approbation of Lucian's exegetical labours in the separate fates of his right arm and the rest of his body (!). In the Pseudo-Athanasian, *Dial. Trin.* 3. 1 (PG 28. 1204A–B) 'Macedonius' is portrayed as insisting on the martyred exegete's authority and in still another non-Nicene commentary on Job the blessed martyr is said to have been 'lucidus vita, lucidus et fide, lucidus etiam tolerantiae consummatione' in accordance with his name (Lucianus), Ar. ign., *Job* 2 (PG 17. 471A).

was one of *periti*, of 'experts' bearing witness in varying degrees to the 'teaching of the saints'.⁷⁹ The authority of these experts could be determined on the basis of their fidelity to the founding revelation. Lucian himself was beyond criticism—any errors of his could be assumed to be interpolations⁸⁰—but anyone less privileged was more vulnerable. Thus Philostorgius tells us that not only had Eusebius of Caesarea and Arius erred,⁸¹ but that (if it were possible 'to deceive the very elect') even some of Lucian's own disciples had gone astray. Of the ten such disciples named by Philostorgius, five are said to have erred to one degree or another, not excluding the 'great' Eusebius himself.⁸² Assessments so confidently expressed are the signs of some other concern, and in this case its identity is not in doubt: to 'continuity' we must add *akribēia* (ἀκρίβεια), precision in doctrinal expression. Aetius and Eunomius were convinced (perhaps reflecting Lucian's own concern for textual accuracy⁸³) that the biblical record was an unerring reflection of a divine precision.⁸⁴ Indeed, this concern so visible in their own writings⁸⁵ is almost a leitmotif in those of their followers.⁸⁶ But

⁷⁹ Eun., *Apol.* 25. 3-4, cf. 15. 3-4, *EF* 6. 1-2 (Vaggione 66, cf. 50, 158). One teaching derived from such a 'saint' may have come directly from Lucian himself, for he is specifically said to have taught a doctrine of 'innate knowledge' similar to that of Aetius and Eunomius, Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 31. 8-9, cf. 30. 22-31. 1).

⁸⁰ Thus, the occurrence of ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα in his writings could be explained on the assumption that Asterius the Sophist had interpolated them, Philost., *HE* 2. 15 (*GCS* 25. 25-7).

⁸¹ Philost., *HE* 1. 2, 2. 3 (*GCS* 6. 2-5, 14. 1-5), cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 12. 2 (*GCS* 154. 18-22).

⁸² Philost., *HE* 2. 14, cf. 15 (*GCS* 25. 10-15, cf. 25. 22-5).

⁸³ Lucian had produced a highly influential revision of the Greek Bible which was well received, even by so captious a critic as Jerome: *Vir. Inlus.* 77 (*TU* 14. 1. 41. 29-42. 1), *Prologus in Libro Paralipomenon* (Weber i. 546. 9-10); cf., however, *Praefatio in Evangelio* (Weber II. 1515. 23-7).

⁸⁴ Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 17. 12-13, cf. *EF* 2. 2-3 (Vaggione 54, cf. 150).

⁸⁵ Though the word is not found in the little that survives from Aetius, its cognates appear frequently in the writings of his disciple: Eun., *Apol.* 4. 8, 6. 16, 7. 15, 9. 17, 22. 7 (Vaggione 38, 40, 44, 62); *AA* 2 (J i. 326. 17, 21, 328. 23/4), 3 (J ii. 284. 25).

⁸⁶ This is particularly true of the anomoean commentary on *Job* by Julian. Starting from the exact knowledge proper to God, who knows things with a precision based not on numerical knowledge but on an ἀνάρχον θεωρίας (*Job* (Hagedorn 233. 18-19, cf. 70. 7-9, 150. 7-8), see below Ch. 6, pp. 253-8, Ch. 7, p. 284), Julian mentions not only the many things which, revelation apart,

where theology must be 'precise', tradition can only be treated critically.⁸⁷ No intermediate authority can be preferred to the clarity of the original revelation.⁸⁸ In the end, then, all theologians, whether Nicene or 'Arian', must be prepared to be judged before the bar of an unerring and clearly discernible divine Truth.⁸⁹

Such convictions are not likely to make one popular—indeed, it is difficult not to wonder with Job whether wisdom might not be expected to 'die with them'—but of one thing we can be sure: that Arius was as subject to this exacting standard as any other theologian. So far from possessing the privileged authority of a Cyprian or Lucian, his was the more ambiguous role of one whose unjust condemnation had inaugurated a new era in Christian history.⁹⁰ If his innocence was to be stoutly maintained, his theology was to be no less minutely scrutinized; for though certainly a witness to 'the arguments used in times past by the saints',⁹¹ he was also the source of doctrinal incongruities whose seductive appeal had misled many.⁹² In the highly charged atmosphere of Arius' native city, then, Aetius and Eunomius found themselves the uncomfortable partisans of a theologian whose teachings they could only partially accept.⁹³

That left them, of course, still very much on the 'left'. Arius

we cannot know exactly (Hagedorn 65. 9–11, cf. 84. 13–15), but portrays Job as asking God to stop speaking *ἀνύμωτος* and to tell him precisely wherein he has erred (Hagedorn 147. 1–4, cf. 69. 18–19). In contrast to the opponents of truth, moreover (Hagedorn 257. 6–7), Job is not only morally exact (Hagedorn 189. 17–18, cf. 133. 10), but, like Elihu, teaches the exact truth about the resurrection of the body (Hagedorn 100. 16–17, cf. 220. 4–6) and contemplates the righteousness of God with precision (Hagedorn 27. 6–7).

⁸⁷ It is possible they claimed an inherent human right to question, cf. Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 2. 304, cf. 353–6 (*SC* 28bis. 166, cf. 170).

⁸⁸ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 284. 20–5), cf. *Apol.* 2. 1–11 (Vaggione 36).

⁸⁹ Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 27. 29–40, cf. 3. 1–5 (Vaggione 72, cf. 36).

⁹⁰ Thus, Philostorgius begins his history of the contemporary Church with Arius' break with Alexander, Philost., *HE* i, prologue (*GCS* 4. 6–7).

⁹¹ Eun., *Apol.* 15. 3–4 (Vaggione 50), referring to an argument found also in Arius, *Ep. Eun.* 4–5 (Opitz iii. 2. 9–3. 8).

⁹² Philost., *HE* 2. 3 (*GCS* 14. 2–9).

⁹³ This is a further reason for thinking that Aetius cannot have been the editor of a revised version of the *Thalia* as suggested in Kannengiesser, *Crisis*, 16. In addition to the reasons mentioned by T. A. Kopecek, *ibid.* 54–7, it seems unlikely that Arius would have had the kind of authority in Aetius' eyes which would have made revision of his works necessary.

may have occupied an ambiguous place on their sliding scale of theological virtue, but Aetius and Eunomius were as convinced as any of his other partisans that he had been condemned for loyalty to a fundamental Christian truth,⁹⁴ and that on that level at least he was to be supported unequivocally. Thus, as they looked back on their immediate past, their understanding of it was strikingly different from that of their adversaries. It is true enough that partisan accounts of the controversy's origins had appeared almost on the morrow of the dispute itself,⁹⁵ and that even the emperor had difficulty getting the facts,⁹⁶ but by the time Aetius and Eunomius arrived in Alexandria the rival versions had already hardened into 'fact'. The version transmitted by one of Aetius and Eunomius' later followers is doubtless (at some remove) a glimpse of the recent past as seen by their Alexandrine colleagues.⁹⁷ According to this group, then, Arius was the unhappy victim of local jealousy and international intrigue; a presbyter of enough standing to be able to swing an episcopal election,⁹⁸ he had come into conflict with his bishop only because an appropriately misshapen colleague had invented the doctrine of the *homoousion*.⁹⁹ His subsequent condemnation at Nicaea was a result of the sinister machinations of Alexander of Alexandria and Hosius of Cordoba, who briefly

⁹⁴ Cf. Philost., *HE* 2. 3 (*GCS* 14. 1).

⁹⁵ Both sides are said to have sent rival embassies to other bishops, Soc., *HE* 1. 6. 36 (*GCS* 11. 17-20).

⁹⁶ This seems to be part of what is implied by his exasperated rebuke of both the participants in *Ep. Alex. et Ar.* 6 (Urkunde 17, Opitz iii. 33. 1-5).

⁹⁷ It is worth noting that the Nicene account which is closest to that of Philostorgius is that found in the *Panarion* of Epiphanius whose works show numerous signs of familiarity with Alexandria and its tradition (cf. e.g. nn. 6 and 18 above). Epiphanius is the only Nicene source to mention that the name of Arius' parish was Baucalis or to tell us that another presbyter served there with him, *Haer.* 68. 4. 2, cf. 69. 1. 2 (*GCS* iii. 144. 5-8, cf. 152. 20-1); though garbled by their authors' prejudices, both accounts seem to be developments of a common tradition.

⁹⁸ It was his support that had made Alexander bishop in the first place, Philost., *HE* 1. 3 (*GCS* 6. 8-10).

⁹⁹ The grotesque story of the invention of *ὁμοούσιος* by Arius' hunchbacked colleague Baucalis (cf. n. 97 above) sounds like a bit of Alexandrian bazaar gossip based on a specious etymology of the name of Arius' parish church, Philost., *HE* 1. 4 (*GCS* 6. 11-17). The unfortunate presbyter's handicap was a visual metaphor of the 'Arian' understanding of his doctrine: a single entity joined to an adventitious mass of deformed flesh 'of one substance' with it.

hoodwinked the emperor,¹⁰⁰ so that in the face of imperial terror all but two of his supporters fell away, leaving Arius to stand alone.¹⁰¹ None the less, though banished to Illyricum,¹⁰² his isolation scarcely outlasted his exile; after only a few years according to Philostorgius, so many of his enemies had come to their senses that the emperor not only repudiated *homousios*, he reaffirmed the genuine distinction between Father and Son.¹⁰³ So complete was the triumph of this 'orthodoxy', indeed, that even Alexander of Alexandria returned to the fold and was graciously admitted to communion by the followers of a restored Arius.¹⁰⁴

Doubtless the product of wishful thinking, this almost photographic negative of the Nicene version of the same events is a striking reminder of the gulf opened in the Christian imagination by the condemnation of Arius. The council at which he was condemned marked not only a parting of the ways doctrinally but, in effect, the beginning of separate histories—for as Eunomius looked back on the now distant events of the time of his birth he discerned a past fundamentally different from that of his Nicene contemporaries. The condemnation of Arius had marked a point at which previously tacit divisions became fully explicit. As each side looked back on this event in light of its subsequent history it became from their different points of view the node of an otherwise unbroken line linking them to the apostles. In each case the point of intersection was the Council of Nicaea.

Most later histories were written from the point of view of the eventual victors, and successive generations have tended to treat Nicaea's opponents as the 'wholly others' of western theology.¹⁰⁵ 'An-homoeans' indeed, they have been relegated to the

¹⁰⁰ Philost., *HE* 1. 7, 7a (*GCS* 8. 1–9. 2, 8. 5–17).

¹⁰¹ Philostorgius lists twenty-two supporters of Arius at Nicaea, *HE* 1. 8a (*GCS* 9. 10–23), of whom all but Secundus and Theonas are said to have subscribed, though many surreptitiously read *ὁμοιούσιος* instead of the invention of the unfortunate Baucalis, *HE* 1. 9 (*GCS* 9. 6–11. 3). Severianus Gabalensis, *Abr.* 6 (*PG* 56. 560D) seems to imply that there were only seven supporters of Arius out of the 318 at Nicaea.

¹⁰² Philost., *HE* 1. 10 (*GCS* 11. 15–16).

¹⁰³ i.e. the *ἐτεροούσιον*, Philost., *HE* 2. 1 (*GCS* 12. 6–13. 1).

¹⁰⁴ *HE* 2. 1 (*GCS* 13. 2–3).

¹⁰⁵ See Williams, *Arius*, 2, 5–6, 8, 11, 22–5.

story's margins and related to the main theological process primarily as foils of their conquerors. And yet if we take their own self-understanding seriously, we shall have to take a very different approach—for in their own eyes they were as much the heirs of an apostolic past as any of their opponents. Perhaps the best way to do justice, then, to these radically different perceptions of continuity is to treat the two sides as representatives of related, but increasingly independent historical and theological dialectics, dialectics which were to address, after Nicaea, a common theological problem. Such a framework enables us to understand each movement in its integrity while taking its internal diversity seriously.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, predecessors within the same tradition—even those like Lucian or Cyprian claimed by both—can be treated as parameters defining a dialectic and Arius himself can be seen, not as the founder of a movement, but as one of the factors determining its shape. This not only enables us to treat the controversy in dynamic terms, it enables us to acknowledge both the reality of continuity and the very real ambivalence felt by almost all 'Arians' about Arius. What remains is to establish the nature of the problem posed by the council that occasioned the split.

As the source of a rich theological tradition, the council that met at Nicaea in the summer of 325 was to acquire an authority which continues to the present day. In the middle of the fourth century, however, such authority was far from obvious, and, in spite of its size,¹⁰⁷ the council was guaranteed neither abiding

¹⁰⁶ By treating these dialectics as comparatively independent, moreover, we are able to take account of the apparent inability of either side to engage the other in a fruitful theological discourse. In spite of continuing contacts (see n. 77 above) and some reactive influence, most exchanges were either polemical or apologetic, and neither side seems to have been prepared to take the arguments of the other seriously. Thus in his *Apology*, for instance, Eunomius does not argue the falsity of the Nicene position, he takes it for granted; his primary goal is to show that the 'Semi-Arian' theology of Basil of Ancyra will eventually land him in the arms of Athanasius.

¹⁰⁷ Somewhere around 300. Numbers vary considerably in the sources. According to Eustathius of Antioch, an actual participant, there were about 270, though *διὰ τὸν τῆς πολυανδρίας ὄχλον* he could not be certain, *Thdt.*, *HE* 1. 8. 1 (*GCS* 33. 24–34. 3); Eusebius of Caesarea speaks of 'more than 250', *VC* 3. 8 (*GCS* i. 81. 2–3), while Constantine, in a letter to the Alexandrians, *Ep. Alexand.* 5, 8 (Urkunde 25, Opitz iii. 53. 7–8, 54. 3–4), speaks of 'more than

relevance nor automatic acceptance. Indeed, even thirty years later its creed, a theological manifesto rather than a summary of the faith, was so little known that Hilary of Poitiers could claim never to have seen a copy!¹⁰⁸ Moreover, in the eyes of many the council's authority was seriously compromised by its connection with the state; for, in an action destined to remain controversial even after eleven centuries,¹⁰⁹ a Roman emperor, as head of state, had summoned a council of the Church to deal with an ostensibly ecclesiastical problem, the condemnation of a presbyter by his bishop. That this problem was itself not without political overtones is shown by the prominent place afforded it on the council's agenda and the emperor's personal participation.¹¹⁰ Inevitably, such participation rendered the council's decisions as suspect to Arius' supporters as those of later councils were to be to Athanasius.¹¹¹ Any hope, then, that this council would prove to be the end rather than the beginning of debate depended on its ability to resolve the theological problem convincingly. If its efforts in this direction were not entirely successful, it is all the more important to try to deter-

300'. Athanasius, *H. Ar.* 66. 3, cf. 67. 3 (Opitz ii. 219. 17-18, cf. 220. 9), followed by Sozomen, *HE* 1. 17. 3 (*GCS* 37. 4-7), mentions 'around 320', though in *Ep. Afr.* 2 (*PG* 26. 1032B) he gives what eventually became the canonical number, 318, as do Hilary and Ambrose (Hilary, *Syn.* 86 (*PL* 10. 538B-539A); Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. prol. 32-7, cf. 16-20 (*CSEL* 78. 6, cf. 5)). In any case, on the basis of mere size later councils would have been as impressive; there were 'more than 400' at Ariminum in 359 (see below, Ch. 6 n. 94).

¹⁰⁸ See n. 57 above. On the other hand, twenty years later, Ambrose was prepared to describe it as written, not by 'humana industria' but by God, *Fid.* 1. 18. 18-23 (*CSEL* 78. 51).

¹⁰⁹ For the difficulties experienced at the Council of Florence over who might rightly call an Ecumenical Council, pope or emperor, see *Quae Sanctam Generalem Florentinam Synodum Antecedunt* (Mansi 31A. 473/4C-475/6E), and *Les Mémoires de Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence*, ed. V. Laurent (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1971), iv. 38-41 (240. 1-244. 24).

¹¹⁰ Concilia, C. Nic., *Ep.* 2 (Urkunde 23, Opitz iii. 47. 8-9), cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 4. 4 (*GCS* 98. 12-14). Constantine might well have worried, for in their rage some of the participants in this controversy had gone so far as to overturn the imperial statues, a very serious political offence, Eus., *VC* 3. 4 (*GCS* i. 79. 3-5).

¹¹¹ Ath., *H. Ar.* 36. 2, 52. 3, cf. 15. 3 (Opitz ii. 203. 15-22, 213. 5-10, cf. 190. 15-17); Athanasius is careful, however, to exempt the Council of Nicaea from such strictures. For the view of Arius' supporters see nn. 100 and 101 above.



mine what it is the participants thought the solution meant at the time.

It is unlikely that we will be able to do this definitively, but we can get a good sense of the issues by comparing this council with another that met earlier in the same year at Antioch—the solution proposed at Nicaea was at once both more nuanced and more limited. At Antioch the participants had depended for their information almost exclusively on Alexander of Alexandria.¹¹² They thus replied in detail to what they believed to be his position, and then went on to excommunicate any of their number who did not agree, including Eusebius of Caesarea.¹¹³ The goal at Nicaea was more modest. There the participants made no attempt at a general exposition, but concentrated instead on what they believed to be the most divisive issues. They therefore tried to address Arius' teaching from two complementary points of view, the one negative, the other positive. Negatively, they condemned certain propositions which dealt with the Son's status prior to the incarnation. No one was to say:

That there was ever a time when the Son was not in existence (*ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*);

That the Son was not in existence before he was begotten;

That he came into existence out of nothing or from some other substance or essence;

or,

That he might rightly be described as created, mutable, or changeable.¹¹⁴

This part of their strategy was successful. Negatively, these

¹¹² Concilia, C. Ant. (325), *Ep.* 7, cf. 6 (Urkunde 18, Opitz iii. 38. 5–6 (7–9), cf. 37. 15–38. 2 (37. 17–38. 3)). In fact, the opening words of this synodical letter are, in the (almost certainly correct) retroversion, identical with the opening words of Alexander's own encyclical letter: *Ἐνὸς σώματος ὄντος τῆς καθολικῆς . . . ἐκκλησίας*, *ibid.* 2 (Opitz iii. 36. 11), Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 2 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 6. 3). Since the bishops excommunicated Eusebius of Caesarea, they presumably paid no attention to any conflicting information he may have been able to provide. In their refutation of Arius, they again follow the points raised in Alexander's letter, C. Ant. (325), *Ep.* 8–12 (Urkunde 18, Opitz iii. 38. 11–39. 13 (38. 14–39. 16)).

¹¹³ C. Ant. (325), *Ep.* 14–15 (Urkunde 18, Opitz iii. 40. 6–18 (5–17)).

¹¹⁴ *Symb. Nic.* (325) (Urkunde 24, Opitz iii. 52. 2–4 = Hahn, § 142, p. 161).

'anathemas' were widely considered to summarize the main points at issue.¹¹⁵ The reaction to their positive solution, however, was more mixed. The bishops' starting-point is said to have been a profession of faith used in one of the local churches and connected with the liturgy of baptism.¹¹⁶ It was hoped that the addition of a number of specific phrases would exclude the offending propositions and make it possible to define the Son's relationship to the Father more acceptably. In the beginning the intent was to take these clauses from scripture. The Son would be described as 'not from nothing, but from God', the 'Word and Wisdom of God', and 'not a creature or thing made'.¹¹⁷ Moreover, he was to be affirmed as the true Power and Image of the Father, the Word exactly like him in all things (τὸν λόγον ὁμοιον τε καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον . . . κατὰ πάντα τῷ πατρὶ), existing in him without change or separation.¹¹⁸ None of these proved adequate. The reason was that in each case the opposition was able to come up with another passage which used the phrase in a sense compatible with the condemned propositions.¹¹⁹ The only remaining alternative seemed to be to go outside of scripture altogether. As a result the Nicene majority, in a decision of almost Edenic consequence, decided to introduce language from the technical vocabulary of philosophy. They

¹¹⁵ With variations these propositions came to be widely regarded, at least by Nicenes, as an adequate summary of their opponents' position: C. Nic. (325), *Ep.* 3 (Urkunde 23, Opitz iii. 48. 2-4); Ath., *Ar.* 1. 5 (PG 26. 21A), *Syn.* 15. 1 (Opitz ii. 242. 1-3), *Ep.* *Joan.* 1. 4 (PG 26. 816A, 817C); Soc., *HE* 1. 5. 2 (GCS 5. 24-6. 2); Soz., *HE* 1. 15. 3 (GCS 33. 3-9); Thdt., *HE* 4. 3. 4, 12 (GCS 213. 12-13, 215. 23-5).

¹¹⁶ In a somewhat ingenuous letter to his congregation, Eusebius of Caesarea implies, without quite saying so, that the council used the local creed of Caesarea (Hahn, § 123, pp. 131-2) as the basis of its labours, *Ep. Caes.* 7 (Urkunde 23, Opitz iii. 43. 26-44. 4, cf. 8-9). The very significant differences between that creed and Nicaea's, however, suggest at the least a very thorough process of redaction!

¹¹⁷ Ath., *Decr.* 19. 1 (Opitz ii. 15. 36-16. 1); the Synod at Antioch had adopted a similar tactic, cf. C. Ant. (325), *Ep.* 9 (Urkunde 18, Opitz iii. 38. 14-15 (18-19)).

¹¹⁸ Ath., *Decr.* 20. 1 (Opitz ii. 16. 27-30), *Ep. Afr.* 5 (PG 26. 1037A-B), here both less diffuse and more precise than Antioch, cf. C. Ant. (325), *Ep.* 10 (Urkunde 18, Opitz iii. 39. 1-3 (1-4)).

¹¹⁹ Ath., *Decr.* 20. 1-2 (Opitz ii. 16. 30-17. 5), *Ep. Afr.* 5 (PG 26. 1037B-1040A); cf. Hilary's complaint in *Trin.* 2. 5. 5-6 (CCL 62. 41): 'Forma fidei certa est, sed quantum ad hereticos omnes sensus incertus est'.

described the Son as begotten 'from the Father's essence' (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός), and as 'of one essence or substance', *homoousios* (ὁμοούσιος), with the Father.

This indeed excluded the condemned propositions, but not without cost. For one thing, there was the question of authority. In spite of valiant efforts to infer *homoousios* from scripture,¹²⁰ or derive it from such biblical rarities as *periousios*¹²¹ or *epiousios*,¹²² not even its most ardent supporters claimed to find it in scripture itself.¹²³ But if so, on what basis was it used? In creeds scriptural words and titles take their meaning primarily from their context and from their relationship to one another.¹²⁴ Many of them ('son', 'lord', 'king', 'father') also occur in ordinary discourse, and that can cause confusion. When a philosophical word is introduced into a creed, it is because its comparative clarity makes it possible to specify the meaning of the scriptural words more clearly. The usefulness of such words, therefore, depends on clarity. But if that is the criterion, then *homoousios* is not—to say the least—an obvious choice. Indeed, it would be interesting to know just who did choose it. It is unlikely to have been the bishops themselves. Like their predecessors at Antioch,¹²⁵ they were not well versed in philosophy,¹²⁶ and it was probably one of the many 'experts' present

¹²⁰ e.g. Ath., *Decr.* 21. 2–4 (Opitz ii. 18. 4–20), cf. Concilia, C. Arim., *Decr.* 1. 2 (*CSEL* 65. 96. 1–3).

¹²¹ Exod. 19: 5, 23: 22; Deut. 7: 6, 14: 2, 26: 18; Titus 2: 14.

¹²² In the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6: 11; Luke 11: 3), Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 15. 27–9 (*CSEL* 78. 152).

¹²³ e.g. Ath., *Ar.* 1. 30 (*PG* 26. 73B), *Ep. Afr.* 6 (*PG* 26. 1040B), Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 72. 1 (*GCS* iii. 220. 6–11).

¹²⁴ In creeds biblical words have been removed from their original context and are used in a sense which, though not unrelated to it, is determined in large part by their new context within the creed. Thus in the second creed of the Council of Antioch, for instance (Hahn, § 154, pp. 184–6), the role of the Son is characterized by a series of biblical words ('Word', 'Wisdom', 'Light', 'Way', 'Image', etc.) all of which take part of their specific meaning from their context (they are part of a paragraph dealing with the Son) and part from their relationship to one another (as a series they are intended to clarify the sense in which the Son is 'begotten from the Father before the ages' and is 'God from God', etc.). Philosophical terms have been added to some of them (e.g. 'exact' to 'image') because the compilers thought that, in view of the hostile environment, context alone could not guarantee their meaning.

¹²⁵ C. Ant. (325), *Ep.* 7 (Urkunde 18, Opitz iii. 38. 4–5 (5–7)).

¹²⁶ Eusebius, *VC* 3. 9 (*GCS* i. 81. 5–11) emphasizes their diversity and notes

to advise them¹²⁷ who suggested those famous five syllables.¹²⁸ But that was not the real difficulty. The real problem was that, at least as then understood, *homoousios* was almost unacceptably vague. It was much more useful in excluding the condemned propositions than in expressing the council's positive message.

At least one of the reasons for this lay in the word's pre-history. Like its opposite *heteroousios* (ἑτεροούσιος),¹²⁹ *homoousios* had been used by such philosophical writers as Plotinus,¹³⁰ Porphyry,¹³¹ and Iamblichus¹³² to discuss the soul's relationship to the divine. Thus in its original context this word described the relationship between two entities that had some things in common but were at least superficially different. The entities in question were considered to be immaterial, but much of the language used to describe them had a material origin.

that there were some who were distinguished for eloquence and wisdom; but though the Macedonian Sabinus exaggerates when he describes them as ἰδιώτας καὶ ἀφελεῖς, Soc., HE 1. 8. 24, cf. 9. 28 (GCS 21. 11, cf. 33. 11), most of them were probably forced to rely on the advice of their *periti*, just as Alexander is said to have relied on that of Athanasius. It is worth noting in this regard that Sozomen, who mentions this while discussing the participants' skill in dialectic, is careful not to limit his generalization to the bishops, HE 1. 17. 7 (GCS 38. 10-14).

¹²⁷ Cf. Soc., HE 1. 8. 14-15, 15. 3 (GCS 19. 14-20, 54. 6-8), Soz., HE 1. 17. 3 (GCS 37. 4-7), cf. Ruf., HE 10. 3 (GCS II. ii. 961. 28-962. 17).

¹²⁸ It would be interesting to know just who suggested this word initially, but it seems unlikely that we shall ever find out. According to Eusebius, *Ep. Caes.* 7 (Urkunde 22, Opitz iii. 43. 26-44. 4), it was proposed by the emperor himself, but since he is also said to have been only moderately accomplished in Greek (Eusebius, *VC* 3. 13 (GCS i. 83. 21-3, cf. 13)), he is unlikely to have come up with it in the first place. Ambrose claims that ὁμοούσιος was first mentioned by a horrified Eusebius of Nicomedia in a letter; his opponents then took it up to gall him. But while certainly possible (Eusebius did use 'substance language' prior to the council, *Ep. Paulin.* 3 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 16. 3)), Ambrose's statement seems based on inference from the letter rather than actual information, *Fid.* 3. 15. 15-21 (CSEL 78. 151), cf. Eustathius apud Thdt., HE 1. 8. 1-3 (GCS 34. 3-11). If Constantine did suggest it, we may assume it came from one of the bishops in his entourage (Hosius?), but one of their 'expert' advisers had probably suggested it to them.

¹²⁹ 'Of a different or alien essence'. Porphyry, *Sent.* 32, 35, 37 (Lamberz 32. 4-5, 40. 18-19, 43. 6-7), Iamblichus, *Myst.* 1. 19. 59. 4-5 (Des Places 73), cf. Or., *Jo.* 20. 24. 204, 206 (GCS iv. 358. 7-10, 17).

¹³⁰ Plotinus 4. 4. 28. 55. 4. 7. 10. 19 (Henry and Schwyzer ii. 114, 214).

¹³¹ Porphyry, *Abst.* 1. 19 (Nauck 54. 31-2).

¹³² Iamblichus, *Myst.* 3. 21. 150. 9 (Des Places 128).

Ousia—the word that underlies *homoousios*—is a case in point. It is usually translated 'substance' or 'essence' and in a philosophical context is considered to be immaterial. In its original sense, however, it meant something like 'possessions', 'stuff' or (physical) 'substance',¹³³ and that is the sense in which it is used in scripture.¹³⁴ Philosophers naturally try to exclude all those meanings when they use the term, but even so some of them survive imaginatively and tend to resonate in their cognates, including *homoousios*. Thus, it requires a considerable amount of mental discipline to exclude material images altogether. In Iamblichus¹³⁵ and Plotinus¹³⁶ the linguistic companions of *homoousios* are *ὁμοειδές*, *ὁμοφύες*, and *συγγενής* ('of one species, nature, or kind'), but the same considerations that apply to *homoousios* also apply to them. In an incautious moment, it is very easy to use them in a material sense, as though they referred to some kind of physical property or substance shared by a number of individuals. None of this is a necessary concomitant of *homoousios*, of course, but it is an obstacle to clarity. A person who was not being careful might very easily start to think that saying the soul was *homoousios* with God meant it shared some kind of *Urstoff*, or quasi-physical property with God.¹³⁷ Clearly, that is not what Iamblichus and Plotinus meant, but not everyone could be so imaginatively rigorous. In the absence of a clear distinction between grace and nature, it was possible for pagan¹³⁸ and Christian alike to speak of the experience of the divine as a kind of interpenetration of essence. People 'in the Spirit' could thus be said to be *homoousios* with God.¹³⁹ It is thus easy to understand why applying this word to

¹³³ e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 2. 4. 11–12 (SC 305. 20), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 1. 395. 18–19 (SC 231. 158).

¹³⁴ Luke 15: 12–13, cf. Tobit 14: 13 (BA), 3 Macc. 3: 28; at Ariminum, however, the Nicenes claimed that the word was in fact present by implication (*insinuatim*) in many scriptural passages, C. Arim., *Definitio Homousiarum* 1. 2 (CSEL 65. 96. 1–3).

¹³⁵ Iamblichus, *Myst.* 3. 21. 150. 8–9 (Des Places 128).

¹³⁶ Plotinus 4. 7. 10. 1–2, 19. (Henry and Schwyzer ii. 214).

¹³⁷ As e.g. negatively in Clement, *Strom.* 2. 16. 74. 1 (GCS ii. 152. 6–10).

¹³⁸ This is the general context of the passages from Iamblichus cited in nn. 132 and 135.

¹³⁹ This was the interpretation given by the Valentinian Heracleon, not only of the divine presence, but also of the diabolic, Or., *Jo.* 13. 25. 148–50, 20. 20. 168, 170, 24. 205–6 (GCS iv. 248. 31–249. 13; 352. 24–6, 33–5; 358. 13–19).

Father and Son made some people nervous. But there is yet another difficulty. When we use *homoousios* to describe how the divine generates, presumably we are saying that even though 'God' the Father begets 'God' the Son, the resulting entities are *homoousios* with one another. An unsympathetic person might very well take that to mean that a pre-existing divine entity had grown new parts or that it had somehow been divided in two. Previous Christian history seemed to suggest such fears were not groundless. An earlier Orthodox usage was alleged,¹⁴⁰ but all the more obvious examples were either heretical¹⁴¹ or the object of conciliar condemnation.¹⁴² The obstacles in the path of this word's acceptance were therefore truly formidable.

Its supporters were not ignorant of this. They knew that some people would take it as meaning an extension or diminution of the divine essence, or some sort of *tertium quid* underlying the divine Persons.¹⁴³ Even Athanasius said it had to be

Presumably it was some such understanding of divine inspiration that caused people to accuse the Nicenes of being 'Montanist', Soc., *HE* 1. 23. 7 (*GCS* 70. 2-5).

¹⁴⁰ Eusebius, *Ep. Caes.* 13 (Urkunde 23, Opitz iii. 46. 4-6); a glossator ad loc. identifies the Orthodox user as Theognostus of Alexandria, but Athanasius, though claiming that the latter supported ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας (*Decr.* 25. 2 (Opitz ii. 20. 33-21. 8)), fails to mention any use of *ὁμοούσιος*. On the other hand, Rufinus, in his translation of a work by Eusebius' teacher Pamphilus on Origen, the *Apologia pro Origine* 5 (*PG* 17. 580C), cf. Rufinus, *De Adulteratione Librorum Origenis* (*PG* 17. 619A), claims that Origen used this word to describe the Son in a now lost work on the Epistle to the Hebrews. If so, however, it is difficult to understand why Eusebius, who venerated both Origen and Pamphilus, failed to mention this in a letter addressed to their spiritual descendants. Elsewhere, only Sozomen, *HE* 1. 15. 5 (*GCS* 33. 14-16) and Theodoret, *HE* 1. 5. 6 (*GCS* 27. 15-16) portray *ὁμοούσιος* as an issue during the immediate prelude to the council. On the vexed question of the use of this word by the two Dionysii (of Rome and Alexandria) see the literature cited by Hanson, *Search*, 191-3.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Adamantius, *Dial.* 3. 7 (*PG* 11. 1797C), Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 3 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 10-13. 1).

¹⁴² A council meeting at Antioch in 258 is said to have condemned this word in the sense used by Paul of Samosata, Hilary, *Syn.* 81, cf. 86 (*PL* 10. 534B, cf. 538B-539A); Ath., *Syn.* 43. 1 (Opitz ii. 268. 16-19); Basil, *Ep.* 52. 1. 28-30 (Courtonne i. 134).

¹⁴³ Eun., *Apol.* 9. 3-15 (Vaggione 42-4), *AA* 3 (J ii. 51. 8-14), cf. Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 2 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 1. 8-2. 3), Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 3 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 16. 1-4, Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 44 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 26. 22-5),

used in a 'healthy' sense.¹⁴⁴ But how to be sure that this would happen? The official solution was to define the word very rigorously. *Homoousios* was to be stripped of all physical connotation and used only in the most carefully defined and restricted sense. As explained by the emperor, that sense was that all thoughts of passion, division, or separation were to be excluded and *homoousios* was to be used to express three things and three things only: that the Son is not similar to any created being; that he is similar to the Father in every particular (κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀφωμοιωσθαι); and that he derives his existence, not from any alien substance or essence, but from the Father alone.¹⁴⁵ This strict limitation of meaning enabled most of those present to sign the formula, if only for the sake of peace,¹⁴⁶ but sadly—and in part because of it—*homoousios* was unable to provide the lasting theological solution looked for by its proponents.

To understand why we need to think about the 'Nicene Creed' itself. Christians have been reciting a creed called 'Nicene' in worship for almost thirteen centuries, and that is the context in which we usually think of it. But the original 'Nicene Creed' had no such purpose. The 'faith' signed by the bishops

Soc., *HE* 1. 8. 32 (*GCS* 22. 22–23. 2), Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 4. 1–28, cf. 6. 2–4 (*CCL* 62. 103–4, cf. 104–5), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 8. 21–4 (*SC* 250. 192).

¹⁴⁴ Ath., *Decr.* 23. 2 (Opitz ii. 19. 17–19), *Syn.* 42. 1–2 (Opitz ii. 267. 27–268. 14), cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 88 (*PL* 10. 541A), Basil, *Ep.* 125. 1. 16–31 (Courtonne ii. 31).

¹⁴⁵ Eusebius, *Ep. Caes.* 7. 12–13, cf. 9–10 (Urkunde 23, Opitz iii. 44. 4–6, 45. 21–46. 3, cf. 45. 8–11); this 'official' explanation is clearly echoed in Ath., *Decr.* 20. 3, 5, cf. 6 (Opitz ii. 17. 7–11, 19–21, cf. 23–8), cf. Constantine, *Ep. Nicom.* 1, 3 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 58. 4–6, 13–15).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Eusebius, *Ep. Caes.* 10 (Urkunde 23, Opitz iii. 45. 12–14), cf. Eus. Nic., *Libell.* 1 (Urkunde 31, Opitz iii. 65. 4–5). Of the twenty-two supporters claimed for Arius by Philostorgius (Ruf., *HE* 1. 5 (*GCS* II. ii. 965. 3–6), followed by Sozomen, *HE* 1. 20. 1 (*GCS* 41. 15–17), mentions only seventeen), only two, Secundus and Theonas, are said to have refused to sign outright, but others are, somewhat implausibly, said to have substituted *ὁμοιούσιος* for the offending formula of Constantine, *HE* 1. 8a, 9 (*GCS* 9. 10–23, 9. 6–11. 3). Socrates mentions five who refused to sign, including (besides Theonas and Secundus) Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognus of Nicaea, and Maris of Chalcedon, though he also claims, *HE* 1. 8. 34 (*GCS* 23. 7–9), probably in an attempt to reconcile conflicting data, that Eusebius and Theognus later repented. Eusebius and Theognus themselves claim that they signed the creed but not the deposition of Arius, Eus. Nic., *Libell.* 2 (Urkunde 31, Opitz iii. 65. 6–10), cf. Soz., *HE* 1. 21. 3 (*GCS* 42. 15–18).

in 325 was a document for episcopal professionals. It was intended to provide, on certain specific issues, a guarantee of uniform teaching. As such, its purpose was neither homiletic nor liturgical but dogmatic—it was aimed at the pulpit, not the pew. Its content therefore consisted of both the polyvalent language of scripture and the comparatively univocal language of philosophy, albeit with the implied proviso that the latter be used only in a very restricted sense. At the council itself it was possible for bishops to do this because, in that context and for that purpose, they could undertake the rigorous act of abstraction necessary to use *homoousios* in the required sense. But once they returned home, they faced an entirely different problem. As soon as they tried to use *homoousios* in the course of their ordinary duties, it became obvious that, without redefinition, it could not bear the required meaning. In effect, it had been asked to do two incompatible things: on the one hand, it was to function as technical term from which all ‘ordinary’ meaning had been abstracted; and on the other, it was to function ‘ordinarily’ as the bishop’s guide to the polyvalent world of religious discourse. But that was not all. There was another and perhaps more serious difficulty. Because the council had elected to limit itself so severely and had chosen to deal with the disputed propositions and not their systematic context, there was no agreed interpretative framework within which to understand its solution. Thus even when the participants came to a verbal agreement there could be striking differences in interpretation. Eusebius of Caesarea is a case in point. Like most non-Egyptians,¹⁴⁷ he had signed the formula only after careful enquiry and after receiving assurances as to its strictly limited intent.¹⁴⁸ He therefore felt able to reassure his congregation at

¹⁴⁷ Eusebius, *VC* 3. 23 (*GCS* i. 88. 29–31), speaks of disturbances in Egypt after the Council, but this seems to have been connected with the council’s decision about Melitius rather than Arius; cf. *VC* 2. 61, 62, 3. 4 (*GCS* i. 66. 8–10, 17–20, 78. 28–79. 7), where the ‘Arian’ controversy in Egypt seems to have been largely Alexandrian and Libyan (as opposed to Upper Egyptian and Theban). Soz., *HE* 2. 21. 1–5 (*GCS* 76. 30–77. 24) speaks of considerable dissension and a joining of forces by ‘Arian’ and ‘Melitian’ against ‘the clergy of Alexandria’ (*HE* 2. 21. 4 (*GCS* 77. 12–13)), but organized episcopal opposition seems to have been primarily Melitian.

¹⁴⁸ Eus., *Ep. Caes.* 14, cf. 9–10 (Urkunde 22, Opitz iii. 46. 7–9, cf. 45. 5–14); cf. also Eus. Nic., *Libell.* 1 (Urkunde 30, Opitz iii. 65. 3–4).

home that subscription had in no wise altered his (or their) ancestral faith.¹⁴⁹ In particular, he made a point of telling them that *homoousios* was consistent with a strictly hierarchical interpretation of the baptismal formula (Matthew 28: 19).¹⁵⁰ In his zeal against modalism he understood the council's anathemas to be aimed more against Paul of Samosata than Arius, and could thus describe the Son's eternal existence as potential (*δυνάμει . . . ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἀγεννήτως*) before it became a reality in fact (*ἐνεργείᾳ γεννηθῆναι*).¹⁵¹ It did not bode well for the future that he could scarcely have found an interpretation more repugnant to Athanasius of Alexandria had he tried.

The bishops, then, did return home in peace. But the appearance of unanimity they brought with them served only to disguise a diversity of time was to make more pronounced. A very few had been convinced that to reject Arius was to embrace the *homoousion*;¹⁵² fewer still had determined that to reject it was to defend the Gospel; far larger and more diverse was that body of reluctant signers who, like Eusebius, had agreed for the sake of peace and now hoped that their reservations would be addressed. The concerns of this group are obviously important. Limiting ourselves for the moment only to those matters actually raised at the council, let us try to determine the kinds of solutions they would have been willing to consider. In effect our task is to try to establish the parameters of a dialectic which, more than twenty years later, was to provide Aetius and Eunomius with the context in which they 'did' theology.

This will be by no means easy. Writing nearly a century after the events he records, the historian Socrates describes the controversy of those years as a kind of 'battle in the dark' (*νυκτομαχίας*): on the one hand there were those who claimed that *homoousios* was Sabellian or Montanist, and on the other those who claimed that denying it was pagan or polytheist.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Eus., *Ep. Caes.* 3 (Urkunde 22, Opitz iii. 43. 5–6).

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. 5 (Urkunde 22, Opitz iii. 43. 15–21), cf. Arius, *Ep. Const.* 4 (Urkunde 30, Opitz iii. 64. 12–16).

¹⁵¹ Eusebius, *Ep. Caes.* 16, (Urkunde 22, Opitz iii. 46. 16–21), cf. Arius, *Ep. Const.* 4 (Urkunde 30, Opitz iii. 64. 12–16); the teaching of Paul of Samosata is implied, not mentioned.

¹⁵² Cf. Ath., *Deer.* 20. 6 (Opitz ii. 17. 26–8).

¹⁵³ Soc., *HE* 1. 23. 7 (*GCS* 70. 2–7), Soz., *HE* 2. 18. 3 (*GCS* 74. 15–19).

Moreover, very little of this appeared in public. Constantine insisted on a rigorous external peace, and this kept the two sides worshipping together for more than ten years.¹⁵⁴ Indeed, almost up to the very end of the reign it was safer to reinterpret *homousios* than deny it;¹⁵⁵ anything more venturesome had to be pursued in private. It is the latter, of course, that is of greatest interest. So far as we can tell, the main discussion was centred in Syria-Palestine and along the Asiatic shore of the Hellespont.¹⁵⁶ Its principal contributors are said to have been those described by their enemies as οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον,¹⁵⁷ 'the partisans of Eusebius (of Nicomedia). Membership in this close-knit group obviously varied over time, but it certainly included not only several disciples of Lucian but at least two of teachers of Aetius.¹⁵⁸ Early on we hear of Narcissus of Neronias, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Maris of Chalcedon, Paulinus of Tyre, Theodotus of Laodicaea, and Athanasius of Anazarbus,¹⁵⁹ as well as of Theognus of Nicaea and, later, of the young Illyrians Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa.¹⁶⁰ To these must be added the influential layman Asterius, retired 'sophist', disciple of Lucian, and indefatigable presence in ecclesiastical assemblies.¹⁶¹ Our information about their discussion is naturally limited, but we should be able to discover at least something about what was being discussed in this influential and close-knit theological circle.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁴ Soz., *HE* 2. 32. 1, cf. 3. 1. 1-2 (*GCS* 96. 30-97. 3, cf. 101. 4-9).

¹⁵⁵ Soz., *HE* 2. 32. 7-8 (*GCS* 98. 4-11).

¹⁵⁶ Soz., *HE* 2. 21. 6, cf. 33. 1-4 (*GCS* 77. 25-78. 5, cf. 98. 12-99. 8).

¹⁵⁷ e.g. Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 6. 1 (Opitz ii. 91. 33-92. 1), *Deocr.* 6. 4, 18. 1, 35. 11 (Opitz ii. 6. 11, 15. 9, 32. 38-9), cf. Concilia, C. Serd., *Ep. Cath.* apud Thdt., *HE* 2. 8. 6, 28 (*GCS* 102. 18-20, 109. 10-14 = Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 42. 5, 46. 1 (Opitz ii. 119. 23-4, 122. 14-18)), Thdt., *HE* 1. 21. 3, 4 (*GCS* 70. 9-11, 15-20). Note also in Soz., *HE* 3. 1. 5 (*GCS* 101. 21) the corresponding τοῖς ἀμφὶ Εὐσέβιον.

¹⁵⁸ See n. 70 above.

¹⁵⁹ Ath., *Deocr.* 17. 1 (Opitz ii. 244. 22-5), cf. Philost., *HE* 1. 8a (*GCS* 9. 14-15, 16, 17), where they are included in Philostorgius' very optimistic list of Arius' supporters at Nicaea.

¹⁶⁰ Soc., *HE* 1. 27. 7, 31. 3, 35. 2, cf. 2. 12. 3 (*GCS* 76. 4-7, 81. 16-17, 85. 5-6, cf. 103. 12-17), Soz., *HE* 2. 28. 13 (*GCS* 92. 5-10); note that Ursacius and Valens were still being described as 'imperitis adulescentibus' eight years after these events, C. Serd., *Ep. Iul.* 4. 1 (*CSEL* 65. 129. 7-8), and *Ep. Const.* 5. 2, apud Hilary, *Liber I Ad Constantium*, i (*CSEL* 65. 184. 7-8).

¹⁶¹ Soc., *HE* 1. 36. 3, cf. 5 (*GCS* 86. 8-13, cf. 15-17).

¹⁶² We have attempted neither to establish this circle's full extent nor record

One thing becomes clear almost immediately: there was never any real engagement with the theology of the *homoousion*. Constantine had tried to enforce a dialogue, but as soon as he was no longer present to do so there was little incentive to begin anew, and an earlier and more congenial dialectic could be resumed. If anything, its parameters were given new definition by an increasingly settled rejection of Nicaea. This debate seems to have been defined by three issues: the nature of the Son's premundane begetting; the degree to which the Son could be said to 'know' his God and Father; and the sense in which he is the Father's 'image'.

To start with the first of these, we may note that one of the assumptions that underlay almost all Eusebian and many Nicene efforts to understand the Son's generation or begetting was that 'generation language' inherently implies a discrete, and therefore finite activity on the part of God. Thus when Nicenes claimed that the Son was begotten 'from the Father's essence', many people took this to mean that the activity was a physical one—in other words, there was a starting-point before the begetting which led to a changed state after it. If with that in mind we claim that the new entity is 'of one essence' with its progenitor, it sounds very much as though the whole thing were comparable to dividing a piece of cloth in two.¹⁶³ No one really thought such language was applicable to God, but it did seem to suggest the need for another analogy. An imperial letter gives us a glimpse of some of the possibilities. Having exiled Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Emperor Constantine had occasion to address his outraged congregation,¹⁶⁴ trying to persuade them to accept its history. What is significant, however, is that its numbers not only varied with time and circumstance but that, in addition to those already mentioned, it included at various times such names as Dianius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Flacillus of Antioch, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Theodore of Heraclea, Acacius of Caesarea, Eudoxius of Germanicia, Gregory of Alexandria, etc., cf. Julius of Rome in Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 21. 1 (Opitz ii. 102. 13–14), Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 10 (*GCS* 107. 4–13). As to whether there was a second session of the Council of Nicaea or a Council of Nicomedia at which Arius and others were rehabilitated, see the literature cited by Simonetti, pp. 118–24, and Hanson, *Search*, 174–8.

¹⁶³ So Eusebius of Nicomedia according to Soz., *HE* 2. 21. 7 (*GCS* 78. 5–9). This concern was still visible fifty years later in Eunomius' *εἰς ὑπόστασιν τρισσὴν σχιζόμενον*, *EF* 2. 6–7 (Vaggione 150).

¹⁶⁴ They had been told that by resisting Nicaea they would become Confessors, Const., *Ep. Nicom.* 9 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 60. 2–5).

the Nicene definition. The emperor therefore starts with an emphatic rejection of any physical category as applied to God,¹⁶⁵ and then defines 'begetting' as 'undivided procession' (*ἀμερίστῳ προελεύσει*);¹⁶⁶ more to the point, he describes the Son as the Father's *boulēsis* or 'will'.¹⁶⁷ By using a 'psychological' analogy he was able to avoid the physical categories so repugnant to his hearers; he was also able to portray the Son as at once present with the Father and yet actively obedient to him.¹⁶⁸ We are not told whether his arguments were successful, but we may reasonably assume that they were chosen with an eye to what his hearers would find attractive. Since we know that similar arguments were in fact used by other members of the school,¹⁶⁹ it seems likely that this gives us a brief look at the terms of an on-going debate. As the members of this school tried to understand the Son's premundane begetting, one of the ways they were trying to do so was through the mystery of the divine Will.¹⁷⁰

The issue of the divine knowledge, however, was contested more sharply. To what extent could the Son be said to 'know' his God and Father? This will be discussed in a later chapter, but for the moment we can note that Arius, at any rate, considered the Son's ability to perceive his Progenitor as strictly proportional to his place in the chain of being (*ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἰδίοις μετροῖς*).¹⁷¹ That meant that, given the ontological gulf

¹⁶⁵ Const., *Ep. Nicom.* 9. 1, 4 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 58. 4-6, cf. 16-19).

¹⁶⁶ Ibid. 2, cf. 8 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 58. 7-12, cf. 59. 20-1).

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. 1, cf. 2 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 58. 3, cf. 11-12).

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. 2-3 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 58. 11-15); Eustathius of Antioch was also concerned with this problem, albeit with very different results, *Fr. in Prov.* 8: 22 30, cf. 31 (Spanneut 104. 9-12, cf. 104. 19-25).

¹⁶⁹ It was, for instance, presumably on some such basis that Eusebius later accepted the Nicaenum, cf. *Libell.* 1 (Urkunde 31, Opitz iii. 65. 3-5).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. e.g. Asterius Sophistes, apud Eusebius, *Marcell.*, fr. 34 (*GCS* iv. 190. 17-22). It is worth noting that, long before Constantine, Arius too had recognized that the bishop of Nicomedia would find the divine Will an appropriate analogy for the Son's generation, Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 4 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 3. 1-2), cf. *Ep. Alex.* 3 (Urkunde 5, Opitz iii. 13. 4).

¹⁷¹ Ath., *Ar.* 1. 6 (*PG* 26. 24A). In this paraphrase of the *Thalia*, Athanasius portrays Arius as saying that the Son both sees and knows the Father in proportion to his own capacities (cf. Philost., *HE* 10. 2 (*GCS* 126. 14-19). For Aetius and Eunomius' rather different approach to this problem, see below Ch. 7, p. 284). In the passage cited in n. 172, however, Arius is portrayed as speaking only of the Son's limited sight of the invisible Father. On the distinction between 'seeing' and 'knowing', see below, Ch. 6, p. 261.

between them, the Son could not know the Father either exactly (*ἀκριβῶς*) or completely.¹⁷² Athanasius actually claimed that, so far from knowing his Father's essence, Arius' Son scarcely knew his own!¹⁷³ It is worth pointing out, however, that in Arius' only direct surviving quotation on the subject, he speaks of 'seeing' rather than 'knowing': an inherently invisible God can be 'seen' neither by the Son nor any other being.¹⁷⁴ Whatever Arius actually meant, what both friend and enemy took him to mean was that God is beyond all comprehension, inconceivable, and unknowable (*ἀκατάληπτος*, *ἀεννόητος*, and *ἄγνωστος*).¹⁷⁵ Any such teaching obviously had implications for the doctrine of revelation, and otherwise sympathetic theologians found themselves sharply divided on the subject. Some, like Eusebius of Caesarea, agreed that God was indeed incomprehensible,¹⁷⁶ while others thought that any such teaching was an abomination (*ἀτοπίαν*). Significantly, among the latter were almost all who were close to Aetius and Eunomius: Secundus and Theonas no less than the 'Lucianists' Antony, Leontius, and Eusebius of Nicomedia.¹⁷⁷ Beneath the deceptively smooth surface of the opposition to Nicaea, then, the seeds of conflict were growing.

The remaining issue was also divisive, though for a different reason. Authors writing in the last few centuries before Christ had tried to explain the increasingly hypostasized figure of Wisdom by describing her as the 'image' (*εἰκὼν*) of the divine goodness.¹⁷⁸ Later, when it was necessary to find language to

¹⁷² Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 8 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 8. 4-5), Ath., *Ar.* 1. 6 (PG 26. 24A).

¹⁷³ Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12 (PG 25. 565C), Ath., *Ar.* 1. 6 (PG 26. 24B).

¹⁷⁴ Ath., *Syn.* 15. 3 (Opitz ii. 242. 19-24); the Son sees the Father *ἰδίους τε μέτροις*, even though in *Syn.* 15. 3 (Opitz ii. 242. 9) God is *ἄρρητος ἅπασι*. Note, however, that in Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 8 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 8. 4-5) and Ath., *Ar.* 1. 6 (PG 26. 24A), Alexander and Athanasius both speak of the Logos as unable to 'know' nor to 'see' the Father. This is taken by Kannengiesser, *Crisis*, 33, 38, and Williams, *Arius*, 211, as indicating that 'seeing' and 'knowing' are the same. Given his other statements about the Son's ignorance, this is probably correct, but we need to note that we do not have any *ipsissima verba* that say so.

¹⁷⁵ Philost., *HE* 2. 3, cf. 10. 2 (GCS 14. 1-5, cf. 126. 14-19), cf. Marius V., *Ep. Cand.* 1. 3. 28-9 (SC 68. 112).

¹⁷⁶ Philost., *HE* 1. 6 (GCS 6. 2-5).

¹⁷⁷ Philost., *HE* 2. 3 (GCS 14. 5-9), cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 12. 2 (GCS 154. 18-22).

¹⁷⁸ Wisd. 7: 26.

describe Jesus' relationship to his Father, that kind of analogy seemed an obvious one. Thus Paul and his imitators could describe Jesus as 'the image of the invisible God' (Col. 1: 15, cf. 2 Cor. 4: 4), the one who though in the form (*μορφή*) of God had not striven for equality with God but emptied himself, taking upon him the form of a servant and becoming obedient unto death, even death on a cross (Phil. 2: 6-8). The religious power of such language is obvious, but unfortunately it is ambiguous. It does not specify whether or not the resemblance is on the level of being, whether it is ontological or not. Thus in secular tradition it is possible to speak of wise persons as 'images' of God.¹⁷⁹ Moreover, the word 'image' itself seems to imply something which is distinct from its exemplar.¹⁸⁰ Then too, biblical language about Wisdom speaks of her as the image of God's *goodness*, not his person—not an ontological relationship at all. But there is a further problem. Even if we were sure that an ontological relationship is what was meant, most of the words used to describe it have some sort of material resonance. The Epistle to the Hebrews is a case in point. The author of that work says the Son is the 'very stamp of the divine substance' (1: 3, *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως*); but the word he chose to use is one usually associated with the minting of coins. Physical analogies are perhaps a concomitant of substance language as such,¹⁸¹ but in this case at least one of the words used to make things clearer only confused things more—that word was *ἀπαράλλακτως*, 'exactly' or 'without any difference'. In Eusebian circles the use of that word to qualify 'image' led to an impassioned debate.

One of the reasons why the word was controversial, of course, was quite simply that it had been used by Arius' enemies. They had described the Son as the 'exact image' of the Father (*ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν*),¹⁸² and at Nicaea said he was 'the

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Sextus, *Sent.* 190, DL 6. 51, Lucian, *Pro Imaginibus* 28; cf. also Philost., *HE* 3. 6a (*GCS* 36. 29-31).

¹⁸⁰ This could be interpreted in either a positive or a negative sense: positively in the sense that an image is a true if limited copy of its prototype, as in Heb. 10: 1; negatively in that it is by definition inferior to its exemplar, as in Plato, *Rep.* 509 E-510 A or *Tim.* 52 B-C.

¹⁸¹ See above pp. 55-7.

¹⁸² Cf. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 38 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 25. 25), Ath., *Gent.* 41. 2-3, 46. 60-1 (Thomson 112, 130); its continuing popularity with later

Word exactly like him in all things' (τὸν λόγον ὁμοιον τε καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον . . . κατὰ πάντα τῷ πατρὶ).¹⁸³ They believed that this addition would exclude Arius' teaching. In point of fact, it was found to be as vulnerable as everything else they tried. Their opponents evaded it at Nicaea,¹⁸⁴ and in earlier usage it had referred to an identity of will, not essence.¹⁸⁵ It was thus not without acceptable meaning,¹⁸⁶ but even so some of Arius' supporters refused to use it. In their eyes it did not really address the issue. The main problem was not whether or not the image was an accurate one, but just what it was an image of. Almost all Eusebians would have been willing to say the Son was the image of a divine attribute such as the will, but they would have been very reluctant to say that he was the image of the divine essence. That could all too easily lead to *homousios*.¹⁸⁷ There was one branch of the school, however, that was not so restrained, that associated with Asterius 'the sophist'. Asterius was undoubtedly committed to the Son's autonomous existence,¹⁸⁸ but he was also willing to say that the Son was the 'exact image', not merely of the Father's 'will, glory', and 'power' but of his essence (οὐσίας τε καὶ βούλης καὶ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα).¹⁸⁹ To many that did sound like *homousios*. Asterius was a disciple of Lucian, and since this formula occurs in a creed ascribed to him,¹⁹⁰ it may be that

Nicenes can be seen in Hilary, *Syn.* 32, 33, 54, 67, 69, 73 (PL 10. 504B–C, 505B, 519B, 525B, 526B/C, 528A), (Ps.–)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 1 (PG 29. 692A), etc.

¹⁸³ Ath., *Decr.* 20. 1 (Opitz ii. 16. 27–30), *Ep. Afr.* 5 (PG 26. 1037A–B).

¹⁸⁴ Ath., *Decr.* 20. 1–2 (Opitz ii. 16. 30–5).

¹⁸⁵ Origen, *Jo.* 13. 36 (GCS iv. 260. 32–4).

¹⁸⁶ Indeed, when pressed, even Aetius was prepared to use it, Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (GCS 65. 12–14). Some of the difficulties inherent in the concept are shown by (pseudo-?)Athanasius' attempt to use the similarity between the emperor and his statues to try to explain it, *Ar.* 3. 5 (PG 26. 332A). Aetius would have had no difficulty with this explanation at all! Another Pseudo-Athanasius displays a different method of escape; his 'Macedonian' distinguishes sharply between ἀπαράλλακτον and τὴν αὐτήν, *Dial. Trin.* 3. 2, 15, 16 (PG 28. 1205A, 1225C/D, 1228A).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 33 (PL 10. 505B, 506A), 54 (PL 10. 519B), 67, 69, 73 (PL 10. 525B, 526B/C, 528A), Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 8 (GCS 106. 25–9).

¹⁸⁸ As ἄλλος.

¹⁸⁹ Asterius Sophistes, apud Eus., *Marcell.*, fr. 96 (GCS iv. 205. 30–1, cf. 27).

¹⁹⁰ This is the so-called 'Second Creed of Antioch' in 341 (Hahn, § 154, p. 185). For the possibility that Lucian was the author, see Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 9, cf. 6.

Asterius was right in ascribing it to his master.¹⁹¹ But whether that is the case or not,¹⁹² the mere fact that there were so many others vehemently prepared to deny it shows that the issue was a crucial one.

While Constantine lived none of these issues could easily be discussed in public;¹⁹³ but with the emperor's sudden death in 337 everything began to change. The empire (in happy imitation of the Trinity!¹⁹⁴) was divided among his surviving sons and the fertile and theologically troubled East passed into the hands of the second, Constantius. The remaining brothers, Constantine and Constans, divided the West between them. Since this was the first truly Christian imperial generation it would be interesting to know who was responsible for their religious education; but though latterly it must surely have been someone acceptable to Eusebius of Nicomedia,¹⁹⁵ it cannot have been overly doctrinaire, for on their arrival in their new dominions the religious opinions of all the brothers bore a striking resemblance to those of their subjects. Still, it was somewhat ominous that the only exception was the new ruler of the East. Constantius had a personal interest in theology, and later even the pagans would complain that he had turned the relative simplicity of Christianity into a senile superstition.¹⁹⁶

12. 4 (*GCS* 106. 30-107. 3, cf. 252. 9-12). According to the *libellus synodicus* (elsewhere dependent on the historians) Asterius was actually present at this council, apparently in the entourage of Dianius of Caesarea (Mansi ii. 1350D).

¹⁹¹ Philost., *HE* 2. 15 (*GCS* 25. 25-7), cf. Bardy, *Recherches*, 125-7.

¹⁹² Bardy, *Recherches*, 9, 85-132, was convinced that the creed was Lucian's, albeit more circumspect on the question of interpolations, *ibid.* 109, 115-16.

¹⁹³ Soc., *HE* 2. 2. 1 (*GCS* 93. 3-6), Soz., *HE* 3. 1. 1-2, cf. 2. 32. 1 (*GCS* 101. 4-9, cf. 96. 30-97. 3).

¹⁹⁴ Eusebius, *VC* 4. 68. 3 (*GCS* i. 148. 27-9).

¹⁹⁵ Or someone under his influence. All the Nicene historians (apparently on the basis of Rufinus *HE* 10. 12 (*GCS* II. ii. 976. 23-977. 16)) speak of an unnamed but influential 'Arian' priest introduced into the court by Constantine's dying sister, Constantia, Soc., *HE* 25. 1-6, 2. 2. 2-7 (*GCS* 72. 4-73. 4, 93. 7-22), Soz., *HE* 2. 27. 1-4, 3. 1. 3-4 (*GCS* 88. 6-89. 1, 101. 11-19), Thdt., *HE* 2. 3. 1-7 (*GCS* 96. 7-97. 10) Though apparently identified (incorrectly?) with Eusebius of Nicomedia by Philostorgius, cf. *HE* 2. 16 (*GCS* 27. 1-5), Eusebius' influence certainly increased as the reign progressed and in the end it was he who baptized the emperor, *ibid.*, Anhang VII. 13 (*GCS* 209. 1-2, 19-20, 29-32).

¹⁹⁶ Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 16. 18.

His Nicene subjects were more ambivalent; by the end of his reign they described him as 'the enemy'. Unable to ascribe his changing policies¹⁹⁷ to either ignorance or poor advice,¹⁹⁸ they thought of him as a new Nero or Decius,¹⁹⁹ a disciple of the Antichrist.²⁰⁰ He himself complained of their 'unprofitable hair-splitting'.²⁰¹ Twenty-five years earlier, however, their attitude had been different.²⁰² Then there was little to indicate a personal hostility, and even after things had changed, incredulous Nicenes could be found asking themselves whether Constantius was really 'a heretic'.²⁰³ Still, if this emperor could start as the possessor of a 'beatae religiosaeque uoluntatis'²⁰⁴ and end up as Antichrist, it was because he had inherited a theological problem which neither Church nor State had been able to resolve. His father had managed to drive the debate underground, but it was not long before it became obvious that this was a luxury to be denied his son.

There is no need for us to try to unravel the complicated political manœuvrings that made that inevitable—the mere existence of an imperial triumvirate made suppression difficult—but we can try to determine some of the ways the shift from private to public changed the nature of the dialectic and thus helped define the kinds of theological problem addressed by Aetius and Eunomius. The geographical centre of this public debate, as earlier of the private one,²⁰⁵ was not Egypt but Constantinople, Antioch, and the cities of the Aegean littoral.²⁰⁶

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 3. 6 (*GCS* 97. 2-4).

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 78 (*PL* 10. 531A-B).

¹⁹⁹ Hilary, *Const.* 4. 1-5. 14, 7. 1-2, 8. 1-2 (*SC* 334. 174-6, 180, 182), cf. *Auxent.* 3 (*PL* 10. 611A).

²⁰⁰ Ath., *H. Ar.* 76. 1, 77. 1 (Opitz ii. 225. 13-15, 226. 4-5).

²⁰¹ Ath., *Apol. Const.* 30 (*PG* 25. 633A).

²⁰² i.e. outside Egypt. Our Nicene sources tend to follow Athanasius himself in interpreting political efforts to curb or remove him as religious efforts to undermine Nicaea. As we have already seen, however (nn. 23-5, 49 above), whatever their real motivation all the early accusations were canonical or political rather than doctrinal (cf. Soc., *HE* 1. 27. 7-19 (*GCS* 76. 4-78. 18), Soz., *HE* 2. 22. 3-4, 23. 1-8, 25. 3-5 (*GCS* 79. 1-10, 80. 12-82. 2, 84. 13-25)), and even in Egypt itself, as n. 203 makes clear, Constantius was not universally reckoned to be hostile.

²⁰³ Ath., *H. Ar.* 54. 3 (Opitz ii. 214. 5-7).

²⁰⁴ Hilary, *Lib. Const.* 8. 1 (*CSEL* 65. 203. 1-3).

²⁰⁵ See n. 156 above.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 2. 10 (*GCS* 94. 4-7).

A good place to begin is with one of the occasions on which these matters truly became public, and one of the best is the so-called 'Council of the Dedication' held at Antioch in the spring of 341.²⁰⁷ Though this synod was summoned to mark the completion of the city's sumptuous new 'Great Church', it was destined to have a chequered reception. Described by the Nicenes alternatively as 'an assemblage of heretics'²⁰⁸ or a 'synod of saints'²⁰⁹ its decisions did eventually come to be regarded as authoritative, and acquired a fixed, if ambivalent place in the collections of canon law.²¹⁰ But though it was chaired by Eusebius of Nicomedia²¹¹ and was allegedly aimed at the destruction of the Nicene definition,²¹² there is little to indicate so sinister a purpose. The ninety-seven participants, most of whom were from Syria or Asia Minor,²¹³ were aware that they worked in an atmosphere of controversy²¹⁴ and showed an unseemly zeal in distancing themselves from Arius,²¹⁵ but they began their legislation with an appeal to 'the holy and great synod' of Nicaea,²¹⁶ and according to Hilary were more interested in modalism than the *homoousion*.²¹⁷ The council's

²⁰⁷ Ath., *Syn.* 22. 1 (Opitz ii. 248. 18–19) regards the Council of Jerusalem in 335 as the beginning of the 'Arian' synods, but the matters discussed there were disciplinary rather than (directly) doctrinal.

²⁰⁸ *Libellus Synodicus* (Mansi ii. 1350C).

²⁰⁹ Hilary, *Syn.* 32 (PL 10. 504B), cf. *Const.* 23. 4–18 (SC 334. 212–14).

²¹⁰ Cf. Mansi ii. 1305–50.

²¹¹ Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 10, cf. 6. 7 (GCS 107. 4–13, cf. 108. 11–14), *Libellus Synodicus* (Mansi ii. 1350C–D).

²¹² Soc., *HE* 2. 8. 2, 10. 2 (GCS 97. 12–13, 99. 14–18), cf. Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 2 (GCS 105. 21–2).

²¹³ Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 2, cf. 5. 10–6. 1, 7 (GCS 105. 19–21, cf. 107. 4–13, 108. 11–14) gives ninety-seven, but according to Ath., *Syn.* 25. 1 (Opitz ii. 250. 22), followed by Soc., *HE* 2. 8. 3 (GCS 97. 14), there were only ninety. Twenty-nine names are appended to the synodical letter in Mansi ii. 1307A–1308B; all the participants in this manifestly incomplete list (cf. *ibid.* 1350C–D) are from Palestine, Phoenicia, Arabia Petraea, Mesopotamia, Coele-Syria, Cilicia, or Isauria.

²¹⁴ The Council is described as *ἀγία καὶ εἰρηνικωτάτη* in the MSS (Mansi ii. 1305–6), and the participants allude several times to 'the spirit of peace' and appeal for *δύμωια* and *συμφωνία* (*ibid.* 1305A–1308A).

²¹⁵ *Symb Ant.* (341) 1 (Hahn, § 153, p. 183).

²¹⁶ C. Ant. (341), *Can.* 1 (Mansi ii. 1308C).

²¹⁷ Hilary, *Syn.* 32 (PL 10. 504B–C), cf. Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 5–7 (GCS 106. 9–23).

present importance lies in its being the first in a series whose decrees form the collective backdrop to some of Aetius and Eunomius' earliest independent efforts to 'do theology'. Unfortunately, no less than four strikingly different formularies are associated with this doctrinally ambiguous assembly.

Of the four, only two are relevant here, the second and the fourth.²¹⁸ The second seems to have been the creed of the council proper and is associated with the glorious name of the martyr Lucian;²¹⁹ it was venerated in later generations as the true 'creed of the fathers',²²⁰ and could be regarded favourably even by so committed a Nicene as Hilary.²²¹ The fourth only appeared some months later and was sent as a kind of *eirenikon* to the western Emperor Constans.²²² Its importance lies in its almost verbatim reappearance in two later formularies published in the years immediately prior to Eunomius' arrival in Alexandria: one was a kind of 'minority report' issued by the eastern delegates to the abortive ecumenical council of Serdica in 343; the other an annotated version published at Antioch in 345 whose numerous and lengthy explanations caused it to be nicknamed 'Macrostich' ('long-winded').²²³ In what follows I shall not try to discuss any of these in detail but shall use them as a collective witness to the way in which the issues earlier discussed in private began to enter the public domain.

As we have seen, both at Nicaea and in the private debate

²¹⁸ It has been plausibly suggested by J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London: Longmans, 1960), 265, that the first (Hahn, § 152, pp. 183-4) was part of a lost synodical letter. It was general enough to defeat even Athanasius' efforts to discover anything in it more sinister than the identity of its authors, *Syn.* 22. 2 (Opitz ii. 248. 23-8). The chief thing against it is a certain resemblance to an equally general creed submitted by Arius to Constantine in 327 as part of an effort at rehabilitation (Urkunde 30, Opitz iii. 64. 5-11). The third creed (Hahn, § 155, pp. 186-7) was a private composition submitted by Theophronius of Tyana, apparently to clear himself of the charge of modalism, *Ath.*, *Syn.* 24. 1 (Opitz ii. 250. 5-7).

²¹⁹ See n. 190 above.

²²⁰ cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 40. 26 (*GCS* 174. 16-17).

²²¹ Hilary, *Syn.* 32 (*PL* 10. 504B-C), cf. Soz., *HE* 3. 5. 8 (*GCS* 106. 25-9). *Ath.*, *Syn.* 23. 1 (Opitz ii. 249. 9-10), mentions it but describes it only as *πλεῖστα*.

²²² *Ath.*, *Syn.* 25. 1 (Opitz ii. 250. 23-8).

²²³ In the following decade it was the basis of several further imperial efforts at comprehension, see below Ch. 6, pp. 206-7.

which followed the focus was on a number of specific problems surrounding the relationship between the Father and the Son. The systematic context of these problems was by and large ignored. With the advent of a new effort to express the faith in a conciliar format, however, this limitation was no longer possible. The modalist interpretation of the *homousion* associated with Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus of Sirmium²²⁴ (and in eastern eyes the Council of Serdica) forced a previously 'Christological' internal debate into a new 'Trinitarian' framework. It is therefore not surprising that we find the word 'Trinity' here in a non-Nicene context for the first time.²²⁵ The systematic questions glossed over at Nicaea now reasserted themselves with a vengeance, but, of the issues that characterized the private debate, only two came to the fore in public: the Son's premundane begetting and the nature of the divine image, and both in a new context. They were now part of a larger and more systematic discussion of meaning of relationship as such.

One of the reasons for a contextual change was the continuing ambiguity about language. The not overly clear 'majority report' of the Council of Serdica, for instance, had used the word *hypostasis* or 'substance' (later equivalent to 'person') as equivalent to *ousia*. It then went on to speak of the divine unity in terms of a single *hypostasis*.²²⁶ That kind of language was almost an invitation to misunderstanding. To unsympathetic ears it sounded as though a single entity or person had been divided into parts, a position described by its opponents as 'modalist' or 'Sabellian'.²²⁷ The Eusebians tried to combat this in two ways: first, by emphasizing the continuous

²²⁴ Of the documents under consideration only *Symb. Ant.* (341) 3 (Hahn, § 155, p. 187) and *Symb. Ant.* (345), vi (Hahn, § 159, p. 194) refer to modalism directly; however numerous clauses are aimed at them elsewhere: *Symb. Ant.* (341) 1 (Hahn, § 153, p. 184), 4 (Hahn, § 156, p. 187), and in 2 (Hahn, § 154, p. 186) the phrase *τῇ ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν*. According to Hilary, *Syn. 32* (PL 10. 504B-D), this also includes the last four anathemas of *Symb. Serd. Orient.* (Hahn, § 158, p. 191), cf. *C. Serd., Ep. Syn. Orient.* 2-5 (CSEL 65. 49. 22-53. 11), etc.

²²⁵ *Symb. Ant.* (345), ix (Hahn, § 159, p. 195). For later examples see Aug., *Trin.* 2. 9. 41 (CCL 50. 101).

²²⁶ *C. Serd., Ep. Cath.* (Hahn, § 157, pp. 188, 188-9).

²²⁷ And not implausibly, cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 67 (PL 10. 525A).

witness of catholic tradition to a really existing divine Triad;²²⁸ second, by trying to find a more adequate way to express the relationships this implied. The issues debated earlier did not disappear, but they were now being discussed in a more systematic context, a context which though not necessarily anti-, was increasingly *non*-Nicene.²²⁹

We can get some sense of what this meant by looking at one of the issues already discussed, the divine generation. The documents we have been considering all reaffirm the Nicene condemnation of a begetting in time or of a Son made out of nothing,²³⁰ but they also leave something out. They omit the wholesale Nicene rejection of 'creation' as an analogy for the begetting of the Son.²³¹ Here the preferred analogy is one we

²²⁸ *Symb. Ant. (341) 1* (Hahn, § 153, p. 183), 2 (Hahn, § 154, p. 184, cf. 186), C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 1, cf. 28. 2 (*CSEL* 65. 49. 15–21, cf. 67. 13–14). It is worth noting that no clear distinction is made between tradition as a continuity in faith and tradition as a continuity of (canonical) practice, C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 12. 2, 17. 1, 3, 23. 3, 4 (*CSEL* 65. 57. 12–13, 59. 10–15, 24–7, 63. 12–13, 17–19).

²²⁹ The absence of an agreed interpretative framework made it possible for people to take quite different theological positions without any conscious intent to reject the council. Eustathius of Antioch, for instance, though usually portrayed as a victim of anti-Nicene sentiment (cf. Soz., *HE* 2. 18. 4–19. 1 (*GCS* 74. 19–75. 4)), is said by Socrates, *HE* 1. 24. 1 (*GCS* 70. 15–17) to have been condemned as a Sabellian for rejecting the teaching of Nicaea. Moreover, in spite of Athanasius' efforts to portray opposition to himself as opposition to Nicaea, the charges against him were disciplinary rather than doctrinal, Soc., *HE* 1. 27. 7–11 (*GCS* 76. 8–77. 2), Soz., *HE* 2. 22. 3–4, 23. 1–8, 25. 3–5 (*GCS* 79. 1–10, 80. 12–82. 2, 84. 13–25), C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 6. 1–2, cf. 7. 3 (*CSEL* 65. 53. 12–30, cf. 54. 17–23); by way of contrast, Marcellus of Ancyra was accused of modalism pure and simple (C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 23. 2 (*CSEL* 65. 63. 8–12)) and it was possible to be anti-Athanasian without being anti-Nicene. It may be doubted whether most of the bishops had yet realized that a vigorous response to modalism might end up as opposition to Nicaea, cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 32 (*PL* 10. 504B–C).

²³⁰ *Symb. Ant. (341) 2* (Hahn, § 154, p. 186), 4 (Hahn, § 156, p. 188), *Symb. Serd. Orient.* (Hahn, § 158, p. 191), *Symb. Ant. (345)*, ii, iii (Hahn, § 159, p. 192, 193). Of the four only *Symb. Ant. (341) 2* fails to condemn the ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων.

²³¹ In *Symb. Ant. (341) 4*, *Symb. Serd. Orient.*, *Symb. Ant. (345)*, the relevant anathema is simply omitted; in *Symb. Ant. (341) 2* (Hahn, § 154, pp. 186), cf. *Symb. Ant. (345)*, viii (Hahn, § 159, p. 195), it is nuanced as in Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 9–10): the Son is not to be called a creature 'like any other creature'.

have already met, the divine Will.²³² And yet dialectical continuity is less important than contextual change, for although the arguments themselves are externally similar, their changed context has subtly altered the focus of the debate. As before, the divine unity is described in terms of congruity of purpose (*συμφωνία*), but the focus is elsewhere—the real emphasis is on the reality of the scriptural Triad (*τῇ . . . ὑποστάσει τρία*).²³³ It is agreed that there cannot be three gods, but the emphasis is on the concrete reality of the persons as guaranteed by such terms as ‘entities’ or ‘personal beings’ (*πράγματα* or *πρόσωπα*).²³⁴ But if there are indeed three entities, then the real question becomes, ‘How do they relate to one another?’²³⁵ In the documents we are considering these relational differences are just beginning to be seen as inherent, as rooted in what the entities *are*. Personal identities are thus starting to become irreducible natural relationships (‘God *from* God, whole *from* whole, sole *from* sole’, etc.).²³⁶ It is no accident that in the fourth creed of Antioch the exact likeness to the Father’s essence so prominent in the second is absent: in very different ways relationship is being transformed into ontology.²³⁷ One result was an increased exegetical interest in the ontological meaning of scripture: when scripture speaks of ‘Father’, ‘Son’, or ‘Holy Spirit’, and describes the Son as ‘Truth’, ‘Resurrection’, or ‘Shepherd’, what does it mean?²³⁸ Questions such as these were to form a very considerable part of the theological background of Eunomius’ life.

²³² *Symb. Serd. Orient.* (Hahn, § 158, p. 191), *Symb. Ant.* (345), viii (Hahn, § 159, p. 194–5), cf. *Symb. Ant.* (341) 1 (Hahn, § 153, p. 183), 2 (Hahn, § 154, p. 185).

²³³ *Symb. Ant.* (341) 2 (Hahn, § 154, p. 186).

²³⁴ *Symb. Ant.* (345), iv (Hahn, § 159, p. 193), cf. *Symb. Serd. Orient.* (Hahn, § 158, p. 191).

²³⁵ This was true even across ‘denominational’ lines; both Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eustathius of Antioch are said to have agreed that the Son of God could only exist *ἐν ὑποστάσει*, Soz., *HE* 2. 18. 4 (*GCS* 74. 20–2).

²³⁶ *Symb. Ant.* (341) 2 (Hahn, § 154, pp. 184–5), 4 (Hahn, § 156, p. 187) cf. 3 (Hahn, § 155, p. 186).

²³⁷ *Symb. Ant.* (341) 2 (Hahn, § 154, pp. 185) versus 4 (Hahn, § 156, p. 187–8).

²³⁸ *Symb. Ant.* (341) 2 (Hahn, § 154, pp. 185–6); see below, Ch. 6, pp. 233–8.

We can leave Eunomius' answers to one side for the moment, but we do need to consider the context in which he worked. As a theological neophyte in the late 340s Eunomius was heir to two distinct but related traditions: one was the 'expert' theology of the Eusebian school with its roots reaching through Lucian into a perceived apostolic past; the other was the attempt of the wider Christian community to address these same issues in a more popular context. It is the second of these that concerns us here. Histories of doctrine almost always focus on the kind of discourse represented by the former, and that makes it easy to forget that even its original authors did not speak that way all the time. No theological argument after all, even the most rarefied, takes place in a vacuum. If we are to understand what Eunomius or any of the other participants made of the 'technical' language so prominent in their writings, we need to start by identifying its human context. I will have occasion to address this matter again, but for the moment the subject can be looked at briefly in outline.

The documents we have been considering were intended to help their episcopal authors achieve a *modus vivendi* with one another, if not necessarily always a common theological understanding. To that extent, then, they are professional documents. But though the bishops who composed them were assisted by *periti* or experts, their ultimate audience was not a specialized one but that far larger body of ordinary men and women who made up their congregations at home. It was because Nicaea had failed to satisfy *them* that the bishops had to try again.²³⁹ Theodoret tells us that very soon after the beginning of 'the Arian controversy' there were public debates on the matter in almost every city and village of the East. In most of these debates the participants were doubtless 'professionals' of one kind or another, lay or ordained; but standing behind them and judging them we also find 'the rest'—that far larger mass of ordinary Christians²⁴⁰ who were to be their judges and who are the final arbiters of theological debate.

This mass was by no means uniform, however, and if its

²³⁹ Note Eusebius of Caesarea's extreme nervousness in the face of the obvious outrage of his local congregation at his acceptance of Nicaea, *Ep. Caes.* 1 (Urkunde 22, Opitz iii. 42, 3-43. 2).

²⁴⁰ Thdt., *HE* 1. 6. 9-10 (*GCS* 29. 21-30. 4).

internal debates had become the focus of imperial attention it was because they had begun to impinge on the outside world in several new and striking ways. Indeed, this second stage of the dispute is said to have begun at the imperial court, and then spread immediately beyond its bounds. It is the means of that diffusion that interests us here, for it gives us a glimpse of some of the less 'professional' participants. The whole thing began, we are told, when an 'Arian' presbyter won over some eunuchs attached to the imperial bedchamber; these eunuchs then managed to sway the empress and she in turn won over the emperor; from there the dispute spread to the *cubicularii* of lesser households and through them to the women's quarters in the city,²⁴¹ so that, finally, almost every upper-class household in the city was a scene of dialectical warfare.²⁴² If all this bears a suspicious resemblance to other courts in other times (the prolonged dispute over French and Italian opera at the court of the French kings, for instance) the similarity is not accidental. Disputes of this kind allowed members of the upper classes to establish personal and communal identities in comparative political safety. If the emperors were now drawn into what was still at base a deeply felt religious dispute it was because many of their supporters had begun to define their relationship to the throne and to one another in just these terms. Significantly, many of these persons were women.

The importance of women in religious disputes was apparent long before Plutarch counselled wives to worship only the gods of their husbands and to 'shut the door on queer rituals and outlandish superstitions'.²⁴³ Celsus mentions the zeal of Christians in pursuing women²⁴⁴ and Libanius complains bitterly of their malign influence on the nobles of Antioch;²⁴⁵ but once the Christian community had itself become divided, women were not only active in the debate, they were often principal agents of its diffusion and thus also targets of its propaganda.²⁴⁶ Aetius,

²⁴¹ On eunuchs as providing the necessary external interface for upper-class women, cf. Julian Imp., *Ath.* 274B.

²⁴² Soc., *HE* 2. 2. 4-7 (*GCS* 93. 14-22), cf. Soz., *HE* 3. 1. 3-5 (*GCS* 101. 11-21).

²⁴³ Plutarch, *Coniugalis Praecepta* 140D, cf. 145B-E.

²⁴⁴ Celsus apud Or., *Cels.* 3. 44 (*GCS* i. 240. 3-5).

²⁴⁵ Libanius, *Or.* 16. 47 (Foerster ii. 178. 17-179. 4).

²⁴⁶ Cf. e.g. Hieron., *Ep.* 22. 28, cf. 53. 7 (*CSEL* 54. 185. 1-11, cf. 453. 7-11).

for one, after the example of Lucian,²⁴⁷ had both male and female disciples,²⁴⁸ and in later years Athanasius²⁴⁹ and Gregory of Nazianzus²⁵⁰ were to complain bitterly of 'Arian' efforts to attract women. The followers of other schools were equally assiduous.²⁵¹ More to the point, upper-class women and their husbands formed a major part of the congregations who were the ultimate objects of the bishops' labours.²⁵² Because almost all the surviving documents are aimed at their episcopal mentors it is easy to lose sight of the audience, but Gregory Nazianzen addressed a congregation consisting of men, women, girls, boys, children, old people, nobles, commons, rulers, and soldiers on furlough.²⁵³ Few of them would have claimed to be *periti*, but it was they who were the solid 'middle brow' focus of his sermons and the ultimate arbiters of his performance.

But even they did not stand alone. Behind the influential men and women who were the objects of a bishop's attention there stood that far larger mass of other human beings who made up the bulk of the Church in that and every other age. Though doubtless often clients or dependants of their more powerful neighbours, they were also the people who were prepared to riot in support of rival bishops,²⁵⁴ and their opinions could no more be ignored by a preacher than those of their more powerful patrons. A substantial portion of them, moreover, were women, often consecrated virgins or widows, and even where violence

²⁴⁷ Philost., *HE*, Anhang vi. 10 (*GCS* 192. 18–22).

²⁴⁸ Aetius, *Synt.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 11. 2, 12. 37 (*GCS* iii. 352. 6, 359. 23), cf. Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. iii, syr. 73–7 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 417).

²⁴⁹ Ath., *Ar.* 1. 22, 3. 67 (*PG* 26. 57B–C, 465A, B).

²⁵⁰ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 27. 2. 11 (*SC* 250. 74).

²⁵¹ Cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 8 (*GCS* 62. 5–10), Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 1. 12. 338 (*PG* 37. 1190).

²⁵² Cf. Ramsay MacMullen, 'The Preacher's Audience (AD 350–400)', *JTS* 40 (1989), 503–11, on the upper-class focus of contemporary preaching.

²⁵³ Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1066–8, cf. 1092–4 (*PG* 37. 1102, cf. 1104).

²⁵⁴ e.g. the riots occasioned by the contest between Paul and Macedonius over the throne of Constantinople shortly after Constantius' accession; it was all too easy for both sides to tout this up in terms of a division between Nicenes and 'Arians' respectively, Soc., *HE* 2. 6. 4–6 (*GCS* 96. 14–22), Soz., *HE* 3. 4. 1–2 (*GCS* 105. 1–11). Similar tumults occurred at the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia a few years later, Soc., *HE* 2. 12. 1–6 (*GCS* 103. 8–104. 2), Soz., *HE* 3. 7. 4–8, 9. 3 (*GCS* 109. 16–110. 11, 112. 12–15). It would be interesting to know just how the participants in these riots were linked to the upper-class audiences of their candidates' sermons.

was most to be expected we find them a constant presence.²⁵⁵ Without them, neither 'Arianism' nor the triumph of 'Orthodoxy' can be understood. They provided another, different, and yet essential portion of the late antique theologian's audience and had to be addressed accordingly.

As a theological beginner in the middle years of the fourth century, then, Eunomius was heir to a historical and theological dialectic already several times removed from its point of origin. Yet if it had begun to transcend the unsystematic fervour of its youth, it had signally failed to address the concerns of its enemies, and when encountered by Eunomius was increasingly non- if not necessarily always anti-Nicene. Far from univocal, it was, like its Nicene counterpart, conducted on at least three levels: that of the 'experts' or *periti*, with its emphasis on *akribeia* and technical accuracy; that of the active pastor, with its atmosphere of *haute popularisation* and its focus on a theologically literate upper class; and that of the *ἀκεραιότεροι*,²⁵⁶ the 'simpler sort', without whom no large-scale movement can be explained at all. We have already seen that Eunomius understood himself to be one of the *periti*, but the success of his movement depended on his ability to step outside that limited circle and speak the polyvalent religious language of the world beyond. In later chapters we shall explore his attempts to do so.

Eunomius' stay in Alexandria was a short one. If he had arrived with any personal or religious uncertainties, association with Aetius had resolved them. What had been done earlier on the level of a city was now repeated in the life of an individual:²⁵⁷ in the great polarization of opinion associated with the name of

²⁵⁵ In spite of frequent admonitions to stay at home ([Ps-]Basil, *Virg.* 27-34 (RB (1953), 63. 41. 9-43. 1)), at least when young (Basil Anc., *Virg.* 19 (PG 30. 708D-709A)), we find ascetic women playing a significant role in contemporary controversies. They were prominent early supporters of Arius (Epiph., *Haer.* 68. 4. 3, cf. 69. 3. 2, 7 (GCS iii. 144. 13-16, cf. 154. 17-21, 155. 16-17)); cf. also Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 5, 58 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 20. 14-16, 29. 5-8)), and we find them later (on both sides) conspicuously present in situations where violence was to be expected (Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 15. 1-2 (Opitz ii. 98. 29-99. 8), *Fug.* 6. 3, 6-7; 7. 2 (Opitz ii. 72. 4-8, 15-18; 73. 3-6), cf. C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 9. 1 (CSEL 65. 55. 12-19)).

²⁵⁶ Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 1. 11-12 (Vaggione 34), and Ch. 4, pp. 100-2 below.

²⁵⁷ Cf. Philost., *HE* 3. 14 (GCS 44. 1-7).

Arius Eunomius had chosen a side, and henceforth is only to be understood as a partisan. We do not know when Aetius and Eunomius left the Egyptian capital, but if in doing so they to some extent left Arius behind, it was only to become enmeshed in the wider dispute convulsing the cities of the Roman East. When next we encounter them it is in Antioch at the century's midpoint—poised on the edge of an imperial circle.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁸ Philost., *HE* 3. 27 (*GCS* 52. 18–53. 2).

Logic Chopper

One of the things which most astonished almost all the participants in these controversies was the sheer inability of their adversaries to understand the plain meaning of scripture.¹ Indeed, the very fact that so much else was held in common made their disagreement on this all the more puzzling—foes who had begun as members of a single eucharistic assembly,² and who continued to share a common liturgical inheritance,³ found themselves bitterly divided over the interpretation of a book they regarded as ‘the common possession of all’.⁴ Their problem was neither canonical⁵ nor textual.⁶ Largely agreed as

¹ Hilary, *Const.* 4. 1–5. 14, cf. 8. 14–16 (*SC* 334. 174–6, cf. 182), even goes so far as to wish himself back in the days of Nero or Decius when there was an open enemy! See also the complaint in Cyril H., *Catech.* 15. 9 (Reischl ii. 166) to the effect that formerly heretics were at least obvious, but now *πεπλήρωται ἡ Ἐκκλησία κεκρυμμένων αἵρετικῶν*. See n. 13 below.

² Soz., *HE* 2. 32. 1 (*GCS* 96. 30–97. 3), cf. Philost., *HE* 3. 14 (*GCS* 44. 1–7).

³ (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* i. 34 (*PG* 39. 437A–B), 2. 7. 8, 19, 25 (*PG* 39. 588C, 595A, 736A–B, 748D), 3. 2. 28, 2. 52, 13, 16, cf. 3. 6 (*PG* 39. 797B, 804D–805A, 861A, 869B, cf. 857B), though cf. *ibid.* 2. 23, 3. 23 (*PG* 39. 745A, 928C–929A) where some differences are acknowledged. Cf. also Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 10, 5 73. 1–5 74. 50 (*CCL* 87/i. 244–5), where an appeal is made to the baptismal liturgy with its creed and the proper prefaces of the Eucharist. The argument only makes sense if both sides acknowledged a common liturgical tradition. Indeed, to the consternation of all, ordinary folk obviously had great difficulty in discerning any real difference between them, cf. n. 142 below.

⁴ Aug., *Coll. Max.* 1, cf. 4. 13, 14. 3, 14. 11, 14. 13, 14. 20 (*PL* 42. 709–10, cf. 711, 719, 724–5, 729, 730, 736).

⁵ With one notable exception differences over the canon reflected the continuing fluidity of its boundaries rather than a willingness to tailor it to measure. Both sides could occasionally cite ‘The Shepherd’ as scripture (the Eusebians in Ath., *Deer.* 18. 3 (Opitz ii. 15. 19–21), *Ep. Afr.* 5 (*PG* 26. 1037B), Athanasius in *Inc.* 3. 7–10 (Thomson 140)), and later Arius would be portrayed as appealing to the Clementina ([Ps.-]Ath., *Disp.* 31 (*PG* 28. 480C)),

Arius Eunomius had chosen a side, and henceforth is only to be understood as a partisan. We do not know when Aetius and Eunomius left the Egyptian capital, but if in doing so they to some extent left Arius behind, it was only to become enmeshed in the wider dispute convulsing the cities of the Roman East. When next we encounter them it is in Antioch at the century's midpoint—poised on the edge of an imperial circle.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁸ Philost., *HE* 3. 27 (*GCS* 52. 18–53. 2).

Logic Chopper

One of the things which most astonished almost all the participants in these controversies was the sheer inability of their adversaries to understand the plain meaning of scripture.¹ Indeed, the very fact that so much else was held in common made their disagreement on this all the more puzzling—foes who had begun as members of a single eucharistic assembly,² and who continued to share a common liturgical inheritance,³ found themselves bitterly divided over the interpretation of a book they regarded as 'the common possession of all'.⁴ Their problem was neither canonical⁵ nor textual.⁶ Largely agreed as

¹ Hilary, *Const.* 4. 1–5. 14, cf. 8. 14–16 (*SC* 334. 174–6, cf. 182), even goes so far as to wish himself back in the days of Nero or Decius when there was an open enemy! See also the complaint in Cyril H., *Catech.* 15. 9 (Reischl ii. 166) to the effect that formerly heretics were at least obvious, but now *πεπληρωται ἡ Ἐκκλησία κεκρυμμένων αἱρετικῶν*. See n. 13 below.

² Soz., *HE* 2. 32. 1 (*GCS* 96. 30–97. 3), cf. Philost., *HE* 3. 14 (*GCS* 44. 1–7).

³ (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* i. 34 (*PG* 39. 437A–B), 2. 7. 8, 19, 25 (*PG* 39. 588C, 595A, 736A–B, 748D), 3. 2. 28, 2. 52, 13, 16, cf. 3. 6 (*PG* 39. 797B, 804D–805A, 861A, 869B, cf. 857B), though cf. *ibid.* 2. 23, 3. 23 (*PG* 39. 745A, 928C–929A) where some differences are acknowledged. Cf. also Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 10, 5 73. 1–5 74. 50 (*CCL* 87/i. 244–5), where an appeal is made to the baptismal liturgy with its creed and the proper prefaces of the Eucharist. The argument only makes sense if both sides acknowledged a common liturgical tradition. Indeed, to the consternation of all, ordinary folk obviously had great difficulty in discerning any real difference between them, cf. n. 142 below.

⁴ Aug., *Coll. Max.* 1, cf. 4. 13, 14. 3, 14. 11, 14. 13, 14. 20 (*PL* 42. 709–10, cf. 711, 719, 724–5, 729, 730, 736).

⁵ With one notable exception differences over the canon reflected the continuing fluidity of its boundaries rather than a willingness to tailor it to measure. Both sides could occasionally cite 'The Shepherd' as scripture (the Eusebians in Ath., *Decr.* 18. 3 (Opitz ii. 15. 19–21), *Ep. Afr.* 5 (*PG* 26. 1037B), Athanasius in *Inc.* 3. 7–10 (Thomson 140)), and later Arius would be portrayed as appealing to the Clementina ([Ps.-]Ath., *Disp.* 31 (*PG* 28. 480C)),

to *what* was to be interpreted, they found themselves sharply divided as to *how*. And yet in spite of Arius' reputation as an exegete,⁷ and the controversy's alleged exegetical origins,⁸ faced with the seemingly mindless repetitions and endless proof-texts of the actual debate⁹ the modern reader can find it all too easy to lose sight of one of the things considered almost self-evident by the original participants:¹⁰ that the purpose of it all was to

but the only serious debate was over the Epistle to the Hebrews. Though the latter was cited confidently enough in the controversy's opening stages (Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 14 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 22. 1-3), Ath., *Ar.* 1. 53, 2. 1, 18, 3. 1 (PG 26. 121B, 121B/C, 148A, 149A, 185A, 321B, etc.), later some opponents of Nicaea—notably those associated with Eunomius—began to feel uncomfortable about it: (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 5, cf. 22 (PG 28. 1124C-1125A, cf. 1149C); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 37. 2 (GCS iii. 185. 8-10), cf. Thdt., *Proemium in Pauli Epistulas* (PG 82. 673C), Ath., *Ar.* 1. 58 (PG 26. 133A-B). Most eastern non-Nicenes seem not to have shared this concern (e.g. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 5, 11, 30. 6. 1-2, 2-3, 16. 14, 15-16 (SC 250. 214, 236, 260), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 588. 41-3 (SC 246. 14), *Thes.* 7 (PG 75. 100B), etc.) and westerners never seem to have felt it at all. Ambrose's opponents, at any rate, do not seem to have questioned it, *Fid.* 4. 9. 47-8 (CSEL 78. 193), while Maximinus cites it not only as scripture but as Paul's, Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 4, 9 (PL 42. 725, 728). Elsewhere too it is cited without question: Germinius, *Ep. Ruf.* 2. 1 (CSEL 65. 163. 4), Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 10. 6. 64^v. 16 (CCL 87/i. 77), *Jud.* 7. 3. 86^v. 16-17 (CCL 87/i. 103).

⁶ Charges of tampering with the text are rare. Hilary claims that his opponents changed the text of Isa. 65: 16 (*Trin.* 5. 26. 7-13 (CCL 62. 178)), and elsewhere the Macedonians are said to have altered several passages ([Ps.-?]Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 11, cf. 3. 36 (PG 39. 664B-665B, cf. 953A), cf. Didymus, *Spir.* 232. 1-4 (SC 386. 352-4)). Ambrose, however, though clearly interested in textual matters (*Fid.* 3. 8. 21-2; 4. 1. 67-70, 11. 67-9, 93-5, 5. 10. 85-6 (CSEL 78. 128, 162, 209, 210, 265)), accuses them of falsification (incorrectly) in only one instance (Matt. 24: 36, *Fid.* 5. 16. 36-9 (CSEL 78. 289)) and elsewhere accepts a variant in their favour without demure (John 11: 4, 'per ipsum' for 'per ipsam' (some MSS of the Vulgate read 'per eum'), *Fid.* 4. 10. 124-7 (CSEL 78. 205)). Tendentious translation, of course, was something else, and we find Augustine, for instance, prepared to translate one of his opponents' chief proof-texts, John 17: 3, as 'unum verum', not 'solum verum Deum', in *Trin.* 1. 13. 127-8 (CCL 50. 75).

⁷ Thdt., *HE* 1. 2. 9 (GCS 6. 15-16).

⁸ Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 2. 6 (GCS 154. 2-8).

⁹ Already a matter of complaint in antiquity! Cf. Soc., *HE* 4. 7. 6 (GCS 234. 4-5).

¹⁰ Modern scholars (largely basing their work on Nicene sources) have shown a notable reluctance to recognize the importance of scripture for 'Arian' theologians. Cf. e.g. E. Vandenbussche, 'La Part de la dialectique dans la théologie d'Eunomius "le technologue"', *RHE* 40 (1944/5), 65, cf. 64, who

ensure a right understanding of scripture, and that the dialectical details could only be understood in terms of this.

Such a consideration, indeed, goes a long way toward explaining one of the more puzzling features of the last chapter: that such a debate can have meant so much to so many different kinds of people. For even if we are right in supposing that the controversy itself had little to do with Arius as an individual, the issues we have so far encountered are not the stuff of which mass movements are usually made. Indeed, while there were certainly people who thought them of little importance,¹¹ there were equally clearly thousands of others for whom they were all too literally matters of life and death. If we are ever to understand, then, the meaning behind the dialectics, this is a factor which we will have to take into account.

One thing is obvious: the original controversy became a mass movement almost overnight.¹² More to the point, it provoked a polemical outburst whose immediacy and emotional content were out of all proportion to the alleged provocation. Almost from the beginning all the participants were willing to refer to one another in terms usually reserved for non-Christians.¹³ Arius' enemies called him an 'apostate' and 'enemy of Christ',¹⁴

states that for Eunomius 'les textes de l'Écriture ne sont que des pièces justificatives d'une pensée basée sur d'autres principes.' Other scholars have been almost as negative: e.g. C. R. W. Klose, *Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius* (Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1833), 37; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma* (New York: Dover Publications, 1961), iv. 74; M. Spanneut, 'Eunomius de Cyzique', *DHG* xv. 1403; J. A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Church and Religion* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1849), iv. 80, etc. Much closer to the truth as we shall see is the statement by Th. Dams in his unpublished doctoral thesis, 'La Controverse Eunoméenne' (Paris, 1951), 74, to the effect that Eunomius possessed a genuine 'souci . . . de fonder la doctrine sur la révélation'.

¹¹ Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 1. 7 (PG 26. 25B), or those members of Severian of Gabala's congregation who had become tired of sermons *περὶ πίστεως* and wanted some *περὶ ἡθῶν*, Sev. Gab., *Abr.* 7 (PG 56. 562B-C).

¹² Thdt., *HE* 1. 6. 9-10 (GCS 29. 31-30. 4), cf. Soc., *HE* 1. 6. 1-2 (GCS 3-10).

¹³ Later, Eunomius was prepared to describe even Basil as a non-Christian, *AA* 3 (J ii. 284. 12-19). Doubtless Ambrose was right in saying that a 'domesticus hostis' was 'detestabilior . . . quam extraneus', *Fid.* 1. 16. 32-3 (CSEL 78. 45). Cf. also n. 1 above and Ch. 3, nn. 46 and 48.

¹⁴ Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 3, cf. 6 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 6. 6-7. 2, cf. 7. 14-16).

while he was equally convinced that he was 'truth's defender'¹⁵ standing in opposition to the heretical machinations of his bishop.¹⁶ The combined rebuke of civil and ecclesiastical authority might normally have been considered enough to dampen such zeal, but even during the reign of Constantine the followers of Eusebius of Nicomedia had begun to refer to themselves as 'confessors',¹⁷ and by the date of Eunomius' arrival in Alexandria all sides were prepared to claim the title of 'martyr'.¹⁸ There is no need to take all such ascriptions at face value,¹⁹ but we do need to take them seriously.²⁰ The Nicene Heraclianus was as conscious of speaking 'for his life' before Germinius²¹ as the non-Nicene Maximinus was later before Augustine;²² all sides were convinced of their loyalty to the One

¹⁵ Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 1, 2 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 1. 2-3, 1. 8-2. 3).

¹⁶ Ibid. 4 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 2. 8-9).

¹⁷ Const., *Ep. Nicom.* 9 (Urkunde 27, Opitz iii. 60. 2-5).

¹⁸ Cf. Concilia, C. Serd., *Ep. Alex.* 4 apud Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 38. 4 (Opitz ii. 117. 11-17), Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 21 (PG 25. 588A), *H. Ar.* 60. 3, 79. 1, 81. 9, cf. 33. 6, 65. 3 (Opitz ii. 216. 30-3, 227. 16-18, 229. 30-3, cf. 201. 28-34, 219. 2-10), Hilary, *Const.* 1. 3-6, 7. 17-20 (SC 334. 166, 180), Vigilius, *Dial. Ar.* 1. 2 (PL 62. 156A), etc. Given the political circumstances, of course, such language did not develop with equal rapidity on all sides of the controversy. Apart from the Eusebian examples cited in n. 17, most of the instances prior to 360 are Nicene or specifically 'Athanasian' (though cf. Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 4 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 2. 8-9)). This reflects the anti-Athanasian focus of the government prior to that time. Thereafter non-Nicenes not in favour with the government, and, increasingly those unable to accept the 'neo-Nicene' compromise, also began to adopt an attitude of principled resistance which led them to use the language of martyrdom, e.g. Wulfila, *Symb.* apud Palladius, *Ep. in Maximinus, Comment.* 63. 308^r. 2 (SC 267. 250), Eun., *Apol.* 3. 1-9 (Vaggione 56), *EF* 1. 1-7, 6. 1-5 (Vaggione 150, 158), Philost., *HE* 1. 1, cf. Anhang i. 4 (GCS 5. 1-7, cf. 154. 4-7), Ar. ign., *Job* 1 (PG 17. 378A, 427B-428A, cf. 375A-C, 382A-B), Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 7, 5 193. 14-31, cf. *Jud.* 9. 3. 90^r. 1-14 (CCL 87/i. 239, cf. 107), etc.

¹⁹ Athanasius, for instance, was prepared to give the slain Emperor Constant the courtesy title of 'martyr', *Apol. Const.* 7 (PG 25. 604D).

²⁰ Though sometimes only as politics. We may note Hilary's complaint in *Const.* 8. 11-23 (SC 334. 182) about Constantius' savage leniency, which deprived his victims of the outward signs of martyrdom while corrupting their faith.

²¹ *Heracl.* 134 (PLS 1. 345C/D).

²² Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13 (PL 42. 719). Note too, that like Eunomius in the *EF* 1. 1-4 (Vaggione 150), Maximinus is conscious of bearing witness to the Christian faith as such, citing Christ's eschatological judgement in Matt. 10: 32-3, *Coll. Max.* 4 (PL 42. 711).

who would indeed one day judge, and who was prepared to offer rewards to those who counted even death itself a gain in his behalf.²³

Assertions of a willingness to die are usually signs of the presence of an issue of overwhelming or even ultimate import. Martyrs after all are people who, almost by definition, stand for the truth; theirs is the difficult task of laying out that truth 'naked' and 'unveiled' because 'the threats levelled against the ungodly' really are 'more fearful than any earthly suffering or temporal death'.²⁴ But while then as now, however, there were certainly people who loved God 'more than was proper' and were prepared to turn almost anything into a matter of 'faith',²⁵ the early appearance, long duration, and stubborn persistence of this controversy point to something else: a principle of enough moment that some were indeed prepared to die, but also one which they found difficult to put into words.

The ancients were frustratingly conscious of this. Despite an occasional convergence²⁶ they were all too bitterly aware that they could cite no passage of scripture which would of itself convince their opponents.²⁷ To take only the most prominent example, almost from the beginning of the controversy Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and the non-Nicenes generally cited the speech of Wisdom in Proverbs 8 as an instance of the Son's premundane subordination to the Father and of the use of 'creation language' in describing his begetting.²⁸ I Corinthians 1: 24, after all, spoke of the Son as 'the Power . . . and . . .

²³ Eun., *Apol.* 27. 36-7 (Vaggione 72).

²⁴ Ibid. 3. 3-5 (Vaggione 36).

²⁵ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 2. 83. 1-5, 85. 1-3 (*SC* 247. 198, 200).

²⁶ Both Alexander of Alexandria and Hilary, for instance, cite John 14: 28, one of the classic 'Arian' proof-texts, in a sense not far removed from that of their adversaries: Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 52 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 28. 2-7), Hilary, *Trin.* 3. 12. 3-6, 9. 53. 1-12, 54. 15-38, 55. 27-9, 39-41 (*CCL* 62. 83, 62A. 430-1, 432-3, 435). Hilary takes a similar approach to John 5: 19 and 5: 22-3, *Trin.* 7. 17. 9-39, cf. 7. 20. 1-21. 46 (*CCL* 62. 277-9, 281-4).

²⁷ Cf. Athanasius' great frustration at finding that even when he had successfully confuted his Eunomian, Eudoxian, or Eusebian opponents, they remained stubbornly 'Arian', *Ep. Serap.* 4. 5 (*PG* 26. 644D-645A); from the other side, note Maximinus' aside to Augustine: 'Quamvis etiam etsi per totum diem quisque de divinis Scripturis proferat testimonia, non in verborum illi imputabitur revera. . .', *Coll. Max.* 13 (*PL* 42. 718).

²⁸ Prov. 8: 22-5 (see Appendix).

Wisdom of God',²⁹ and if, in a premundane context, Wisdom described herself as 'created' and 'the beginning of <God's> ways for his works' it seemed perverse not to draw the obvious conclusion. The Nicenes of course went to a great deal of trouble to avoid doing just that.³⁰ Their problem, however, was not the use of 'creation language' *per se*, but its use in this particular context. For as with another passage at the other end of the time scale (1 Cor. 15: 24-8),³¹ the obvious extramundane setting seemed to preclude a reference to the human nature of Christ.³² And yet from a Nicene point of view it was difficult to see how it could refer to anything else; for if the authority of the Septuagint made it difficult to question the translation,³³ the only remaining solution that 'saved the phenomena' was a series of shifts between incarnate and pre-incarnate language that even some Nicenes found improbable.³⁴ It is thus pleasantly

²⁹ See Appendix, 1 Cor. 1: 24.

³⁰ Hilary obviously regarded it as his enemies' most powerful argument, *Trin.* 12. 1. 17-18 (CCL 62A. 579), as did Basil, *Eun.* 2. 20. 21-3 (SC 305. 82).

³¹ See Appendix, 1 Cor. 15: 24-8. Cyril of Alexandria's Nicene interlocutor seems to have found this passage particularly daunting, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 583. 3-4 (SC 237. 374).

³² Hilary, *Trin.* 12. 42. 1-3 (CCL 62A. 612). Cf. also Ambrose's obvious embarrassment and appeal to the 'prophetic perfect' in *Fid.* 3. 9. 1-6, cf. 7. 1-7, 32-42 (CSEL 78. 129-30, cf. 124-5, 126), as well as his general statement of principle in 1. 15. 15-23 (CSEL 78. 42-3). See also the passage from the Pseudo-Athanasian dialogue cited in n. 34 below.

³³ As was done by Basil, *Eun.* 2. 20. 37-44 (SC 305. 84), and with more hesitation by Gregory of Nyssa, *Conf.* 110 (J ii. 358. 11-20). As they pointed out, though the Septuagint translated the Hebrew יָסַד (to lay down or establish) by the very specific ἐκτίσεν με (create), it was possible to render it in terms less open to 'Arian' misunderstanding. In some respects the controversy still continues. While the Authorized Version translates this by 'the Lord established me', most modern versions, less preoccupied with theological concerns, have returned to the 'created' of the Septuagint.

³⁴ Basil, *Eun.* 2. 20. 21-32 (SC 305. 82) refused to discuss it at all, giving it up as a mystery pure and simple. The sheer amount of ink wasted by others in trying to make this passage refer to the incarnation shows their awareness of the difficulties, cf. e.g. Ath., *Ar.* 2. 44-56 (PG 26. 240C-268B), Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. i. 21-65 (J ii. 10. 22-27. 8), Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 7. 1-7, cf. 9. 1-22 (CSEL 67. 124-5, cf. 129-31), etc. But note the interesting suggestion by (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 704C), echoing the real Basil, *Eun.* 2. 20. 27-31 (SC 305. 82), that as the author of this book was a proverb-maker (Παροιμιαστής) and not a prophet, such discrepancies could be taken as εἰκόνας ἑτέραν. The 'Orthodox' respondent in (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 9 (PG 28. 1129D-1132A), like

ironic to reflect that when, at a much later time, the Nicenes found a more acceptable solution, it was strikingly similar to that proposed by Arius in the first place.³⁵ The Nicenes came to agree that the 'Wisdom' in that passage was not the divine Son, the uncreated Wisdom of God, but a *created* 'Holy Wisdom' (κτιστὴ σοφία); this 'wisdom' was indeed 'made not begotten', but for the ordering and governance, not the creation of the world.³⁶ If this undercut one of the more successful non-Nicene arguments and made the feminine imagery of Proverbs genuinely available to the iconographer, it also brought home one of the difficulties common to all the participants: that similar problems tended to beget similar solutions and that where so much was held in common, it was particularly difficult to articulate what was not.³⁷

One thing was obvious: exegesis by itself convinced no one. Faced with their enemies' most telling evidence and threatened with the loss of home and altar, even the most deeply divided made scripture their final defence,³⁸ and found in its united voice a sure refuge against the craftiness of the foe.³⁹ Mere Ambrose in n. 32 above, takes it as grammatically a kind of proleptic or 'prophetic' perfect for the incarnation.

³⁵ According to both Alexander of Alexandria (*Ep. Encycl.* 7 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 7. 22-8. 2)) and Athanasius (*Decr.* 16. 1 (Opitz ii. 13. 19-20), *Dion.* 23. 1 (Opitz ii. 62. 27-63. 2), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12, 13-14 (PG 25. 565A, 569A), *Ar.* 1. 6, 37 (PG 26. 21D-24B, 225A), cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Ar.* 4. 8 (PG 26. 477D-480A), *Epiph., Haer.* 69. 17. 6-18. 3 (GCS iii. 166. 30-167. 27)) Arius had taught that the Logos incarnate in Jesus was not the Word or Wisdom proper to God's own being, but a created entity called 'Word' and 'Wisdom' by scripture because it participated as fully as any such being could in the Logos or Wisdom which was properly God's.

³⁶ A 'created Wisdom', in other words, which was not the 'creative wisdom' (ἡ δημιουργὸς σοφία) embodied in the Son, cf. (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 3 (PG 39. 812A, cf. 808B-813B).

³⁷ Cf. Hilary, *Auxent.* 12 (PL 10. 616B-C). A case in point is the difficulty experienced by almost all Nicenes in trying to explain 'orthodox' sentiments in 'heretical' authors; for most, the only solution was to assume a deliberate desire to deceive, an orthodox 'hook' inserted 'to deceive the simple', e.g. (Ps.-?)Ath., *Ar.* 3. 59 (PG 26. 445C-448A), cf. *Syn.* 39. 2-3 (Opitz ii. 265. 13-21), Grg. Nyss., *Conf.* 115 (J ii. 360. 22-6). As Hilary put it elsewhere, *Trin.* 7. 1. 22-3 (CCL 62. 259), 'nostris aduersum nos usa doctrinis et ecclesiae fide contra ecclesiae fidem pugnans'.

³⁸ (Ps.-)Chrys., *Opus Imperf.* 49 (PG 56. 909A-B).

³⁹ e.g. Ath., *Ar.* 1. 58 (PG 26. 133A-B), cf. Basil, *Ep.* 235. 2. 31-4 (Courttonne iii. 48), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 8. 1 (PG 39. 613C).

text could not be allowed to 'tyrannize' truth.⁴⁰ The heretics might distort the *words* of scripture⁴¹ but their meaning was guaranteed by the realities to which they referred and not the other way around.⁴² Hence, while divided on all else, there was one thing on which the participants did agree—the locus of the problem. It was the 'meaning' or 'mind' of scripture their opponents set out to pervert and only incidentally its parts,⁴³ and in the eyes of his enemies that was as true of Cyril of Alexandria⁴⁴ as of Eunomius or any 'Arian'. They were all guilty of trying to 'steal' the mind of scripture.⁴⁵

Unfortunately, an accusation of theft usually achieves little without a description of the item stolen, and that is where consensus collapsed. For, like the harlots before Solomon, the parties to this controversy were more eager to assert their claim than describe its object. Each assumed that their own was the original form of Christianity, and that they were the contemporary representatives of the founding revelation. The only thing that required explanation, therefore, was how a sane⁴⁶ person could believe anything else. Thus, in Aetius and Eunomius' eyes, if a self-proclaimed 'Christian' like Basil⁴⁷ rejected this

⁴⁰ Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 583. 13–28 (SC 237. 376), cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 5. 1. 9–36 (CCL 62. 150–1), Gr̄g. Naz., *Or.* 31. 21. 5–8 (SC 250. 316), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 13. 3. 29 (PG 39. 688C–689A, 948A).

⁴¹ Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 3, cf. 4 (PG 25. 544C, cf. 545B–C), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 12, 13 (PG 39. 673B, 688B, 688C–689A), cf. Eun., *Apol.* 6. 4–17 (Vaggione 38–40).

⁴² On both sides, cf. Ath., *Ar.* 2. 3 (PG 26. 152C), Gr̄g. Naz., *Or.* 29. 13. 21–2 (SC 250. 204), Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 5. 20–2 (CSEL 78. 121). See also the sources cited in Ch. 6 n. 250 below, Eun., *Apol.* 18. 7–8 (Vaggione 54–6), and *AA* 3 (J̄ ii. 299. 21–3). Presumably some source such as Or., *Princ.* 4. 3. 15 (GCS v. 347. 5–14) lies in the background.

⁴³ e.g. (Ps.-?)Ath., *Ar.* 3. 35, cf. 29, 38 (PG 26. 397A–400A, cf. 385A, 445A), *Ep. Serap.* 2. 7 (PG 26. 620A), Sev. Gab., *Abr.* 5, 6 (PG 56. 560A, D, 561D), etc. As Ambrose aptly commented about the non-Nicene interpretation of Mark 10: 18, from his point of view the 'apices sine crimine sunt, sensus in crimine', *Fid.* 2. 1. 9–10 (CSEL 78. 63).

⁴⁴ Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 561. 22–6 (SC 237. 310).

⁴⁵ Gr̄g. Naz., *Or.* 30. 1. 4–6 (SC 250. 226).

⁴⁶ Questions about the sanity of the opposing party early became a feature of the debate: e.g. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 42 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 26. 14–15).

⁴⁷ Eun., *AA* 2 (J̄ i. 281. 25–7, 312. 30–313. 3, 315. 31–316. 3), 3 (J̄ ii. 112. 10–16, 113. 9–16), cf. *Apol.* 6. 1–2 (Vaggione 38) and the passage cited in n. 13 above.

inheritance, the only real question was, 'Why?' The answer in this case was obvious: *kakanoia* or 'wrong-mindedness'.⁴⁸ In contrast to the 'right-minded' or 'orthodox'⁴⁹ who, with the help of the Holy Spirit,⁵⁰ maintained a 'partiality' for the truth,⁵¹ the enemies of God lacked one of the truly essential virtues: *eunoia* or 'right-mindedness'.⁵² Though this word is usually translated 'goodwill', its actual meaning goes well beyond benevolence, for *eunoia* could be considered a principal mark of sanctity and reckoned among the earthly echoes of the divine goodness itself.⁵³ It implied a mind as fully turned toward God⁵⁴ as the Devil's was against—for the chief characteristic of that dark mind was its opposite, *kakanoia*.⁵⁵ Thus, in an extensive commentary on Job by one of Eunomius' Antiochene⁵⁶ sympathizers, we find the biblical patriarch portrayed as the possessor of an *eunoia* which enabled him to share in the unswerving (*ἀπαράτρεπτον*) fidelity of the saints to God's will.⁵⁷ This will was understood by the commentary's author (and, as we shall see, by Eunomius himself) as accessible only to the 'right-minded', that is, to persons who understood aright not only scripture itself, but the knowledge of God implanted in all human minds by the Creator (*ἐμφυτον γνῶσιν*).⁵⁸ Though this

⁴⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 6. 10–13, 23. 3–4, 27. 40 (Vaggione 38, 62, 72), *AA* 3 (J ii. 238. 4–10), cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 229. 1–6), Palladius, *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 85. 337^r. 2–7 (SC 267. 272).

⁴⁹ i.e. the *εὐσεβείς*: Aetius, *Synt.*, proem. apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 11. 2 (GCS iii. 352. 5–6), cf. Eun., *Apol.* 27. 34–7 (Vaggione 72), *AA* 3 (J ii. 113. 11–14).

⁵⁰ Eun., *EF* 4. 22–4 (Vaggione 158).

⁵¹ Eun., *Apol.* 2. 9–11, 20. 12–14 (Vaggione 36, 58–60).

⁵² Cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 3. 4–4, 14, 6. 4–8, 14. 19–20, 21. 15–16, 24. 1–2, 20, 51. 9–10). This idea seems related to Origen's demand for the need to be *ἐγγνωμόνως* in approaching scripture, e.g. Or., *Cels.* 1. 12, 26, 31, cf. 2, 10 (GCS i. 64. 18–23, 78. 17–21, 82. 13–17, cf. 57. 2–3, 63. 9–10), etc.

⁵³ Cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 228. 9–10).

⁵⁴ Cf. *ibid.* (Hagedorn 126. 1–10).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* (Hagedorn 13. 21–14. 1, 20. 15, 77. 19–78. 3, 161. 15–16, 284. 12–13, 298. 15, cf. 224. 10–12), cf. *Const. App.* viii. 7. 21–2 (SC 336. 158), (Ps.-)Ignat., *Phil.* 11, 12 (Lightfoot II. iii. 199. 26–7, 200. 13–14).

⁵⁶ For a guess as to his identity, see Ch. 7 n. 106, Ch. 8 n. 44. His connection with Syria, at any rate, seems inescapable, cf. Hagedorn, *PTS* xiv, pp. lvi–lvii, cf. xxxv.

⁵⁷ Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 24. 20, 106. 1–10, cf. 15. 1–5, 248. 18–20). Julian makes a distinction between those who are *ἀτρεπτος* by nature and those who have become so δι' ἐκούσιον. The latter are the saints, of whom Job is one.

⁵⁸ Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 220. 8–9, 232. 8–14, cf. 172. 20–171. 3, 310. 17–19).

knowledge was ultimately made explicit in scripture, Job (who lived long before it was written⁵⁹) could be seen as one who was faithful to it from the beginning.⁶⁰

'Right-mindedness', then, like 'mind of scripture' its object, was one element in a larger picture of what perceived reality is. For like most of his contemporaries (pagan as well as Christian⁶¹) Eunomius believed that some of our knowledge about God is inherent and can be discerned in the *κοινῶν λογισμῶν* or 'shared conceptions' found in all human beings.⁶² Thus in addition to the knowledge available to us through 'the teaching of the fathers' (holy scripture and its orthodox interpreters), there is also another, complementary source of knowledge available to us in the *φυσικὴν ἐννοιαν* or 'innate knowledge' implanted by God in all human minds.⁶³ Though the idea

The close connection of *εὐνοια* and knowledge is mirrored by a similar connection between *κακόννοια* and ignorance (*ἄγνοια*) in the closely related *Apostolic Constitutions*, cf. *Const. App.* 8. 2. 13–14 (SC 336. 136). In that work one result of *κακόννοια* in both bishop and heretic is *ἄγνοια*, a lack of positive knowledge (*Const. App.* 6. 5. 2–3 (SC 329. 302)), though in the case of the latter there are some who are only irreligious (*ἀσεβεῖς*) and err through ignorance alone. Cf. also (Ps.-)Ast. Soph., *Ps.* 25. 10 (Richard 191. 27–31), where those who are *κακόφρονα* are said to have denied *τῆς ἐμφυτος καὶ κοινῆς φρονήσεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων*.

⁵⁹ It was commonly believed that Job had lived before Moses and that Moses had either written or translated the book, e.g. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 1. 5–3. 3); Ar. ign., *Job* 1 (PG 17. 373B–374C); cf. Chrys., *Job*, prol. 1. 1–2. 12 (SC 346. 78–80), 30. 8. 16–17, 42. 9. 2–8 (SC 348. 126, 240).

⁶⁰ And not only for non-Nicenes, cf. Olympiodorus, *Job* 1, fr. 3. 3–5 (PTS 24. 8), Chrys., *Job*, prol. 2. 9–10, 4. 6–7 (SC 346. 80, 82), *Hom. Div.* 4. 3 (PG 63. 481C–D), where Job is portrayed as one who, in fidelity to the *φυσικὴν καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆν ἐννοιαν* (Olympiodorus), keeps the Law before there is a Law to keep; cf. *Const. App.* 6. 19. 7 (SC 329. 354), where the Law is a *βοήθειαν φυσικοῦ*, *Const. App.* 20. 6. 3–4, 14, 22. 50, 23. 1 (SC 329. 358, 368), 8. 35–6, 12. 111–12, 157–62, 198–200 (SC 336. 164, 186, 190, 194), and Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 424. 20–2 (SC 231. 242).

⁶¹ e.g. Julian Imp., *Gal.* 52B; Ath., *Gent.* 6. 17–18 (Thomson 16); Hilary, *Trin.* 9. 44. 34–6 (CCL 62A. 421); Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 186, cf. 2. 11 (J 1. 81. 17–18, cf. 230. 2–3) and the treatise entitled *Ad Graecos ex Communibus Notionibus* (J III. i. 17–33); Chrys., *Job*, prol. 4. 8–14, cf. 1. 1. 60–2, 3. 5. 54–5 (SC 346. 82, cf. 88, 212); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 424. 20–2 (SC 231. 242), Chrys., *Anom.* 7. 2 (PG 48. 758A), etc.

⁶² Eun., *Apol.* 10. 8–10 (Vaggione 44), cf. (Ps.-)Ast. Soph., *Ps.* 25. 10 (Richard 191. 27–192. 11), (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 5 (PG 28. 1164A).

⁶³ Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 7. 1–2 (Vaggione 40), *AA* 1 (J i. 201. 4) and the passages

of such knowledge was originally Stoic,⁶⁴ it had long been naturalized in Platonism (at least since the first century BC).⁶⁵ In the philosophical manuals it is described as 'that which . . . intellection [or contemplation of the world of forms] is called, after the soul has entered the body'.⁶⁶ In other words, both Eunomius and his adversaries believed that, apart from scripture, there was another, non-empirical source of knowledge about God which was inherently human and in principle open to everyone. Naturally, Christian apologists found this almost literally a godsend, for without necessarily requiring them to accept all the philosophical ideas behind the concept, it allowed them to establish a link between Christian doctrine and what they believed to be human experience as such.⁶⁷ They could thus legitimately speak of a 'Christianity as Old as Creation',⁶⁸ and both explain⁶⁹ and correct⁷⁰ non-Christian parallels while at the same time connecting them to basic human values.⁷¹ Not all of the results, however, were positive. Since 'shared conceptions' were by definition a direct apprehension of reality, they were to be proclaimed rather than argued.⁷² Then again, since the whole point was that the specifics of Christian doctrine could be identified with one particular tradition of human interpreted experience (usually that of the Greek philosophers), the boundary between the two

from Julian cited in n. 58 above. Interestingly, Basil, *Eun.* 1. 5. 25-7 (*SC* 299. 170-2), treats *ταῖς κοιναῖς πάντων ἐννοίαις* as equivalent to *φυσικὴν ἐννοίαν*.

⁶⁴ Cf. e.g. Chrysippus, *SVF* ii. 32, 34.

⁶⁵ Cf. J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977), 68-9, 276, and R. E. Witt, *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1971), 11-12.

⁶⁶ Albinus, *Introductio in Platonem* 4. 6 (Louis 17. 5-7), unpublished translation by kindness of R. A. Norris, Jr.

⁶⁷ This was, however, an appeal to general and universal, not individual experience; see pp. 130-2 below.

⁶⁸ Eusebius, *HE* 1. 4. 4 (*GCS* ii. 40. 2-7).

⁶⁹ Clement, *Strom.* 1. 19 (*GCS* ii. 60. 15-19).

⁷⁰ Or., *Cels.* 4. 14 (*GCS* i. 284. 26-8).

⁷¹ Justin, *Dial.* 93. 1 (Goodspeed 207), cf. also Justin, *Apol.* 2. 6. 3, 8. 1, 13. 5 (Krüger 65. 11-12, 67. 3-6, 72. 6-7), Athenagoras, *Res.* 14. 1-2 (Schoedel 120), Or., *Cels.* 1. 4 (*GCS* i. 58. 7-14).

⁷² According to Basil it was as unnecessary to try to prove a real 'shared conception' as to use logic at high noon to show that the sun is the brightest object in the sky, *Eun.* 1. 5. 25-30 (*SC* 299. 170-2).

became more difficult to discern. And finally, since 'truth' within a specific religious tradition was now believed to be grounded in a potentially universal human experience, error within that tradition had to be the result of 'wrong-mindedness' or one of its analogues. Heresy could *only* result from mental or moral failure.

From Eunomius' perspective, then, the problem was not merely that his opponents had tried to 'misrepresent the divine oracles'⁷³ and conform them 'to their own point of view';⁷⁴ they had also rejected one of the most obvious sources of natural knowledge.⁷⁵ By substituting their own intention⁷⁶ for that of the apostles⁷⁷ they showed the full extent of their ignorance,⁷⁸ for they were rightly 'deprived of a sound mind' for examining the Lord's teachings 'with an impaired intellect and chronically dishonest disposition'.⁷⁹ Not surprisingly, almost all these statements can be paralleled by exactly similar ones from the other side, for the two camps were separated less by method than by content and, when faced with similar difficulties, tended to adopt similar solutions.

The Nicenes claimed that Eunomius was just as ignorant of the content of scripture as any other 'Arian'⁸⁰ and equally adept at twisting it to his own point of view.⁸¹ Any claims to 'awesome' exegetical powers⁸² coming from that quarter had to be a disguise for some more sinister purpose—the attempt to distort scripture⁸³ by forcing it into a perverted personal framework.⁸⁴

⁷³ Eun., *AA* 2 (J i. 312. 30–313. 1).

⁷⁴ Ibid. (J i. 281. 25–6), *σφετερίζεται τὴν ἐρμηνείαν*.

⁷⁵ Cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 5 (PG 28. 1164A).

⁷⁶ Eun., *Apol.* 24. 22–3 (Vaggione 66).

⁷⁷ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 113. 9–11, 115. 11–13), cf. Cyril, *Thes.* 19 (PG 75. 313A/B) where the Nicenes are said to distort the σκοπός of Scripture.

⁷⁸ Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 47. 25).

⁷⁹ Ibid. 2 (J i. 316. 8–11).

⁸⁰ Cf. Soc., *HE* 4. 7. 6, 2. 35. 10 (GCS 234. 3–4, 151. 3–6), Grg. Nyss., *Conf.* 43 (J ii. 329. 14–22).

⁸¹ Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 1. 399. 40–2 (SC 231. 170); Hilary, *Trin.* 12. 50. 4–27 (CCL 62A. 620–1).

⁸² Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 7. 657. 30–3, cf. 655. 35–41 (SC 246. 218–20, cf. 214).

⁸³ (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 7. 8 (PG 39. 584A).

⁸⁴ Ath., *Ar.* 1. 1, 52 (PG 26. 13A–B, 121A–B), Hilary, *Trin.* 12. 50. 4–27 (CCL 62A. 620–1), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 1. 399. 40–2 (SC 231. 170); cf. Eun., *Apol.* 4. 6–9 (Vaggione 36–8). There were times, however, when the methodo-

The origins of the latter were said to lie in a characteristic fault:⁸⁵ a misuse of that very appeal to 'natural knowledge' that so fascinated the apologists. For the Nicenes too had something to explain. As convinced as their adversaries that theirs was the apostolic faith, they were obliged to explain how any sane person could depart from it. Given the known apologetic stance of their opponents, it is hardly surprising that they would focus on that peculiar mix of natural knowledge and doctrinal precision so characteristic of their writings.

We can get at the specifics by looking at a theme used by almost every Nicene author who ever attacked Aetius or Eunomius. As we saw in the last two chapters, both men were conscious of a deep personal call to defend the faith. Like their Lucianic forebears, they were convinced that, as *periti*, their role was to defend the apostolic faith and that in part its survival depended on that vigilance.⁸⁶ Yet their choice of method left them open to criticism; for by appealing to 'innate knowledge' they implied extra-biblical authority, and by striving for *akribeia* they subjected the Word of God to the analysis of the schools. This was as clear to those who shared their theological convictions as to those who did not, for the Nicenes were not alone in their discomfort. Much later, when western non-Nicenes were forced to defend themselves before the relative theological sophistication of an Ambrose⁸⁷ or Augustine,⁸⁸ they spoke of the corrupting influence of 'philosophy' and demanded a return to biblical simplicity.⁸⁹ This was not the *sola*

logical shoe was on the other foot; cf. e.g. Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 5. 284-5 (*SC* 28bis. 296) and Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 554. 41-556. 20, 566. 35-568. 27 (*SC* 237. 290-4, 326-32), where the argument starts with general considerations and then goes on to scriptural proof.

⁸⁵ He was, after all, 'the leader of Arius' theatrical dancing-floor', Eunomius, *Fr.* 3. 1 (Vaggione 178).

⁸⁶ See above, Ch. 2, pp. 23-4, Ch. 3, pp. 45-7.

⁸⁷ Palladius, *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 86. 337^r. 29-87. 337^r. 49 (*SC* 267. 272-4), cf. Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 1. 12-18 (*CSEL* 78. 108-9).

⁸⁸ Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 5, cf. 14. 8 (*PL* 42. 725, cf. 726).

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 1, 13, 14. 3, 14. 11, 14. 13, 14. 20, cf. 4 (*PL* 42. 709-10, 719, 724-5, 729, 730, 736, cf. 711); cf. also Eusebius of Nicomedia, *Ep. Paulin.* 4, cf. 2 (*Urkunde* 8, Opitz iii. 16. 8-9, cf. 15. 8-9); Ath., *Ar.* 1. 30 (*PG* 26. 73B-C). Some Eastern non-Nicenes referred sarcastically to Gregory Nazianzen as *φιλοσοφώτατε* or *θεολογικώτατε* because he claimed to understand God and trusted in *λογικαῖς*, Grg. Naz., *Or.* 28. 7. 1-4, cf. 11. 7-9 (*SC* 250. 112, cf. 122),

scriptura of later ages, but it did imply a rejection of the kind of 'technical' philosophy favoured by Aetius and Eunomius; for its authors put *their* trust in a solid alliance of scripture and tradition.⁹⁰ If in this they differed methodologically from their more 'expert' eastern colleagues, it was not because Aetius and Eunomius failed to oppose paganism⁹¹ or assert the apostolic tradition,⁹² but because in their view the problem lay not in the use of philosophy but its abuse. For if a so-called 'Christian' theologian like Basil could make statements mimicking those of Epicurus⁹³ or Aristotle,⁹⁴ it was not because he used reason, but because he used it badly.⁹⁵ In effect, by denying providence⁹⁶ he had, like the philosophical pagans, tried to impose an alien meaning on scripture.⁹⁷

Eunomius' problem, then, was not unlike that of the bishops at Nicaea. The latter, frustrated by the inability of their enemies to understand the plain meaning of scripture, had fallen back on the technical vocabulary of philosophy.⁹⁸ Eunomius, faced with what a significant portion of the Christians around him believed was a deliberate effort to change the Christian faith ('whether through ill will or some

while the fictional 'Arius' of (Ps.-)Ath., *Disp.* 22 (PG 28. 465A) demands that 'Athanasius' abandon his syllogisms and stick to scripture. By the 5th cent. (especially in the West) hostility to syllogistic logic seems to have become a fixed element in non-Nicene apologetic; cf. Vigilius, *Felic.* 4, 6 (PL 42. 1159, 1161), *Ar. Dial.* 1. 5, 14 (PL 62. 158B, 164C), *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 1. 17, 23, cf. 14 (PL 62. 192B, 196A, cf. 190A). Such 'Arian' rejections of philosophical argument did not, of course, mean (any more than it did for Nicenes) that truth could not sometimes be found elsewhere, even in pagan authors, e.g. *Ar. ign.*, *Pag.* 7. 2. 110^v. 19 ff. (CCL 87/i. 132, here based on Cyprian).

⁹⁰ Cf. e.g. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 44. 304^v. 38–40, 46. 305^f. 14–35 (SC 267. 236, 238), and Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 546. 14–19 (SC 237. 264), (Ps.-)Ath., *Disp.* 14 (PG 28. 452D–453A), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 24 (PG 39. 745A).

⁹¹ Eun., *Apol.* 16. 4–5, 19. 4–6, 22. 10–12 (Vaggione 52, 56, 62), cf. *AA* 2 (J i. 282. 1–14, 362. 7–9).

⁹² Aetius, *Synt.*, proem. apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 11. 2 (GCS iii. 352. 6–7); Eun., *Apol.* 4. 6–9 (Vaggione 56–8), *EF* 1. 4–5, 6. 1–5 (Vaggione 150, 158).

⁹³ Eun., *AA* 2 (J i. 345. 25–9).

⁹⁴ Ibid. (J i. 346. 4–11).

⁹⁵ Ibid. 1 (J i. 214. 6–10, cf. 54. 6–12), 3 (J ii. 310. 25–6).

⁹⁶ Ibid. 2 (J i. 282. 1–14, 311. 24–8).

⁹⁷ Ibid. (J i. 281. 25–7).

⁹⁸ See Ch. 3, pp. 53–7 above.

other perverse inclination') felt obliged to do the same. If the words of scripture could not provide their own 'confirmation' (πίστωση), its supporters would have to do so for it. The means, however, was to be 'further argument',⁹⁹ and according to his opponents, that was just the problem. These so-called 'arguments' (especially those based on 'logic') did not so much confirm scripture as impose an alien meaning on it. Hence if Eunomius thought his opponents erred through ill will, they were convinced that he strayed through 'artifice' or τέχνη. In their eyes he was now a 'logic chopper' (τεχνόλογος), not a Christian.¹⁰⁰

In ordinary usage τέχνη was the harmless designation of a trade and without polemical intent.¹⁰¹ As the characterization of a theologian, however, it was the near fatal description of a disorder as pervasively destructive as *kakanoia* itself, for behind it lay the ancient dichotomy between philosopher and rhetor. Eunomius' early efforts to become a 'craftsman of words' thus indeed came home to roost, for in the eyes of a philosopher, a rhetor or sophist was a mere artisan—a wizard or illusionist¹⁰² whose goal was power over others and whose 'art' (τέχνη) was mere 'smoke and mirrors', naked persuasiveness without regard for truth.¹⁰³ Hence as the Nicenes looked back past the Council

⁹⁹ Eun., *Apol.* 6. 10–17 (Vaggione 38–40), cf. Aug., *Trin.* 4. 21. 68–72 (CCL 50. 204–5).

¹⁰⁰ e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 2. 604 (J i. 402. 28), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 17–19 (SC 250. 224).

¹⁰¹ e.g. Justin, *Apol.* 1. 9. 2 (Kühn 6. 15–19). Some later authors, however, found it hard to pass over the parallels with Aetius' vagabond youth, Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 36–41 (J i. 34. 18–36. 20), cf. Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. 1, gk. 1–28, syr. 1–24 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 408–9).

¹⁰² Plato, *Sophista* 234E–235B. Τέχνη often carried a resonance of magic which ancient readers would have taken seriously, e.g. Justin, *Apol.* 1. 14. 2, 30. 1 (Kühn 10. 22–3, 23. 29–30), *Dial.* 85. 3 (Goodspeed 197), Ath., *V. Anton.* 80. 3. 11 (SC 400. 338). Cf. Vigilus, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 2. 41 (PL 62. 224A/B), where 'Athanasius', an 'egregium artis suae magistrum', is guilty of 'praestigiorum fraudibus', and, in Vigilus, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 2. 50 and *Ar. Dial.* 2. 15 (PL 62. 230B, 178D), of 'magicas artes'.

¹⁰³ Cf. Plato, *Gorgias* 452D–E, cf. 455A–457C. Eventually the word came to mean verbal trickery of almost any kind, not just the logical sleight of hand usually meant as e.g. in Basil, *Eun.* 2. 5. 10–17 (SC 305. 24), where Eunomius is accused of τέχνη because he claims that 'many saints' (in scripture) refer to the Son as κτίσμα but fails to give an example. Earlier Trypho had accused

of Nicaea along the time-line separating them from the apostles, they found in this ancient dichotomy a plausible explanation for their enemy's departures—his very efforts to 'confirm' the scriptures were what drew him furthest from them. By putting his trust in 'natural knowledge' this so-called 'rhetor'¹⁰⁴ had made knowledge of God equivalent to that of wood or stone, and by applying rational argument he had abandoned the humble confidence essential to faith.¹⁰⁵ His error, then, was as much one of orientation as of method, for after all in other hands 'logic' had proved harmless enough.¹⁰⁶ If in his, 'theology' had become 'technology'¹⁰⁷ the reason could only lie in the attitude with which it was used, that of overweening curiosity or presumption (πολυπραγμοσύνη¹⁰⁸ or τόλμα).¹⁰⁹ Used with this intent τέχνη did not bolster faith, it changed it. The result was a theology which 'smelled of the lamp'; a Christianity for 'experts',¹¹⁰ not ordinary folk.¹¹¹

We may well ask whether there is anything new 'under the sun', but there is only rarely anything new in theology. Before going on to explore the implications of these polemics, we need to look a little bit at their 'prehistory'. For the polemic directed

Justin of exactly the same kind of verbal misrepresentation, Justin, *Dial.* 79. 1 (Goodspeed 190).

¹⁰⁴ e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 64 (J i. 44. 11–12), 3. 3. 47, 4. 38, 51, 5. 23, 6. 55, 8. 29, 10. 50, 54 (J ii. 124. 20–2, 148. 18, 153. 23–4, 168. 9, 205. 10, 249. 22, 309. 16, 311. 3); (Ps.-)Chrys., *BVM* 2 (PG 59. 712C).

¹⁰⁵ Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 54. 17 (GCS iii. 411. 22–8).

¹⁰⁶ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 43. 23 (PG 36. 528B–C), cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 2. 551 (J i. 387. 16–388. 2), 3. 1. 131 (J ii. 47. 30–48. 3), Soc., *HE* 3. 16. 17 (GCS 211. 28–30). Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 425. 30–1, cf. 431. 34–6 (SC 231. 246, cf. 264–6) could even accuse his non-Nicene opponents of being ἀτεχνές τε καὶ ἀκαλλές because of their φιλαίτης αὐτοῖς ἐπιστήμης.

¹⁰⁷ Thdt., *Haer.* 4. 3 (PG 83. 420B); θεολογία had been turned into τεχνολογία.

¹⁰⁸ e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 365, 376, 641 (J i. 134. 22–6, 137. 22–7, 210. 21–6), 2. 12, 70 (J i. 230. 24–6, 246. 20–2), etc.; often used with περιεργάζομαι, e.g. Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 322–3, 2. 141–4, 166–7, 370–3, 377–9 (SC 28bis. 128, 154, 156, 172), cf. 2. 75–80, 102–4, 309–26 (SC 28bis. 148, 150, 166–8).

¹⁰⁹ e.g. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 4. 7 (SC 250. 232), cf. Eun., *Apol.* 13. 1–2 (Vaggione 48). In Latin, *temeritas*: Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 1. 10–11, 26. 1–3, 38. 16–18, 5. 10. 1–2, 6. 22. 1, 7. 1. 1–2, 16. 6 (CCL 62. 101, 129, 142, 159, 220, 259, 276).

¹¹⁰ Cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 14 (J i. 26. 11–16).

¹¹¹ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 32. 26, cf. 25 (PG 36. 204A–C, cf. 201C).

against Eunomius was only a specific example of a more general polemic aimed at 'expert' theology as such.¹¹² A few years earlier, for instance, the Emperor Constantine had roundly denounced Arius as a high-brow theoretician given to the public airing of questions better left unasked,¹¹³ and subsequent tradition portrayed him as an almost exclusively speculative theologian. From that point of view his interpretation of scripture could be seen less as the source than as the result of his doctrine,¹¹⁴ the reflection of a theological framework¹¹⁵ whose roots lay in pagan philosophy rather than divine revelation.¹¹⁶ Hence, in a polemic destined to have a long life, Arius was portrayed as the 'new Aristotle',¹¹⁷ a dialectician literally rushing in where angels feared to tread,¹¹⁸ one more interested in dialectical niceties than the faith once delivered to the saints.¹¹⁹ Given the prevailing view of the relationship of 'Arianism' to its 'founder', then, it was more or less inevitable that Eunomius and other non-Nicenes would be tarred with the same brush. They were said to be the purveyors of 'an alien and unwritten God' (ξένον θεὸν καὶ ἄγραφον),¹²⁰ a 'God' not found in scripture but derived from the writings of some pagan philosopher.

¹¹² It was a theme which was much older than 'Arianism'; e.g. Eusebius, *HE* 5. 28. 14 (*GCS* II. i. 504. 19–20).

¹¹³ Const., *Ep. Alex. et Ar.* 6–8 (Urkunde 17, Opitz iii. 33. 1–21); it is worth noting, as we have already seen, that his son, Constantius, said exactly the same thing of Athanasius! Ath., *Apol. Const.* 30 (*PG* 25. 633A).

¹¹⁴ Nicenes complained that 'Arians' cited scripture not to discover its meaning but only to lend a specious plausibility to their arguments, Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 7. 4–11 (*CCL* 62. 106), cf. Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 3, 4 (*PG* 25. 544C, 545B–C).

¹¹⁵ Cf. e.g. Ath., *Ar.* 1. 1, 52 (*PG* 26. 13A–B, 121A–B), Ath., *Ep. Serap.* 2. 1 (*PG* 26. 609A–B).

¹¹⁶ Cf. e.g. Ath., *Decr.* 28. 1 (Opitz ii. 24. 16–19), *Ar.* 1. 30 (*PG* 26. 73B–C), *Syn.* 36. 4–6 (Opitz ii. 263. 14–28), Ambrose, *Fid.* 4. 4. 66–71 (*CSEL* 78. 173).

¹¹⁷ Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 71. 1–2 (*GCS* iii. 218. 26–219. 1), cf. *Haer.* 69. 15. 1, 70. 1 (*GCS* iii. 164. 13–14, 218. 10–14).

¹¹⁸ Ath., *Hom. in Mt.* 11: 27. 6 (*PG* 25. 217C).

¹¹⁹ Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 18 (*PG* 25. 580A); note also such themes as the contrast made by the aged Antony between faith and dialectic in Ath., *V. Anton.* 77. 1–22 (*SC* 400. 330–2) and the conversion of the philosophers and dialecticians at Nicaea in Ruf., *HE* 1. 3 (*GCS* II. ii. 961. 27–963. 9).

¹²⁰ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 31. 1. 5–6, cf. 3. 1–7, 21. 1, 29. 1 (*SC* 250. 276, cf. 278, 314, 332); cf. also Basil, *Eun.* 1. 5. 43, 9. 8–11 (*SC* 299. 172, 200), Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 46, 2. 411 (*Ji.* 37. 19–22, 346. 4–6), etc.

Aristotle was their real 'bishop',¹²¹ while their theology was a mere farrago, picked and culled out of his *Categories*¹²² and the writings of the Stoic Chrysippus.¹²³ Into this comprehensive and apparently satisfying picture the vigorous apologetic of Aetius and Eunomius was bound to fit with seductive ease.

That makes it somewhat disconcerting to learn that almost the same accusations were made from the other side. Gregory of Nazianzus, for instance, could be called disobedient and rebellious, a denier of God,¹²⁴ and even *τολμηρός* for enquiring too closely into the generation of the Son.¹²⁵ Like Arius, Chrysostom could be considered 'faithless' and 'arrogant' for asserting the incomprehensibility of God.¹²⁶ But while both sides set revelation at the heart of a debate which took part of its polemical form from the prophetic attack on 'curiosity',¹²⁷ neither form nor substance could account for the intensity with which they pursued it. And that does require explanation; for it is yet another sign that none of the ancient explanations account for the phenomena. For while the idea that doctrine is more than the words by which it is expressed is (in just that form) a modern invention,¹²⁸ the clear inability of so many of the

¹²¹ Faustinus, *Trin.* 12 (PL 13. 60B/C), cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 2. 411 (J i. 346. 3-6), Hieron., *In Naum* 676-9 (CCL 76A. 574).

¹²² Basil, *Eun.* 1. 9. 8-11 (SC 299. 200), Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 10. 50 (J ii. 309. 8-12), cf. 1. 46, 55 (J i. 37. 19-22, 41. 3-7), 3. 5. 6, 7. 15 (J ii. 162. 10-12, 220. 4-5).

¹²³ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 5. 43-5 (SC 299. 172-4), cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 2. 163 (J ii. 106. 3-4).

¹²⁴ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 5. 9-11 (SC 250. 234).

¹²⁵ 'Presumptuous', Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 4. 7 (SC 250. 232).

¹²⁶ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 2. 60, 63 (SC 28bis. 146), 3. 60-2, cf. 68-70 (SC 28bis. 190, cf. 192); for Arius see Ch. 3 n. 175 above.

¹²⁷ Most of the accusations of *πολυπραγμοσύνη* or infidelity were connected with the debate over the generation of the divine Son (e.g. Hilary, *Trin.* 2. 10. 11-16 (CCL 62. 48)); Isaiah's assertion in 53: 8 that this debate was ultimately futile ('his generation who will describe?') proved too useful to either side to be passed over in silence and (whether explicitly mentioned or not) formed a significant part of the polemical background: e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 12. 15-18 (SC 305. 212), Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 235-40 (SC 28bis. 120) for the Nicenes, and *Symb. Sirm.* 2 apud Hilary, *Syn.* 11 (PL 10. 488B), Ath., *Syn.* 28. 6 (Opitz ii. 257. 8-9 (= Hahn, § 161, p. 200), cf. *Symb. CP* (360) apud Ath., *Syn.* 30. 3 (Opitz ii. 258. 30 (= Hahn, § 167, p. 208), Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 14 (PL 42. 730-1), for their opponents.

¹²⁸ Though in the end someone like Athanasius, for instance, might admit

ancients to understand, or in many cases, even address the concerns of their adversaries points to something genuinely beyond their ability to articulate. This is shown by the kind of polemical categories they chose. Both *kakanoia* and *τέχνη* are failures to understand an interpretative framework, but neither is defined primarily by its propositional content—in each case the determining factor is, rather, attitude or orientation. What this meant in historical terms was that when, after the breakdown of effective dialogue in 341, the two sides began to contemplate the positions of their adversaries, they found that what needed addressing was not the propositions themselves (which were often identical), but the place they occupied within an alien framework.¹²⁹ In effect, context was now almost as important as content. The result was (in a situation where neither exegesis *nor* argument would convince) that the perceived source of error had to be systemic: ‘heresy’ could only be a defective orientation or *habitus* working itself out in doctrinal terms. Participants on both sides thus found themselves staring at one another across a cognitive gulf whose increasing width made communication all but impossible. Profoundly loyal to interpretative frameworks deeply felt but only partially articulated, they were reduced to addressing one another’s arguments piecemeal while interpreting their context as moral defect. The result was a cognitive dissonance of major proportions, one which was in the end to prove insurmountable. Its source, however, is to be sought not in the propositions of the actual argument, but in the hidden and tenaciously held interpretative frameworks which, though universally assumed, were almost never argued.

This is not a comfortable conclusion. It does, however, bring us one step closer to knowing where to place Eunomius within

that different *λέξεις* could be used to express the same idea (their misinterpretation being the real problem), Ath., *Tom.* 8 (PG 26. 805A–B), there is nothing to indicate that this insight was applied in any general way.

¹²⁹ This is particularly visible in instances where a ‘heretic’ makes an otherwise unobjectionable statement; an Orthodox person saying the same thing does so with an *εὐσεβῆ διάνοιαν* and hence speaks ‘rightly’ even if not always precisely; a heretic, on the other hand, is trying to deceive even when his or her words are formally unexceptionable, (Ps.-?)Ath., *Ar.* 3. 59 (PG 26. 445C–448A), *Syn.* 39. 2–3 (Opitz ii. 265. 13–21); cf. Grg. Nyss., *Conf.* 115, 133, 171 (J ii. 360. 22–6, 369. 12–18, 384. 8–19).

the controversy, for it tells us where to look for the boundaries and what we have to explain. For if the propositions of the public debate were indeed the outriders of some more powerful but less well articulated concern, then the propositions by themselves cannot explain the debate—indeed, merely by occupying centre stage for so long they have darkened counsel. What must now be recognized is that among the chief obstacles to understanding this controversy is a category error: a failure to identify the phenomena correctly. In order to move forward we will have to rework the categories.

Recently, Professor Michael Slusser has argued cleverly that taxonomy is not merely 'the Cinderella of the sciences' but, at least for historians, their Queen.¹³⁰ And surely that is true here. In the last chapter we saw that the 'school classification' which made 'Arianism' the common offspring of an eponymous ancestor could not be sustained—Arius was *part* of 'Arianism', not its source.¹³¹ In the present chapter we shall see that the system of classification by 'propositional allegiance' which grew up after Nicaea is also inadequate, at least as a description of the real boundaries of the debate.¹³² The very form of the Nicene

¹³⁰ By Michael Slusser, 'Traditional Views of Late Arianism', in Barnes and Williams, p. 3, citing S. J. Gould, *The Flamingo's Simile* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1985), 18.

¹³¹ See Ch. 3, pp. 39–43 above. This was not, however, a 'categorical' sin of which only Nicenes were guilty; cf. e.g. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 49. 305^v. 1–8 (SC 267. 240), Hilary, *Trin.* i. 25. 2–8 (CCL 62. 22), etc.

¹³² It is also very difficult to apply in practice. Though it is perhaps unfair to cite an individual as an instance of an almost universal tendency, R. P. C. Hanson's *Search* is a good illustration of the problem precisely because it is such an excellent summary of earlier research. Hanson readily acknowledges the ambivalence of almost all 'Arians' about Arius, and recognizes that 'Arian-ism' itself is a misnomer (pp. xvii, 123–8), but he describes many of those studied as 'Arian' or 'near Arian'. Thus Eusebius of Caesarea is said to be 'a supporter of Arius' and 'sliding into' Arianism but not an 'Arian' (pp. 46, 56–9), whereas Euzoius is 'an Arian *sans pur*' standing in opposition to 'Neo-Arianism' (p. 384), a divagation, not a development of 'original Arianism' (p. 100 n. 3). 'Homoian Arianism [and] Neo-Arianism', on the other hand, are said to be distinct though easily confused (pp. 557, 588), but Eunomius sometimes represents 'Arians of every complexion' (p. 107, cf. pp. 745–6) while Eusebius of Emesa and Cyril of Jerusalem, who stand in the 'best tradition' of Arian doctrine (pp. 394–5), are unclassifiable and stand merely as 'warning(s)'

definition required any who opposed it to come up with an alternative. That in turn led to a system of classification based on the alternative chosen: 'homoiousians',¹³³ 'homooousians',¹³⁴ or 'anomoceans'.¹³⁵ But the formulae underlying these designations were less important than the criteria used to choose them, since the former could be changed and the latter almost never.¹³⁶ It is this hidden basis of selection and interpretation, then, that we must explain, for it is this which is the real centre of affective allegiance, and it is for this that some were indeed prepared to die. In spite of Gibbon's famous dictum, it was no more easy to draw an ancient than a modern audience into a 'furious contest' over a diphthong.¹³⁷

A consideration of some of the polemical consequences of the Nicene theory of *τέχνη* confirms this. The Nicenes, as we have seen, located their opponents' error in a misuse of 'learned' as opposed to 'popular' theology—they could be considered mere 'logic choppers', devoid of real religious purpose. That certainly accounted for propositional error; what it could not do was explain *religious* appeal. And yet, as we saw earlier, among

of the difficulty of applying doctrinal labels (pp. 398, 413, cf. 403). Thus in spite of a deliberate rejection of Athanasius' 'school' classification, Hanson's own 'propositional' classification, based on each group's solution to a particular problem, itself lacks coherence—his largest 'Arian' grouping, the 'Homoians' (archotypically represented by 'Akakius' of Caesarea, pp. 579, 583, cf. 558–60), in the end seems to include almost everyone who cannot be placed in another category (Aetian, Nicene, or 'Semi-Arian')! This seems to suggest that the problem lies in the categories and not in the obvious skill with which they are applied.

¹³³ e.g. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 46. 305^r. 15–16, 49. 305^r. 7 (SC 267. 238, 240).

¹³⁴ e.g. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 10, 27 (PG 28. 1133A, 1156D–1157A), Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 46. 305^r. 3, 47. 305^r. 35, 49. 305^r. 6 (SC 267. 238, 240), Ar. ign., *Sermo* 34 (PL 42. 682), etc.

¹³⁵ e.g. Ath., *Ep. Afr.* 7 (PG 26. 1041A), Hilary, *Const.* 12. 20–5, cf. 11–16 (SC 334. 194, cf. 192–4), Basil, *Ep.* 9. 2. 5–7 (Courtoune i. 38), cf. the slightly different form in (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5. 2 (PG 29. 752A).

¹³⁶ This puts a somewhat different 'spin' on complaints by Hilary and others that it was a 'fides temporum' not that of the Gospels that was being proclaimed, and that there were 'quot uoluntates, et tot . . . doctrinas', *Lib. Const.* 4 (CSEL 65. 199. 19–200. 4). Not every change in 'doctrina' was necessarily intended to change 'fides'.

¹³⁷ Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (New York: Random House, n. d.), Ch. 21, i. 690.

the few really incontrovertible things about this whole affair were the speed of its rise and the numerous social levels on which it functioned;¹³⁸ by itself τέχνη could only explain one. By thus concentrating on the propositions of the *periti* and not the reactions of their middle-brow and plebeian hearers the Nicenes made the controversy as such almost incomprehensible—they were unable to explain the one thing about it that made it something other than a ‘paltry, vain contention about words’.¹³⁹ the vulnerability of the non-expert.

For that, ironically, is one of the few things on which the participants did agree:¹⁴⁰ the fear that, lulled by plausible citations of scripture,¹⁴¹ deceptively similar liturgies,¹⁴² and specious appeals to ‘reason’,¹⁴³ these ‘simpler’ Christians would be lost, beguiled by seeming normality and long custom into seeing ‘heresy’ as the faith of their ancestors.¹⁴⁴ Indeed, the

¹³⁸ See Ch. 3, pp. 74–7 above.

¹³⁹ Const., *Ep. Alex. et Ar.* 10 (Urkunde 17, Opitz iii. 34. 14–15). Note Constantine’s concern throughout that the δῆμος be not corrupted, *Ep. Alex. et Ar.* 2, 6, 8 (Opitz iii. 32. 11–13, 33. 5–7, 10–13).

¹⁴⁰ Albeit from different points of view. Given the ‘expert’ claims of their opponents the Nicenes were more likely to be afraid that the ‘simple’ would be corrupted by argument: Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 58 (Opitz iii. 29. 5–8), Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 4 (PG 25. 545B–C), *Ar.* 1. 22, 26, 28, 32, 2. 18, 3. 67 (PG 26. 57B–C, 65B, 69C, 77C–80A, 185A, 465A, B), *Ep. Mon.* (PG 26. 1188A), Basil, *Eun.* 1. 1. 13–14, 4. 65–7, 8. 7–8 (SC 299. 142, 166, 192), Hilary, *Trin.* 7. 1. 12–26 (CCL 62. 259), 8. 3. 10–19, 35. 2–3, 9. 5. 14–18, 15. 1–6 (CCL 62A. 315, 348, 376, 386), *Auxent.* 6 (PL 10. 613A–B), Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 16. 6–12, 5. 3. 8–9 (CSEL 78. 130, 232), Cyril, *Dial Trin.* 2. 423. 35–9 (SC 231. 242), etc.; the non-Nicenes, on the other hand, though no less afraid that the ‘many’ might be corrupted (see nn. 142–4 below), were more likely to be afraid of their being overcome by force: Eun., *Apol.* 1. 4–5, 17–19, 27. 25–34 (Vaggione 34, 72), Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 49. 305. 9–26 (SC 267. 240), *Ar. ign.*, *Job* 1 (PG 17. 382A–B, 427B–428A), though cf. n. 21 above. For a more generalized popular concern see also Philost., *HE* 2. 2 (GCS 13. 6–10, 27–9), Ath., *Ar.* 1. 7 (PG 26. 24C).

¹⁴¹ Ath., *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 3, cf. 4 (PG 25. 544C, cf. 545B–C), Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 7. 4–11 (CCL 62. 106).

¹⁴² Hilary, *Auxent.* 6 (PL 10. 613A–B), (Ps.-)Chrys., *Opus Imperf.* 19 (PG 56. 736D–737A), cf. n. 3 above.

¹⁴³ Hilary, *Trin.* 2. 4. 24–7, cf. 8. 3. 20–1, 53. 6–12 (CCL 62. 40, 62A. 315, 366), Ambrose, *Fid.* 5. 3. 8–9 (CSEL 78. 232), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 3 (PG 39. 480B), (Ps.-)Chrys., *Opus Imperf.* 20 (PG 56. 744E–745A).

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 6. 1. 1–17 (CCL 62. 196), Ath., *Ar.* 1. 32 (PG 26. 77C–80A), (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 39 (PG 26. 1289C–D), Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 16.

mere fact that so few of them actually understood the arguments of the 'learned' was itself a motive for theology,¹⁴⁵ giving some of its more abstruse practitioners a 'popular' orientation they did not always hasten to deny.¹⁴⁶ Aetius and Eunomius, though they might fight in a shrinking theological arena,¹⁴⁷ were as determined as anyone else to defend this 'popular' faith.¹⁴⁸ And that, surely, requires explanation, for a faith which it was impossible to communicate could not have become 'popular'. The interpretative frameworks, then, which controlled and impeded the communications of the *periti* had to be available on some level to the *simpliciores* or we cannot explain their response. Only a faith which was accessible across all social levels can account for the controversy we actually see. And that means that by and large we have been looking at things the wrong way round; we have been trying to explain a very widespread controversy from the standpoint of its *least* rather than its most numerous participants. For while the sentiments of the *periti* could certainly spark such a crisis, they could never have sustained it. As Origen might have said, the 'fruits of individual

6-12 (CSEL 78. 154), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 3 (PG 39. 480B), (Ps.-)Chrys., *Opus Imperf.* 20 (PG 56. 743C), etc.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 5. 83-4 (SC 299. 176).

¹⁴⁶ Cf., Clement, *Strom.* 1. 6, 4. 18 (GCS ii. 23. 8-10, 298. 18-20), Or., *Cels.* 6. 10 (GCS ii. 79. 29-80. 4), *Jo.* 20. 33 (GCS iv. 379. 15-29), and Eun., *Apol.* 1. 4-5, 11-12 (Vaggione 34), *AA* 1 (*J* i. 54. 7-8).

¹⁴⁷ Compare the topics considered appropriate for theological speculation by Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 27. 10. 17-22 (SC 250. 96-8) and those recognized by Origen a century earlier, *Princ.* 1, praef. 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 (GCS 5. 11. 3-5, 13. 7-11, 13. 12-17, 14. 1-5, 16. 1-8). Cf. also the lists of suitable theological topics in *Recogn. Clem.* 1. 1. 2-2. 3, 14. 2-4, 20. 7-9, cf. 3. 75. 1-10 (GCS ii. 6. 4-7. 4, 15. 1-7, 18. 30-19. 8, cf. 145. 2-21), a work well thought of in non-Nicene circles.

¹⁴⁸ e.g. Eun., *Apol.* 1. 4-5, 6. 1-3 (Vaggione 34, 38), Philost., *HE* 3. 15 (GCS 47. 10-11). This twofold orientation, moreover, is reflected in the form of Eunomius' most extensive extant work, the *Apology*. In this work Eunomius presents his teaching in two forms: 'expert' arguments which form the bulk of the treatise, 7. 1-25. 26 (Vaggione 40-68), and a more popular summary in credal form giving 'the whole force' of his argument, 26. 1-27. 15 (Vaggione 68-72). The *Expositio Fidei*, which is similar to the latter in form, is known to have been used in Eunomian missionary activity among the 'simple' (Grg. Nyss., *Conf.* 19; *J* ii. 320. 5-10), and a similar use was probably made of the Eunomian confession appended to MSS of the *Apology* (*Apol.* 28; Vaggione 74).

study' only make sense in the context of *necessaria* that are available to all.¹⁴⁹ The heart of this controversy, then, has to lie exactly where the two sides said it did: in the *necessaria*—the apostolic tradition of scripture which was still the 'common possession' of all.

But if that was indeed the case, it was a possession which virtually guaranteed that one's foes would be 'those of one's own household'. For when Eunomius wished to present a summary of that 'essential faith' which is 'common to all . . . Christians'¹⁵⁰ he selected a biblically based creed which even his enemies regarded as an ancestral inheritance.¹⁵¹ Their reply, however, is revealing. They said, it was too vague to be used by any but the 'simple-hearted' (those with a pure Nicene intention);¹⁵² in other words, they appealed to a meaning which went beyond the words of which it was composed. This confirms our point: that the logomachies and proof-texts of the formal debate are the 'outward and visible signs' of more popularly accessible hermeneutical frameworks which formed the basis of their selection and interpretation. Indeed, this very accessibility is one of the things which makes them so difficult to define; for whether we call them 'framework', 'orientation', 'mind', or 'good will', there are few conceptual models able to encompass their distinctive blend of intellectual content and religious affect. We have already seen the deficiencies of the ancient models; we need now to ask whether we can devise anything better.

One possible avenue is suggested by Cardinal Newman. In a characteristic description of the way the mind apprehends propositions, Newman distinguishes two kinds of assent, 'notional' and 'real'. The propositional object of the former is intellectual and abstract ('a line is length without breadth'), and that of the latter external and concrete ('Philip was the father of Alexander').¹⁵³ And yet both types of proposition may be

¹⁴⁹ 'Pigriores erga inquisitionem divinae scientiae', cf. Or., *Princ.* 1, praef. 3 (GCS v. 9. 1-6).

¹⁵⁰ Eun., *Apol.* 6. 1-3 (Vaggione 38).

¹⁵¹ Ibid. 5. 1-7 (Vaggione 38) = Hahn, § 190, pp. 260-1, based on 1 Cor. 8: 6.

¹⁵² Basil, *Eun.* 1. 4. 1-6 (SC 299. 162).

¹⁵³ John Henry Newman, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 1870), 7-8.

experienced as either concrete or abstract depending on how they are received by the individual. Thus in the contextual experience of different persons, both historical narratives and theoretical formularies can be received either as terse abstractions or as records of immediate experience (as mere commonplaces or as aspirations 'inflaming the imagination and piercing the heart').¹⁵⁴ Even the dry bones of religious dogma can be received as theological and 'notional' on the one hand or as 'real' and religious on the other. In the latter event, however, dogma is 'discerned, rested in, and appropriated as a reality by the religious imagination'¹⁵⁵ and becomes 'real' when apprehended practically and imaginatively. For Newman, then, doctrine may be apprehended imaginatively as well as intellectually, for the imagination is one of the means which transforms dogma into gospel. And this is relevant. For if abstract propositions may indeed be apprehended as 'real' by the religious imagination, then the link between theological content and religious affect so characteristic of this controversy becomes intelligible: the factor which so surprisingly transcended education and class, and allowed 'simple' and 'learned' alike to die for an abstraction, was not doctrine *per se*, but doctrine imagined.

This seems to put us back on firmer ground. For in actual fact, despite (or perhaps because of) the enormous amount held in common, the participants in this controversy found it almost impossible to communicate across party lines. Serious theological discussion (even when adversarial) tended to be within rather than across traditions.¹⁵⁶ Thus while most of the participants were aware that their opponents used a different (and *ex hypothesi*, non-apostolic) 'hermeneutical framework' in selecting and interpreting evidence,¹⁵⁷ they found it more

¹⁵⁴ Cf. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, 8.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 94.

¹⁵⁶ See Ch. 3, pp. 60-7. By 'serious' I mean encounters in which the parties considered the opposing position worthy of serious discussion, even when there was much that might be rejected, e.g. Ath., *Tom.* 8 (PG 26. 805A-B). Almost all the discussion between Nicenes and their opponents involved positions to be rejected *a priori*, and thus to be refuted rather than discussed.

¹⁵⁷ e.g. Ar. ign., *Haer.* 1. 133'. 14-133". 5 (CCL 87/i. 142), cf. Concilia, C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 2. 4, 3. 4 (CSEL 65. 50. 15-17, 51. 22-5); Ath., *Ar.* 1. 58 (PG 26. 133A-B), Hilary, *Trin.* 3. 20. 36-42 (CCL 62. 92), etc. As many readers will recognize, the theoretical basis of this approach parallels that of M. Polanyi in *Personal Knowledge* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958).

difficult to recognize a similar process in themselves.¹⁵⁸ The result was a 'night battle'¹⁵⁹ of the kind described by Socrates, a battle of the deaf and very often of the blind. For while one fruit of Newman's distinction is a broader and more supple means of determining the parameters of the debate, another is the ability to account for the 'shape' of the controversy, and to explain why a conflict whose participants included some of the best minds of the age, should have been so persistently and frustratingly carried on 'in the dark'.

What frustrated the participants themselves was the degree to which they seemed so often to be dealing with a total identity of content coupled with an insuperable disparity in context. As Hilary of Poitiers put it, they were able to agree on 'the form' of the faith but not its 'meaning'.¹⁶⁰ And yet from within their respective frameworks the reactions of each side were remarkably similar: as each read the 'data' of scripture from within a particular hermeneutical context (its own special way of 'realizing' the gospel), their response to anyone who presented the same data from within another hermeneutical context was *to repeat the data*. Hence the almost total absence of communication and mind-numbing immobility of the argument. Even after more than a century of debate, we find the last participants repeating the arguments of the first (now solidified as a kind of *mos maiorum*)¹⁶¹ to equally uncomprehending ears.¹⁶²

Progress in such a context is possible only in increments:

and Thomas S. Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd edn. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).

¹⁵⁸ An exception is Basil, *Ep.* 236. 1. 11-13 (Courtonne iii. 47-8), where the saint recognizes that his starting-point is 'that which from a child we have heard from the Fathers, and which, on account of our love for what is good, we have received without question'.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Soc., *HE* 1. 23. 6 (*GCS* 69. 25-70. 2).

¹⁶⁰ Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 5. 5-13 (*CCL* 62. 41), cf. Eun., *Apol.* 6. 1-9 (Vaggione 58).

¹⁶¹ Cf. Vigilius, *Felic.* 3, 7, cf. 4, 6 (*PL* 42. 1158, 1162, cf. 1159, 1161).

¹⁶² By the 6th cent., however, this was to some extent the result of a conscious revival. The increased contact between Nicenes and non-Nicenes occasioned by Roman expansionism in the West led to the resumption of earlier apologetics, cf. e.g. Vigilius, *Mariv.* 1. praef. (*PL* 62. 351C-354B). The work as a whole is a kind of 'data bank' of scriptural quotations for the use of Justinian's missionaries.

small changes in the presentation of data over time finally change the framework. On the macroscopic level such a process is almost too large to be seen; but on the more accessible level of Senate, Circus, and Council it is visible in miniature. The minutely changing acclamations of an imperial *adventus* or senatorial debate permitted the ancients to establish a common mind without dangerously isolating the individual.¹⁶³ The same process on a world-wide scale served to disguise change even while permitting its reality: the great majority of Christians were enabled to move from one framework to another without conscious departure from 'the faith once delivered'. This slow change in the presentation of the 'data' (over nearly fifty years) is what underlies the Nicene triumphs of the 380s.¹⁶⁴ The language of successful theological revolution was rooted in the slowly changing *praxis* of sermon and catechesis. It is in this context that we need to assess the work of the *periti* (Aetius and Eunomius among them) and not the other way around. Efforts, whether ancient or modern,¹⁶⁵ to locate the primary meaning of the debate in the *τέχνη* of the experts have not been notably successful. The 'expert' role was in point of fact a more humble one—they were the defenders and servants of the 'maps' that gave scripture its coherent shape. The arguments and proof-texts that so weary the modern reader are but the ruined defences of those maps, the outworks of a slowly changing and only partially explicit 'reality'—signs, not of an unmediated difference in religious experience, but of different ways of integrating the symbols that give it cognitive shape.

To clarify the nature of a question is to underscore the need for an answer. Given the nature of the question we have uncovered, then, 'map' is a very useful analogy, for maps have the advantage of being at once both very abstract and primarily visual. Like propositions, moreover, they can be understood both 'really' and 'notionally'. But while such considerations

¹⁶³ See Ramsay MacMullen, *Corruption and the Decline of Rome* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988), 65–8, 240.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus' comparison of the Nicene movement to the hidden waters of an underground stream, that is a distant rumble and then suddenly breaks forth, *Or.* 42. 14 (*PG* 36. 473B–D).

¹⁶⁵ For a discussion of some current efforts, see Vaggione, *Arius*, 63–87.

underscore the general relevance of Newman's distinction, they also draw attention to one of the ways in which the ancients' apprehension of 'text' (particularly narrative text) differed from our own. For in some ways it had that particular combination of the 'real' and the abstract we experience in maps. One of the more cryptic features of early Christian art is a case in point. Modern viewers are often puzzled by the extent to which early Christian artists used biblical individuals (often quite obscure ones) to represent abstract ideas.¹⁶⁶ And yet the presence of their literary equivalent in the writings of even the most ordinary Christians shows that this was indeed one of the ways in which their age differed exegetically from our own. Daniel and Susanna, Moses, Judas, and Job are all present, either as abstractions and in their concrete personae, in documents we would label secular.¹⁶⁷ The result was a kind of 'circumincision' of elements that we would normally keep apart; for when a figure functions both historically *and* symbolically, the words and actions associated with the former tend to acquire increased importance as signs of the latter.¹⁶⁸ This was especially true of Jesus himself. Modern readers, who have often been taught to think of the Gospels as 'passion narratives with extended introductions',¹⁶⁹ are surprised to discover his ancient importance as a purveyor of religious information. And yet, whether we consider the 'True Prophet' of popular imagination¹⁷⁰ or the more

¹⁶⁶ Cf. e.g. André Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of its Origins* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 18–19, 112–27, and the comments on 'typological' portraiture on p. 65.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. e.g. Leslie S. B. MacCoull, 'Coptic Documentary Papyri as a Historical Source for Egyptian Christianity', in Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 46, 48–50.

¹⁶⁸ This is true whatever the attitude of a given author toward typology or allegory. The ancients' interest in the symbolic or moral content of what they read transcended their disputes over the manner of its expression. For an example from a largely non-allegorical milieu, see the various portraits of Job discussed in an article by the author cited, Ch. 5 n. 166 below.

¹⁶⁹ The phrase seems to have originated with Martin Kähler's *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Biblical Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 80 n. 11.

¹⁷⁰ e.g. *Hom. Clem.* 1. 1. 2–5, 3. 1–4, 19. 1, cf. 2. 4. 3 (*GCS* i. 23. 5–13, 23. 21–4, 8, 32. 24–33. 1, cf. 37. 15–16), *Recogn. Clem.* 1. 1. 2–2. 3, 3. 1–5, 16. 1 (*GCS* ii. 6. 4–7. 4, 7. 6–21, 15. 21–5), etc.

sophisticated creations of Justin,¹⁷¹ Hilary,¹⁷² or Augustine,¹⁷³ we are repeatedly in the presence of One whose teaching was at least as important as his person, a truly Divine Philosopher who, unlike his earthly counterparts, could indeed speak 'with authority'.¹⁷⁴ Even Athanasius, as ready as any to regard the death of Christ as the *κεφάλαιον τῆς πίστεως*,¹⁷⁵ could lay special emphasis on his role as Revealer.¹⁷⁶ But while an interest in Jesus as a purveyor of religious knowledge points to one difference between that age and this, it is also reveals something of what then separated one Christian from another. For in an era which thought Christ's earthly teaching and conduct worthy of mention in the creeds¹⁷⁷ it was particularly important to determine who was speaking or acting when he did so. To put it more concretely: if one chose to listen to this extraordinary individual, to whom exactly was one listening? It is in their respective answers, so different and yet so consistent over time, that the two sides begin to reveal themselves most clearly.

Certainly their portraits of Jesus in action were strikingly different. One of the things which most outraged Nicenes about the non-Nicene portrait of Christ was the extent to which the passages describing his glory were played down at the expense of those describing his humiliation.¹⁷⁸ The passages in

¹⁷¹ Justin, *Dial.* 7. 1-8. 2 (Goodspeed 98-100).

¹⁷² Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 4. 1-6. 44 (CCL 62. 4-7).

¹⁷³ Aug., *Conf.* 7. 24 (CCL 27. 108. 1-17).

¹⁷⁴ Cf. the contemporary artistic theme of the Heavenly Teacher surrounded by his disciples in e.g. Grabar, *Christian Iconography*, illustrations 24, 171, 172, 328, etc.

¹⁷⁵ 'Chief point of the faith', Ath., *Inc.* 19. 20-4 (Thomson 180).

¹⁷⁶ Cf. e.g. Ath., *Gent.* 1. 29-30, 29. 46-30. 12, 44. 29-33 (Thomson 4, 82, 122), *Inc.* 11. 2-20, 12. 1-2, 16. 1-6, 41. 17-26 (Thomson 158-60, 162, 172, 236), etc.

¹⁷⁷ e.g. Eusebius, *Ep. Caes.* 4 (Urkunde 22, Opitz iii. 43. 13), *Const. App.* 7. 41. 18-19, 8. 12. 213-21 (SC 336. 98, 194), Eun., *Apol.* 27. 7-8, cf. *EF* 3. 41-2 (Vaggione 70, cf. 156); cf. also *Symb. Ant.* (341) 1, 2 (Hahn, §§ 153, 154, pp. 183, 185), *Symb. Sirm.* 3 (Hahn, § 163, p. 204), *Symb. Nic.* (359) (Hahn, § 164, p. 206), *Symb. CP* (360) (Hahn, § 167, p. 209), and (Ps.-)Ignat., *Smyrn.* 1, cf. *Trall.* 9 (Lightfoot II. iii. 218. 17-18, cf. 157. 27). Note Ambrose's complaint in *Fid.* 3. 16. 47-9 (CSEL 78. 135) about an 'Arian' infatuation with Christ's raising the dead, walking on water, or healing the sick—even God's servants do that!

¹⁷⁸ e.g. Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 16 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 9. 20-22), *Ep. Alex.*

question were those in which he was seen praying,¹⁷⁹ displaying fear,¹⁸⁰ anguish,¹⁸¹ or ignorance,¹⁸² hunger,¹⁸³ fatigue,¹⁸⁴ or thirst,¹⁸⁵ recognizing his subordination¹⁸⁶ or assigning limits to his authority.¹⁸⁷ We can gauge their effectiveness by the vehemence of the response. For in Nicene eyes there could be only one reason for such a tack: to deny the divinity of the Son and make him equivalent to any other creature.¹⁸⁸ Non-Nicenes, naturally, took it all quite differently.

We can get a sense of how by examining one of the passages from outside the Gospels where we happen to possess the reactions of both sides: the awful *κένωσις* of the Son of God described in the Epistle to the Philippians. There we are told that it was One who was 'in the form of God' who was willing to embrace 'death on a cross' for our sake.¹⁸⁹ Hence when Basil the Great wished to refute one of Eunomius' more obscure references to scripture¹⁹⁰ and wrongly took him to be alluding to Acts 2: 36¹⁹¹ (a well-known 'Arian' proof-text¹⁹²), this passage was a fairly natural one to quote.¹⁹³ What it meant in Basil's view, however, was that there was a sharp distinction between the One who 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God' and

4, 37 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 20. 8-11, 25. 17-22); Ath., *Inc. et c. Ar.* 1 (PG 26. 984A-985A), cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 24 (PG 26. 1276C-D); Basil, *Eun.* 1. 18. 1-6 (SC 299. 234); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 3. 484. 42-485. 4, cf. 6. 589. 8-11 (SC 237. 70-4, cf. SC 246. 16); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 1 (PG 39. 780B-C); Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 10. 25-8 (CSEL 78. 132), Chrys., *Anom.* 7. 3 (PG 48. 759B), Thdt., *Ep.* 151 (PG 83. 1417C), etc.

¹⁷⁹ e.g. Matt. 26: 39 (see Appendix).

¹⁸⁰ e.g. Matt. 26: 37, Mark 14: 33 (see Appendix).

¹⁸¹ Matt. 27: 46, cf. Mark 15: 34 (see Appendix).

¹⁸² e.g. Matt. 24: 36, cf. Mark 13: 32 (see Appendix).

¹⁸³ e.g. Matt. 4: 2, cf. Luke 4: 2 (see Appendix).

¹⁸⁴ e.g. John 4: 6 (see Appendix).

¹⁸⁵ John 4: 7, cf. 19: 28; Hilary, *Trin.* 10. 24. 1 (CCL 62A. 478).

¹⁸⁶ e.g. Mark 10: 18, cf. Luke 18: 19, 23: 46, John 14: 28 (see Appendix).

¹⁸⁷ e.g. Matt. 20: [20]-23, cf. Mark 10: 40; John 5: 19 (see Appendix).

¹⁸⁸ e.g. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 4, 13-14 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 20. 7-8, 21. 19-23), *Ep. Encycl.* 7 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 7. 21-8. 2), Ath., *Ar.* I. 6 (PG 26. 21D-24B).

¹⁸⁹ Phil. 2: 6-11 (see Appendix).

¹⁹⁰ Eun., *Apol.* 12. 1-6 (Vaggione 46-8).

¹⁹¹ Basil, *Eun.* 2. 2. 3-8 (SC 305. 12).

¹⁹² See Appendix.

¹⁹³ Basil, *Eun.*, 2. 3. 1-26 (SC 305. 16-18).

'the form of a servant' which he assumed. That meant that, since the passage in Acts describes the One made 'Lord and Christ' as 'crucified', it refers to 'the form of a servant' and *not* to the One who was 'in the form of God'. As far as Eunomius was concerned, this was blasphemy in the strict sense, for in his eyes Basil could only mean that there were *two* Christs, one human and the other divine. From his point of view, the only way to represent the real 'mind of the apostle' was to assume that he meant the same subject throughout.¹⁹⁴

And that, surely, is fundamental. For when Eunomius accused Basil of being 'ashamed of the cross' of Christ¹⁹⁵ he was referring to one of the most characteristic features of Nicene exegesis. For the Nicenes, Jesus' cry of dereliction from the cross or anguished words in Gethsemane were the expressions of his human, not his divine nature;¹⁹⁶ if his ignorance of 'the

¹⁹⁴ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 112. 10-116. 28), cf. Aetius, *Ep. Mazona* (Diekamp 311. 2-7). (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 6 (PG 39. 844A-B) seems to be replying to non-Nicene arguments of a similar kind; cf. also Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 25 (PL 42. 739), where, in reply to Augustine's assertion that the Father in John 14: 28 is greater than the *formam servi*, Maximinus asserts that even the angels are greater than that! The Father, then, must be greater than the Son. It is easy to understand non-Nicene qualms when we read such statements as that in (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 18 (PG 39. 352B-353A) to the effect that Christ's humanity was joined to his divinity through obedience and *ἔργως* and was 'saved' by it, or that in (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 31 (PG 26. 1285B-C), cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 11. 49. 6-29 (CCL 62A. 578-9), which asserts that we can be imitators only of 'the Man' and not of the Godhead of the Logos, for no one could be a *μυητής* of the Word!

¹⁹⁵ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 112. 12), cf. (Ps.-)Ignat., *Trall.* 6, 11, *Phil.* 3, *Her.* 2 (Lightfoot II. iii. 154. 6-7, 162. 10-12, 191. 26-7, 245. 26-7), *Const. App.* 6. 26. 1. 5-6 (SC 329. 376). This is the mirror opposite of an accusation in Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 5. 30-2 (CSEL 78. 121), where the great doctor calls the Arians worse than those who crucified the Lord because they believe that the 'divinitatem Christi' was 'cruci subditam'; but cf. the striking image in Ar. ign., *Job* 2 (PG 17. 457A, 458D-459A) of the Devil prostrate before the cross of the Only-begotten God while the perfumed aroma of his shed blood fills the whole world.

¹⁹⁶ e.g. Ambrose, *Fid.* 2. 5. 17-21 (CSEL 78. 70-1). Note the interesting idea in this same passage, 5. 33-6 (CSEL 78. 71), that Christ feared death more than Peter because being God in the flesh he was able to demonstrate the full weakness of the flesh in a way impossible to Peter because the latter (being merely human) could not know death's real power. Some non-Nicenes also had difficulty with this passage and suggested that it was not the 'deitas' of the Only-begotten that shook with fear in Gethsemane but the 'carnis

day or the hour' could not well be denied, there was comfort in the thought that it was Mary's and not God's Son who spoke.¹⁹⁷ And yet this still left a difficulty. For however satisfying it might be to distinguish intellectually between things said *θεικῶς* and things said *σωματικῶς*,¹⁹⁸ it is extremely difficult to imagine anyone speaking now as God and now as a human being—particularly in the same sentence.¹⁹⁹ And that, for non-Nicenes, was a major difficulty; for if there was only one Christ there had to be only one voice.²⁰⁰ If there were only one voice, there had to

infirmatatem', Ar. ign., *Job* 3 (PG 17. 515B), presumably echoing the ambiguities of some such passage as Or., *Cels.* 2. 25 (GCS i. 154. 16–21), where Jesus says some things as 'First-born of all creation' and others as a mere human being.

¹⁹⁷ (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 33 (PG 26. 1288B); note, however, the more 'economic' explanation in Aug., *Trin.* 1. 12. 1–26 (CCL 50. 61–2). Ambrose, discussing a similar passage (Luke 2: 52), notes that some Orthodox are prepared to assert 'confidently' that as a human being Jesus was ignorant of some things prior to the crucifixion; he could not make up his mind about this himself, *Fid.* 5. 18. 11–28 (CSEL 78. 300–1).

¹⁹⁸ Things said as God and things said as a creature of flesh: e.g. Ath., *Tom.* 7 (PG 26. 804C–805A); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 3. 479. 40–3, cf. 479. 1–4 (SC 237. 64, cf. 60), 4. 534. 27–32 (SC 237. 228), 5. 547. 22–35, 571. 10–20 (SC 237. 268, 340); Ambrose, *Fid.* 2. 9. 36–8 (CSEL 78. 85); Aug., *Trin.* 1. 11. 1–6, cf. 7. 4–13, 9. 3–14 (CCL 50. 60, cf. 44–5, 54), Sev. Gab., *Abr.* 7 (PG 56. 562A), etc.

¹⁹⁹ Some of the difficulties can be seen in Augustine's efforts to describe Jesus at prayer, *Trin.* 1. 10. 70–1 (CCL 50. 59): 'Ex hoc enim rogat quo minor est pater; quo uero aequalis exaudit cum pater.' Note, however, Pseudo-Athanasius' charming analogy of identically stamped gold and silver coins to explain divine and human sayings in close proximity, *Serm. Fid.* 24 (PG 26. 1276D–1277D).

²⁰⁰ The power of this assumption is visible in one of Eunomius' more abstruse arguments, *AA* 2 (J i. 326. 14–22, 327. 9–12, 328. 21–5). In *Eun.* 1. 6. 39–47 (SC 299. 186) Basil had argued that things known *κατ' ἐνύοιαν* were given different names depending on how they were analysed by the human mind; in 1. 7. 1–15 (188–90) he applied this to the titles of Christ. Eunomius replied if these titles were bestowed by the apostles or some other human being Basil would have a case; but as they originated with Christ himself there were not successive stages of thought and hence no *ἐνύοια* (on the meaning and implications of this word, see below, Ch. 6, pp. 241–3). Eunomius' argument rests on the assumption that only one voice was heard in Jesus, that of the Only-begotten God, for the Only-begotten God's knowledge was simple, the reflection of his nature, not the outcome of a process of mental analysis. He and Basil were arguing from fundamentally different ways of envisaging the incarnate Christ.

be only one subject—and that subject could not be a mere man (*ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος*).²⁰¹ It had to be the Only-begotten God, the instrumental cause of the universe.²⁰²

The Nicenes, of course, were aware of this.²⁰³ And while on occasion they were prepared to deny that the non-Nicenes described the Son as 'God' at all,²⁰⁴ in their more sober moments they knew that this was not the case.²⁰⁵ Indeed, one of their more prominent fears was the concern that the less well educated, hearing 'Christum Deum' on 'Arian' lips, might actually think them Nicene!²⁰⁶ From a Nicene point of view, then, the ascription of all the Son's sayings to a single subject was one of their enemies' more devilish ploys, for it made the non-Nicene position exegetically, and therefore imaginatively, accessible to almost everyone.²⁰⁷ Eunomius' claim that Basil's 'two Christs' subverted the 'mind of the Apostle' was in some ways only an echo of the same charge directed at himself,²⁰⁸ but

²⁰¹ Ar. ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 1: 32. 28^v. 16–29^f. 4 (CCL 87/i. 205), cf. (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 364–5 (SC 146. 90), (Ps.-)Ignat., *Phil.* 5, *Philad.* 6 (Lightfoot II. iii. 193. 20–2, 212. 7–13), (Ps.-)Ast. Soph., *Ps.* 22. 3 (Richard 173. 19–20); see also nn. 218, 246 below. That not all such qualms were unjustified is shown by the assertion in (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 17, cf. 19 (PG 26. 1272B, cf. 1272C) to the effect that prior to the eschaton we can know only the Son of Man, and not the Word or Wisdom of the Father. For the same accusation directed at Eunomius, see (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 701B).

²⁰² e.g. Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 14 (PL 42. 732), Ar. ign., *Job* 1 (PG 17. 400D, 403A, 406A), etc.; cf. *Const. App.* 8. 12. 203 (SC 336. 194): ὁ δημιουργὸς ἀνθρώπου ἄνθρωπος γενέσθαι.

²⁰³ See Gregory of Nyssa's complaint regarding John 20: 17 in *Eun.* 3. 10. 8–9 (J ii. 292. 7–12).

²⁰⁴ In *Trin.* 6. 7. 8–11 (CCL 62. 202) Hilary claims that the heretics never use 'God' of the Son, but later he claims that for them the Son is 'God' in name, not in nature, *Trin.* 8. 3. 26–7 (CCL 62A. 315), while later still he asserts that they teach either that the Son is alien from the Father, or that he is another kind of God, or that he is not God at all, *Trin.* 10. 3. 7–9 (CCL 62A. 461); cf. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 4, 10, 11 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 20. 10–11, 21. 9, 12–14), Ath., *Ar.* 1. 6 (PG 26. 21D–24B), etc.

²⁰⁵ e.g. Ambrose, *Fid.* 3. 16. 32–4 (CSEL 78. 155), Aug., *Trin.* 2. 13. 34–5 (CCL 50. 111), *Coll. Max.* 11 (PL 42. 714), cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 14. 23–4 (SC 250. 206).

²⁰⁶ ('Christ is God') Hilary, *Auxent.* 6 (PL 10. 613A–B), cf. *Fr. Hist.* B. II. 11. 2 (CSEL 65. 151. 12–18), Phoebad., *Ar.* 19 (PL 20. 27B–C).

²⁰⁷ Hilary, *Trin.* 9. 5. 14–18, 15. 1–6 (CCL 62A. 376, 386).

²⁰⁸ (Ps.-?)Ath., *Ar.* 3. 35, cf. 29, 38 (PG 26. 397A–400A, cf. 385A, 445A), *Ep. Serap.* 2. 7 (PG 26. 620A), *Serm. Fid.* 24 (PG 26. 1276C–D); Cyril, *Dial.*

none the less, in these sharply differentiated ways of hearing the voice of the One 'obedient unto death' we do seem to have found an issue capable of sparking the kind of controversy our sources describe. For if the formulae of the experts were indeed the guardians of the vision of the simple, then there *were* abstractions capable of moving a world—abstractions that had become 'real'.

This is confirmed by a look at the non-Nicene Christ in detail. Nicene interpretations of the non-Nicene Christ tend to be negative—to focus on what he was not: *not* the Unbegotten God.²⁰⁹ Non-Nicene interpretations tend to be positive—to focus on what he was: the Maker of the world made flesh. Thus, while non-Nicenes certainly wished to claim that the God acknowledged by Jesus Christ was his God as well as ours,²¹⁰ their devotional emphasis was on his role as God of all the things 'which came into existence after him and through him'.²¹¹ Thus Mary carries in her arms the Sustainer of the universe,²¹² while shepherds²¹³ and Magi²¹⁴ alike adore 'God in the body'. The great hymns of later centuries, *Quem terra, pontus, aethera*,²¹⁵ and *A solis ortu cardine*,²¹⁶ could have been sung with

Trin. 1. 397. 20–5 (SC 231. 164); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 1 (PG 39. 780B–C), etc.

²⁰⁹ e.g. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 4. 13–14 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 20. 7–8, 21. 19–23), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 1 (PG 39. 781A), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 575. 32–3 (SC 237. 352), etc.

²¹⁰ John 20: 17 (see Appendix).

²¹¹ Eun., *Apol.* 15. 13–14 (Vaggione 52), *AA* 3 (J ii. 273. 27–274. 1, 276. 6–7, 281. 23–4), Aetius, *Exp.* 4. 45–6 (SC 317. 156), cf. Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 2 (PL 42. 724), Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 1. 79r. 8–11 (CCL 87/i. 95), etc.

²¹² Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 1. 4. 1^v. 19–24 (CCL 87/i. 48–9).

²¹³ Ar. ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 1. 3. 6^r. 5–7 (CCL 87/i. 200).

²¹⁴ Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 1. 5. 40^r. 13 (CCL 87/i. 49); cf. also *Jud.* 9. 6. 90^r. 24–5, 91^r. 14–16 (CCL 87/i. 108).

²¹⁵ 'Quem terra, pontus, aethera | colunt, adorant, praedicant | trinam regentem machinam, | claustrum Mariae baiulat' ('The God whom earth and sea and sky | adore and laud and magnify, | whose might they own, whose praise they tell | in Mary's womb was pleased to dwell').

²¹⁶ Note especially the verse, 'Feno iacere pertulit, | praesepe non abhorruit, | parvoque lacte pastus est | per quem nec ales esurit' ('The manger and the straw he bore, | the cradle he did not abhor, | a little milk his infant fare, | who nourishes each fowl of air'). Much non-Nicene piety would have been familiar to later, more 'Nicene' ages, cf. e.g. (Ps.-)Ign., *Trall.* 10 (Lightfoot II. iii. 159. 32–3, 36–160. 1).

equal gusto by Nicene and non-Nicene alike, for non-Nicenes were as devoted as their Nicene counterparts to the piety of the wondrous interchange, rising on occasion to almost Athanasian heights: 'the Son of God became Son of Man that sons of men might become sons of God'.²¹⁷ What they could not do was admit that there was ever any but a single voice or a single subject, for what truly frightened them about the Nicenes' doctrine was that it seemed to deny the incarnation:²¹⁸ no Nicene could be sure of hearing and seeing 'God walking upon earth'.²¹⁹

But if we may now conclude that this was one of the main building blocks of the controlling vision, we also find another piece of the puzzle falling into place: like their opponents, the non-Nicenes were so much more consistent in imagining the incarnation than in explaining it. For while theoretically their starting-point may not have been all that different from that of their opponents, on this level their internal progression was intellectual rather than religious, an effort to expound a vision rather than unpack a theory. Arius, for example, like the young Athanasius,²²⁰ seems to have started from a 'Logos-

²¹⁷ Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 1. 4. 1^v. 17-19 (CCL 87/i. 48), cf. 10. 2. 62^v. 16-24 (CCL 87/i. 75), *Const. App.* 8. 12. 210-13 [31] (SC 336. 194), (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 23-34 (SC 146. 58).

²¹⁸ Cf. Philost., *HE* 8. 13 (GCS 114. 6-115. 3). This also seems to be the import of the accusation reported by Athanasius in *Ep. Adolph.* 3, cf. 4 (PG 26. 1073D, cf. 1076C-1077A) to the effect that Nicenes worshipped a creature. The presence of a human personality meant that one could not be truly worshipping God made flesh, but only a human being (see nn. 201 and 246).

²¹⁹ Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 5. 1. 50^v. 11-12 (CCL 87/i. 61), cf. Ar. ign., *Fid.*, fr. 18, 5. 76. 22-50 (CCL 87/i. 258). A number of authors, notably R. P. C. Hanson (*Search*, 109, 112, 121, 303, 425-6, 566-7, cf. 40-1, 42-3) and Maurice Wiles and Robert Gregg ('Asterius: A New Chapter in the History of Arianism', in Gregg, *Arianism*, 132-3, 134, 135-6, cf. 126) have presented the divine suffering *per se* as the central non-Nicene concern. I have deliberately referred to 'presence' rather than suffering, however, because in my view non-Nicene authors show about the same range of emphasis on this issue as their Nicene contemporaries. That is, as a group they are all interested in saying that, whatever Jesus did or experienced, it was the Creator God who did or experienced it; their interest in suffering, however, varies with time, occasion, and personal interest. Thus, in describing the central tenets of the movement (as opposed to the theologies of individuals), it seems better to concentrate on the reality of the divine presence rather than its particular manifestations.

²²⁰ e.g. Ath., *Inc.* 8. 24-5, 42. 20-1, 34-5, cf. 22. 24-5 (Thomson 152, 238,

Sarx²²¹ Christology of a typically Alexandrine kind, though one with a difference: a strong emphasis on the Logos as the subject of the earthly experiences of Jesus.²²² Significantly however, and in sharp contrast to his successors and colleagues, there is little to indicate any particular speculative interest in *how* this was accomplished.²²³ For that we need to go to the followers of Lucian of Antioch. It is they with their focus on *akribeia* who are said to have placed so much emphasis on an explicit denial of a human soul in Jesus and to have portrayed the Logos 240, cf. 188), though cf. *Inc.* 8. 18–25 (Thomson 152) for an adumbration of the concerns later expressed in e.g. *Ath.*, *Ep. Epict.* 7 (*PG* 26. 1061A/B), etc.

²²¹ Cf. Arius, *Ep. Const.* 2 (Urkunde 30, Opitz iii. 64. 8–9).

²²² The insistence that scriptural passages referring to Jesus' humiliation and suffering applied directly to the Logos is attested almost from the beginning, cf. *Alex. Al.*, *Ep. Alex.* 37 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 25. 17–21).

²²³ At least there is very little evidence for this; Arius may have speculated on this subject, but (with one exception) all the evidence that he did so comes from later stages of the controversy: e.g. (Ps.-)Ath., *Apoll.* 2. 3 (*PG* 26. 1136C–1137A), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 21, 30 (*PG* 39. 900A, cf. 904A, 949B), *Epiph.*, *Haer.* 69. 19. 7 (*GCS* iii. 169. 4–10), *Thdr. Mops.*, *Catech.* 5. 9 (*ST* 145. 111–113), etc. The one exception is a fragment from the writings of Eustathius of Antioch preserved by Theodoret: *Thdt.*, *Eran.*, flor. 3. 11 (Ettlinger 231. 22–7) = Spanneut, fr. 15 (p. 100. 2–6). Though the opponents denounced by this fragment clearly taught that the body taken by Christ did not possess a human soul, their identity is something of a mystery because they are nowhere identified by name. The possibility that they might be 'Arians' is deduced from the title of the book from which the fragment is said to come. Unfortunately this is not itself consistent; it is variously described as, *De Anima* (*Thdt.*, *Eran.*, flor. i. 29, ii. 18, iii. 10 (Ettlinger 100. 13, 157. 20, 231. 10), cf. Hieron., *Vir. Inlus.* 85 (*TU* 14. 1. 44. 14), and John Damascene, Spanneut, fr. 2, 6 (pp. 95. 15, 96. 27)), *De Anima et Contra Philosophos* (Spanneut, fr. 2 (p. 95. 19–20)), and (more promisingly), *De Anima Contra Arianos* (Spanneut, fr. 16 (p. 100. 10–11)). However, even if all these references are to the same work (and this is by no means certain, cf. R. V. Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1928), p. 72, n. 7, and Spanneut, pp. 63–4, 67–8), only the fragment cited under the first might really be anti-Arian; the rest could just as easily be anti-Docetist (cf. Spanneut, pp. 67–8). But even if we ignore the circularity of the argument ('the original title shows the opponents to be Arians; the opponents were Arians so the title must be original') and agree that the fragments do indeed describe 'Arian' doctrine, we still do not know which 'Arians'; Eustathius might just as easily have been referring to the Lucianists, who are known to have been active in Antioch and who are specifically said to have taught this doctrine (see n. 224). There is nothing in any of the fragments to indicate that they refer to Arius as an individual; here as so often we must be content to know his general and not his specific doctrine.

as functioning in its stead.²²⁴ If we assume, then, that like Arius they were starting from the Church's common stock of inherited scriptural imagery,²²⁵ this makes perfect sense; for to those determined to defend the earthly presence of the Creator, none of the others, whether leaven in a loaf,²²⁶ light in a body,²²⁷ or God in a temple,²²⁸ could equal the power of soul in a body.

It is easy to see why. One purpose of the latter dichotomy is to explain the self-motivating force which distinguishes animate from inanimate beings.²²⁹ In an ancient context that meant that any seemingly regular or purposive movement could be seen as an indication of the presence of soul;²³⁰ so much so that even Athanasius, that fount of Nicene orthodoxy, could take the ordered moving of the cosmos as a sign of the soul-like presence of the Logos.²³¹ The real difficulty with all this was that object and motivating force were thought to belong to different orders of reality. The resulting 'dis-ease' was symbolized by such images as oil and water,²³² water and wine,²³³ or even the two halves of a centaur (!).²³⁴ It was here that

²²⁴ Epiph., *Anc.* 33. 4 (GCS i. 42. 19-24).

²²⁵ Many shared with their enemies: e.g. Ath., *Inc.* 17. 26-36 (Thomson 174-6), Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 645 (PG 37. 1073), the sun penetrating a body; Ath., *Inc.* 8. 24-5, cf. 22. 26-7, 26. 7, 31. 31-2 (Thomson 152, cf. 190, 196, 210), *Ep. Adolph.* 7 (PG 26. 1080D-1091B), (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 5 (PG 26. 1265D), God in his temple, etc.

²²⁶ Ar. ign., *Anmunt.* i. 6 (Leroy, *Epektasis*, 349).

²²⁷ Ar. ign., *Jud.* 4. 8. 83^v. 3-10 (CCL 87/i. 99-100).

²²⁸ Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 8 (PL 42. 726-7), Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 2, 5. 195. 19-29, cf. fr. 5, 5. 285. 13-16 (= 5. 285. 43-7), fr. 6, 5. 277. 47-5. 278. 4 (CCL 87/i. 232, cf. 236, 238), Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 5. 3. 51^r. 9-11, cf. 10. 4. 64^r. 3-6 (CCL 87/i. 62-3, cf. 76), etc. It is worth noting, however, that this image had already long been used of the soul in the body, e.g. Philo, *Op.* 69, 82, 137 (Cohn and Wendland i. 23. 8-9, 28. 22-3, 48. 4-5), etc.

²²⁹ e.g. Philo, *Op.* 65-6, cf. 62 (Cohn and Wendland i. 21. 17-27. 7, cf. 20: 13-15).

²³⁰ e.g. Or., *Princ.* 1. 7. 3 (GCS v. 88. 12-89. 6).

²³¹ e.g. Ath., *Gent.* 43. 7-12 (Thomson 118), cf. *Inc.* 41. 17-26, 42. 1-41 (Thomson 236, 238-40) and Aug., *Trin.* 3. 3. 1-49 (CCL 50. 133-5); for others this analogy better fit the Spirit, cf. e.g. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (PG 29. 769A/B), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 7. 652. 14-20 (SC 246. 204).

²³² Basil Anc., *Virg.* 46, cf. 47 (PG 30. 760B-C, cf. 761C).

²³³ Nemesius, *Nat. Hom.* 3 (Morani 39. 5-11, cf. 38. 23), cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 3. 23. 9-10 (CCL 62. 95). Cf. also Demophilus of Constantinople according to Philost., *HE* 9. 14 (GCS 121. 2-5): milk diluted in Ocean.

²³⁴ Cf. Basil Anc., *Virg.* 7 (PG 30. 681D-684C), where human beings are like centaurs, a λογικός joined to an ἀλογικόν at the navel.

the imagery broke down. As a means of visualizing the living Christ it could attract even Nicenes;²³⁵ as an explanation of the dead one it was next to useless. This was especially true of those who, like the non-Nicenes, wished to emphasize that it was indeed the Only-begotten *God* who walked among us, suffered, and died:²³⁶ too much distance vitiated the concept, too little impaired the divinity.²³⁷

Non-Nicene efforts to address this issue illustrate the problem. For the ancients it was axiomatic that the Deity could never undergo the change implied by suffering.²³⁸ For although this might be possible in principle for lesser intelligibles,²³⁹ it was difficult, even in their case, to see how the gap between material and immaterial could be overcome. Jesus' bodily sufferings were generally acknowledged to be real; but if those sufferings were to be meaningful they had to be experienced by their subject in some way.²⁴⁰ It was idle to say as some did that damage to the garment was damage to the wearer,²⁴¹ for as the Nicenes were quick to point out, pain by itself was irrelevant.²⁴²

²³⁵ Cf. Ath., *Inc.* 17. 14–24 (Thomson 174), (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 10 (PG 26. 1268D–1269A); cf. also Aug., *Trin.* 2. 9. 28–34 (CCL 50. 100), where the great doctor finds the analogy attractive in a more restricted sense.

²³⁶ For a Nicene example note the interesting idea in (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 27, cf. 29 (PG 39. 401A, 405A, 413B) that it is proper (*ἰδιον*) to a Creator to die for its creatures and that only the suffering of an *αὐτοκρατορικῆς* nature could bring salvation to all.

²³⁷ Obviously, this was not a concern (or a problem) limited to non-Nicenes; cf. e.g. Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 508. 19–509. 25 (SC 237. 150–4), Ath., *Ep. Adolph.* 5, 8 (PG 26. 1077C/D, 1082C–1084A), Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 36. 1 (GCS iii. 184. 11–14), etc.

²³⁸ Cf. Arius' own teaching as reported in Const., *Ep. Ar.* 29 (Urkunde 34, Opitz iii. 73. 6–7); note also Hilary's none too convincing attempt to uncouple change and suffering in *Syn.* 49 (PL 10. 516B–517A): 'Non enim idipsum est, pati et demutari. . . .'

²³⁹ Cf. e.g. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 47. 15–17, cf. 310. 5–6), and Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 623. 32–5 (SC 246. 118).

²⁴⁰ Cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 79 (PL 10. 532B–533A), where, in reply to *Symb. Sirm.* 1, anath. 13 (Hahn, § 160, p. 198), he accuses his enemies of saying that two entities suffered, Jesus and the Son of God. A parallel difficulty arose with regard to more ordinary humans; if soul and body did not really interact, the soul could not be held responsible for the body's actions, cf. Ar. ign., *Job* 3 (PG 17. 515D–516A).

²⁴¹ Ar. ign., *Sermo* 7 (PL 42. 679–80), cf. Cyril H., *Catech.* 4. 23 (Reischl i. 114).

²⁴² (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 21 (PG 39. 900A, cf. 904A–B); this seems also

If the Logos was the subject, the Logos had to be the patient. Moreover, the attendant theoretical difficulties, while certainly felt by others,²⁴³ were particularly acute for the non-Nicenes, for if they wished to assert that it was *God* who died, they had to find a mechanism for the death. Yet if no mortal could save and the Logos could not die, how could the cross be anything other than the dissolution of a partnership? There were certainly some who said that it was,²⁴⁴ and others who claimed that it wasn't really necessary,²⁴⁵ but with respect to all the things that 'inflamm the imagination or pierce the heart' the non-Nicenes were little different from their Nicene contemporaries, though equally deficient in theory. Not unsurprisingly, one of the clearest and most 'precise' attempts at the latter comes from the hand of Eunomius himself.

Like the rest of his school, Eunomius believed that the Son could not have been born a man 'for the freedom and salvation of our race' if he had taken upon him 'the man' made up of body and soul.²⁴⁶ Hence, on the analogy of the soul's entrance into the foetus, he seems to have believed that the 'Spirit' which impregnated Mary was the second and not the third of the divine natures.²⁴⁷ At any rate he took a very firm line on the

to be the import of the complaint in (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 39 (PG 26. 1289C-D) that the author's opponents are *σαρκόφρονες* who refuse to be enlightened by those who are spiritually minded—their interest is in physical suffering.

²⁴³ Cf. the claim in (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 21 (PG 39. 908A-909A) that the agony in the garden was a sham to fool the Devil and show the compassion of the Deity!

²⁴⁴ e.g. Ar. ign., *Sermo* 7 (PL 42. 679); that this was not a problem limited to non-Nicenes is shown by Athanasius' frequent description of the Logos offering up his body (*Inc.* 8. 26-31, 10. 8-11, cf. 37. 48-50 (Thomson 152, 156, cf. 226)) or raising it up in a very external way (*Inc.* 26. 10-12, 28-30, 27. 9, cf. 25. 36-7, 33. 1-2 (Thomson 196, 198, cf. 196, 213); cf. also (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 2, 29 (PG 26. 1265B, 1284C/D)); note too the rather striking description of the risen body as a *τρόπαιον* of victory in *Inc.* 30. 9-14, 32. 25-33, cf. 31. 24-33 (Thomson 206, 212, cf. 210).

²⁴⁵ Cf. Ath., *Ar.* 2. 68 (PG 26. 292A). Ambrose may be responding to the same approach in *Fid.* 2. 11. 15-30 (CSEL 78. 90-1).

²⁴⁶ Eun., *EF* 3. 40-1 (Vaggione 154-6); cf. nn. 201, 218 above. Basil's complaint, in *Eun.* 2. 21. 20-2 (SC 305. 86) that Eunomius made the Son *οἷόν τι ὄργανον ἁψυχον* refers to the role of the pre-incarnate Logos.

²⁴⁷ He never actually discusses the matter, but such an interpretation would be in accordance with his general understanding of the Spirit as sanctifying rather than creating. Presumably his teaching was similar to that of Maximinus

corresponding moment in ordinary human generation. In contrast to those who asserted that the soul was transmitted directly from Adam through intercourse, he taught that God, by a concomitant act, imparted an individual soul to every body in the womb.²⁴⁸ Thus, while the primary focus of this doctrine was the incorporeal individuality of the soul²⁴⁹ (with a possible anti-Apollinarian twist²⁵⁰), of related interest was the parallel between divine and human generation: in each case a finite series of divine or human actions led to the production of a single composite individual.²⁵¹ Thus according to Nemesisius of Emessa, Eunomius

in Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 21 (*PL* 42. 736), where the Holy Spirit descends upon Mary for sanctification to enable her to receive the *virtus altissimi*, Christ himself. For other examples, see Ar. ign., *Jud.* 4. 5. 82^v. 22–83^f. 2 (*CCL* 87/i. 99), *Hom. Sollemn.* 1. 4. 40^f. 3–5 (*CCL* 87/i. 49).

²⁴⁸ Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 79. 13–81. 16, cf. 207. 2–3), *Const. App.* 5. 7. 128–35, 7. 38. 19–23 (*SC* 329. 232–4, 336. 90), and the Anomoean interpolation in *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 4. 6–8 (*GCS* ii. 98. 20–99. 5). Cf. also Eunomius himself in *Apol.* 13. 8–11 (Vaggione 48), where the bodies of human beings, presumably reckoned among the ἐμβόχων . . . σωματών, grow by physical augmentation and hence cannot be used to explain the incorporeal generation of the Son.

²⁴⁹ As not implying corporal transmission, cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 80. 7–13), *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 4. 8 (*GCS* ii. 99. 2–5). Note that in the Macedonian fragment cited in (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 7. 3 (*PG* 39. 573A) it appears to be the φύσις generally rather than the soul specifically which is transmitted and διεμορφώθη, and this fits well with the idea of a communication of (bodily?) nature or essence (μετουσίᾳ) as at Eun., *Apol.* 16. 2–3, cf. 18. 1–2 (Vaggione 52, cf. 54).

²⁵⁰ At least this is what Hilary seems to have in mind in espousing a similar doctrine in *Trin.* 10. 20. 1–22. 11 (*CCL* 62A. 474–5); he portrays his (Apollinarian?) adversaries as arguing that if Christ had possessed a human soul, it must have been a sinful one inherited from Adam through Mary—an idea which, while undoubtedly a *reductio ad absurdum* in Apollinarius, was as blasphemous to Eunomius as to Hilary. It is also worth noting that in Nemesisius' discussion of the subject (*Nat. Hom.* 2 (Morani 30. 18–32. 19)) the obviously well-informed account of Eunomius is immediately followed by another of Apollinarius; and it is just possible that this reflects the sequence of ideas in his (Eunomian?) source, cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 79. 13–81. 16).

²⁵¹ e.g. like the Son himself in Eun., *Apol.* 12. 10–12 (Vaggione 48), ordinary human beings in Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 207. 2–3, cf. 147. 9–10) are begotten οὐκ ὦν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι. It is possible that a similar parallelism underlies the Eunomian denial of Mary's ever-virginity (Philost., *HE* 6. 2 (*GCS* 71. 3–9) and (Ps.-)Chrys., *Opus Imperf.* (*PG* 56. 635C)). In Eun. 4 (*PG* 29. 701C–D) Pseudo-Basil argues that 'Firstborn of all creation' (Col. 1: 15) need not imply

'... defined the soul as a bodiless essence created in a body (οὐσίαν ἀσώματον ἐν σώματι κτιζομένην),²⁵² agreeing thereby with both Plato and Aristotle; for though "bodiless essence" came from Plato, "created in a body" was the teaching of Aristotle. And yet, for all his acuteness, Eunomius could not see that the things he was trying to reconcile were incompatible.²⁵³

There is no need to try to 'unpack' Nemesius' criticisms here or go into the background of the doctrine. We need only note that, exegetically, Eunomius seems to have taught that human souls originated along with the rest of the intelligible universe in the process described in Genesis 1: 1 to Genesis 2: 3 and were stored up in the divine foreknowledge pending the creation of material reality.²⁵⁴ Thus in Genesis 2: 7, because the divine breath is mentioned *after* the creation of the body, Eunomius could take it as a paradigm for the infusion of the soul.²⁵⁵ But since in his view an unboundaried or eternal creative act was impossible,²⁵⁶ the souls created in the beginning had to be numerically finite, as did the bodies intended to receive them. Hence, when the final number was reached, the world itself would come to an end. According to Eunomius, then,

'... the world is not yet full but is even now incomplete and in constant need of addition, for at least fifty thousand intelligible essences are added to it every day (οὐσίαι νοηταὶ προσγίνονται). But the really

that the 'firstborn' was a creature (i.e. continuous with those that followed it) since Mary's 'firstborn' was not the first of many (citing Matt. 1: 25). By insisting that Mary was the mother of other sons and daughters Eunomius may have been attacking this argument.

²⁵² Cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 265. 5-6): ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἀνθετός ἐστιν ἐκ ψυχῆς ἀσώματου καὶ σώματος εὖ κειμένου πρὸς λογικῆς φύσεως ἑνώσω.

²⁵³ Nemesius, *Nat. Hom.* 2 (Morani 30. 18-22).

²⁵⁴ Cf. Nemesius, *Nat. Hom.* 2 (Morani 31. 16-32. 2), and Eunomius himself, *Apol.* 24. 11-13 (Vaggione 64); cf. Aetius, *Synt.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 9, 31 (*GCS* iii. 354,5, 358. 12), *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 9. 4 (*GCS* ii. 103. 13-17).

²⁵⁵ This is implied by the fact that Nemesius refutes this interpretation in the passage immediately following, *Nat. Hom.* 2 (Morani 30. 23-31. 8), and is confirmed by the use of the identical argument in Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 81. 5-7). This may also be the background of a similar argument in (Ps.-)Ath., *Trin. et Spir.* 18 (*PG* 26. 1211C, cf. 1212A) rejected as being 'secundum fabulatores Judaeos' (a reference to some such argument as that in Philo, *LA* 1. 39 (Cohn and Wendland i. 70. 21-5)?).

²⁵⁶ Cf. Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 224. 4-5).

hard thing,' says Nemesius, 'is that once this process is complete, in his view the world itself will come to an end since the foreordained number of souls (τὸν ψυχικὸν ἀριθμὸν) will be reached in the completed human beings awaiting resurrection.'²⁵⁷

This intricate interweaving of biblical and speculative elements is characteristic of Eunomius and parallels an equally adventuresome theory of Logos and body in Christ. Using the terminology of contemporary medicine,²⁵⁸ Eunomius speculates that it was through the faculties or δυνάμεις of the body that the divine Logos encountered his creation:

'... there are some,' says Nemesius, 'especially the Eunomians, who claim that God the Word was united to the body, not in essence (κατ' οὐσίαν), but by means of the faculties proper to each (κατὰ τὰς ἐκατέρου δυνάμεις). There was thus no union or mixture of essences, but a mingling of the faculties of the body with those of the divinity. But since (speaking organically only) they mean by "faculties of the body" like Aristotle the senses, in their view it was with the latter that the divine faculties mingled to form a union (ἐνωσιν) of Word and sensation.'²⁵⁹

Eunomius' theory was not widely accepted or even, perhaps, very successful, but what is significant about it for our purposes is that it is fairly clearly the product rather than the source of his particular way of seeing the incarnation. Its purpose was to ensure that the words we hear in the mouth of Jesus are those of the Only-begotten God and none other. This confirms what we are told elsewhere,²⁶⁰ for while there are indeed signs of other

²⁵⁷ Nemesius, *Nat. Hom.* 2 (Morani 31. 8–13). The same doctrine is found in *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 26. 4 (GCS ii. 116. 1–5), a work with at least one substantial Anomoean interpolation, and possibly also in *Ar. ign.*, *Job* 3 (PG 17. 511D–512A).

²⁵⁸ Note the very similar terminology in Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 89. 5–7) and *Ath.*, *Gent.* 28. 31–5 (Thomson 78), where every bodily member has its own ἐνέργεια, combining or separating according to ἡ φύσις ἢ συνάξασα.

²⁵⁹ Nemesius, *Nat. Hom.* 3 (Morani 43. 16–44. 4, cf. 44. 4–13); this seems to show that Hanson is wrong in claiming Eunomius was not much interested in the incarnation (*Search*, 627–8, cf. 732).

²⁶⁰ Cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 10. 50. 1–51. 10 (CCL 62A. 504–5); more ambiguously, note the interesting 'Arian' (?) speculations in *Trin.* 10. 20. 1–7 (CCL 62A. 474), and the tripartite theory described in *Trin.* 10. 61. 1–5 (CCL 62A. 515). Cf. also the later speculations recorded in *Ath.*, *Ep. Adolph.* 1, 4 (PG 26. 1073A, 1076C).

'Arian' theories, there are none of other 'Arian' pictures. It seems, then, that a great deal of what separated supporters from opponents of the Council of Nicaea was a particular way of 'seeing' Jesus Christ.

In the last chapter we concluded that relations among the participants could best be understood in terms of 'two related, but increasingly independent historical and theological dialectics';²⁶¹ in the present one we have explored one prominent manifestation of this in an almost insuperable exegetical impasse based on partially tacit hermeneutical frameworks. If we have now correctly identified the imaginative heart of these frameworks in two related but subtly different portraits of Jesus, we can move on to examine their wider context. For no picture of this kind ever stands alone: if the Creator of the world, in order to walk among us, could not have possessed a human soul, the drama of salvation moves back a notch—the *pre-incarnate* Logos becomes the focus of mediation and what is meant by mediation becomes an issue. But if that is the case, then espousing such a solution must have had imaginative as well as ontological consequences. In antiquity most of the discussion centred on the latter.²⁶² The former, though equally pervasive and certainly no less fundamental, were more often assumed than expressed. The result was a subtle, progressive, and poorly articulated disjunction in the way the Christian story was imagined. We now need to explore the shape of that disjunction.

It is one of the minor ironies of history that what ended in ultimate imparity began with a good deal of similarity, if not identity. The two sides began with what was in effect the same visual inheritance: the descending *taxis* or hierarchy of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This all but apostolic 'order', indeed, so seemingly fixed in creed²⁶³ and catechesis,²⁶⁴ was

²⁶¹ Above, Ch. 3, p. 50.

²⁶² e.g. (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 27 (PG 39. 944A), cf. Ath., *Ep. Adolph.* 5 (PG 26. 1077C).

²⁶³ Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 5. 1–7, cf. 4. 6–9, 6. 1–3 (Vaggione 37–8), where the traditional hierarchical structure of the creed is described as a *γνώμονα* or *κανόνα* defining the faith common to all Christians.

²⁶⁴ Cf. e.g. Cyril H., *Procatech.* 15, *Catech.* 4. 4, 16, 7. 1, 11, etc. (Reischl i. 20, 94, 108, 208, 220, etc.).

what non-Nicenes usually meant when they spoke of 'catholic tradition'.²⁶⁵ Arius' claim to have learnt his doctrine at Alexander's knee was perhaps as much ingenuous as mendacious,²⁶⁶ for the latter was on occasion prepared to refer to the Son as a 'mediating nature' (*μεσιτεύουσα φύσις*);²⁶⁷ in unguarded moments, indeed, even the unbending Athanasius seems to take this hierarchy for granted.²⁶⁸

But if there was a general agreement as to the existence and membership of the hierarchy, there was little or none as to its meaning. The pre-eminence of the ultimate Triad was guaranteed by scripture and tradition²⁶⁹ but its relationship to other celestial powers was by no means so certain. How, for instance, did angels and archangels, thrones and dominations, principalities and powers, relate to these more puissant entities? Was the Holy Spirit a kind of Archangel?²⁷⁰ Did the divine Son, the biblical 'Angel of great Counsel',²⁷¹ lead the heavenly hosts or was he the mirror of the everlasting Father?²⁷² More to the

²⁶⁵ e.g. *Symb. Sirm.* 2 (Hahn, § 161, p. 201), quoted below, n. 300; cf. also Ch. 3 n. 49, and Eun., *Apol.* 12. 1-6 (Vaggione 46-8). As has been well pointed out by R. P. C. Hanson (*Search*, 714, cf. 64, 730, 872), prior to the 4th cent. this doctrine would have been regarded as 'catholic' by almost everyone; how difficult it was to eradicate even after can be seen in Basil's willingness to speak of the Spirit as secondary to the Son (*δευτερεύειν τοῦ υἱοῦ*) in *Eun.* 3. 1. 26-8 (*SC* 305. 146), and in his impassioned defence of the *τάξις* in *Ep.* 52. 4. 5-21 (Courtonne i. 136-7); cf. also (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (*PG* 29. 724C, 732B, 753B), where the Spirit is as much the image of the Son as the Son is of the Father.

²⁶⁶ Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2, 4 (Opitz iii. 12. 3-4, 13. 13-14).

²⁶⁷ Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 45 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 26. 27-8), but cf. the passages cited in n. 274 below.

²⁶⁸ e.g. Ath., *Gent.* 40. 8-16, 41. 16-27 cf. 9. 18-19, 19. 20-1 (Thomson 110, 114, cf. 24, 52), *Ep. Serap.* 1. 30, cf. 1. 25, 3. 5 (*PG* 26. 597C, cf. 588C-589A, 632B), etc.

²⁶⁹ Even the 'Arians' says Ambrose in *Fid.* 5. 18. 46-7 (*CSEL* 78. 303) acknowledge the Son as 'supra angelos'.

²⁷⁰ (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 4, cf. 2, 7. 8 (*PG* 39. 489A, cf. 456B/C, 581C-584A); cf. also Didymus, *Spir.* 50. 2-8, 60. 1-63. 15 (*SC* 386. 190, 198-202). Others thought the Holy Spirit was intermediate between the divine and angelic natures, (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 6. 18, 8. 1 (*PG* 39. 548A, cf. 548C-549A, 620A), cf. Basil, *Ep.* 125. 3. 34-9 (Courtonne ii. 34). In the *Alteractio Heracliani* (*PLS* 1. 347A), Germinius of Sirmium describes the Spirit as 'principem angelorum, archangelorum'.

²⁷¹ Isa. 9: 5 [9: 6] (LXX).

²⁷² Both sides were comfortable with 'angel language' about the Son, even if

point, where did the 'break' come? For unlike their pagan contemporaries these otherwise divided Christians were convinced that there was no continuum, no unbroken chain linking final shade to ultimate source.²⁷³ The opening words of Genesis had created a gap in the chain of being which no mere creature could cross. Granted, then, that there was a gap at all (*διάστημα*), where did it come? Between Father and Son? Son and Spirit? Or between Spirit and all else? For while it was generally agreed that the road to the ultimate Source lay through the Logos, the angel and interpreter of the Father,²⁷⁴ different visions of the incarnate Logos forced them to put the 'break' in different places. The Nicenes, then, with their insistence that the *incarnate* Christ was both human and divine, had to place the 'break' between contingent and non-contingent at that point. But if the 'break' could come no higher, if there were truly no 'gap' between Father and Son,²⁷⁵ there had to be one between the ultimate Triad and all else.²⁷⁶ Nicenes therefore could place the 'break' below the Spirit. Non-Nicenes, on the other hand, had to see it differently. Since they insisted that the Redeemer was univocal from first to last, to place the 'break' within the incarnate Logos was to make two Christs. The 'break' between contingent and non-contingent could only

they used it in different ways: e.g. Ath., *Gent.* 45. 1-6, cf. 34. 25-6, 47. 3-4 (Thomson 122, cf. 94, 130), Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 23. 11-27, 5. 11. 1-15 (*CCL* 62. 125-6, 162-3), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 7. 8 (*PG* 39. 588A), etc. for the Nicenes; for the non-Nicenes: Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 1. 20-4, cf. 4. 97^v. 25-98^v. 7 (*CCL* 87/i. 115, cf. 116) and the passages cited in n. 295 below.

²⁷³ See the picture of the celestial hierarchy in e.g. (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 2. 1. 12-27 (*SC* 146. 94-6), Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.*, apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 51. 306^f. 2-19 (*SC* 267. 242), Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 1. 79^f. 8-11, 4. 4. 82^f. 24-82^v. 11, 14. 1. 20-4 (*CCL* 87/i. 95, 98-9, 115), Ar. ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 5. 1. 155^f. 22-155^v. 12 (*CCL* 87/i. 213), *Const. App.* 2. 30. 4-10, 5. 85-6 (*SC* 320. 248-50, 329. 282), and the passages cited in n. 265 above.

²⁷⁴ This seems to be one of the starting-points of Nicene doctrine, found even before *ὑποούσιος* was devised to defend it: Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 18 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 22. 15-19), cf. Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 2 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 2. 2-3), and e.g. Hilary, *Syn.* 35 (*PL* 10. 507C-508A), Basil, *Eun.* 2. 12. 27-33 (*SC* 305. 46), etc.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Basil's stark refusal to recognize anything but the *δύο . . . λεγομένων πραγμάτων, θεότητος τε καὶ κτίσεως, καὶ δεσποτείας καὶ δουλείας* in *Eun.* 3. 2. 18-19ff. (*SC* 305. 152), language echoed in Grg. Naz., *Or.* 34. 8. 1-4 (*SC* 318. 212).

²⁷⁶ Cf. Aug., *Coll. Max.* 5 (*PL* 42. 711): grace descends 'per gradus'.

come as the final, mediating term of a hierarchy whose node was the mysterious dichotomy between Father and Son.²⁷⁷

It was to prove a defining moment. For by seeing the Christian message from one vantage-point or the other the two sides laid the groundwork of the interpretative frameworks that were to define them for the rest of their existence. But though the frameworks themselves were doctrine 'realized' (narrative and visual), the concrete discussion centred around particular formulae. The chief symbolic issue was whether or not the word 'creature' might properly be applied to the Son. Almost everyone was willing to say that the Son was a *γέννημα*, or 'offspring';²⁷⁸ after the Council of Nicaea,²⁷⁹ however, only committed non-Nicenes would say without further ado that the Son was *ποίημα* or 'thing made'. The question, of course, is why they thought this important and what they meant. One of the reasons they thought it was important was because they believed it to be the language of scripture (Proverbs 8: 22),²⁸⁰ but what did they mean? The Nicenes thought they knew: they meant it was just another way of saying the Son was one creature among many.²⁸¹ The non-Nicenes

²⁷⁷ e.g. Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 3 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 10-12), (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 9 (PG 28. 1129C); Ath., *Decr.* 17. 5, 23. 2, 24. 1, 3 (Opitz ii. 14. 19, 19. 16, 20. 1, 13), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12 (PG 25. 565B), *Syn.* 42. 1-2 (Opitz ii. 267. 27-268. 14), (Ps.-)Ath., *Ar.* 4. 3, 4 (PG 26. 472B. 473B), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 2. 17 (SC 250. 180), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2 (PG 29. 681C, 684B-685A, 688C/D, 689C, 692C), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 454. 33, 459. 43, 460. 41 (SC 231. 334, 348, 352), etc.

²⁷⁸ e.g. Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 3 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 10-12), (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 9 (PG 28. 1129C); Ath., *Decr.* 17. 5, 23. 2, 24. 1, 3 (Opitz ii. 14. 19, 19. 16, 20. 1, 13), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12 (PG 25. 565B), *Syn.* 42. 1-2 (Opitz ii. 267. 27-268. 14), (Ps.-)Ath., *Ar.* 4. 3, 4 (PG 26. 472B. 473B), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 2. 17 (SC 250. 180), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2 (PG 29. 681C, 684B-685A, 688C/D, 689C, 692C), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 454. 33, 459. 43, 460. 41 (SC 231. 334, 348, 352), etc.

²⁷⁹ It was claimed that before the council Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, had described the Son as 'made'. This in fact seems to have been the case as even an embarrassed Athanasius had to admit, though it was used (he said) in a more acceptable sense, Ath., *Dion.* 20. 3 (Opitz ii. 61. 19-27).

²⁸⁰ e.g. Eun., *Apol.* 12. 1-12 (Vaggione 46-8), Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 4 (Opitz iii. 16. 8-12), *Heracl.* (PLS 1. 345D-346A, cf. 348C, D), etc. See below, n. 285.

²⁸¹ This was true almost from the beginning: Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 4 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 20. 7-8), cf. *Ep. Encycl.* 7, 16 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 7. 13, 9. 24-5), Ath., *Decr.* 6. 1 (Opitz ii. 5. 28), *Syn.* 48. 2 (Opitz ii. 272. 22-5).

themselves denied this,²⁸² and by and large their practice bears them out.

For one thing, as we have already seen, the two sides defined the word differently. For the Nicenes 'creature' was equivalent to 'not God'.²⁸³ Hence if there were only two possibilities (God or creature), and the Son was 'creature', the Son could not be God.²⁸⁴ To the other side the situation was more nuanced. True, the word itself had to be retained because it was implied in holy scripture,²⁸⁵ but in this instance its meaning was unique. The speech ascribed to Wisdom in Proverbs 8 shows us why. In that speech three words are used to describe the divine generation, 'beget', 'create', and 'establish'. In spite of their difference in form, for non-Nicenes these words had to be synonyms because what they designated was absolutely unique, the mysterious divine act that brought the Son into being.²⁸⁶ Used in a context like that, 'create' and its cognates were indeed useful in showing that the Son was not identical with the Father,²⁸⁷ but they could not be taken to mean that he was just 'one of the creatures' because he was the God and Maker of all

²⁸² Eusebius, *Ep. Alex.* 3 (Urkunde 7, Opitz iii. 14. 14-15. 1), Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Opitz iii. 12, 9-10), cf. Eun., *Apol.* 28. 20-2 (Vaggione 74), but cf. Hilary, *Fr. Hist.* II. A. b. viii. 2, *textus narratiuus* 2. 1 (CSEL 65. 176. 5-15).

²⁸³ See e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 27. 1-6 (SC 299. 266), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2 (PG 29. 692B), Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 6. 1-23 (PG 39. 508B-536C/D), Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 16. 13-21 (CCL 62. 16-17), Aug., *Trin.* 1. 6. 17-19 (CCL 50. 38), etc.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Basil, *Eun.* 2. 31. 20-30 (SC 305. 128-30). On occasion some Nicenes were able to recognize that this was an inference drawn by them and not their adversaries' actual teaching: e.g. Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 16. 1-9, cf. 5-6 (CSEL 78. 44).

²⁸⁵ By inference from the corresponding verbs (see above, n. 280). For some purposes (e.g. the possibility of a new Ecumenical Council) non-Nicenes were prepared to admit that (like *homoousios*) the word as such could not be found, Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 94. 338^v. 1-5[5-7] (SC 267. 280).

²⁸⁶ e.g. Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 9-10), Eun., *Apol.* 28. 20-3 (Vaggione 74), Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.* 5 202. 36-8 (CCL 87/i. 231), cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 12. 42. 1-5 (CCL 62A. 612), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 676B, cf. 688D-689A), Sev. Gab., *Abr.* 5 (PG 56. 560A-B). See appendix ad loc. What gives some substance to Nicene qualms is the use of the same language with regard to creatures of the Son, e.g. Ar. ign. *C. Orth. et Maced.* 5 195. 2-4 (CCL 87/i. 232). Cf. R. P. Vaggione, 'Οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν γεννημάτων: Some Aspects of Dogmatic Formulae in the Arian Controversy', SP 18 (1982), 181-7.

²⁸⁷ Cf. e.g. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 46. 305^v. 14-35 (SC 267. 238).

the rest.²⁸⁸ More tellingly, however, and despite the best efforts of Nicene controversialists to make it the linchpin of the 'Arian' system,²⁸⁹ 'creature' is almost never applied to Christ outside controversial or apologetic contexts. Even Proverbs 8: 22, that 'mighty fortress' of non-Nicene theology, is more often assumed than quoted,²⁹⁰ and there are no prayers are addressed to a 'Created God' or 'Greatest of Creatures'.²⁹¹ On the contrary, all the positive emphasis is on the Son as the Father's 'minister'²⁹² by nature, the prophet,²⁹³ priest,²⁹⁴ and angel²⁹⁵ who is Maker and God of all the rest. True, as 'firstborn of all creation'²⁹⁶ and first among 'many brothers'²⁹⁷ the Son is contingent and at home in the world he has made,²⁹⁸ but for just this reason the word 'creature' functions in non-Nicene

²⁸⁸ e.g. Wulfila, *Symb.* apud Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* in Maximinus, *Comment.* 63. 308^r. 4-5 (*SC* 267. 250), but cf. George Alex., *Ep. Alex.* (Urkunde 13, Opitz iii. 19. 4-5), Hilary, *Fr. Hist.* II. A. b. viii. 2, textus narratiuus 2. 1 (*CSEL* 65. 176. 5-15). It is possible, of course, that Arius himself was more vulnerable than others on this count, but he did not necessarily 'unpack' every implication of his theory, see below, Ch. 5, pp. 166-9.

²⁸⁹ e.g. Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 16. 13-21 (*CCL* 62. 16-17). Athanasius, in *Ep. Serap.* 2. 3 (*PG* 26. 612B), seems to place the origin of Arianism in the question: 'is there any similarity between Son and created things?'

²⁹⁰ Only at Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 3. 79^v. 25-80^r. 2, 12. 3. 95^r. 10-13 (*CCL* 87/i. 95, 113), *Comm. in Lc.* 1: 33. 29^v. 4 (*CCL* 87/i. 206). All other references are either in works of academic theology or found in Nicene sources.

²⁹¹ The nearest approach to one is found in *Const. App.* 7. 36. 4-5 (*SC* 336. 82): τῆς ὑπὸ σου κτισθείσης σοφίας.

²⁹² e.g. Ar. ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 4: 44. 155^r. 7-9 (*CCL* 87/i. 212): 'praeco patris, minister altissimi, nuntius celsitudinis, sacerdos dei summi, doctor beatitudinis'.

²⁹³ Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 1. 79^r. 8-11 (*CCL* 87/i. 95), and the references to the 'True Prophet' taken from the *Clementine Recognitions* in Ar. ign., *Pag.* 7. 5. 112^v. 3, 8. 1. 112^v. 12-13 (*CCL* 87/i. 134).

²⁹⁴ Ar. ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 5: 14. 167^r. 8-9 (*CCL* 87/i. 220, *C. Orth. et Maced.* 5. 195. 5-9 (*CCL* 87/i. 232); Ar. ign., *Sermo* 27, cf. 19, 32 (*PL* 42. 681, cf. 680, 682), (Ps.-)Ignat., *Magn.* 7 (Lightfoot II. iii. 171. 17-18), *Smyrn.* 9 (Lightfoot II. iii. 225. 28-30).

²⁹⁵ e.g. Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 1. 20-4 (115): 'Vtique et filius est patris et angelus eius dicitur, id est nuntius, et propheta et sacerdos et puer et advocatus et uirtus et sapientia et cetera.' Cf. Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 4. 97^r. 25-98^r. 7, 97^r. 18-20 (*CCL* 87/i. 116).

²⁹⁶ Col. 1: 15 (for occurrences, see appendix ad loc.).

²⁹⁷ Romans 8: 29 (for occurrences, see appendix ad loc.).

²⁹⁸ Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 597. 1-8 (*SC* 246. 40). Cf. Grg. Naz., *Carm.* I. i. 2. 47-50 (*PG* 37. 405) for a devotional use of this theme.

theology much as does *homoousios* in that of its opponents. Its purpose was to safeguard the 'mind' of scripture and the world of lived devotion that grew from it. Like *homoousios*, therefore, the proper locus of 'creature' in this sense is *τέχνη*, the language of experts, and it is rare to find it anywhere else.

If we can be reasonably sure, then, that a principal component of what divided those who worked on a Nicene basis from those who did not was a difference in the 'realization' of the incarnate Christ, we must also recognize that neither approach was without wider imaginative consequence. For if, as the non-Nicenes claimed, it was truly crucial that there be one and only one Christ, and that the Logos be a single subject throughout, then that unity had to extend to his *entire* history and not merely to its earthly portion. In the controversial literature, this concern is chiefly visible in a prolonged dispute over the nature of the Old Testament theophanies.²⁹⁹ Earlier theologians, such as Justin Martyr, had insisted that these appearances had to refer to two entities, and by the fourth century this duality had become a datum of faith.³⁰⁰ Thus in the fire called down by God from God on Sodom,³⁰¹ in the mysterious visitants at Mamre,³⁰² in the entity who wrestled with Jacob³⁰³ or encountered Moses in the bush,³⁰⁴ Justin felt called upon to acknowledge the one who was numerically different from the Maker of all things (*ἄλλος* or *ἕτερος*), and yet still called 'God'.³⁰⁵ But the point is

²⁹⁹ Williams, *Arius*, 148 is probably correct to note that one factor behind all this is the changed problematic introduced by Origen's systematic exposition of scripture.

³⁰⁰ Cf. Aetius, *Synt.* 16 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 16 (*GCS* iii. 355. 10-14), *Symb. Sirm.* 2 (Hahn, § 161, p. 201): 'Et hoc catholicum esse nemo ignorat, duas personas esse Patris et Filii, majorem Patrem, Filium subjectum cum omnibus his, quae ipsi Pater subiecit. . .'

³⁰¹ Gen. 19: 24: Justin, *Dial.* 56. 19-57. 2, cf. 60. 5, 129. 1 (Goodspeed 159-61, cf. 166, 250). For non-Nicene parallels, see Appendix.

³⁰² Gen. 18: 1-33: Justin, *Dial.* 56. 1-18, cf. 126. 4 (Goodspeed 155-9, 247). For non-Nicene parallels, see Appendix.

³⁰³ Gen. 32: 23-31: Justin, *Dial.* 58. 3-9 (Goodspeed 161-3). For non-Nicene parallels, see appendix ad loc.

³⁰⁴ Exod. 3: 1-15 (see below, pp. 137-40): Justin, *Dial.* 59. 1-60. 5, 126. 2 (Goodspeed 164-6, 247). For non-Nicene parallels, see Appendix.

³⁰⁵ Justin, *Dial.* 56. 4, 11, 126. 3-4, cf. 55. 1 (Goodspeed 156, 157, 247, cf. 154), etc.

not Justin's metaphysical ambiguity, but rather his exegetical clarity. For when applied to this kind of exegesis, one effect of the non-Nicene insistence on the presence of an absolutely univocal Logos was to create a Christocentric system³⁰⁶ in which the traditional hierarchy, its order and all that grew from it, became not only a narrative but a metaphysical reality—a datum of faith, one of the building blocks of the everlasting gospel, something that could not be changed by any human power whatsoever. By thus insisting on the ontological as well the numerical distinction of the entities, while at the same time proclaiming that it was 'the Great God' and none other who had come 'in the flesh',³⁰⁷ the non-Nicenes in effect 'froze' the hierarchy. Their attempt to safeguard exegesis through metaphysics made the traditional descending hierarchy a dogmatic as well as a dramatic necessity. The result was that while, as they claimed, many of their formulations could indeed be found in Lucian, Cyprian, or one of the other 'Fathers' to whom they so frequently appealed, the context in which they were presented was now subtly new. The novelty lay neither in the formulations themselves nor in the apostolic hierarchy to which they seemed to point, but in that same hierarchy now swung around, solidified, and frozen to meet the requirements of a particular view of the incarnate Christ.

This is abundantly reflected in the sources. One of the things I noted earlier was the astonishing degree of passion generated by this controversy. If we ask, where, when, and on what issues non-Nicenes found they were no longer able to compromise, we find again and again that it is this newly solidified hierarchy. To take that doughty non-Nicene, Maximinus, as an example, we find that when haled before the court of Augustine he made perfectly clear that there were some things (no idle boast in the context) that he would faithfully proclaim even from the tree:

'Who is so foolish', he asks, 'that they do not understand that the one bore witness to the other—the Father to the Son—when he said: "*This is my Son, the Beloved; with him I am well pleased; listen to him*"? So then, I read "Beloved", and I believe it is the Father who loves and the Son who is loved. I hear that Christ is "Only-begotten" and I have no

³⁰⁶ Cf. Phoebadius, *Ar.* 17 (*PL* 20. 25D): 'Quidquid enim de Patre negant, de Filio confitentur'.

³⁰⁷ Cf. Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13 (*PL* 42. 718–19).

doubt that the one was begotten by the other. When Paul calls him "First-born", saying: "*He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation*", I assert according to the divine scriptures that the Son is "First-born", not "unborn"; and that: "*in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him.*" He is the Son of God, the Only-begotten God, because he exists before all things. . . . Now this Son (and even you admit he took flesh) says in the holy Gospel: "*If you loved me, you would rejoice that I am going to the Father, because the Father is greater than I.*" This is what we read, and so we believe and confess that, as the Apostle says, all things will be "subject" to him as to the "Great God . . ." I read "born" and I accept what I read; I read "Firstborn" and I don't deny it; I read "Only-begotten" and, if I were hung on a gibbet, I wouldn't say anything else. What Scripture teaches is what I confess.³⁰⁸

No reader of the entire exchange can fail to be struck by the utter inability of either side to understand the other. And yet, whether we look at the confession of the dying Wulfila,³⁰⁹ the profession of Auxentius,³¹⁰ or the words of an otherwise unknown apologist,³¹¹ we find in each the same assertion of an 'apostolic' hierarchy and the same determination to defend an 'apostolic' faith—even to the death. The words of scripture have become so enmeshed in a hermeneutical framework that an alternative interpretation cannot even be imagined.

As the controversy progressed, of course, the Nicenes found themselves increasingly in the same situation. For them, however, the break with the theological past was both more subtle and more complete, and therefore, perhaps, slower in taking effect. Much of what was new in non-Nicene theology was the traditional view of the biblical past newly solidified under the influence of a very specific view of the incarnate Christ and his mission; that of the Nicenes was to lead to a new way of understanding the biblical story itself, for greater clarity in placing the ontological 'break' led to a change in the way the temporal

³⁰⁸ Cf. Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13 (*PL* 42. 718–19).

³⁰⁹ Palladius, *Ep. apud Maximinus, Comment.* 63. 307^v. 38–308^r. 35 (*SC* 267. 250).

³¹⁰ Hilary, *Auxent.* 15 (*PL* 10. 617B–618B).

³¹¹ Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.* fr. 2, 5. 202. 21–5 195. 45, cf. fr. 6, 5. 277. 4–5. 278. 29 (*CCL* 87. 231–2, cf. 237–8).

one had to be understood. This will become clearer later as we look at a number of specific examples, but before we can understand what they mean we need to look at some of the 'technical' terminology in which they are couched.

To the modern reader this terminology may seem at first to be without religious importance. It is centred around the idea that *ousiai* or essences (the 'whatness' of things) can be known from their actions, activities, and effects (*energeiai*, *dunameis*, and *erga*).³¹² On this theory, the presence or absence of such effects enables us to determine the presence or absence of the originating essence. In the case of the divine essences what this means is that we should be able to determine which particular essence (Father, Son, or Holy Spirit) is at work in any given instance on the basis of its perceived effects.³¹³ There is nothing particularly 'Arian' about all this,³¹⁴ but a superficial resemblance between this and the modern idea of inference from non-interpreted personal experience makes it easy for us to misunderstand what is meant by 'experience' and 'perceived effects'.

The ancients, of course, like ourselves recognized that some experience is wholly personal and, like us, they were prepared to use it.³¹⁵ Where they differed from us was that they did not distinguish as systematically as we do between what is *purely* individual or personal and the *interpreted experience* transmitted by voice or literature.³¹⁶ This is similar to their idea of 'shared

³¹² Eun., *Apol.* 20. 7-10, 15-19 (Vaggione 58, 60), *AA* 1 (*J* i. 72. 7-73. 3). On some of the technical background of this terminology, see Ch. 6, pp. 239-43 below.

³¹³ Eun., *AA* 1 (*J* i. 72. 20-73. 3), 3 (*J* ii. 174. 18-24), cf. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (*PG* 29. 717-18B).

³¹⁴ e.g. Or., *Princ.* 1. 3. 5, 7, 8 (*GCS* v. 55. 2-4, 60. 5-12, 62. 13-15, *Ath.*, *Gent.* 16. 25-32 (Thomson 44), Grg. Nyss., *Trin.* (*J* III. i. 10. 18-11. 3).

³¹⁵ e.g. Pausanias 3. 3. 6, 8, 25. 7, Basil, *Eun.* 1. 14. 16-20 (*SC* 299. 220-2), 2. 32. 11-18 (*SC* 305. 134), Aug., *Trin.* 4. 21. 15-35, 8. 4. 26-50, 11. 8. 94-8 (*CCL* 50. 202-3, 275-6, 352), etc.

³¹⁶ The context of the modern discussion is by and large sense-perception as a source of knowledge. We thus distinguish sharply between strictly personal 'raw' perception, perception in an interpreted form as it is processed by an individual mind, and the same interpreted experience communicated between minds by speech. Much modern discussion centres around the sense in which the latter can or cannot be called 'knowledge'. Some ancient attempts to describe this process (Aristotle's, for instance) were very sophisticated, but their starting-point was not, by and large, uninterpreted sense-perception; for

conceptions': they believed that some contemporary interpreted experience was universal and could, when identified, bring them to truth. They made a similar appeal to the shared interpreted experience of the past. Indeed, for many of them the 'true doctrine' was, almost by definition, that which was present 'from the beginning'.³¹⁷ It was therefore presumably experienced (perhaps with even greater clarity) by the sages of old.³¹⁸ Cyril of Jerusalem was referring to this transmitted past interpreted experience when he advised an educationally diverse³¹⁹ lay audience to appeal to literary rather than personal experience when answering pagan or Jewish charges;³²⁰ he did not distinguish between the original experience and its transmitted form. Similarly, Julian the Apostate could appeal to 'the remote past' as well as the present when he tried to define human 'experience' as such (*πείρα*).³²¹ This faith in the uniformity of *interpreted* human experience was as natural to the people of Eunomius' day as scepticism about it is to ours, and it is this which underlies the conflation of personal and literary that we find so often in their works.³²² This helps us understand

them, its processed or interpreted form was assumed to be the proper object of knowledge. In a narrative context, then, they were less concerned than we would be to distinguish between an event as immediately experienced by an individual and the same event communicated to others by speech or writing.

³¹⁷ So Celsus according to Or., *Cels.* 1. 14 (GCS i. 67. 15-17).

³¹⁸ e.g. Iamblichus, *Myst.* 1. 1. 5-2. 2, cf. 4. 9-16 (Des Places 38, cf. 40) and the passages cited in n. 60 above. A similar approach underlies the Christian search for doctrinal echoes in the pagan past, e.g., Grg. Naz., *Or.* 31. 5. 6-9, 15. 1-3 (SC 250. 282-4, 304), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 27, cf. 6. 13, 7. 5, 7. 11, 8. 1, 8. 2, 12, 3. 1, 2. 1, 2. 2, 3. 2, 6 (PG 39. 753A-760B, cf. 540B, 577A, 597C, 612A, 624A, 676C, 685C, 688C, 776A, 780B, 781B, 788A-B, 788C, 789A/B, 789C), etc. Cf. also the many collections of pagan 'witnesses' to Christian doctrine such as those cited in Vaggione, *Eunomius*, appendix ii, pp. 188-9.

³¹⁹ Cyril H., *Procatech.* 14, cf. 5, 13 (Reischl i. 18-20, cf. 8, 18).

³²⁰ Cyril H., *Catech.* 12. 27, 28, 13. 37, 14. 26 (Reischl ii. 36-8, 98, 142-4). On the availability of the necessary historical knowledge, note the expectation of Pausanias in 1. 22. 1 that everyone, even 'a Greek-speaking barbarian', will know the story of Phaedra.

³²¹ Julian Imp., *Gal.* 115E-116A.

³²² Thus Justin Martyr, for instance, cites the experience of Saul with the witch of Endor as proof of human survival coming *ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων*, *Dial.* 105. 4 (Goodspeed 221), while Or., *Cels.* 1. 42 (GCS i. 92. 6-93. 8); argues that the evidence for Gospel miracles is as sound as that for events in the Old Testament and in Greek legend, and (suppressed premise) both Jews and Greeks accept those.

what they meant when they spoke about being able to discern the divine essences from their effects. If we ourselves made a statement like that, we would probably be referring primarily to individual experience (our own or others). Our fourth-century ancestors did not distinguish as sharply as we do between literary and personal experience, and so in this context very often meant the former. Thus when Eunomius and his contemporaries looked for evidence of the divine activity, they found it clearly and primarily in the *interpreted* experience of scripture and less clearly and derivatively in their own.³²³ An argument over the origin of the divine 'energies' seen in scripture, then—something that seems to us literary and abstract—was for them an attempt to understand their own corporate and individual interpreted experience by looking at one of the main 'lenses' through which it was accessible: the complex record of God's activity in scripture.

When they looked at that record, therefore, and asked which words described *energeiai* and which *ousiai*, they were asking a question with definite narrative consequences—to associate a word with one or the other was to change the meaning of the story. But when they did this, they were blurring interpreted and non-interpreted experience in a way that is alien to us. The best way, then, for us to understand them in terms that make sense to us is to take them as discussing the total meaning of a body of literature, the Bible, and seeking (as they would have said) its 'mind'. What this means as a matter of practice as we explore the way they used their technical language is that, from within our own presuppositions, we will take language which they saw as both metaphysical and exegetical as primarily exegetical. We will take it to apply primarily (and not, as they thought, secondarily) to the integration of a body of literature. Thus when they speak of *ousia* or essence in a context of this kind we will take them as referring to the actor or entity underlying a given exegetical event (*ergon*); when they speak of an *energeia* or action, we will take them to mean the *activity* or 'energy' causing the event. In other words, we will temporarily prescind from the metaphysical implications of the terminology in order to see how different ways of applying these categories reflect (and sometimes create) different ways of understanding

³²³ We ourselves, of course, do almost exactly the reverse.

the Christian drama itself. This is not merely because the task of integrating so large a body of literature made diversity inevitable,³²⁴ but because reference in any literary context is crucial. Who is acting, and who is acted upon? The Bible so often uses the same terms of Father and of Son³²⁵ that the exegete is frequently left wondering, 'who is supposed to be speaking?'³²⁶ Or to put it in concrete terms: are Father and Son both 'Lord'³²⁷ or is one 'Lord' and the other 'God'?³²⁸ For that matter, is the Holy Spirit ever referred to as 'Lord' at all?³²⁹ Ambiguities of this kind were the cannon-fodder of a controversy that lasted several hundred years, and in one form or another still underlies a good deal of Christian thought.

On some things, of course, there was agreement. Everyone could admit, for instance, that some words did refer to the divine essence, at least in so far as it was the source of exegetical events.³³⁰ They could also admit that some other words referred to the actions behind those events.³³¹ But that is where agreement ceased, for it made a great deal of difference which was which.³³² Eunomius, for instance, agreed that God's activity was to be looked at from two directions—from that of the originating essence (the source), and from that of the implied activity (as shown by the event); but in his view, neither of these showed any identity of Father and Son.³³³ The Nicenes, on the other hand, used the same evidence to show exactly the opposite! Both sides agreed that a name like I AM ($\delta' \Omega \nu$) referred to

³²⁴ Cf. Aug., *Trin.* 2. proemium, 1. 4-5 (CCL 50. 80).

³²⁵ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 8. 47-53 (SC 299. 196).

³²⁶ e.g. Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 8. 11-13 (CSEL 78. 24), about Isa. 43: 10. Note that in *Heracle.* (PLS 1. 346A-C) this is the point at issue on a popular level.

³²⁷ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 5. 169-70 (SC 28bis. 286).

³²⁸ (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 33 (PG 39. 432B/C).

³²⁹ (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 3. 13 (PG 28. 1221B).

³³⁰ There was much empirical but little philosophical agreement; the exegetical effect could be recognized even when the theory was not, e.g. Grig. Naz., *Or.* 30. 18. 1-7 (SC 250. 262), Aug., *Trin.* 15. 5. 45-55 (CCL 50A. 470), etc.

³³¹ e.g. Ath., *Gent.* 16. 25-32 (Thomson 44), Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 1. 37-8, cf. 2. proem. 20-4 (CSEL 78. 10, cf. 59).

³³² Cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 19 (PL 10. 495B), (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 2 (PG 28. 1159B).

³³³ Eun., *Apol.* 20. 5-22, cf. 24. 8-13 (Vaggione 58-60, cf. 64), AA 1. cf. 2 (J 1. 72. 7-73. 15, cf. 332. 18-22).

the divine essence,³³⁴ but they were divided as to most of the other names. Eunomius, for instance, claimed that 'Father' as applied to God could not refer to God's essence but to God's essence in action (*energeia*),³³⁵ in other words, it described what God was doing, not who God is. For Gregory Nazianzen, however, 'Almighty' referred to God's capacity to act, while 'Father' was a distinction of his Person within a common essence.³³⁶ In each case the category in which a given word is placed reflects a particular understanding of how and why God acts. It is considerations such as these and not terminology *per se* that underlie the categorization. The categorization is tactical; only the frameworks that govern the choice are strategy.

But while the tactics may have been new, the problem they addressed was not—indeed, in many ways it was as old as Christianity itself.³³⁷ For the idea that there was a divine Son who was to be identified with Jesus but who was in existence prior to his earthly career required a rethinking, not only of Israel's history, but of the way 'God' was thought to act in it. Between Nicene and non-Nicene, as we have seen, the primary controversial focus for the period from Abraham to Christ was the theophanies of the Old Testament. Both sides agreed that two entities were required to explain these theophanies, but the hierarchical rigidity required by the non-Nicene insistence on a *literal* presence of the Logos meant that they had to be reinterpreted—it was necessary to be able to affirm that it was always the same entity and the same voice both before and after the incarnation.³³⁸ The Father could indeed sometimes be said

³³⁴ e.g. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 18. 1–7 (*SC* 250. 262), Eun., *Apol.* 17. 1–3 (Vaggione 54).

³³⁵ Eun., *Apol.* 24. 18–28, cf. 1–4, 17. 4–6 (Vaggione 66, cf. 64, 54), *AA* 1 (J i. 186. 3–10), 2 (J i. 334. 23–4, cf. 370. 14–19, 371. 5–9).

³³⁶ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 19. 1–3, 19. 20–3 (*SC* 250. 264, 266).

³³⁷ See the references to the problem of the two 'Lords' in Ps. 109 (110): 1 at Matt. 21: 41–5, Mark 12: 35–7, Luke 20: 41–4. (for non-Nicene usage see Appendix).

³³⁸ Compare Eun., *EF* 3. 36 and 3. 41–2 (Vaggione 154, 156), the same one who spoke to the people of old through the prophets is the One who (literally) in Christ preached peace 'with tongue and voice' to those near and those far off. Indeed, Christ's prophetic office was sometimes seen to have begun with the creation itself, for it was as God's 'Prophet' that the Son, himself God, proclaimed the words which called the world into being, Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 1. 79'. 3–11 (*CCL* 86/i. 95).

to act alone,³³⁹ but for most non-Nicenes it was clear that the One seen by patriarchs and prophets in the Old Testament was the Only-begotten God born of Mary in the New.³⁴⁰

That, of course, raised a problem all by itself. For one thing, how did these later encounters differ from the former ones? For if a univocal Christ were indeed the focal point of mediation, in what sense was the One seen by the apostles different from Him who appeared to the patriarchs?³⁴¹ The Nicenes were quick to claim that in Arian eyes there was no difference; as far as they could see, all this emphasis on a univocal Christ merely eliminated the distinction between the dispensations—there *was* no difference between an 'Arian' Old Testament and the New.³⁴² There is nothing to show that the 'Arians' ever went where logic might have taken them, but there is some justice to the claim that they blurred the distinction between the incarnate and the pre-incarnate Christ. For while the Nicenes sometimes thought it was the Logos who had been seen in these theophanies,³⁴³ and sometimes another of the divine Persons,³⁴⁴ they insisted nevertheless (in the face of substantial theoretical difficulties³⁴⁵) that it was always the true God.³⁴⁶

³³⁹ (Ps.?) Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 28 (PG 39. 944C).

³⁴⁰ e.g. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 280. 11–281. 8), cf. Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 26 (PL 42. 739): 'Hoc ipsum affirmans utique Deus, qui in praemeditatione collectabatur cum Jacob, quod in passione Christi impletum videmus'. In Hagedorn 301. 12–15, despite the fact that the One encountered by Job is *ὁ θεὸς τῶν ὄλων*, he is still *φύσει ἀόρατος*, *ibid.* 301. 3–7.

³⁴¹ Phoebadius, *Ar.* 17 (PL 20. 26A–B), cf. Aug., *Trin.* 2. 8. 3–4, 9. 1–6, cf. 7. 6–13, 9. 34–44 (CCL 50. 98, 99, cf. 97, 100–1). The claim in 2. 6. 6–27 (CCL 50. 99–100) that some Arians claimed the Son was mortal even before the incarnation appears to be an attempt at a *reductio ad absurdum*.

³⁴² Hilary, *Trin.* 11. 18. 1–3 (CCL 62A. 547), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 3. 479. 40–3, cf. 479. 1–4, 5. 571. 10–20 (SC 237. 16, cf. 60, 340), cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 31. 26. 1–7, 26. 18–30, 27. 6–19 (SC 250. 326, 328, 328–30).

³⁴³ e.g. Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 13. 34–41, 2. 8. 98–105, cf. 2. 2. 7–26 (CSEL 78. 36, 81, cf. 64–5), Basil, *Eun.* 2. 18. 13–45 (SC 305. 72–4), etc.

³⁴⁴ e.g. Aug., *Trin.* 3. 10. 148–87 (CCL 50. 156–8).

³⁴⁵ Augustine (*Trin.* 4. 21. 36–40, 51–68 (CCL 50. 203, 204)), following Hilary (cf. *Trin.* 6. 10. 1–10, 15. 3. 43–5 (CCL 50. 241, 50A. 464), gives the most sophisticated discussion of the sense in which Old Testament worthies 'saw' God *per creatura quidem*, but the problem he addressed was a general one. Note the similar non-Nicene concern in the discussion of the sense in which Satan and the angels could 'speak' to God in *Job* 1 (PG 17. 373D, 400A–405D).

³⁴⁶ Cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 5. 22. 1–14 (CCL 62. 173).

The result was a definite, if not always fully articulated difference in the way the Christian story was told. For depending on the identities of the *dramatis personae*, it was possible to create strikingly different renditions of the same event. This was as true of 'prophecy' as of 'history'. The obscurity that made the prophetic books so tantalizing³⁴⁷ also made it difficult to identify the speaker.³⁴⁸ If a passage said 'I the Lord', then who was speaking, the Father or the Son? Such questions were not limited to the boundaries of human history. When God is shown in Genesis addressing someone else before there were human beings to converse with,³⁴⁹ who was he speaking to?³⁵⁰ One possibility was Wisdom, with Him 'from the beginning' and 'daily his delight' as in Proverbs 8,³⁵¹ or it might be the rejoicing angels of Job 38: 7 (LXX),³⁵² or it might be God the Word.³⁵³ But if it was the latter, then there was a new difficulty. For if the Bible indeed shows instances from before the incarnation in which 'God' speaks to 'God', then we must ask in what capacity (*πρόσωπον*)?³⁵⁴ Jesus had raised a similar issue with regard to Psalm 109 (110):1,³⁵⁵ but his followers' growing emphasis on his own pre-existence made it one of the

³⁴⁷ Cf. Justin, *Apol.* 1. 36. 3 (Krüger 30. 5-9), *Dial.* 32. 2-3 (Goodspeed 126), Or., *Princ.* 4. 1. 6, cf. 4. 3. 11 (GCS v. 301. 8-16, 25-302. 10, 15-26, cf. 340. 3-12, 18-23).

³⁴⁸ The classic example is perhaps the Ethiopian eunuch's question to Philip about Isa. 53: 7-8: 'About whom, pray, does the prophet say this, about himself or about someone else?' (Acts 8: 34). Cf. (Ps.?-)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 1 (PG 39. 780C).

³⁴⁹ Notably the implied conversation in Gen. 1: 26: 'Let us make. . .' For non-Nicene examples in this sense, see Appendix.

³⁵⁰ Cf. Philo, *Op.* 72 (Cohn and Wendland i. 24. 11-18).

³⁵¹ Cf. Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 3. 79^v. 22-80^v. 7 (CCL 87/i. 96).

³⁵² e.g. Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 4. 80^v. 20-1 (CCL 87/i. 96).

³⁵³ Justin, *Dial.* 62. 1-4 (Goodspeed 167-8), Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 2. 18 (Grant 56), Or., *Cels.* 2. 9 (GCS i. 135. 2-6), etc.

³⁵⁴ e.g. Justin, *Apol.* 1. 36. 1, 37. 3, 9 (Krüger 29. 25-30. 5. 30. 16-17, 28-30), etc.; Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 2. 22 (Grant 62); Or., *Cels.* 1. 55 (GCS i. 106. 10-16, cf. 19-20), Cyril H., *Procatech.* 6, *Catech.* 10. 2, 12, 12. 26, 13. 13, 14. 6 (Reischl i. 10, 262, 276, ii. 36, 68, 112), etc.; Eun., *Apol.* 26. 15 (Vaggione 70). The theatrical origins of this usage are well illustrated in Origen's references to the dialogue between Celsus' fictional Jew and Jesus, Or., *Cels.* 1. 6, 28, 34 (GCS i. 54. 29-31, 79. 18-21, 85. 16-18), etc.

³⁵⁵ Matt. 22: 43-5, Mark 12: 35-7, Luke 20: 41-4. For non-Nicene examples, see Appendix.

keys of their Old Testament interpretation. For non-Nicenes that meant that the 'sundry times' and 'divers manners' in which 'God' had spoken in the Old Dispensation witnessed to a plurality of entities at work.³⁵⁶ To say, as the Nicenes did, that there was but a single essence was to make a hash of the whole thing,³⁵⁷ for it assumed either that God was talking to himself (diverse voices in a monologue),³⁵⁸ or that humans were an image of three entities.³⁵⁹ It is this concern to maintain the separate identities and roles of the actors that lies behind the Eunomian insistence that when scripture changes its terminology about 'God', it is pointing to a difference in the entities to which it refers.³⁶⁰ The diverse hermeneutical frameworks that led to such different understandings of the activity of Christ in the New Testament thus led to a similar divergence in respect of his activity in the Old. The baptismal formula itself is a case in point. The Nicenes (then as now) found it natural to read this formula as witnessing to the activity of a united Godhead;³⁶¹ the non-Nicenes found it equally natural to see it as a guarantee of the distinct activities of the essences.³⁶² In both cases a particular understanding of the exegetical effect of the *energeiai* both reflected and contributed to a different understanding of the saving activity of God.³⁶³

Perhaps the best way to get a sense of this is by looking at a concrete example, 'God's' appearance to Moses in the burning bush (Exodus 3: 1-4: 17). This theophany is significant, not only for its content (the revelation of the divine Name), but also because of the status of its human recipient. More than Jacob, Job, or Gideon,³⁶⁴ who spoke to God 'face to face' (*πρόσωπον*

³⁵⁶ Through their *ἐνέργειαι* or *operationes*, cf. e.g. Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 1. 7-9, cf. 10. 25-7 (*CSEL* 78. 7, cf. 8).

³⁵⁷ e.g. Ar. ign., *Job* 1 (*PG* 17. 428A-B).

³⁵⁸ As in (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 7. 3 (*PG* 39. 565C-D), cf. Athenag., *Leg.* 2. 15. 16-20, 18. 7-10 (Schoedel 52, 56).

³⁵⁹ e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Hom. Opif.* 6 (*PG* 44. 140B-C, cf. 137D), Chrys., *Anom.* 11. 3 (*PG* 48. 800A), etc.

³⁶⁰ e.g. Eun., *Apol.* 12. 3-4, 18. 5-9 (Vaggione 48, 54-6), cf. *AA* 1 (*Ź* i. 72. 20-73. 12), (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 153-4 (*SC* 146. 70).

³⁶¹ (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 5 (*PG* 39. 493A).

³⁶² e.g. Ambrose, *Fid.* 5. 9. 1-6 (*CSEL* 78. 259-60).

³⁶³ Eun., *AA* 1 (*Ź* i. 72. 26-73. 3), cf. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (*PG* 29. 717B).

³⁶⁴ Gen. 32: 31, Job 42: 5, Judg. 6: 22, cf. 1 Cor. 13: 12. Gideon, of course, sees an 'angel', but in this context that scarcely resolves the issue.

πρὸς πρόσωπον), Moses is said to have spoken with God 'mouth to mouth', the way one person speaks to another.³⁶⁵ But however privileged the human recipient, to what 'God' was he speaking? And here scripture was not clear. For in the story's opening verse (3: 2) the One who addresses Moses is said to be the 'angel' or 'messenger' of the Lord (ἄγγελος κυρίου), while two verses later this same personage is said to be 'the Lord' himself, calling to Moses from the bush. In the verses that follow this strangely inconsistent Being identifies itself alternately as 'God' and 'Lord',³⁶⁶ and then finally as ὁ ὢν, I AM, the truly Existent. At least since the eighteenth century modern critics have taken such variations as signs of different underlying sources, sources which have to be distinguished and interpreted before the passage as a whole can be understood. Ancient critics, however, took narrative unity for granted and so assumed that this kind of variation indicated a deeper meaning which they were required to uncover.³⁶⁷ It need scarcely be added that with different frameworks in play, such a quest was a fruitful source of controversy.

Thus St Basil, in his reply to Eunomius' first *Apology*, tried to refute the claim that his teaching was that 'used in times past by the saints' (the authors of sacred scripture)³⁶⁸ by mentioning this theophany. According to Basil, because the Word, speaking 'in the person of the Lord' (ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου), described *himself* as 'I AM' (ὁ ὢν), he meant this Name should be referred to him directly; he thus implied that he was 'True God' and shared in the Father's godhead and eternity.³⁶⁹ For Basil, the 'angel' mentioned in verse 2 is a proleptic reference to the Only-begotten's incarnate role as 'Angel of Great Counsel', the 'child' to be born to us described in Isaiah 9: 5 (LXX).³⁷⁰ We have only fragments of Eunomius' reply, but his main argument is not difficult to reconstruct. Eunomius had no

³⁶⁵ Num. 12: 8, Exod. 33: 11.

³⁶⁶ Κύριος, Exod. 3: 4, 7, 4: 2, 4, 6, 11, 14; θεός, Exod. 3: 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 4: 1, 5, 11, 16; κύριος ὁ θεός, Exod. 3: 15, 16, 4: 5.

³⁶⁷ e.g. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 2. 104. 4-105. 9 (SC 247. 224).

³⁶⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 15. 3-7 (Vaggione 50-7).

³⁶⁹ Basil, *Eun.* 2. 18. 11-47 (SC 305. 70-4), cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 5. 22. 1-14 (CCL 62. 173).

³⁷⁰ Basil, *Eun.* 2. 18. 11-47, cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 24. 1-30. 16 (CCL 62. 126-34), Aug., *Trin.* 3. 10. 148-87 (CCL 50. 156-8).

difficulty in affirming that the One who met Moses was the Only-begotten God and that he spoke 'in the person of the Lord'.³⁷¹ What he could not affirm was Basil's version of what that might mean. For as he pointed out, there was at least one other instance where a word applying strictly only to God was used of Jesus, and Jesus rejected it. That word was 'good'. When called 'good', Jesus replied that there was none good 'save one', that is, God.³⁷² Despite all the sinister accusations this example provoked,³⁷³ Eunomius did not mean that Jesus was the opposite of 'good' and thus 'bad'; rather, he meant that since the Only-begotten's goodness came from the Father, it had a source outside itself, as the Father's did not.³⁷⁴ When the Son, therefore, used the name 'I AM', he did so in the same way he used the word 'good'—in so far as he was the messenger and angel of the Father, the Only-begotten God who from within his bosom was privileged to make Him known.³⁷⁵ The strength of Basil's argument lay in the use of the first person singular (*I am the I AM*). Eunomius contended, on the contrary, that just because the Son's role was to proclaim, his use of 'I' here was in virtue of his office. Since *I AM*, like all other names,³⁷⁶ could only refer directly to its originating essence; and that essence in this case was higher than the Only-begotten God, the only way the Son could use it here was in a ministerial capacity appropriate to himself.³⁷⁷ All such problems, in Eunomius' eyes, had the same solution.³⁷⁸

This conforms to what we have already seen of Eunomius' method, for here his general, though not his technical, exegesis

³⁷¹ Cf. Eun., *EF* 3. 35–6 (Vaggione 154), and note the use of the expression *ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου* at *Apol.* 26. 15 (Vaggione 70).

³⁷² Eun., *AA* 2 (J ii. 264. 4–12, cf. 267. 17–18), cf. *Apol.* 21. 12 (Vaggione 60), Cyril, *Thes.* 9 (PG 75. 113D), (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 11 (PG 28. 1133B), citing Mark 10: 18/Luke 18: 18, a standard non-Nicene proof-text (for occurrences, see Appendix).

³⁷³ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 9. 3–7 (J ii. 265. 3–266. 20) cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 11 (PG 28. 1133B–1136A).

³⁷⁴ Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 21. 12–20 (Vaggione 60–2), *EF* 3. 8–9 (Vaggione 152).

³⁷⁵ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 251. 18–23, 273. 24–274. 2). The image, if not the theory, was completely traditional, e.g. Cyril H., *Catech.* 4. 8 (Reischl i. 98).

³⁷⁶ Eun., *Apol.* 17. 1–3 (Vaggione 54).

³⁷⁷ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 254. 27–255. 3).

³⁷⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 19. 15–16 (Vaggione 58).

is that of his school.³⁷⁹ Starting with an inherited vision of the passage's general meaning, he uses *τέχνη* to expand and illustrate a meaning which *τέχνη* cannot be said to create. We can see the same situation in other cases. The same controlling frameworks that led 'Arians' and Nicenes to interpret the appearance to Moses differently, led them to similar divisions over those to Abraham,³⁸⁰ Jacob,³⁸¹ and Job.³⁸² By reading such passages from one point of view or the other, it was possible to construct superficially similar, yet radically different understandings of the same events. For those like Aetius and Eunomius who combined a belief in a 'break' between Father and Son while still insisting that the latter was 'God' in both Old Testament and New, the One heard and seen by the apostles must be in literal truth the One who appeared to Moses and none other.³⁸³ For those who, like Basil, placed the 'break' between primal Triad and all else, the incarnation marked a fundamental, inescapable change in the way humans encounter God. Basil, therefore, had to explain not only why some in the Old Testament had been able to see the 'True God' in one way and live; but also why still others in a very different way had later been able to 'handle with their hands the Word of life'.

³⁷⁹ e.g. Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 4. 97^v. 26–98^v. 7 (CCL 87/i. 116), cf. (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 209–10 (SC 146. 74), Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 71. 3 (GCS iii. 219. 1–3), Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 26 (PL 42. 740), etc.

³⁸⁰ Compare e.g., Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 24. 1–30. 16 (CCL 62. 126–34) with (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 204–5 (SC 146. 74), Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 134. 346^v. 37 (SC 267. 316), Aug., *Trin.* 2. 11. 21–3, 12. 3–4 (CCL 50. 107, 108), Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 26 (PL 42. 739), Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 2. 97^v. 7–9 (CCL 87/i. 115), Ar. ign., *Annumt.* 3. 15 (Leroy, *Epektasis*, 350), Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 1. 2. 7^v. 24–1^v. 5 (CCL 87/i. 47), etc.

³⁸¹ e.g. compare Basil, *Eun.* 2. 18. 33–47 (SC 305. 72–4), Hilary, *Trin.* 5. 19. 9–11 (CCL 62. 169) with the exegesis implied in Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 4. 5. 50^v. 11–20 (CCL 87/i. 61), Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 134. 346^v. 38 (SC 267. 316), Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 3. 97^v. 17–18 (CCL 87. 116), Ar. ign., *Job* 1 (PG 17. 390A), etc.

³⁸² Compare e.g. Olympiodorus, *Job* 26 (PTS 24. 335. 13–25) with Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 247. 3–249. 21).

³⁸³ By way of contrast, the people of Nineveh repented when they heard the voice of a servant (Jonah), while the Jews did not do so even when they heard the very voice of the Lord himself (in Jesus), *Lect.* 8. 6. 16^v. 12–16^v. 6 (CCL 87/i. 19).

The frameworks we have been exploring led the two sides, as we have seen, to very different understandings of the history from Abraham to Christ. But 'before Abraham was, I am';³⁸⁴ what of the history *before* there was a material creation? St Ambrose, in his great hymn, *Veni Redemptor Gentium*, portrays Christ's redemptive journey as taking him from the throne of heaven to 'very hell' and back again.³⁸⁵ In this one instance his non-Nicene opponents could have joined in, for they were as convinced as he was that the guardians of the infernal kingdom trembled at the coming of their Lord.³⁸⁶ Where they did not agree was in the way that journey began or in the meaning of its intermediate stages. They viewed the theophanies of Christ, which culminated in the incarnation, as successive stages in a single journey, because it was the journey of a single entity from first to last.³⁸⁷ Thus for them the drama of redemption began, not at Bethlehem or in the Jordan,³⁸⁸ but with the great concomitant³⁸⁹ act of creation which marked the beginning of the contingent universe as a whole.

Given the narrative requirements of such a scheme, the Nicenes were thus perhaps not without excuse when they claimed their opponents thought the Son originated in time.³⁹⁰ Certainly, it requires a fair mental effort *not* to think that way. In any case they exploited the opening ruthlessly. In particular, they liked to ask why, if the Son had a beginning in time, any one time was better than another?³⁹¹ After all, they said, if the Son, who was time's Creator, had a beginning within time, time would be older than its Creator; it therefore became a kind of

³⁸⁴ John 8: 58. Not used in surviving non-Nicene literature, but its prologue is cited by Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 26 (*PL* 42. 739).

³⁸⁵ In the verse, 'Egressus eius a Patre | regressus eius ad Patrem; | excursus usque ad inferos, | recursus ad sedem Dei' ('From God the Father he proceeds; | To God the Father back he speeds: | Proceeds—as far as very hell; | Speeds back—to light ineffable').

³⁸⁶ Citing Job 38: 17 (see Appendix).

³⁸⁷ The Son, after all, is *ἐν* as well as *μόνος*, Eun., *Apol.* 12. 1-3, 25. 21-2, cf. 5. 5 (Vaggione 46-8, 68, cf. 38), *EF* 3. 33 (Vaggione 154).

³⁸⁸ Cf. Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Mac.* 5. 195. 5-9 (*CCL* 87/i. 232).

³⁸⁹ Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 524. 42-3, 536. 14-19 (*SC* 237. 200, 234), cf. Eun., *Apol.* cf. 15. 12-14 (Vaggione 52).

³⁹⁰ e.g. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 22-3 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 23. 12-19).

³⁹¹ e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 2. 12. 1-6 (*SC* 305. 44), Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 6. 55-9 (*J* ii. 205. 8-207. 10).

mediating principle between Father and Son (ridiculous!).³⁹² The non-Nicenes, of course, denied both charge and imputation,³⁹³ as even a few of their enemies acknowledged;³⁹⁴ but there was enough ambiguity in Arius' original formula (*ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*, 'there was when he was not') to make the charge plausible,³⁹⁵ and the same was true of the less provocative form of it favoured by Aetius and Eunomius: the Son did not exist 'before his own coming to be'.³⁹⁶

Part of the problem lay in the tension between the way such a scenario had to be imagined, and the way it was explained. In non-Nicene eyes the metaphor of birth absolutely required a priority of parent to child. But what kind of priority was it? Here terminology caused a problem. At this period it was common to distinguish between *χρόνος* ('measured time' as determined by the motions of the heavens),³⁹⁷ and a less determinate but still bounded kind of time known as 'age' or 'eternity' (*αἰών*) which preceded or lay outside it.³⁹⁸ Because the

³⁹² e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 2. 11. 28–32, 12. 27–33 (SC 305. 44, 46).

³⁹³ Cf. Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 15. 5 (PL 42. 725–6), *Eun.*, *Apol.* 10. 5–12 (Vaggione 44).

³⁹⁴ Cf. Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 616. 11–14 (SC 246. 96).

³⁹⁵ Arius at his most conciliatory, for instance, was able to speak of the Son as 'begotten, created, or made' *πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων* and *πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων*, Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2, 3 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 7, 13. 4).

³⁹⁶ . . . *γεγεννησθαι μὲν οὐκ οὖσαν πρὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἀναστάσεως*, *Eun.*, *Apol.* 12. 10–12, cf. 13. 15, 24. 12 (Vaggione 48, cf. 50, 64), *AA* 3 (J ii. 194. 11–22, 248. 23–7), *EF* 3. 3–4 (Vaggione 152). It is not impossible, however, that others within their theological orbit did take such ideas temporally. At any rate, Aetius refers in his *Syntagmation* to opponents whom he mysteriously describes as *Χρονίτας* or 'temporists'. Pace Kopecek i. 240, following (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 11 (PG 27. 1123C), it is extremely unlikely that either homoiousians or homoousians were originally meant. Aetius' persecutors are people prepared to 'appropriate' his writings to their own way of thinking (*σφετερισάμενοι*), and to do so in such a way that his own followers may be deceived (Aetius, *Synt.* 1 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 11. 1 (GCS iii. 351. 22–352. 4). That describes an internal dispute, not an attack from outside. The original document, then, may date from the 350s, but there was at least one later possibility for the revision (including an attempt at 'persecution'): Aetius' dispute with Theodosius of Philadelphia over Christ's temporal progress in virtue in 364, see Ch. 7 nn. 131, 135 below.

³⁹⁷ As in *Eun.*, *Apol.* 10. 6–8 (Vaggione 44), Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 254. 4–6) following Plato, *Tim.* 37C–39E.

³⁹⁸ It was sometimes said that *χρόνος* was characteristic of sensible reality, while *αἰών* marked the intelligible, as in Basil, *Eun.* 2. 13. 19–22 (SC 305. 48).

latter was boundaried it was not outside time, and yet because it was not measured, to speak of 'before' or 'after' made no sense. Almost everyone agreed that Christ was begotten before all 'ages' (αἰώνων)³⁹⁹ and was in fact their Creator. The non-Nicenes were being perfectly truthful, therefore, when they denied they had ever said the Son was begotten in 'measured time' (χρόνος). They were at the very least ingenuous when they minimized the imaginative significance of their 'break' between Father and Son, for in their eyes *that* was the beginning of the αἰών and all later history. The significance of this becomes clear when we take a look at non-Nicene literature as a whole. For there we find a very considerable variation in theory, but almost none in imagining the story. In every instance where we can discern the imaginative background, we find a unique Christ who begins a single journey from heaven to hell and back again, and who is the sole subject of this immense history.

This leaves the problem of how the beginning of the story was seen in imaginative terms. One of the more puzzling bits of information that has come down from the early stages of the controversy is a claim that Arius thought the Son was chosen proleptically for his task because God foresaw that he would be faithful in it. The most detailed summary of this episode is also one of the earliest, that in a letter from Alexander of Alexandria to Alexander of Thessalonica:

These 'Arians' say, said Alexander, 'that "God made all things out of nothing"; they therefore reckon even God's Son part of the created order of rational and irrational beings. In keeping with this, they claim that the Son's nature is susceptible to change and is capable of both virtue and vice . . . Thus according to these pernicious fools, "*we* are able to become sons of God in the same sense that he is" because scripture says, "I have begotten and brought up sons [and they have rebelled against me]". . .⁴⁰⁰ They claim, therefore, that since by foreknowledge and prevision God knew that this son would not rebel, he was chosen in preference to all the rest—not because he possessed a

³⁹⁹ e.g. Cyril. H., *Catech.* 4. 4 (Reischl i. 94), Germinius Sirmiensis apud *Heracl.* (PLS 1. 347A, cf. 348B), Aetius, *Synt.* 37 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 37 (GCS iii. 69. 35), Eun., *Apol.* 10. 4-5, 8-10 (Vaggione 44), *EF* 3. 14 (Vaggione 152), etc. See also n. 395 above.

⁴⁰⁰ Isa. 1: 2 (LXX). Alexander, ad loc., cites the bracketed second half of the verse as though it were antithetical to the Arians, but in fact it is necessary to make sense of their interpretation.

natural superiority which distinguished him from other sons, but because, though by nature capable of change, his diligence and practice of virtue were such that he never did change for the worse.⁴⁰¹

Apart from two rather mysterious lines in the *Thalia*⁴⁰² and an allusion in Athanasius (apparently to a work *not* by Arius),⁴⁰³ the only other mention of this doctrine from the first 'Arian' generation is a reference to the Parable of the Lost Sheep in a letter ascribed to Athanasius of Anazarbus.⁴⁰⁴

Here, as usual, the problem is one of context. What could all this mean? Many modern scholars have looked for an answer in the Origenistic background of Arius' thought,⁴⁰⁵ and that is reasonable enough. But from that perspective these passages are almost as interesting for what they do *not* say as for what they do. For in what survives of Arius' theology there is no claim as in Origen⁴⁰⁶ that all intelligible beings share a common nature. Indeed, given Arius' insistence on the Logos as the sole subject in the incarnate Christ, it is difficult to see how he could have said anything of the kind. A world of pure spirits, after all, is a world without matter; in the spiritual world as it existed prior to the creation of matter (and in the pre-incarnate Christ as God of that world), how could one distinguish between 'spirit' and 'spirit'? Ontology alone could guarantee individual identity. Thus in that world, ontological independence is a dramatic necessity—there can be no story without it.⁴⁰⁷ This

⁴⁰¹ Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 11–13 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 21. 10–12, 15–16, 18–20, 21–2).

⁴⁰² Quoted in Ath., *Syn.* 15. 3 (Opitz ii. 242. 14–15).

⁴⁰³ Ath., *Ar.* 1. 5 (PG 26. 21C). Since this passage is introduced with the statement that it is from *ἐτέροις αὐτῶν συγγράμμασιν* it is presumably not from the *Thalia*. Another possibility is the lost *Syntagmation* of Asterius the Sophist, mentioned by name elsewhere in the same work, *Ar.* 1. 30 (PG 26. 76A).

⁴⁰⁴ Ath. Anazarbenus, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Urkunde 9, Opitz iii. 18. 6–8). Nearly forty years later, on the other hand, Theodosius of Philadelphia was teaching (in contrast to Eunomius) that the Son was *τρεπτός* by nature and then became *ἀτρεπτός* through the practice of virtue, Philost., *HE* 8. 3 (GCS 105. 29–31), but even there an ontological progression is not implied.

⁴⁰⁵ e.g. Lorenz, p. 221, and *passim*.

⁴⁰⁶ e.g. Or., *Princ.* 1. 8. 1 (GCS v. 96. 12–13), cf. *Concilium Constantinopolitanum anno 543*, anathemata (Hahn, § 175, pp. 227–9).

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. the implications of Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 301. 7–127–12). That Arius introduced a differentiated chain of being which led to the 'dismantling [of] the

helps us understand a little more clearly what Alexander is describing. Because from his own point of view all 'creatures' are equally 'not God', he makes it sound as though God is making a proleptic choice among ontologically equivalent beings. He does not quite say this, however, and that is not an accident. The reason lies in something that Alexander implies but that Eunomius makes explicit: that the divine foreknowledge applies to *all* contingent beings alike. Like Eunomius,⁴⁰⁸ then, Arius was describing the beginning of a world, not merely the election of an individual. The divine generation was of course boundaried, but it was not in *χρόνος*, and so from our perspective was instantaneous. What Alexander gives us is one fragment of the beginning of the *αἰών*, interpreted through his own 'lens'. He chose to ignore the fact that within a pre-temporal context creation can only be a single concomitant act. Within that act ministerial election can be distinguished logically, but not sequentially. The coming-to-be and anointing of the Christ, then, are simultaneous; it is only we who are forced to imagine them temporally.⁴⁰⁹

Alexander tried to portray Arius' version as an alien, non-Christian intrusion in an otherwise traditional story, but its roots in fact lie in the Church's inherited store of inherited imagery. The royal marriage hymn mentioned by Alexander (Psalm 44[45]: 8) had been applied to the Son's premundane career for centuries,⁴¹⁰ and by the time of Justin⁴¹¹ and Origen⁴¹² had become a standard feature of Christian exegesis. For non-Nicenes it was a reference to the Son's ministerial anointing which paralleled the Christian's own;⁴¹³ for the 'oil of gladness' in the psalm was linked to the joy felt by the heavenly Wisdom

analogical ladder' has already been noted by Rowan Williams (*Arius*, 220–1, cf. 226). In Eunomius this results in an inability to distinguish between 'person' and 'essence' in purely immaterial beings so that all individual angels constitute different species (see below, Ch. 5 nn. 119–21). The radical separations that so scandalized contemporaries in Eunomius' system applied to the entire chain of being!

⁴⁰⁸ In the passages quoted on pp. 119–20 above.

⁴⁰⁹ See Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 616. 11–14 (SC 246. 96).

⁴¹⁰ As e.g. in Heb. 1: 8–9. For non-Nicene examples see Appendix.

⁴¹¹ e.g. Justin, *Dial.* 38. 1–3 (Goodspeed 134–5).

⁴¹² e.g. Or., *Princ.* 2. 6. 4 (GCS v. 143. 18–144. 17).

⁴¹³ See Ch. 8, pp. 336–8 below.

at the sight of the newly habitable world (Proverbs 8: 30-1),⁴¹⁴ and to that of the baptized incarnate Wisdom within it—a foretaste of all his gifts past, present, and to come.⁴¹⁵ Hence, as for Mary at the beginning of her ministry,⁴¹⁶ the gift of the Spirit at the beginning of the *αἰών* was not the sign of an ontological transformation, but one element in the preparation for a dispensation about to begin.⁴¹⁷

The non-Nicene version of this dispensation, reaching as it did from heaven to the trembling keepers of the infernal gates, enables us to answer one of the questions that has been dogging us throughout the chapter: what was it that was so important to so many people that it remained the same through all the changes of doctrinal expression? The answer is, the 'story' itself with its attendant imagery. For while there was much speculative diversity, there was also a broad imaginative consistency which remained a feature of the movement throughout its history. The guardian formularies changed very often, but their imagined representations almost never did. By making this informing 'reality' the defining factor, then, we are in a position to explain much that seemed previously obscure: the great emotional depth of the controversy; its wide social appeal; the popular impact of 'expert' theological language; the continuing ambiguity of people's response. For the deceptive similarity of the opposing systems lay in their differing mixtures of traditional and speculative elements, elements identified in each case as 'apostolic'. Many could be drawn to the traditional elements in one stream or the other without being fully committed to its speculative ramifications. As the century progressed hardening boundaries made it more and more difficult to 'halt between two opinions', but ultimate doctrinal victory could only be the fruit of a developing imaginative consensus.

The theology of Aetius and Eunomius, then, was no more the

⁴¹⁴ Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 16 (PL 42. 734).

⁴¹⁵ Ar. ign., *Comm in Lc.* 4: 18, 143^v. 3-12 (CCL 87/i. 212).

⁴¹⁶ Ar. ign., *Anunt.* 4. 18-19 (Leroy, *Epektasis*, 350).

⁴¹⁷ Ar. ign., *Comm in Lc.* 4: 18, 143^v. 16-143^v. 3 (CCL 87/i. 211-2). The connection with Mary is nowhere made explicitly, though the Spirit functions identically in both cases. Cf. also Eus. Nic. and Arius apud Ath., *Ar.* 1. 37 (PG 26. 88C), Hilary, *Trin.* 11. 10. 11. cf. 4. 34. 4ff. (CCL 62A. 539, cf. 62. 138), Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 13 (PG 39. 860D), cf. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 705B), Vigilius, *Ar. Dial.* 2. 9 (PL 62. 174A), *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 2. 29 (PL 62. 216B).

product of *τέχνη* than that of their opponents was of *kakanoia*. For while there is much in Eunomius that is 'technical', *τέχνη* elucidates a framework it influenced but did not create. The same could be said of his opponents. The position of neither side was a *product* of argument, though each was affected by it. In order to understand Eunomius, then, or any non-Nicene, we must try to see them as participants in a theological dialogue which began before Nicaea and whose parameters were assumed rather than developed. There is nothing to indicate that Aetius or Eunomius ever considered the Nicene position seriously or did more than caricature its principles, for as theologians they were part of a very definite theological tradition (one which they considered 'apostolic'), and it is only within that tradition that we can understand them. True enough, their search for *akribeia* led them to a degree of notoriety which made them as much an abomination to friend as to enemy, but for the former they were always to remain an internal foe. It was only later—when it was already much too late—that they were ever forced to confront Nicene theology directly.

In the sunny heyday of popular acquiescence and imperial favour a necessity such as that was scarcely imaginable. For if there is anyone who symbolizes the theological atmosphere in which Aetius and Eunomius began their public life, it is someone we have already met: Leontius, bishop of Antioch. This prelate's softly mumbling voice during the *Gloria Patri* is a fitting symbol of a theological community struggling to reconcile different 'realizations' of the divine activity. Over time the difference between these 'realizations' was to become more and more pronounced, until it was possible to compromise no longer. As Basil the Great was later to find,⁴¹⁸ in the difference between 'Glory to the Father *with* the Son' and 'Glory to the Father *through* the Son' there lay a world of difference—such slogans were the outward and visible signs of two very different ways of imagining the Christian Gospel.

⁴¹⁸ Basil, *Spir.* 1. 3. 1–6 (SC 17bis. 236–8).

Courtier

The Antioch to which Aetius and Eunomius returned shortly before 350 differed significantly from the one they had left only a few years before. Over most of the previous decade Persian pressure on the eastern frontier had made this city the principal imperial residence.¹ During that time Constantius had spent most of the winters in a sumptuous 'new city' built by Diocletian on an island in the Orontes,² and summers in the field.³ The reason was that, militarily, the East differed strikingly from the West. The long stretches of sparsely inhabited river and woodland that made the western frontiers so hard to defend were absent in the East. There, a daunting combination of desert and mountain came together to limit strategic access to a few points.⁴ Chief among these was the city of Nisibis in Roman Mesopotamia.⁵ Long a centre of commerce between Rome and Persia,⁶ this city had already survived two sieges (in 338 and 346) and, by the spring of 350, was expecting another. That was the point at which word arrived from the West that the emperor's one remaining brother, Constans, had been murdered in Gaul, and that the instigator, Magnentius, had

¹ There is a convenient summary of imperial comings and goings during this period in Barnes, *Athanasius*, 219–24. Unless otherwise specified, detailed dates from this period are taken from this summary.

² See Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 318–23.

³ Cf. Libanius, *Or.* 18. 206–7 (Foerster ii. 326. 13–327. 6).

⁴ Socrates uses one of his stock metaphors to describe the confused and shifting contact there—it is a 'night battle' (*νυκτομαχίας*), in which Constantius was not notably successful, *HE* 2. 25. 5 (*GCS* 134. 4–5).

⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus calls it 'Orientis firmissimum claustrum' in 25. 8.

^{14.}

⁶ See Jones, *LRE* ii. 827, 1342.

claimed the throne for himself.⁷ Several western provinces had already acknowledged the usurper and, not long after, a second revolt broke out in what is now southern Hungary—the troops at Sirmium made their vacillating commander Vetranio emperor.⁸ Constantius was temporarily immobilized by the prospect of a Persian invasion, but the rapidly changing political situation in the West was already beginning to lay the foundations for a new settlement in both Church and State.

In the short term, of course, nothing could happen at all: Magnentius was eager to avoid a conflict he might easily lose and Constantius was in no position to leave the East. But once the Persians withdrew as usual⁹ at the end of the summer and the emperor was free to move, civil war began in earnest. It was to be three very bloody years before the usurper could be driven to suicide (summer of 353). In the mean time Constantius' goal was to gain control of as much new territory as possible, while at the same time leaving his eastern power-base in reliable hands. Those hands had to be close enough to the imperial house to be credible, and yet lacking the kind of independent authority that might easily lead to a revolt. The massacre of most of the emperor's male relatives fifteen years before had severely limited the available candidates. In the end the choice fell on the emperor's closest living male relative, his cousin, the 25-year-old Flavius Constantius Gallus. This young man, the second son of a half-brother of the emperor's father,¹⁰ was made Caesar. With a speed dictated by emergency, he was plucked out of rural retirement, transported to the court at Sirmium, married to the emperor's sister, and declared Caesar, all by 15

⁷ Julian Imp., *Or.* 1 (26B–C). Constantius appears to have been at Edessa at the time, Philost., *HE* 3. 22 (*GCS* 49. 5–6).

⁸ On his character, cf. Julian Imp., *Or.* 1. 30D–31A. At the same time there was also a short-lived insurrection at Rome led by one of Constantine's nephews, Nepotianus. Vetranio was later deposed and (uniquely) allowed to live. Soc., *HE* 2. 25. 9–11, cf. 28. 17–20 (*GCS* 134. 12–18, cf. 139. 10–24); Soz., *HE* 4. 1. 1–2 (*GCS* 140. 3–12), Philost., *HE* 3. 22, 22a (*GCS* 49. 3–50. 6, 49. 23–51. 13), Zosimus 2. 42–3 (*CSHB* 47. 107. 10–109. 17).

⁹ See Julian's comment in Soc., *HE* 3. 21. 1–2 (*GCS* 216. 14–19).

¹⁰ Ammianus Marcellinus 14. 11. 27. Gallus' unnamed older brother is frequently forgotten, but as Julian Imp., *Ath.* 270D, cf. 281B, makes clear, he was killed in the original massacre along with their father and other relatives.

March 351.¹¹ It was not to prove a felicitous choice.¹² The Caesar was to outlive the usurper by only a year, but significantly for us, in that time he managed to make a dramatic change in the lives of both Aetius and Eunomius.

Not all of this was due to the efforts of the Caesar himself. The fact is, no matter who won the civil war, the public religious dynamic would have to change. As long as there was more than one ruler, dissension among the emperors would allow religious dissidence a 'safe haven'. As a result, no one emperor could afford to pursue a religious policy wholly independent of the others.¹³ The elimination of two of the three co-rulers, however, changed that situation radically. Whoever won the civil war would be in a position to impose an empire-wide solution. 'Safe havens' would promptly be a thing of the past. This civil war, therefore, was more than a geopolitical event; it marked a turning-point in religious history. It had the capacity to shift not only the form, but the content of the ongoing religious debate.

To understand why this should have been, we need to think a little about the shape of the religious dynamic as it had developed over the previous quarter century. As we saw in Chapter 3, the driving force behind explicit doctrinal development in the years after the Council of Nicaea was a combination of imperial pressure and the logical requirements of the competing interpretative frameworks. In political terms this worked itself out in two broadly discernible stages. The first, which lasted roughly from the Nicene Council to the death of Constantine (325-37), we may describe as a period of 'enforced encounter'. Once the government recognized that a simple solution was not possible, it tried to 'manage' the conflict by enforcing silence on some of the participants and requiring intercommunion and limited dialogue of most of the rest. The latter was to be based on a specific authoritative document, the 'Faith' of Nicaea. The policy was not a success. Limited dialogue could not overcome an entrenched and largely unspoken

¹¹ See Julian Imp., *Ath.* 272A.

¹² Even his brother had to admit he lacked the capacity to govern, *ibid.* 271D-272A.

¹³ The Church, after all, was one of the very few institutions that transcended the territories of any one emperor.

cognitive dissonance. Substantive theological debate did continue, of course, but out of the public eye, within the gradually separating communities.¹⁴

Constantine's death and with it the end of one-man rule changed this dynamic significantly. We may perhaps best call the new stage one of 'identity creation', for during this period (roughly 337 to 350) the dialogues that had previously been internal to the individual communities emerged in public to form the basis of new ecclesial identities. One result of this was that the Nicene Creed, the primary vehicle of 'official' dialogue in the previous reign, disappeared from view. The new political realities made it more or less irrelevant. And, since it was the 'faith' of no particular Church, and had been proclaimed by no individual in baptism, it lacked the popular appeal that might have kept it in the public eye. Over the next fifteen years, then, the Creed of Nicaea was more ignored than opposed, even by those who were later considered 'Nicene'. During this second period, public ecclesiastical identity tended to be expressed in terms of political and theological loyalty to specific bishops—Athanasius, say, or Marcellus, or Eusebius of Nicomedia.¹⁵ This is not the impression one gets from the historical accounts written a century later. The ecclesiastical historians based most of their work on Athanasius,¹⁶ and naturally tended to read back into the earlier stages of the controversy the clear doctrinal distinctions of the later ones. Anachronistic reading of that kind, however, made it all too easy for later generations to miss the fact that *all* their ancestors had changed theologically during this period, including those later identified as 'Nicene'. This was certainly not because earlier there had been no doctrinal divisions—far from it—but because under the divided empire the implications of these divisions were either still not

¹⁴ See Ch. 3, pp. 60–7 above.

¹⁵ Not because theology as such was unimportant, but because at this stage the person of its proponents was often as important as their position. Later that was to change (as in the case of Marcellus in Ch. 3 n. 229), but in a passage destined to figure prominently in the Counter-Reformation Athanasius presents this 'cult of personality' as a defining characteristic of his 'Arians', *Ar.* 1, 2 (*PG* 26. 16A). In point of fact, he himself was as guilty of this as anyone else (see n. 33 below).

¹⁶ Soc., *HE* 2. 1. 3–4 (*GCS* 92. 12–19) is the *locus classicus*.

clear or were mixed with other concerns.¹⁷ The rapid collapse of frontiers in the 350s changed all this and inaugurated a new stage. The prospect of a reunited empire meant that all sides would need to address a wider audience. Since this new audience transcended local political and regional loyalties it could only be appealed to theologically or ideologically. The result was a third stage which may be called one of 'incipient sectarianism'.

As we have already seen, the disappearance of 'safe havens' upon the defeat of Magnentius brought with it the need to create an empire-wide religious identity. That need, however, was not felt solely by the imperial government or the official 'Church'. There was another, unforeseen result: the universalization of dissent. The attempt to create an empire-wide identity also created an empire-wide resistance. Political and geographical unity made local and personal loyalty less and less useful as a source of communal identity, especially if it had to be transmitted over any distance. The result was an increased pressure to identify particular persons and places with specific theological causes. Athanasius himself is a case in point. In the mid-340s, as an exile separated from his geographical power-base, he was among the first to take account of the new trend. His patron Constans may or may not have been ideologically Nicene, but he was undoubtedly 'Athanasian'; indeed, his commitment to the much-exiled archbishop was one of the few things on which Athanasius and his opponents did agree—Athanasius called Constans a 'martyr',¹⁸ they thought he was killed for supporting Athanasius!¹⁹ One effect of his death, however, was to force his protégé to widen his power-base—something he had already begun to do in exile. Significantly, the means he chose were largely ideological.

¹⁷ A good example is the majority Synodical Letter of the Council of Serdica, where the complaint is of 'falsitates, uincula, homicidia, pugnas, falsas epistulas, uerberationes, nudationes uirginum, exilia, euersiones ecclesiarum, incendia, translationes de ecclesia (minori) ad maiores' and only then of 'ante omnia contra rectam fidem insurgentes Arrianae heresis doctrinas', Concilia, C. Serd., *Ep. Cath.* 8 (CSEL 65. 122. 1-4). The same elements would always be present throughout, but a few years later the balance would be quite different.

¹⁸ Ath., *Apol. Const.* 7 (PG 25. 604D).

¹⁹ Cf. Philost., *HE* 3. 22 (GCS 49. 3-4).

It is easy to see why. In an age without mass media, 'celebrity' and the personal loyalty it commands was very difficult to transmit beyond the narrow range of local power relationships. One of the few means available for overcoming such a limitation was the identity of person and cause. That is why just before, during, and after this period we find a renewed interest in the Council of Nicaea and its controversial 'faith'. That document had languished for some time in the limbo reserved for pronouncements neither formally revoked nor widely accepted; even Athanasius mentioned it only rarely.²⁰ Now, all that began to change. His return to the East in 346 had all the trappings of a missionary journey;²¹ the death of his patron four years later saw him issuing a whole series of works that defended the *homoousion*, including one describing the Council of Nicaea itself.²² None of this seems to have involved any change in theology, but it certainly did involve a change in tactics. The wider geographical and social range of what was now an empire-wide religious dialogue made formulae increasingly important as symbols of partisan identity. The reappearance of *homoousios* was thus not an accident. It was also no accident that about this time a new means of delivering doctrinal formulae to the masses rose to prominence. Significantly, at Antioch it was linked with the name of Aetius.

Not as inventor, but as target. For though the name sounds innocent enough, the means in question was 'antiphonal' or responsorial psalmody.²³ Far from harmless, it was in fact a powerful political tool.²⁴ It had been transferred from a Syriac

²⁰ As G. C. Stead remarks, Athanasius scarcely uses it 'hors du contexte de la formule conciliaire selon laquelle le Fils est homoousios avec le Père' ("Homoousios" selon Athanase', in *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. C. Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974), 233).

²¹ Soc., *HE* 2. 24. 7-8 (*GCS* 133. 9-13), cf. *Soz.*, *HE* 3. 21. 3-5 (*GCS* 136. 1-13), *Philost.*, *HE* 3. 12 (*GCS* 43. 14-18).

²² The *De Decretis*. There is no need for our purposes to date this document more than generally. For a discussion of some of the problems and recent literature, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, 198-9.

²³ *Thdt.*, *HE* 2. 24. 8-9 (*GCS* 154. 12-20). Since these men are also said to have been ascetics (2. 24. 7 (154. 2-3)), some of the 'people' who were being taught these chants 'night and day' must have been monastics.

²⁴ Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 207. 3. 1-17 (Courtonne ii. 186). Note the connection with monastics in *Ep.* 207. 2. 1-11 (ii. 184-5).

to the Greek-speaking milieu by the two powerful laymen,²⁵ Flavian and Diodore of Tarsus.²⁶ The result, however, was not the ethereal sound of an English cathedral choir singing Evensong, but the loud cries of a group of religious activists shouting slogans—for this 'psalmody' was as much at home on the streets as in a liturgical ceremony. This brings us back to Leontius, the bishop of Antioch. We have already noted that prelate's reticence *vis-à-vis* the *Gloria Patri*—his reasons, however, may have had as much to do with wisdom as timidity. He chose, in effect, to co-opt rather than suppress a powerful lay movement, and thus was obliged to limit his own participation to 'world without end'!²⁷

Though the original slogans appear to have been just those differing forms of the *Gloria Patri* that caused Leontius so much trouble, over time they tended to become more and more pointed, and were not limited to any one side. An 'Arian' example from Constantinople nearly forty years later is a case in point: having spent the night praying loudly in the streets, a mob of those excluded from the city churches paraded out the gates at dawn shouting at the top of their lungs: 'Who says the three have one power?'²⁸ Presumably the authorities got the point.²⁹ A similar procession during the reign of Julian accompanied the body of St Babylas. The emperor had ordered it removed from the temple precincts at Daphne; thousands of

²⁵ Thdt., *HE* 2. 24. 8 (GCS 154. 12–13). Kopecek i. 104–5 n. 6 takes the report in Philost., *HE* 3. 18 (GCS 48. 9–12) of Paulinus and Flavian's expulsion (καθελεῖν) by Leontius, to indicate that Flavian was already a priest at that time. The passage, however, does not specify who ordained them, only that they were both followers of Eustathius (of Antioch). Flavian had certainly been ordained by the summer of 381 (see Ch. 8 n. 65 below), but there is nothing to indicate that Leontius was the one who did it; Meletius is surely the better candidate. For even if it were clearer that Philostorgius meant deposition as opposed to expulsion from a preferment, the statement as we now have it may be a conflation by Philostorgius or Photius of two figures differing in ecclesiastical rank (Paulinus was almost certainly ordained to the presbyterate by Eustathius, cf. Thdt., *HE* 3. 5. 1 (GCS 180. 26), Soz., *HE* 3. 11. 7 (GCS 115. 6–7)).

²⁶ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. 2. 1–6 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 413, 417).

²⁷ Thdt., *HE* 2. 24. 10–11, cf. 3 (GCS 154. 23–155. 2, cf. 153. 8–13).

²⁸ Soc., *HE* 6. 8. 2–4 (GCS 325. 2–15), Soz., *HE* 8. 8. 2 (GCS 360. 25–6): Ποῦ εἶπεν οἱ λέγοντες τὰ τρία μία δύναμι;

²⁹ Cf. the Emperor Julian's reaction to the pointed chanting of consecrated virgins at Antioch, Thdt., *HE* 3. 19. 2 (GCS 197. 17–198. 14).

men, women, and children followed the remains of the martyr into the city shouting again and again: 'Confounded be all they that worship carved images and put their trust in idols!' (Ps. 96 [97]: 7).³⁰ Julian was not amused.

Politically such processional refrains were the ecclesiastical counterpart of the shouts accompanying an imperial *adventus*. Theological discourse in the mid-fourth century may not have been conducted in 'sound bites', but similar circumstances required an equally effective equivalent: the easily remembered theological slogan. None of the official formulae that litter the landscape at this period was designed to be used in this way (they were all aimed at the bishop), but they were intended to provide the parameters for those that were. Thus, among the converging needs that led to such an obvious revival of interest in doctrinal formulae at mid-century were the chanting crowds of the great cities and the bishops charged to lead them.

This helps us understand the endless shuffling of formulae that characterized the next decade. Church and State alike were trying to combine enough elements of the available theological 'realizations' to establish an empire-wide religious identity. The system of classification by 'propositional allegiance' which we mentioned in the last chapter, and which came into use at this time reflects this. One of its functions was to enable participants to establish (from very different perspectives) how they and others related to this developing identity.³¹ The propositions underlying it were to be found in professional documents that were never intended to be used in a popular setting. What they did do was set the boundaries of interpretation for those that were; they thus defined the limits of intercommunion. Even the most desiccated doctrinal formula, then, has a double focus: on the one hand, it is abstract and 'technical', intended to bind the religious professional; on the other, it is 'popular' and narrative, intended to establish a specifically religious context (hence the credal form). The link between

³⁰ Ruf., *HE* 10. 36 (*GCS* II. ii. 996. 7-13), Soc., *HE* 3. 18. 3-4 (*GCS* 214. 3-7), Soz., *HE* 5. 19. 18 (*GCS* 226. 3-10).

³¹ None of these groups, of course, ever called themselves by these names. The Nicenes did not describe themselves as 'homoeousians' nor non-Nicenes themselves as 'anomoeans' or 'exoukontians'. Such classifications were devised by their enemies to determine who did not belong. The groups themselves naturally were all, *ex hypothesi*, 'Orthodox'.

the two was the ongoing dialogue between the religious professional in the pulpit and the 'antiphonal' responses of the congregation.³² The *sotto voce* participation of Leontius was more symbolic than he knew.

However, we still need to ask how this chaotic decade fitted into the wider process which was bringing the controlling frameworks more and more into the light. Like Levi in the loins of Abraham, the latter were still nowhere to be seen as a whole, but increasingly they were being articulated piecemeal as the changed political environment brought one slogan or another to the fore. This helps us understand classification by 'propositional allegiance'. Proponents of any given solution would tend to band together in tightly focused, though often temporary groupings to support one formula or another. As the formulae changed, so too did the groupings. The Nicenes were in a somewhat different position. Since they were wedded to a council and formula of the previous reign, they were obliged to support *homoousios* and *homoousios* only. They could not, therefore, express their divisions in propositional terms, but had to do so in personal ones (that is, by support of specific bishops).³³ The non-Nicenes, on the other hand, were by definition committed to finding an alternative, and were thus able to portray both

³² A case in point from the following decade is the so-called *Altercatio Heracliani* (PLS 1. 345A-350D). This dialogue has clearly been edited to bring it into conformity with the martyr acts, but it seems equally clearly based on the stenographic notes of an actual event. In any case it gives us a good picture of the concrete context of theological discourse: the non-Nicene bishop is confronted by Heraclianus, a layman who had once been baptized by him and who shared in resisting his heretical predecessor Photinus. The bishop sits formally enthroned and surrounded by his clergy. The entire 'cast' is there: the confrontation is said to take place in the presence of 'all the people', both male and female, and it is they in the end who are invited to declare Heraclianus a 'omousianus' and cast him out.

³³ In spite of the accusations made by Athanasius cited in n. 15 above, the Nicenes were almost forced to this kind of personalized self-definition. The reason is that while they were indeed agreed as to the formula to be used, they were very far from agreed as to what it meant. Their divisions, therefore, tended to centre on personalities and could thus be treated as non-doctrinal (e.g. Soz., HE 6. 21. 2 (GCS 263. 11-13), Thdt., HE 3. 4. 3-4 (GCS 180. 5-13)), even though they often reflected divergent theologies in fact (see the remarks of S.-P. Bergjan, *Theodoret von Cyrus und der Neunizänismus* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 102-4).

division and allegiance in propositional terms.³⁴ None of these groups was exactly a 'party' in the modern sense; however, to the extent that they were attempting to influence governmental or ecclesiastical policy they did fulfil some of the same functions. Their role in defining this third stage of the dynamic was to signal the various temporary conjunctions of forces. These conjunctions, like the process of which they were a part, were driven by forces from two directions:³⁵ on the one hand, they had to take account of the propositions as such, which placed a limit on what might be 'really' apprehended; on the other, they were influenced by the ongoing traditional 'realizations' which determined the sense in which a proposition could be received (*homousios* itself is a case in point). Because neither of the controlling frameworks was as yet fully articulated, the result was incipient sectarianism, or as the participants themselves expressed it, a 'faith of the day', a 'fides temporum potius quam euangeliorum'.³⁶ Most of these groups were as ephemeral as the circumstances which called them forth, but in helping to assess one path or another they made their contribution to the larger dialectic.³⁷ A very few, however, were longer lived, and one of the most distinctive of these was that associated with the names of Aetius and Eunomius.

Neither man, of course, had any conscious desire to found a 'new' Church, even though they were as a matter of fact just beginning to lay the groundwork for a separate identity. This grew in part out of their understanding of their own function, which was, as we have seen, to be *periti*, 'experts' who defended the faith with rigour (*akribeia*). The practical consequence of that stance, however, was that they were very often called upon to oppose those with whom, under other circumstances, they would probably have been taking 'sweet counsel together'. Such conduct had got Aetius into trouble before, but a new

³⁴ Many writers have emphasized the non-Nicene divisions of this period while ignoring those of the Nicenes (see preceding note). At this point, however, none of the sides could make any claim to unanimity.

³⁵ Or three, if the government is included.

³⁶ Hilary, *Lib. Const.* 4. 3 (CSEL 65. 199. 20-1).

³⁷ As was already beginning to be recognized in the decades that followed, albeit in a logical rather than a strictly historical sense, e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Or. Catech.*, prologue (PG 45. 9A-B), Thdt., *Eran.* 2 (Ettlinger 117. 25-118. 30).

incident was to have dire and lasting consequences. To understand why, we need to step back for a moment and look at the wider context.

When Aetius and Eunomius decided to return to Antioch, they were returning to one of the principal flashpoints of the ongoing debate. For in spite of the imminent political union of East and West, theologically the West was still on the sidelines;³⁸ the centre of the new debate, as of the old, remained Egypt, the cities of the Aegean littoral, and above all Antioch, with its sharply divided Christian community. But while a new controversy was just about to break out, for once the Nicenes were not involved. The latter, under the prodding of Athanasius, were indeed starting to take *homousios* more seriously³⁹ and finding their feet as a party, but their ultimate triumph was still shrouded in the unforeseeable future. In the chaotic mid-century present, their challenge was not to be taken seriously. For Aetius and Eunomius, the more immediate danger came from those ostensibly opposed to Nicaea, two of whom were truly formidable. It was they who were to be the focal points of a controversy sparked once again by the need for 'precision'.

Aetius and Eunomius' targets were both men of established reputation. One it is true, Eustathius of Sebaste, was better known for ascetic zeal than doctrinal consistency (he had managed to be disciple of Arius, mentor of Basil the Great, and, perhaps, teacher of Aetius⁴⁰), but the other was truly intimidating. This was Basil, the exiled bishop of Ancyra. Displaced in the wave of depositions preceding Athanasius' return, this soon-to-be-restored prelate was himself an imperial favourite⁴¹ and a beneficiary of the new political order. Since Constantius was preoccupied with the military situation in the West, restoration would have to await victory, but in the mean time he

³⁸ See Hilary's comments at *Syn.* 8, 63 (*PL* 10. 486A, 523B–C).

³⁹ It is all too easy, looking back from the perspective of Nicene triumph, to assume that loyalty to the council meant the same thing at every point. It is worth noting, for instance, that only ten years earlier it was perfectly possible to profess loyalty to Nicaea in one breath and avoid all mention of its formula in another, cf. *Concilia*, C. Ant. (341), *Can.* 1 (Mansi ii. 1308C), Hilary, *Syn.* 32 (*PL* 10. 504B–C), *Soz.*, *HE* 3. 5. 5–7 (*GCS* 106. 9–23).

⁴⁰ See Ch. 2 nn. 77–9 above.

⁴¹ *Soz.*, *HE* 4. 15. 1 (*GCS* 158. 6–7), *Thdt.*, *HE* 2. 25. 4 (*GCS* 156. 12–13).

had been sent with Eustathius to Antioch, probably in the entourage of the Caesar Gallus. As bishop, physician,⁴² and noteworthy speaker,⁴³ this Basil had, only a month before (in March or April of 351), defeated the heretic Photinus in debate.⁴⁴ Given Aetius' zeal for notoriety,⁴⁵ this must have seemed a God-given opportunity.⁴⁶ At any rate, as he had done in other cases, Aetius challenged Basil and company to a debate, where (at least in his own eyes) he rendered them speechless.⁴⁷

⁴² Hieron., *Vir. Inlus.* 39 (TU 14. 1. 45. 15; note that in 45. 18 he is linked doctrinally with Eustathius).

⁴³ Soz., *HE* 2. 33. 1, 3. 14. 42 (GCS 98. 16-17; 125. 14-18).

⁴⁴ Epiph., *Haer.* 71. 1. 4-8 (GCS iii. 250. 8-251. 2). Barnes, *Athanasius*, 272-3, is certainly right to distinguish this encounter from Photinus' formal condemnation later in the same year. The presence of Thalassius, Gallus' praetorian prefect, at the debate (250. 12) suggests that Gallus had not yet left (the only contrary evidence is an ambiguous passage in Zosimus which places Thalassius in the West just before the battle of Mursa, Zosimus 2. 48 (CSHB 47. 115. 16-20)). Whatever the truth of that, the general sequence makes a good deal of sense: Philostorgius and Gregory indicate that Basil was in Antioch about this time and close to Gallus (see n. 47 below); his recent victory over Photinus explains why Aetius challenged him; the need to be back for the council explains Basil's departure and, perhaps, the ability of Theophilus and Leontius to effect a rescue. Moreover, since Epiphanius seems to have been working from stenographic notes of the debate, Socrates (*HE* 2. 30. 42-5 (GCS 146. 7-16) and Sozomen (*HE* 4. 6. 14-15 (GCS 145. 16-146. 4)) must have been mistaken in placing this encounter at the council itself. In their version, the debate is said (incorrectly) to have taken place before the emperor. This may indicate that they confused it with a later debate on a different subject which took place some years later, cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 8 (GCS 62. 10-14).

⁴⁵ Gregory of Nyssa was almost certainly right in asserting that one of Aetius' motives in challenging him was a desire for publicity, *Eun.* 1. 56 (J i. 41. 14-42. 5). His earlier response to divine confirmation of his special gift was a trip to Alexandria to challenge Aphthonius (see Ch. 2, pp. 23-4 above). On such 'testing of philosophers' and the use of public debate to establish status, see Lim, 53-7, 116-18.

⁴⁶ Eunomius describes the newcomers as *εὐδοκίμους*, *AA* 1 (J i. 41. 15).

⁴⁷ Philost., *HE* 3. 16 (GCS 47. 21-4). The chronology and participants in this episode are particularly difficult to unravel because we are dependent on such fragments of Eunomius' own account as are preserved by Gregory of Nyssa and an epitome of Philostorgius' *History*, which seems to have been based on it. Both here and at 4. 27 (see n. 48) Philostorgius refers to Aetius' opponents as *τοὺς περὶ Βασίλειον . . . καὶ Εὐστάθιον* without specifying that he means the bishops in person. Since 3. 16, the passage in question, is found in a section dealing with events of the early 340s, this needs to be explained. As Philostorgius makes clear at 3. 15, however, the events now being described took place when Constantius was emperor and Theophilus was resident at

Since the two bishops had to return to the West for a council, there was no opportunity for a rematch. They did their best, however, to make Aetius' victory a Pyrrhic one—prior to their departure they denounced him to Gallus.⁴⁸ That bloodthirsty young man was only too happy to oblige. He had Aetius arrested, and would doubtless have gone on to break both his legs as promised had not Aetius' patron Leontius intervened.⁴⁹ Aetius was reprieved. But even though safe for the moment, he was still eager for notoriety and got it. Gallus, an ardent if selective Christian,⁵⁰ had been impressed by Aetius' contributions to a public debate on scripture; and he was not alone. A member of his staff was also impressed and took the further practical step of introducing him at court. The staff-member in question was Theophilus the 'Indian', bishop, wonder-worker, and native of what is now Yemen.⁵¹ We will explore how he and others understood their role later in the chapter, but here we need only

Antioch (*GCS* 47. 18–20); they were presumably introduced here to give further proof of Aetius' invincibility in connection with the story of the Aphthonius (46. 23–47. 8). Gregory, moreover, clearly did understand this encounter as a personal one, because his jibes about Aetius as a publicity hound make no sense on any other basis (see nn. 44–5 above). We can assume, then, that Basil and Eustathius were sent to help get Gallus settled while Constantius prepared for the impending battle of Mursa. Kopecek i. 106–8 denies that this encounter took place and sees it as a 'doublet' of an encounter between Basil and Aetius before Constantius in 359, as in Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 20–65. 18). But there is nothing to indicate that the latter was a 'debate' in any formal sense (see Ch. 6 nn. 146–51), and denying the earlier encounter seems to make it harder to explain Basil's interest in Aetius c.348–51, which Kopecek himself acknowledges, i. 111–12.

⁴⁸ Philost., *HE* 3. 27 (*GCS* 52. 18–53. 2).

⁴⁹ Ibid. 3. 27 (*GCS* 53. 2–5). According to Eus., *HE* 8. 12. 9–10 (*GCS* II. ii. 770. 8–12), this particularly mild penalty was considered a sign of *φιλανθρωπία*!

⁵⁰ There was considerable Christian ambivalence about Gallus. His general blood-thirstiness could not well be ignored (e.g. Damasc., *Artem.* 13. 4–8 (*PTS* 29. 208)), but his fidelity to Christianity was in such contrast to the apostasy of his brother that some were moved to praise the 'piety which he retained to the end', Thdt., *HE* 3. 3. 1 (*GCS* 178. 1), cf. Soz., *HE* 3. 15. 8 (*GCS* 137. 2–3).

⁵¹ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 47 (J i. 58. 5), tries, rather maliciously, to make him a member of the Blemmyes, a pre-Bedouin tribe who were perennially raiding the settled areas of Egypt. On Theophilus' actual origins see A. Dihle, 'L'Ambassade de Théophile l'Indienne examinée', *Travaux du centre de recherche sur le Proche-orient et la Grèce Antiques*, 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 461–6.

note that it was due to his efforts that Aetius became acquainted with the Caesar. In the end, he became a kind of religious adviser.⁵² Presumably this is the capacity in which he was sent to strengthen the wavering faith of the Caesar's brother Julian.⁵³ This mission must be regarded as one of history's notable failures, but his favourable reports did much to earn his pupil's gratitude, and in later years, a reward. However, since for the moment he seemed to be invulnerable, Aetius, who learnt nothing and forgot nothing, seems to have felt no need to temper 'precision'. The results were a new controversy which only compounded the feud with Basil and Eustathius.

The centre of the latest storm was one of the perennial sore points of the controversy—how the Son is related to the Father. We do not know precisely how this was broached when Eustathius and Basil visited Antioch, but we do have an account of their teaching from a conciliar document issued nearly seven years later. Since Aetius and Eunomius are among the primary targets of the latter, we can probably assume that the general approach is the same, even if presented in a more developed form. According to this document, then, divine revelation takes precedence over every rational consideration. The latter is described in the words of St Paul as the 'wisdom of this world' which God's wisdom makes foolish.⁵⁴ Significantly, the focus of that insistence is the literal reality of the scriptural image of divine Sonship. Starting with an analysis of 'son' in its ordinary meaning,⁵⁵ the document then goes on to abstract from it every attribute pertaining to matter.⁵⁶ So far, so good. And yet, significantly, it is here, where 'the wisdom of this world' is most

⁵² Philost., *HE* 3. 27 (*GCS* 53. 4-9). Soz., *HE* 3. 15. 8 (*GCS* 126. 27-127. 5), taken together with Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 47 (*J* i. 38. 2-7) gives us the sequence of events and a good picture of how Aetius rose to prominence: the debate and accusation brought him into the imperial eye (if not necessarily in the manner desired); acquittal and a series of public encounters restored his reputation and enabled him to meet a prominent member of the court; with this person's help he was able to acquire a place and become a friend of the prince.

⁵³ Philost., *HE* 3. 27 (*GCS* 53. 5-7). Julian's contact with his brother while in office was very limited, Julian Imp., *Ath.* 273A-B.

⁵⁴ Concilia, C. Anc. (358), *Ep. Syn.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 6. 2-6, 10. 1 (*GCS* iii. 275. 18-276. 8, 280. 21-2).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 73. 3. 3 (*GCS* iii. 271. 15-18).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 73. 3. 7, 4. 2, 3 (*GCS* iii. 272. 7-10, 22-273. 8).

roundly condemned, that the authors introduce the word 'essence'.⁵⁷ In this document, in fact, 'essence' is used to distinguish subsisting realities from activities (*ἐνέργεια*) that bear the same name.⁵⁸ It is thus especially appropriate to living beings (*ζῶα*) who generate out of their own essence individuals like themselves.⁵⁹ These authors, then, take 'essence' as referring less to an epistemological generality than to a concrete reality; like hypostasis,⁶⁰ therefore, it could be used to describe the genetic intimacy of parent and child. This gives us the general context of the terminology, but in what sense is the divine begetting different from that which we see in the material order? After all, in the material creation parent and child can be said to be *homousios* with one another because the presence of matter enabled them to be distinguished as individuals. Where matter is absent, as in God, such distinctions have to be on the level of essence because there is nothing material to provide a boundary. Immaterial essences, therefore, have to be 'similar' not 'identical' (*homoios kat' ousian* or *homoiousios*), because in the absence of matter they cannot be both *homousios* and distinct.⁶¹ *Homousios*, then, has to be reserved for the plants and animals (including us);⁶² *homoiousios* was the mark of the divine.⁶³

Basil and Eustathius, then, used a very specific understanding of *ousia* when they said that the relationship between Father and Son could best be described as a 'similarity of essence'. Aetius and Eunomius disagreed violently, but before I discuss

⁵⁷ Concilia, C. Anc. (358), *Ep. Syn.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 6. 5-6 (GCS iii. 276. 3-13).

⁵⁸ Ibid. 73. 4. 1 (GCS iii. 273. 9-15), Geo. Laod., *Ep. Dogm.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 12. 6 (GCS iii. 285. 20-2).

⁵⁹ C. Anc. (358), *Ep. Syn.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 4. 3 (GCS iii. 273. 5-6).

⁶⁰ Cf. Geo. Laod., *Ep. Dogm.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 12. 8 (GCS iii. 285. 26-8).

⁶¹ (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 3. 1 (PG 28. 1204C). This is presumably what lies behind Cyril's statement in *Dial. Trin.* 1. 394. 35-7, cf. 6. 592. 24-6 (SC 231. 156, 246. 26) that angels are *ὅμοιος κατὰ φύσιν* to other angels. Significantly, his opponents here are described as *ὁμοιούσιον ὁμολογούντες*, *Dial. Trin.* 1. 410. 14-19 (SC 231. 200).

⁶² Aetius and Eunomius would have agreed with this, cf. *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 2. 3. 9 (GCS ii. 96. 8-10, 97. 14-16).

⁶³ Soz., *HE* 3. 18. 3 (GCS 132. 14-18). On this see Jeffrey N. Steenson, 'Basil of Ancyra on the Meaning of Homousios', in Gregg, *Arianism*, 267-79.

this, how does this new approach relate to the frameworks explored in the last chapter? The results are interesting, if somewhat ambiguous, for we find that in a number of ways Basil and Eustathius represent the undifferentiated hierarchical imagery with which the controversy began. We find, for instance, that there is no sharp imaginative break between God and the intelligible beings, and the latter seem to be distinguished by degree, rather than in kind.⁶⁴ We do find a strong emphasis on the fact that it was *God* who was crucified for us,⁶⁵ and it is clear that that entity is perceived as univocal throughout, but on the one hand, he is not human in the same sense we are because he was not born of human seed, and on the other, he is not 'God' in the sense the Father is because he is begotten.⁶⁶ Then again, we are told that to describe him as 'created' is to make him an artefact and not a son;⁶⁷ the faith of Christians is, that God begot a *Son*.⁶⁸ The insistence on a univocal Christ, then, is clear enough, but the specifically 'Lucianic' framework so important to Aetius and Eunomius is missing. It is thus possible to see how Athanasius of Alexandria could regard Basil and Eustathius as 'not far from the Kingdom of God',⁶⁹ while Basil of Caesarea could express only exasperation at their waffling.⁷⁰

Aetius and Eunomius would have agreed with the bishop of Caesarea. In their eyes Basil and Eustathius' approach was at best ridiculous, and at worst blasphemous.⁷¹ Naturally they took the general 'Lucianic' framework for granted, but they had no need to insist as strongly as Basil and Eustathius on the priority of revealed wisdom because for them there was no conflict.⁷² Indeed, they agreed with their opponents in emphasizing the parallels between divine and human begetting and in placing it on the level of essence;⁷³ where they did not agree was

⁶⁴ Basil Anc., *Virg.* 29 (PG 30. 729A-B), *Soz.*, *HE* 3. 18. 3 (GCS 132. 14-18).

⁶⁵ C. Anc. (358), *Ep. Syn.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 6. 2 (GCS iii. 275. 18).

⁶⁶ Ibid. 73. 9. 1-2 (GCS iii. 279. 16-23) Note the medical interest in generation ἀνευ σπορᾶς καὶ ἡδονῆς.

⁶⁷ Ibid. 73. 3. 6 (GCS iii. 272. 1-6).

⁶⁸ Ibid. 73. 3. 3-4 (GCS iii. 271. 15-21).

⁶⁹ Ath., *Syn.* 41. 2 (Opitz ii. 266. 32-267. 3), referring to Basil.

⁷⁰ e.g. Basil, *Ep.* 244. 7. 7-13 (Courtonne iii. 81), referring to Eustathius.

⁷¹ Eun., *Apol.* 9. 6-7 (Vaggione 42).

⁷² e.g. Eun., *Apol.* 7. 1-2 (Vaggione 40). See Ch. 4, pp. 89-90 above.

⁷³ See Ch. 4, pp. 117-20 above.

in the use of the word 'similar'. Part of their objection was philosophical. When we say that one thing is 'similar' to another we are making a comparison, and that in turn implies either a common standard of measurement or some other quality that both possess in common.

For Aetius and Eunomius that was just the problem. If we say, for instance, that 'this ball is bigger than that ball' we are comparing two objects that are identical in terms of *what* they are (that is, essence or *ousia*) on the basis of a quality they both possess—in this case, size. However, when we try to compare things that are *different* in terms of what they are, we are on much shakier ground. For if we say, for instance, that 'this ball is similar to that box', we still have to ask the further question: 'In what respect?' The two are clearly not comparable in terms of what they are ('ball-ness' or 'box-ness'), so they must be similar in terms of something they possess—colour, say, or position, or size.⁷⁴ In other words, the comparison has to be in terms of an attribute, not the essence. As Aristotle put it most succinctly, 'essence does not admit of degree'.⁷⁵ A thing cannot be more or less itself.⁷⁶ One essence may indeed be compared to another, but only in terms of something it has, not in terms of what it is.⁷⁷

Thus from Aetius and Eunomius' point of view their enemies' teaching was literally 'non-sense'—meaningless. Eustathius and Basil, however, were unlikely to have been disturbed. For them the scriptural analogy of birth was the controlling factor, and they were therefore using the technical language of medicine rather than that of logic.⁷⁸ In a medical

⁷⁴ Cf. Eun., AA 3 (J ii. 174. 22-4).

⁷⁵ Aristotle, *Cat.* 5 (3^b. 33-7), referring to what he calls 'secondary essence'; cf. Cyril, *Theo.* 11 (PG 75. 140B-C).

⁷⁶ A few people, like Iamblichus, made an exception with respect to 'numerical essences' (*οὐσίαν μαθηματικὴν*) because in them relativity is inherent, cf. *De Communi Mathematica Sententia* 14 (Festa 51. 13-27).

⁷⁷ A truism acknowledged e.g. by Basil, *Ep.* 8. 3. 1-4 (Courtonne i. 25), cf. Eun. 2. 32. 9-11 (SC 305. 132-4), Grg. Nyss., *Maced.* (J III. i. 94. 19-23), and Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 1. 409. 37-410. 13 (SC 231. 198-200), among others.

⁷⁸ As already shown by the shape of the argument in the document analysed above. The 'similarity' or otherwise of offspring to parent was discussed at length in ancient medical circles (*ὅμοιον ἢ ἀνόμοιον . . . τὸ ἔγγονον*, Galen, *De Semine Libri* 2 (Kühn iv. 607). In the absence of material attributes the only remaining basis of comparison in this context would be *οὐσία*. Because the

context there was no particular difficulty in regarding *ousia*—which is all that is left when matter has been eliminated—as equivalent to hypostasis in its later sense, the characteristic mark of an individual in a non-material environment. Aetius and Eunomius would probably have accepted that (they regarded *ousia* and *hypostasis* as equivalent in any case⁷⁹). They would also have been able to agree that where matter is present that is what distinguishes individuals who share a common essence from one another.⁸⁰ What they could not accept was how those individuals were to be distinguished in the absence of matter. That is the point behind Basil and Eustathius' insistence on the priority of divine to earthly wisdom. In their eyes the revealed metaphor of begetting had to take priority over every logical consideration. It was thus possible for them to take 'similarity' in an obstetrical sense as defining filial relationship as such, and as therefore applicable to God. Aetius and Eunomius had to do very nearly the reverse. They certainly accepted the metaphor, but they were also committed to the need for logical consistency; they could not ignore the latter in determining what 'begetting' might be. And that did raise a difficulty. For in logic, any attempt to make two immaterial entities 'similar' to one another on the basis of what they are rather than what they possess would lead to one entity, not two.⁸¹ That is because where matter is absent, there is nothing to distinguish them from one another *but* essence. If we say that they have something in common on the level of essence rather than a quality, we are saying that the essence ('what they are') is

Bible is so insistent that this begetting was real, the reply to considerations such as those raised by Aetius and Eunomius would be that this begetting was miraculous in the strict sense, i.e. absolutely unique. Presumably Aetius and Eunomius would have replied that even God cannot do what is *logically* impossible (e.g. make a square circle).

⁷⁹ e.g. Eun., *Apol.* 12. 6–10, 28. 8–10 (Vaggione 48, 74). There may perhaps be a slight difference in emphasis in that *ὑπόστασις* and its corresponding verb are more often used in contexts where source and concrete subsistence are being discussed, e.g. Aetius, *Synt.* 3 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 11. 3, 12, cf. 5 (*GCS* iii. 353. 6–8, 354. 20–2, cf. 353. 13–15), etc.

⁸⁰ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 182. 25–183. 2).

⁸¹ Eun., *Apol.* 11. 4–9, cf. 9. 5–11, 26. 23–4 (Vaggione 46, cf. 42–4, 70), cf. Aetius, *Synt.* 34 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 34 (*GCS* iii. 359. 6–9). Interestingly, even Hilary agreed that this was the general effect of the argument, *Syn.* 72, cf. 76 (*PL* 10. 527B/C, cf. 530A/B).

identical. On that level, then, every essence must be unlike every other (*anomoios*), even if they otherwise possess qualities in common.⁸² The principle was widely accepted—even Athanasius could agree!⁸³ Indeed, Athanasius could agree that the Son was inherently 'unlike' his creation (*ἀνόμοιον τῆς φύσεως*).⁸⁴ Where he could never agree was that the Son was in any sense unlike his Father.

That brings us to the question of how Aetius and Eunomius' approach relates to the non-Nicene position in general. Most Nicene accounts take *anomoios* as just another example of 'Arianism' *per se*—a particularly offensive consequence of placing the 'break' between Father and Son. The fact that other 'Arians' disagreed was merely a sign of their lack of consistency. But as a matter of fact the situation was a good deal more complex, both philosophically and imaginatively. Indeed, in terms of the latter there were some ways in which Aetius was closer to Athanasius than to Arius.⁸⁵ The reason is not that Aetius used *anomoios* and Arius did not. We do not know exactly what Arius' usage was, but we do know his followers used it by the 320s,⁸⁶ and that the word as such was not an innovation. Moreover, Aetius and Eunomius, Arius, Basil, and Eustathius all agreed as to the location of the 'break': it had to come between Father and Son. What separated them, then, was not the issue of 'where' but the issue of 'what'—what lay on either side of the 'break'. And on that, Aetius and Arius held strikingly different opinions.

⁸² Basil catches Eunomius in an inconsistency when he notes that he cannot claim the Father is *ἀνύγκριτος* on the one hand and then cite John 14: 28 to show that he is *μειζον* on the other, *Eun.* 1. 26. 16–27 (SC 299. 264).

⁸³ Ath., *Gent.* 37. 11–12, cf. 7. 8–9 (Thomson 100, cf. 16–18); cf. also (Ps.)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2 (PG 29. 692B), and Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 1. 409. 37–410. 13 (SC 231. 198–200).

⁸⁴ Ath., *Inc.* 34. 22–5 (Thomson 216–8), citing Isa. 53: 8. Presumably like Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius, he meant that the Son's manner of generation distinguished him from other human beings; but whereas those bishops saw the Son as *ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν* both with us and with his Father, Athanasius had to speak of him as *ἀνόμοιος* with respect to us and the *εἰκὼν ἀπαράλλακτος* of his Father, *Gent.* 41. 2–3 (Thomson 112), cf. (Ps.)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2 (PG 29. 692B).

⁸⁵ At least in terms of what they rejected.

⁸⁶ Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 13, cf. 8 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 9. 3, cf. 8. 3–4). Cf. also Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 3 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 16. 4–5): *ὁλοσχερῶς ἕτερον τῇ φύσει καὶ τῇ δυνάμει*.

To understand why, we need to understand that by the 350s an issue that had long been classic had come into new prominence. The issue was the sense in which we, or any other contingent being, can be said to 'know' God. In an earlier chapter we noted that Arius taught that God in his own being was unknowable and ungraspable (*ἄγνωστος* and *ἀκατάληπτος*), and that in that respect he transcended all other entities, even the Son.⁸⁷ Aetius and his Lucianist teachers vehemently rejected this teaching, and claimed that no person who did say that could be called a Christian.⁸⁸ Such vehemence, however, had less to do with epistemology than with the way such a teaching must be imagined, for Arius' approach had imaginative as well as philosophical consequences. For one thing, in Arius' system the Son was not alone in his ignorance—no member of the chain of being could know one of the essences above it exactly. Knowledge of essences was thus limited by the capacity of the receiver (*ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἰδίοις μετροῖς*).⁸⁹ Christians in earlier centuries had liked to think that they could mount up the chain of created being mentally or imaginatively and thus reach the Creator; in effect, Arius severed that chain.⁹⁰ But there was more. The mere fact that for Arius ignorance was universal in the chain of being (except for God) shows that for him it was ontological and not merely practical—that is, such ignorance is part of what the members of the chain are, and not merely a reflection of the information they happened to have. When we apply such an idea to the top of the chain—when we say that the source of the chain is *inherently* unknowable—then we have begun to think of the chain itself in a different way. That is because in a Christian context the boundary between source and not-source (contingent and non-contingent) is absolute. No

⁸⁷ See Ch. 3, pp. 63–4 above.

⁸⁸ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 284. 11–13), (Ps.-)Ignat., *Trall.* 6, *Smyrn.* 6, *Ant.* 5 (Lightfoot II. iii. 153. 26–31, 154. 8–9; 222. 13–15, 236. 1–4), cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 28. 5. 14–18 (SC 250. 110). In *Const. App.* 6. 8. 1–2, cf. 10. 1, 11. 1. 6–7 (SC 329. 314–6, cf. 320, 322–4) and the *Clementine Recognitions* this is the teaching of Simon Magus and other heretics, *Recogn. Clem.* 2. 47. 1–4, cf. 50. 5 (GCS ii. 80. 1–11, cf. 81. 16–17).

⁸⁹ Ath., *Syn.* 15. 3 (Opitz ii. 242. 19–23), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12 (PG 25. 565B–C), *Ar.* 1. 6 (PG 26. 24A–B).

⁹⁰ The Son's glory, for instance, surpasses that of other creatures *οὐ μετρίως*, but *ἀσυνκρίτως ὑπεροχαῖς*, Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 517. 35–7 (SC 237. 178). Cf. Williams, *Arius*, 220–1.

matter where we put it, there must be a 'break'. Yet if we acknowledge that, and then go on to say that it is impossible for one side of the 'break' to know the other, we have changed the way we imagine the 'break'—for we have begun to think that the non-contingent side of the 'break' may not only be unknowable but unboundaried.

That is not, of course, a necessary conclusion. It is perfectly possible, for instance, to speak of something as being 'ungraspable' (*ἀκατάληπτος*)⁹¹ or even 'unknowable' (*ἄγνωστος*)⁹² without necessarily meaning that it is infinite or unboundaried.⁹³ In that case we are saying our ignorance is practical rather than ontological.⁹⁴ We might, for example, say that something invisible was 'ungraspable',⁹⁵ but when we did so we would not necessarily mean that it was 'ungraspable' in itself, only that we ourselves could not see it. It is unlikely that Aetius or Eunomius, or any of the participants in this controversy, would have objected to that distinction in itself. What they did object to, and what made such language controversial was the fact that there were now a significant number of people who said that if we say God is 'ungraspable' or 'unknowable', we must also say he is unboundaried (*ἄπειρος*). Arius may or may not have been one of them, but if he was, then to say that the 'break' between contingent and non-contingent came between Father and Son had definite imaginative consequences: the Son would not only stand on the contingent side of the line, the line itself would mark the boundaries of an Other who was without boundary at all, and thus infinite in the strict sense. If that is what Arius did

⁹¹ Cf. Eus., *PE* 7. 15. 13 (*GCS* VIII. i. 393. 10–14), where the angels, though numerous, are *κατάληπτον* to God and hence finite, whereas they are not so to us. Cf. also Grg. Nyss., *Paup.* 2 (*J* ix. 111. 11–13), *Conf.* 65 (*J* ii. 339. 4–6), etc.

⁹² e.g. Eus., *DE* 5. 1. 26. 2–28. 9 (*GCS* vi. 214. 32–3), where *τῆς τε περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῆς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ θεολογίας* is unknown to all but the Persons themselves.

⁹³ Though cf. Marius V., *Ep. Cand.* 1. 3. 27–8 (*SC* 68. 112).

⁹⁴ As in Origen's distinction between what is invisible by nature and what is merely not seen, *Jo. fr.* 13 (*GCS* iv. 494. 25–495. 8), cf. *Princ.* 1. 1. 5–6 (*GCS* v. 20. 7–21. 9). The focus is our incapacity, not necessarily God's nature.

⁹⁵ e.g. Eus., *PE* 3. 6. 5–6 (*GCS* VIII. i. 121. 22–122. 12), cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 169, 2. 459, 3. 3. 46 (*J* i. 77. 17–22, 360. 27–361. 3; ii. 124. 3–8). Presumably this is one of the reasons why heaven is *ἀκατάληπτον* . . . *τὴν φύσιν* in Philo, *Somm.* 1. 21 (Cohn and Wendland iii. 209. 8–10).

teach, then his Christ was in danger of becoming in imaginative terms exactly what his critics said it was metaphysically, 'one of the creatures'. That does not of course mean that the heresiarch ever intended to go where his logic should have led him (he vehemently denied that he did⁹⁶), but his critics were surely right to want to know why.⁹⁷

Aetius and Eunomius would have been equally curious, for in their eyes this was the *Schwerpunkt* in Arius' thought, the point at which they disagreed with him most violently. Their detailed criticism has not survived, but their comments on the Nicene equivalent are enough to show that in this case Arius would have marched in a procession which included the likes of Valentinus, Cerinthus, Basilides, and Montanus!⁹⁸ For Aetius and Eunomius the God at the top of the ladder of being was neither ungraspable nor unknown, though still unimaginably great.⁹⁹ Like Origen before them,¹⁰⁰ they could not conceive an unboundaried God.¹⁰¹ I will explore why they thought this in a moment, but here let us consider only the imaginative results. If we deny that God is unboundaried one consequence is that, while there is a Necessary Being (God) which is the source of the chain, there is infinity nowhere. Thus even if we insist that the 'break' between contingent and non-contingent comes between Father and Son, we have not created a disproportionate hierarchy. For if the chain itself is not infinite, it can nowhere contain any unbridgeable gulf.¹⁰²

To grasp the meaning of that we need to think a little about its opposite. For at just the time Aetius and Eunomius were beginning to develop this theory, there was a dramatic change in the way people who did say God was open-ended (*ἀπειρον*)

⁹⁶ Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 9-10).

⁹⁷ e.g. Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 7 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 7. 21-8. 2), Ath., *Deer.* 13. 2, *Syn.* 15. 1 (Opitz ii. 11. 19-21, 242. 1-2), etc.

⁹⁸ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 284. 8-11), cf. *Const. App.* 6. 8. 1-14 (SC 329. 314-16).

⁹⁹ He is *ἀνπόσιτος* to us, not necessarily to the angels or intelligible beings, Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 3. 134-5 (SC 28bis. 198).

¹⁰⁰ Or., *Princ.* 2. 9 (GCS 5. 164. 3-9).

¹⁰¹ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 233-4, cf. 2. 217-22, 3. 67-8 (SC 28bis. 120, 160, 192). Presumably, like creation, God might be *ἀπειρον* to us, but certainly never in and of himself, cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 72. 11-13).

¹⁰² Cf. Eun., *AA* 2 (J i. 346. 4-11), where Basil must be a follower of Aristotle because his linguistic theory does not allow God's providence to encompass the whole chain of being.

imagined that. Some of these people, indeed, were among Aetius and Eunomius' most devoted enemies. But what exactly was their approach? They claimed that God is 'in-finite' in the strict sense, that is, absolutely without boundaries. Because in the centuries since this idea has become commonplace, it is difficult to remember the extent to which it was originally an innovation. The problem lay in the fact that the 'infinity' in question was not simply practical (that was an old idea), rather, it was inherent and metaphysical. The origins of this idea may lie in an older usage—in a temporal context¹⁰³ it was not uncommon to say that God's *life* was unboundaried,¹⁰⁴ and it may have been only a short step to extend this to his being. But whether that is the case or not, these newer thinkers went considerably beyond that; they described God's very essence as an unboundaried sea of being (οἶόν τι πέλαγος οὐσίας ἄπειρον),¹⁰⁵ or even as a triple boundlessness.¹⁰⁶ The use of such imaginative terms is not accidental. Both Eunomius and his enemies would have agreed that God is immaterial, and therefore without spatial dimension. But while that is just possible to conceive, it is completely impossible to imagine, and that is where difficulties arose. For this 'realization' made many people uncomfortable, not least among them Aetius and Eunomius.¹⁰⁷

Part of the problem lay in the meaning of the word ἄπειρον ('unboundaried'). It carried with it very definite resonances of 'undefined' or 'unordered', and therefore seemed much more applicable to, say, brute matter than to the bodiless source of meaning.¹⁰⁸ It seemed to imply that God was chaotic. But still more disturbing, it was difficult to see how any 'God' so conceived could be the God revealed by scripture, for this theory seemed to destroy the proportionality (ἀναλογία) between the finite words found there and the putatively infinite God they

¹⁰³ e.g. Eus. *DE* 4. 15. 59, 5. 3. 7, 7. 3. 12 (*GCS* vi. 195. 4-7, 220. 4-5, 339. 18), *Is.* 1. 54, 2. 56 (*GCS* ix. 68. 9-12, 398. 11-12), Or., *Philoc.* 21. 12 (Robinson 163. 20-2), etc.

¹⁰⁴ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 7. 37-42 (*SC* 299. 192).

¹⁰⁵ Gr̄g. Naz., *Or.* 38. 7. 5-14 (*SC* 358. 114-16).

¹⁰⁶ Gr̄g. Naz., *Or.* 40. 41. 12-13 (*SC* 358. 294).

¹⁰⁷ For them their enemies were guilty of arrogance, Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 3. 60-2, cf. 68-70 (*SC* 28bis. 190, cf. 192).

¹⁰⁸ As by Numenius, *Fragmentum* 6 (*FPG* iii. 164b), cf. Or., *Comm. in Mt.* 13: 1 (*GCS* X. i. 176. 24-7).

are supposed to describe.¹⁰⁹ I will consider some of the epistemological consequences of that idea in the next chapter, but concentrate for the moment on the imaginative ones.

In that area Gregory of Nazianzus put his finger on the principal difficulty when he commented that, in the face of such immensity, there is no foothold for the mind to place an image.¹¹⁰ Since images are at least a human practical necessity, we cannot avoid them in discussing God's attributes, even when they are imperfect. Thus the boundlessness of the physical sea¹¹¹ is a useful symbol of the boundlessness of God,¹¹² but actual horizons are only apparently, not really boundless.¹¹³ Such imperfections were fruitful sources of inconsistency. A truly boundless being, for instance, would be inconceivable by any bounded being, but Gregory Nazianzen, like Arius, teaches that the divine reality is apprehended in accordance with the capacity of the receiver.¹¹⁴ Gregory's younger namesake at Nyssa was probably the most consistent contemporary exponent of the theory; and yet even he had to admit it expressed only an 'approximation' of the divine.¹¹⁵ Very little of this, however, would have affected the way the doctrine was perceived by Aetius and Eunomius. Imaginatively it does not matter greatly whether the supporters of this theory were speaking of infinity in the strict sense, or something less comprehensive. In either case the doctrine has to be imaged the same way: created reality, the shore on which we stand, is the only fixed point in an otherwise boundless sea. Between ourselves and that limitless horizon a gulf is fixed, and the analogy of being, if it has not exactly broken down, at least requires reconstruction.

¹⁰⁹ e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Cant.* 12 (J vi. 357. 10-15), *V. Mos.* 242. 2-6 (SC 1. 272), cf. *Const. App.* 6. 10. 1-10 (SC 329. 320-2).

¹¹⁰ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 38. 8. 1-11 (SC 358. 118), cf. 31. 33. 7-20 (SC 250. 340-2), 45. 3-4 (PG 36. 625D-628C), and Grg. Nyss., *Apoll.* (J III. i. 126. 19-20).

¹¹¹ e.g. Basil, *Hex.* 3. 5 (PG 29. 64B), Grg. Nyss., *Usur.* (J ix. 199. 2-3).

¹¹² e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 364. 3. 5. 55 (J i. 134. 17-26; ii. 180. 2-12).

¹¹³ Indeed, this was sometimes the case even in a figurative sense; cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 85. 3-8).

¹¹⁴ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 28. 4. 14-19 (SC 250. 108), cf. 34. 8. 15-17 (SC 318. 212), 40. 45. 39-44 (SC 358. 306). Chrysostom agreed, *Incomprehens.* 3. 163-6 (SC 28bis. 200).

¹¹⁵ Grg. Nyss., *Cant.* 1, 11, 12 (J vi. 36. 20-37. 3, cf. 327. 3-7; 357. 10-15), *Trin.* (J III. i. 10. 22-11. 3), etc.

The world newly imagined by their adversaries was one of the more important features of the theological landscape in which Aetius and Eunomius had to work. Indeed, we cannot understand what they meant by *anomoios* until we understand that they utterly contemned and rejected that picture. For them no entity in the chain of being was infinite, not even its source, and thus the analogy of being must always be proportionate. Though there was indeed a 'break', there was nowhere an unimaginable gulf.¹¹⁶ That fact did not change merely because they thought essences as such incomparable. On the contrary, the position of essences within the chain is inherent in their nature, not determined by any relationship.¹¹⁷ On the level of being, then, *every* intelligible entity is unlike every other, and not just the topmost rung.¹¹⁸ The only things that could be *homouousios* with anything else were things that existed in a material matrix—matter distinguished them as individuals sharing a common essence. Bodiless or intelligible beings, on the other hand, could only be distinct on the level of essence, because in their case the absence of matter made identity and essence the same.¹¹⁹ For Eunomius as for Aquinas,¹²⁰ then, every angel is a separate genus.¹²¹

We need to keep this in mind if we are to understand both what he meant and what he did not mean. For the Nicenes loved to draw all kinds of absurd conclusions from his teaching which did not really follow from his premisses. This is particularly true of the comparability of attributes. As we saw earlier, attributes can be compared even when essences cannot. The Nicenes liked to ask, therefore, why, if God was light (as all agreed), and the Son unlike God (as Aetius and Eunomius

¹¹⁶ Eun., *AA* 2 (J i. 316. 7; 324. 3; 332. 21). *Αναλογία* for Eunomius, however, is a general proportional relationship, and not an exact correspondence.

¹¹⁷ Eun., *Apol.* 23. 4–10 (Vaggione 66).

¹¹⁸ As noted in n. 90 above, the Son's glory surpasses that of all others as the Father's surpasses his own, οὐ μετρίως but ἀσυγκρίτως ὑπεροχαῖς.

¹¹⁹ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 182. 25–183. 2).

¹²⁰ *Summa Theologica*, pars I, quaest. 50, art. 4.

¹²¹ Cf. Julian, *Jab* (Hagedorn 68. 2–7) where the 'ministering spirits' ('angel' and 'angel') are συνώνυμα, sharing a name but distinct by nature. Something similar may lie behind the statement in (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 4, cf. 6. 21 (*PG* 39. 484A, cf. 553A–B) that there is an innumerable number of angelic ὑποστάσεις. This contrasts sharply with Basil, *Eun.* 3. 1. 40–3, cf. 2. 3–9 (*SC* 305. 148, cf. 150), where the angels have a single προσήγορία and nature.

said), the Son (scripture's 'light of the world') was not darkness?¹²² A similar question could be asked about 'Wisdom'¹²³ and 'Power'.¹²⁴ Such arguments, however, were rhetorically effective but philosophically irrelevant. They might have been effective against Arius' implied position (if that is what he really taught), but they were much less effective against those who, like Aetius or Eunomius, denied that God was unboundaried or unknown.¹²⁵ For to say that God is unknown because he is unboundaried by nature is to say that there is an absolute imaginative imparity between God and all else;¹²⁶ there is nowhere any 'foothold for an image'. If like Aetius and Eunomius, however, we reject this idea, we find that, while there may still be an imparity, it is nowhere absolute—none of the things which must be compared is infinite, and therefore none can be absolutely opposed. The Nicenes, moreover, were comparing qualities ('light', 'wisdom', or 'power'), but such comparisons are not affected by distinctions in essence. Since position in the chain of being is determined by ontological status rather than a quality like relationship,¹²⁷ 'unlikeness' in essence implies a gradation in the capacity to receive qualities rather than their opposition. In this scheme God is indeed unimaginably great, but God is God because God is without cause, not because he is lacking in boundaries. He is the Lord of a chain without an entirely disproportionate 'break' anywhere.¹²⁸ Since qualities, then, are ascribed to members of the

¹²² e.g. Ath., *Decr.* 27. 2 (Opitz ii. 23. 24-7), quoting Origen; Basil, *Eun.* 2. 26. 33-47 (SC 305. 110-12), Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 2. 600-1 (J i. 401. 30-402. 8), 3. 7. 57 (J ii. 235. 6-10), etc. Eunomius himself, of course, could level a slightly different version of the same argument, saying that if God were indeed 'unknown' the Son could not be the 'true light which enlightens everyone', *AA* 3 (J ii. 240. 11-14).

¹²³ e.g. Ath., *Decr.* 6. 1, 35. 13 (Opitz ii. 5. 26-30, 33. 8-11), cf. *Ar.* 1. 19-20, 25 (PG 26. 52D-53A, 64B), Basil, *Eun.* 2. 17. 11-13 (SC 305. 66), cf. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 705A), etc.

¹²⁴ e.g. Ath., *Ar.* 2. 38, 3. 2 (PG 26. 228A-B, 325A-B), Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 1. 81 (J ii. 32. 7-15), etc.

¹²⁵ As was recognized from within his own frame of reference by Epiphanius in *Haer.* 76. 3. 7 (GCS iii. 343. 30-32).

¹²⁶ Cf. e.g. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 401 (J i. 143. 22-6).

¹²⁷ *Eun.*, *Apol.* 23. 4-10 (Vaggione 66).

¹²⁸ The Nicenes, of course, could reply that in that case the Son was not higher than his creatures by nature but only in degree, e.g. Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4.

hierarchy of being in accordance with their ontological status; it is absurd to speak of such qualities in opposition. 'Light' as applied to the Begotten and Unbegotten God is not divided between night and day, but only between 'genetic' and 'agenetic' light.¹²⁹

Aetius and Eunomius, then, believed in a graded hierarchy of both qualities and essences, and their picture is generally consistent with the non-Nicene framework as a whole; indeed, there is nothing to indicate they ever considered any other.¹³⁰ But if we ask why, then, they insisted so strongly on the ontological distinctness of *all* the members of the chain of being, we find that their concerns look in two directions. One was toward their fellow Christians. They believed, like the other members of their school, that the Christian hope depended on a dramatic (and therefore an ontological) distinction of the divine actors,¹³¹ a distinction imperilled by the teaching of Basil and Eustathius. The other was directed toward the pagans.¹³² They wished to make clear (as against most Platonists) that the contingent universe was neither necessary nor eternal, and in fact created by God. In their eyes that is exactly where both *homooousios* and *homoiousios* did lead because they implied that the contingent was either identical with or similar to its Source.¹³³ *Anomoios*, then, was revived as an apologetic tool against these errors. For in spite of the dark insinuations of their enemies,¹³⁴ 511. 10-24 (SC 237. 158-60), and that even God was just one more link in the chain, Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 2. 294-5 (SC 28bis. 166). The 'Arian' reply as recorded by Cyril, to the effect that it is the Son's *glory* that is immeasurably greater than that of others, somewhat misses the point, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 517. 35-7 (SC 237. 178).

¹²⁹ Eun., *Apol.* 19. 1-16 (Vaggione 56-8), *AA* 3 (J ii. 236. 14-19).

¹³⁰ Cf. Ath., *Syn.* 6. 2 (Opitz ii. 234. 22-5).

¹³¹ (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 19 (PG 28. 1185D-1188A).

¹³² Eun., *Apol.* 22. 7-12, cf. 16. 3-6 (Vaggione 62, cf. 52), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 1 (PG 29. 677A).

¹³³ Aetius, *Synt.* 4 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 4 (GCS iii. 353. 9-12), Eun., *Apol.* 26. 23-4 (Vaggione 70), Julian, *Joh* (Hagedorn 246. 5-7), Cyril, *Thes.* 9 (PG 75. 113B), cf. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 1 (PG 29. 677A).

¹³⁴ *Symb. Sel.* (Hahn, § 165, p. 207), Soc., *HE* 3. 10. 7 (GCS 205. 17-18), Soz., *HE* 3. 19. 7 (GCS 133. 22-8), Thdt., *Haer.* 4. 3 (PG 83. 417B), Basil, *Eun.* 1. 1. 26-9 (SC 299. 144), though this last is perhaps to be taken no more seriously than the statement in Basil, *Eun.* 2. 33. 13-18, though cf. 34. 3-7 (SC 305. 138, cf. 140) stating that Eunomius was the first to claim the Holy Spirit as a creature.

anomoios was not invented by Aetius and Eunomius. Non-Nicenes had been using it at least since the 320s,¹³⁵ and it was still considered unremarkable enough a decade later to be used by an apparently unruffled Athanasius.¹³⁶ But what they did not invent, they certainly transformed, for they adjusted the emphasis dramatically. To see how, we will need to look at this teaching in an earlier form.

The third-century apologist Athenagoras used *anomoios* to characterize ingenerate beings as such and, like Eunomius, associated this with the idea of immateriality—in the absence of matter an immaterial entity does not participate in other essences but is *anomoion*.¹³⁷ So far, all seems the same. However, unlike Eunomius this author was prepared to describe God as ἀκατάληπτος,¹³⁸ even though at the same time acknowledging that he was unlike his creation. For Athenagoras, then, *anomoios* functions very much as does ‘incomparable’ (ἀσύγκριτος) in other authors,¹³⁹ and that is the sense in which we find it in Athanasius.¹⁴⁰ In earlier usage, then, *anomoios* was a rare, though not unheard of qualification of God, somewhat akin to ‘wholly other’ in English. Aetius and Eunomius agreed. The problem was they went beyond that. They said that, if God is indeed ‘wholly other’ with respect to contingent being, then contingent being—the Son included—was ‘wholly other’ with respect to God.¹⁴¹ They were, of course, looking to shock, and succeeded, but they were also truly convinced that to say any-

¹³⁵ Alex. AL, *Ep. Encycl.* 13, cf. 8 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 9. 3, cf. 8. 3–4), cf. Philo, *LA* 2. 1, *Op.* 22. (Cohn and Wendland i. 90. 4–5, 6. 18–19).

¹³⁶ Though in a different context, see nn. 83–4 above. This argument does not depend on when the much redated *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione* were written.

¹³⁷ Athenag., *Leg.* 8. 2 (Schoedel 16).

¹³⁸ *Ibid.* 10. 1. 2–3 (Schoedel 20); but note that God is *ὡς μόνῳ καὶ λόγῳ καταλαμβάνόμενον*.

¹³⁹ Cf. *Suda* a 2913. 1, 2917. 1 (Adler I. i. 263. 22, 28).

¹⁴⁰ There is a more extended meaning, found primarily in Porphyry, to the effect that the One may be described as ἀνομιότατος, ‘wholly other’. Eus., *PE* 1. 10. 52 (*GCS* VIII. i. 53. 21), cf. Porph., *Parm.*, fr. 3. 1–4. 4 (Hadot 64–6). This is enough to show that such language was current, but there is no indication that Aetius and Eunomius ever made use of it (one could, however, wonder about Arius!).

¹⁴¹ Aetius, *Synt.* 3 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 3 (*GCS* iii. 353. 6–8), Eun., *Apol.* 11. 5–6, 22. 1–5 (Vaggione 46, 62), *EF* 3. 9–11 (Vaggione 152), cf. Cyril, *Thes.* 11 (*PG* 75. 156C).

thing else led to paganism, Sabellianism, or worse.¹⁴² The nature of the shock they prepared is suggested by the way their theory applies to such traditional concepts as 'image'. Since nothing could be compared on the level of essence,¹⁴³ there could be no common ground between the Source of all and the things that came into existence 'after it and [from] it';¹⁴⁴ as a result, when scripture says the Son is 'image of the invisible God' it has to mean he reflects the Father's power and not his essence,¹⁴⁵ for that surpasses even him.¹⁴⁶ The meaning of 'image', then, like that of every other word applied to the divine, depends on ontology, and the Son is the image of a quality, not an essence. That may be philosophically consistent, but it is religiously unsatisfying, and the same considerations apply to *anomoios*. True, it is the boundary-marker of being as such, but in this case the boundary marked is that between the Only-begotten God and the Father who begat him.

But after all, why try to shock at all? For in that at least Aetius and Eunomius succeeded beyond their wildest dreams—they were called 'anomoians' to the end of their days. The term is useful in itself, but we need to be aware that its convenience does not reflect its importance to those designated by it. For *anomoios* was chosen for its tactical rather than its strategic value. Basil and Eustathius had described the Son as 'similar' to the Father in essence, and *anomoios* was the exact opposite. It was thus chosen as an 'attention-getter' and in that succeeded admirably. For while the idea it expressed was important, the word itself was not. The non-Nicenes already had a rich voca-

¹⁴² Cf. Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 246. 27–8), *Apol.* 16. 3–6, 22. 7–12 (Vaggione 52, 62).

¹⁴³ e.g. Aetius, *Synt.* 4, 26 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 4, 26 (GCS iii. 353. 11, 357. 20–1), Eun., *Apol.* 9. 2–3, 10–11, 26. 6–7 (Vaggione 42, 44, 68), etc.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 15. 13–14 (Vaggione 52), referring to the Son; applied to the Father the preposition would have to be *ἐξ*, not *ἐκ*, *Apol.* 5. 1–2 (Vaggione 38).

¹⁴⁵ Eun., *Apol.* 24. 8–15 (Vaggione 64), cf. *AA* 3 (J ii. 66. 20), *EF* 3. 1–2, 31–2 (Vaggione 152, 154); cf. also *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 8. 1, 9. 5, cf. 11. 6 (GCS ii. 102. 1, 103. 18–104. 1, cf. 106. 12–13). Eunomius' interpretation of this passage (Col. 1: 15) is that of his school and not an exegetical novelty, e.g. Asterius Sophista apud Marcellus, *Fr.* 3, 90 (GCS iv. 186. 6, 204. 28–9); Ath., *Ar.* 2. 63, 64, 3. 1 (PG 26. 280C, 281C, 321B). Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 514. 30–1, 517. 36–7 (SC 237. 168, 178), etc.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 243. 23–8).

bulary to describe the 'break'. Arius himself had used *ξένος*, *ἀλλότριος*, *ἀπεσχοινισμένος*,¹⁴⁷ and perhaps even *ἀνόμοιος*. But the function of these words was apologetic, and, as we have seen in another context,¹⁴⁸ it was rare for them to be used in any other way. The same is true of *anomoios*. It came to the fore in a specific context, and there is little to show that it was ever used outside it.¹⁴⁹ It is found today in no 'anomoean' writing,¹⁵⁰ and in fact proved more useful to its enemies than to its authors. Like a political gaffe no amount of explanation can expunge, *anomoios* was far too useful to Aetius and Eunomius' enemies to be forgotten.

Anomoios, then, was more important as a concept than as a word, but before we leave it, we need to call attention to one of its synonyms. This is *heteroousios*, 'of another, or different essence'. *Heteroousios*, as we have seen, was already a recognized technical term before the controversy began; it was the exact opposite of *homoousios*.¹⁵¹ Unlike *anomoios*, then, it appears to have become a permanent rather than a temporary part of the 'anomoean' vocabulary. At any rate we sometimes find it used as convenient shorthand for the Gospel,¹⁵² much like *homoousios* itself.

¹⁴⁷ Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 8 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 8. 3): 'alien', 'foreign', 'separate'.

¹⁴⁸ See above Ch. 4, pp. 124-7.

¹⁴⁹ The 'Anomoean' in (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 27 (PG 28. 1156D-1157A) claims that not to use it would make him a 'homoousian', and this may reflect a real usage, but such language is defensive, not normal speech.

¹⁵⁰ Which does not mean it was not used (*pace* Hanson: *Search*, 370, cf. 439 n. 82); the sole surviving example, however, is a fragment of one of Aetius' letters quoted by both Theodoret and Basil. This does seem to be an actual document, probably the letter submitted to the Council of Seleucia by Eudoxius but authored by Aetius, cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 6 (GCS 159. 24-160. 4) and Basil, *Spir.* 4. 8-15 (SC 17bis. 260).

¹⁵¹ See Ch. 3, p. 55. It was acceptable as a term to their opponents, even if its application was not; e.g. Ath., *Syn.* 50. 3 (Opitz ii. 274. 20-4), (Ps.-)Basil, *Enn.* 4 (PG 29. 696A), etc. Note, too, that even Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 618. 23-8 (SC 246. 103-4) could speak of the Son as indeed *homoousios*, but also *ἕτερος κατὰ γὰρ τὸ εἶναι*.

¹⁵² At least this seems to be what is implied by such fragments of Philostorgius' language as can be glimpsed behind Photius' epitome. On at least some occasions, the historian seems to have used *ἑτεροούσιος* as a kind of doctrinal shorthand for his school's position generally, especially in contrast to the teachings of Nicaea: Philost., *HE* 2. 1, 6, 3. 5 (GCS 12. 4-13. 1, 18. 15-17, 35. 9-11), etc.

All of this goes a good way toward showing that Aetius and Eunomius differed little from their contemporaries—they too were caught up in a swirl of newly coined slogans. What did distinguish them, however, was how they used them, for above all they were determined to be 'precise'. As we saw in Chapter 3, they were convinced that scripture itself was precise enough to allow them to determine the position of anyone on the scale of truth, not excluding Arius himself.¹⁵³ In the volatile political atmosphere of the 350s, however, that was a decided handicap. The Nicenes often made fun of their opponents' theological waffling,¹⁵⁴ and there is no doubt that many of them showed an almost Tudor flexibility; but to stop with that is to miss the point. There is no doubt that the bishops who came so close to breaking the imperial post in their zeal for councils¹⁵⁵ managed to endorse a remarkably diverse set of formularies. Some of them, too, were every bit as pusillanimous as alleged; but that makes it easy to forget that what made their waffling possible was the fact that they did not really consider the formularies the issue.¹⁵⁶ They could therefore strain at a gnat or calmly swallow a propositional camel because the framework governing their choices was never really at risk. Their conversation may not have been 'in heaven', but at the very least it was not in the texts before them. The same was not true of Aetius and Eunomius. For them the link between religious vision and propositional content was intimate and exact. They could therefore dance prettily around a proposition if they had to, but they were not free to accept or reject it merely on the basis of expediency. This was a form of integrity even Newman could admire,¹⁵⁷ but it was also a weakness. For in the end it was this and not any of their actual language that underlay the charge of *τέχνη*. They were 'precisianists' to a man. In a sectarian environment that was more than enough to make them, first a party, and then a church.

¹⁵³ See above, Ch. 3, 45–7.

¹⁵⁴ e.g. Ath., *Syn.* 32. 2–4 (Opitz ii. 260. 7–27), Soz., *HE* 4. 17. 8 (GCS 164. 7–10).

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Concilia, C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 25 (CSEL 65. 64. 24–5), Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 16. 18.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Acacius of Caesarea apud Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 20 (GCS 174. 26–175. 1).

¹⁵⁷ John Henry Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, 3rd edn. (London: E. Lumley, 1871), 349–50.

Before we go on to follow that process in detail, we need to look a little more closely at how the participants understood their roles. As we saw earlier, all parties alike in the 350s were confronted with similar dangers and opportunities, and developed strategies to address them. One opportunity, of course, was the need to address a larger and more diverse audience over a much wider geographical area. Group identity was now as likely as not to be expressed in doctrinal terms, but these groups also had a leadership, partly clerical and partly lay, including a large number of ascetic religious professionals. We have seen the effect of such leadership in the marching crowds of the great cities, but how did they themselves understand their role, and who exactly were they trying to reach? We can get a good idea of how to approach that question by looking at the retrospective efforts of various groups to 'capture' those in leadership roles for themselves. To do so, we need to go back to the beginning of the present chapter, to the siege of Nisibis.

The authors who passed on the story of this siege thirty to a hundred years later had no difficulty identifying the religious villains and heroes; they fitted easily into what was by then a settled theological landscape. Contemporary observers found the situation more open-ended. Not only were many people 'halted between two opinions', but there were determined efforts by both parties to claim such persons for their own side.¹⁵⁸ James, bishop of Nisibis, is a case in point. Later legend made him the chief agent of his city's salvation,¹⁵⁹ and one of the doctors of the Syrian and Armenian churches, but there the agreement ends. In the Syriac lives and in Theodoret he is staunchly Nicene.¹⁶⁰ Indeed, in some writers he is said not only

¹⁵⁸ As had already happened to such departed luminaries as Lucian and Cyprian. See Ch. 3, pp. 39-45 above.

¹⁵⁹ Thdt., *H. Rel.* 2. 16. 1-21. 2 (*SC* 234. 230-40), *HE* 2. 30. 1-10 (*GCS* 167. 20-169. 20), cf. also n. 163 below. It seems reasonably clear that the living James played a role only in the first siege of 338, and that it was the heavenly James who, through relics buried in the walls, achieved the much greater victory of 350: cf. Ephraim, *Nis.* 13. 19-21 (*CSCO* 218. 37. 1-9 (219. 42-3)), Eus., *Chron.* (*GCS* 7. 235. 18-19, 24-5), Gennadius, *Vir. Inlus.* 1 (*TU* 14. 1. 61. 4-5). In panegyric Julian felt obliged to give the absent Constantius the credit, *Or.* 1. 27A-30A, 2. 62B-67A.

¹⁶⁰ Thdt., *H. Rel.* 1. 10. 40-57 (*SC* 234. 180-2), see n. 162 below.

to have attended the Council of Nicaea,¹⁶¹ but to have confronted Arius in person and to have had a hand in his death.¹⁶² Thus it is all the more startling to find that one of Eunomius' staunchest followers claims him as his own!¹⁶³ And not James only—James is only one of many upholders of non-Nicene righteousness who together with Aetius and Eunomius appear in his work. But if we are to understand how the two of them perceived their mission and their new role at court, we need to start by asking why they were so interested in a figure like James. For the mere fact that he was sought after tells us that he was an acknowledged possessor of religious power.

Both sides were clearly interested in using a person like this to confirm their own link with the 'apostolic' past, but they were able to do this because the actual views of such people were often not so easily categorized. That was certainly true of the historical James,¹⁶⁴ who was present at Antioch in 341 as well as at Nicaea in 325.¹⁶⁵ Ambiguities of this kind were what made the competing claims possible in the first place, but the fact that they were made already tells us that there was a struggle, not only over the meaning of the past, but of the present. James was ammunition in that struggle because, abstracted from his actual geographical and historical context, he could be used as a symbol. In the different ways his and other stories were recorded, then, we see the meaning of the symbols and how they were used. In the new and more broadly based Christian empire that was beginning to find its feet in the 350s, all sides needed to come up with a new vision of religious leadership—one that appealed to a mass audience and was at the same time credible to the more sophisticated dignitaries of city

¹⁶¹ See Geltzer, pp. 20, 21, 64, 84, 102, 126, 160, 196.

¹⁶² Cf. P. Peeters, SJ, 'La Légende de saint Jacques de Nisibe', *AB* 38 (1920), 294–5, 361–4.

¹⁶³ Philost., *HE* 3. 23, cf. Anhang VII (*GCS* 50. 8–12, cf. 211. 6–12, 23–6, 31–2). Philostorgius portrays him as an intercessor capable of saving a city through his *παρακατα*. Since elsewhere Philostorgius insists strongly on the link between doctrinal *akribeia* and divine favour (e.g. 1. 10, 3. 22 (*GCS* 11. 4–8, 49. 3–4), etc.), it seems clear he meant to portray James as one of his own.

¹⁶⁴ It was probably more like the 'simple words, milk for infants' mentioned by Ephraim than anything identifiable in western dogmatic categories, cf. *Nis.* 14. 16–22 (*CSCO* 218. 39. 7–27 (219. 46)).

¹⁶⁵ Mansi ii. 1307B.

and court. It was a daunting challenge. The differing ways the various communities told the same stories tell us the meaning of the solutions they proposed.

The easiest place to begin is with the negative. This was undoubtedly one of the great ages of vituperation, and vituperation is often incredibly revealing.¹⁶⁶ Since Aetius and Eunomius were among its most frequent targets, charge and response tell us a good deal about how they and others understood their role. Vituperation rarely aims at issues; its target is character. And so it was here. An attempt was made to make Aetius and Eunomius as much the 'anti-monks' of the fourth century as Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor was the Antichrist of the nineteenth. For the sheer energy of the portrait indicates the importance attached to the issue.

The rising ascetic movement, after all, was an inescapable part of the background of Aetius and Eunomius' life. Certainly it was an immensely powerful movement, and more to the point, lay-led. Starting with the loosely organized male and female ascetics who had originally supported Arius, or were willing to mob the archbishop of Alexandria in his palace, these oddly dressed figures were a constant presence at ecclesiastical demonstrations.¹⁶⁷ The mobs who were learning the new technique of antiphonal psalmody were often composed of them or their sympathizers. Nor were the Syriac roots or lay leadership of its practitioners an accident. The occupants of the episcopal palaces and municipal senates of the Roman world often lived in virtual ignorance of the vast, non-Hellenic populations who surrounded and supported them. Even the great Athanasius, living in the capital of Egypt and bishop of a city with a significant Egyptian population, could speak of the indigenous inhabitants of his native land with all the detachment of a foreigner.¹⁶⁸ The arrival of monasticism made such detachment impossible to maintain. The withdrawal of thousands¹⁶⁹ of Christians and smaller numbers of pagans (as

¹⁶⁶ Portions of the following have been published with fuller documentation in Vaggione, *Monks*, 181-214.

¹⁶⁷ See Ch. 3, pp. 74-7.

¹⁶⁸ Ath., *Gent.* 23, 23-5 (Thomson 62-4).

¹⁶⁹ As usual most of the evidence comes from Egypt. Though it is impossible to establish detailed statistics, at a very early date many Egyptian and, later, some Syrian monastic settlements numbered in the thousands;

Cynics) from active participation in communal life threatened to undermine the traditional relationships upon which urban life was founded. The loiterers who attacked monks,¹⁷⁰ and who are said to have preferred a return to paganism to accepting them,¹⁷¹ claimed that the success of this movement would leave the cities abandoned.¹⁷² This may not have been very likely as fact, but it does effectively symbolize the dilemma of a specialized urban élite faced with a rural and largely non-Hellenic ascetic revolution.

Practical measures were accompanied by a powerful literary response. Thus Libanius could describe the monks of the Syrian hinterland as violent black-robed gluttons hiding their excesses beneath an artificial pallor,¹⁷³ mysterious troglodytes whose chanting¹⁷⁴ could disrupt even a court of law,¹⁷⁵ while Eunapius claims that anyone willing to put on a black robe and make a public display could achieve almost tyrannical power.¹⁷⁶ The ever-unsympathetic Zosimus, on the other hand, echoing some Christians,¹⁷⁷ thought monks as useless for war as any other public endeavour.¹⁷⁸ Those in authority were rapidly beginning to realize that this movement would have to be either co-opted or destroyed, and both Church and State made strenuous efforts to do so. The emperors decreed that decurions fleeing to monasteries were to be returned by force,¹⁷⁹ ordinary monks subjected to the draft,¹⁸⁰ and all resistance was to be

there is a convenient summary of the more accessible evidence in Jones, *LRE* ii. 930-1.

¹⁷⁰ Chrys., *Oppugn.* 1. 2 (*PG* 47. 322B-C).

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.* (*PG* 47. 321B).

¹⁷² *Ibid.* 1. 8 (*PG* 47. 329C), cf. Chrys., *Virg.* 14. 1. 2-2. 31 (*SC* 125. 136-40).

¹⁷³ Libanius, *Or.* 30. 8 (Foerster iii. 91. 12-19); cf. Julian Imp., *Ep. ad Sacerdotem* 288B. Jerome, with his usual gusto, rang the changes on the same theme when dealing with his own enemies, Hieron., *Ep.* 22. 34 (*CSEL* 54. 196. 16-197. 13).

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Chrys., *Oppugn.* 2. 2 (*PG* 47. 334A).

¹⁷⁵ Libanius, *Or.* 45. 26, cf. 2. 32 (Foerster iii. 371. 24-372. 5, cf. i. 249. 5-8).

¹⁷⁶ Eunapius, *VS* 472.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Chrys., *Oppugn.* 1. 2 (*PG* 47. 321B, 322B-C).

¹⁷⁸ Zosimus 5. 23 (*CSHB* 47. 278. 23-279. 6).

¹⁷⁹ Cf. *Cod. Theod.* 12. 1. 63 (Mommmsen i. 2. 678).

¹⁸⁰ Orosius, *Historiarum Adversus Paganos* 7. 33 (*PL* 31. 1144C-1145A); Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epitoma Chronicae* 1 (*PL* 51. 583A); Paul the Deacon, *Historia Miscella*. 12 (*PL* 95. 931C-932A).

dealt with sharply. The bishops, for their part, were equally zealous, though with a different end in view. They had to integrate a dangerous lay movement into existing ecclesiastical structures. Control by ordination became a favourite device,¹⁸¹ and like the bishops, partisans on all sides tried to capture the monks for themselves. In the decades that followed we hear of 'Apollinarian monks',¹⁸² as well as 'Arian' attempts to influence the monks of Egypt;¹⁸³ suspiciously similar efforts are claimed for Syria.¹⁸⁴ None of these efforts appears to have been particularly successful, and later reports of 'Arian monks' seem to be based on misunderstandings, deliberate or otherwise,¹⁸⁵ but if in the end it was the Nicenes who 'won', there was a time when the outcome might have been different. The polemical themes applied so liberally to Aetius, Eunomius, and the non-Nicenes

¹⁸¹ Cf. Thdt., *H. Rel.* 19. 2. 1-7 (SC 257. 60), where a bishop breaks into the cell of an enclosed ascetic to ordain him and then walls him up again!

¹⁸² Ath., *Tom.* 9 (PG 26. 808A).

¹⁸³ Ath., *Ep. Mon.* (PG 26. 1188A). Since Athanasius warns against communicating, associating, or worshipping with the heretics in any way (cf. 1188B-C), it must be assumed that their campaign was not wholly unsuccessful. In writing to Serapion of Thmuis about the same time, Athanasius mentions a letter about 'Arianism' written to the monks (5. 2 (Opitz ii. 180. 17-18)) and implies that a lively debate on the heresy is under way, Ath., *Ep. Mort. Ar.* 1. 2-3, 5. 1 (Opitz ii. 178. 8-14, 180. 12-14). There is an extant letter ascribed to one of Pachomius' disciples comforting the monks in the face of 'Arian' persecution, the *Epistula Theodori Monachi* in BHP 41. 126, and a cautionary tale about an 'Arian' bishop attempting to pray in a monastic church against the will of the monks in *V. Pach.* 1. 138, 3. 190 (BHP 40. 185. 39-186. 6, 41. 74. 19-29).

¹⁸⁴ Thdt., *H. Rel.* 2. 16. 1-6 (SC 234. 230). The story bears a suspicious resemblance to a similar story told of Antony in Ath., *V. Anton.* 69. 1-6 (SC 400. 314-16) and presumably represents a patriotic effort to claim an equal glory for Syria.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Damasc., *Haer.* 101 (PG 94. 765A), where Muhammad is said to have been influenced by an 'Arian' monk. A passage in the *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, par. 41 (CSCO 109 (Syr. 56). 177. 19-20, translation, 139. 23-4) thought to be a reference to 'Arian' monks seems to be a misunderstanding of Soc., *HE* 7. 14. 1-3 (GCS 359. 23-31). Such misunderstandings as were not motivated by malice were made easier by the fact that Melitians could be popularly described in Egypt as τοὺς τὰ Ἀρείου φρονοῦντας (Soz., *HE* 2. 21. 4 (GCS 77. 15-16)), and there were undoubtedly Melitian monks until a quite late period, Thdt., *HE* 1. 9. 14 (GCS 42. 3-8). Another cause of confusion may have been a tendency to link Origenists and 'Arians' during the Origenist controversy, cf. *V. Pach.* 3. 56, 4. 36 (BHP 41. 18. 25-8, 101. 5-6).

generally were the by-blows of this struggle, one at times said to have bordered on civil war.¹⁸⁶ To understand these themes and how they were used, however, we need to return to a distinction we met earlier:¹⁸⁷ the ancient and honourable distinction between philosopher and rhetor.

Eunomius, as we saw, chose the latter. His dreams of becoming a new Demosthenes¹⁸⁸ or Cicero led him to a profession which traditionally exalted the active over the contemplative life, and civic duty over scholarly retirement. Its modern analogue would be the corporate lawyer, not the underpaid professor. There were indeed repeated efforts to combine them (by Plutarch¹⁸⁹ no less than Libanius,¹⁹⁰ by Julian¹⁹¹ no less than Gregory Nazianzen¹⁹²), but the ideals themselves remained distinct; indeed, the same polemical themes return in age after age. Perhaps the best way to put them in focus is to call to mind a story told by Philostratus—about a young man who, as long as he practised philosophy, was abstemious in food and slovenly in dress, but upon ‘converting’ to rhetoric went out and bought himself a decent set of clothes and threw a party!¹⁹³

Drinking parties and theatrical behaviour were a stock feature of anti-rhetorical polemic long before it was applied to Aetius and Eunomius. Thus the rhythmic cadences of an orator’s ‘Asiatic’ style reminded Philostratus of an actor’s castanets,¹⁹⁴ while Dio Chrysostom (himself a rhetor) could tell the Alexandrians that they were so addicted to rhythmic prose that ‘if you passed a courtroom, you would be hard put to decide whether a drinking party or a trial was in progress’!¹⁹⁵ Lucian’s description of the ignorant rhetor possessed of a handful of Attic words striding up and down intoning ‘Gentlemen of the jury’ in a sing-song while slapping his thighs and swaying

¹⁸⁶ Chrys., *Oppugn.* 1. 2 (PG 47. 322C).

¹⁸⁷ See Ch. 4, pp. 93–4.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 10. 50, 54 (J ii. 309. 14–15, 310. 27–311. 2).

¹⁸⁹ Plutarch, *De Liberis Educandis* 10 (7F–8A).

¹⁹⁰ Libanius, *Or.* 12. 30 (Foerster ii. 19. 3–10).

¹⁹¹ Ibid.; cf. also Julian Imp., *Ep.* 53.

¹⁹² Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 292–311 (PG 37. 1049–51).

¹⁹³ Philostratus, *VS* 2. 567. 2.

¹⁹⁴ Philostratus, *VA* 8. 6.

¹⁹⁵ Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32. 68.

his hips¹⁹⁶ is typical of the style, as is his portrayal of an itinerant philosopher in search of a dinner invitation.¹⁹⁷

Christian authors used the same themes with gusto. Theodore of Mopsuestia, for instance, describes Aetius as a rustic clown, spending his days hanging around the offices of physicians¹⁹⁸ and professional scribes, and wandering about the squares seeking a free meal.¹⁹⁹ His description of his victim's behaviour at dinner-parties is a masterpiece of the genre, and only barely printable.²⁰⁰ He concludes his portrait of 'Aetius the profligate' with a mention of the latter's opposition to fasting and some choice innuendoes about female disciples.²⁰¹ Eunomius fares hardly better. Incorrectly alleged to be of servile origin,²⁰² his educational misadventures are made much of, and dark hints point to the reasons for his expulsion from Constantinople.²⁰³

The Rabelaisian gusto of Theodore was matched by the mordant wit of Gregory of Nyssa. In his eyes Eunomius was a mere Arius redivivus,²⁰⁴ a clown²⁰⁵ or drunkard,²⁰⁶ whose theology was better suited to the saloon or cocktail-party circuit²⁰⁷ than sober theological debate. Like Philostratus, Eunomius' ornate literary style reminded him of an actor prancing onto stage with castanets,²⁰⁸ while such ravings as could be understood were to be taken no more seriously than the belches of a

¹⁹⁶ Lucian, *Rhetorica Praeceptor* 16-20.

¹⁹⁷ Lucian, *Nigrinus* 24.

¹⁹⁸ Interestingly, John Chrysostom too, *Oppugn.* 1. 2 (PG 47. 322B), mentions the offices of physicians (*τοῖς ἰατροῖς*) as well as the agora as popular places of assembly.

¹⁹⁹ Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. 3, syr. 1-13 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 413-4).

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, fr. 3, syr. 13-54, 62-4, cf. gk. 5-22 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 414-16).

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, fr. 3, syr. 65-77 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 416-7).

²⁰² *Ibid.*, fr. 4, gk. 1-3, syr. 16-23 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 420).

²⁰³ See Ch. 1, p. 9.

²⁰⁴ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 45, 46 (J i. 37. 15-17, 21-2), cf. Ath., *Ar.* 1. 3, 4, 5 (PG 26. 16C-17C, 20A, 21A). The primary focus of these latter passages, of course, is the literary form of the *Thalia* and not (except by implication) Arius' behaviour; Athanasius' language, however, does seem to have influenced Gregory significantly, e.g. *Eun.* 1. 17 (J i. 27. 13), etc.

²⁰⁵ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 611 (J i. 203. 6-7).

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 1. 404, 493 (J i. 144. 26-7, 169. 3-7), cf. 3. 8. 56 (J ii. 260. 4-6).

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 1. 608, 610 (J i. 201. 23-4, 202. 16-19); cf. also Grg. Naz., *Or.* 27. 3. 15-19, 6. 3-12 (SC 250. 76, 84), cf. also *Or.* 21. 5 (PG 35. 1088A), 42. 22 (PG 36. 484B).

²⁰⁸ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 16 (J i. 27. 6-11).

glutton at dinner.²⁰⁹ Perhaps the best general summary of this theme is Theodoret's description of Aetius' arrival at the court of Eudoxius some years later:

... when [Aetius] discovered that Eudoxius was a co-religionist, and that in addition to his impiety he lived in Sybaritic luxury, he came to prefer the life at Antioch to any other, and together with Eunomius was practically nailed to the fellow's couches—for he affected the life of a professional hanger-on, and was constantly roaming about filling his belly, now to this, now to that person's house.²¹⁰

Complaints about theatrical behaviour were matched by complaints about *akribeia*. As far as the Nicenes were concerned, Aetius and Eunomius had reduced the faith to one word:

“they don't care a fig for holiness of life,” says Epiphanius, “for fasting, the commandments of God, or anything else God commanded us for our salvation; the only thing important to them is to boil the whole thing down to a word . . .”²¹¹

The word in question was *agenetos* or ‘unbegotten’ which, as we will see in the next chapter, was alleged by their enemies to describe God's essence perfectly. Whatever the truth of that, it was claimed by later writers that Eunomians would countenance anything, fornication included, if only their so-called ‘faith’ were kept entire.²¹² Indeed, according to some people, they taught that no sin would be imputed to anyone who held their faith.²¹³

It is not very surprising, perhaps, to find there is little to support this in any actual Eunomian writing, but what we do find is almost as interesting. The table-hopping social parasites of Nicene legend might have been dismissed a priori, but a glance at the Eunomian historian Philostorgius shows that by and large Aetius and Eunomius' later admirers regarded the

²⁰⁹ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 3. 8. 60 (J ii. 261. 19–21).

²¹⁰ Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 9 (*GCS* 160. 14–19).

²¹¹ Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 4. 4 (*GCS* iii. 344. 23–7).

²¹² Damasc., *Haer.* 76 (*PG* 94. 725B).

²¹³ Cf. the Auctor Praedestinati, *Praedestinatus sive Praedestinatorum Haeresis* 1. 54 (*PL* 53. 606C), and Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Liber* 8. 5. 39 (*PL* 82. 301C), followed by Honorius Augustodunensis, *De Haeresibus* (*PL* 172. 238A). It may be that this whole line of thinking arises from a concern such as that found in (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2. 3 (*PG* 29. 688A–B), that if ἀγέννητος does reveal God's nature exactly, even sinners would then know it.

traditional ascetical disciplines much as did their Nicene contemporaries.²¹⁴ And that fits with what we find in other non-Nicene sources. If we put aside routine condemnations of fornication²¹⁵ and some conventional allusions to the fasts of Daniel,²¹⁶ we find that these sources take a generally 'ascetic' view of the Christian life: Peter and Paul are said to have rejected worldly delights and luxuries;²¹⁷ the other apostles never ate to satiety;²¹⁸ Christ himself is a lover of chastity,²¹⁹ and Stephen was as faithful in continence as in the more obvious charity.²²⁰ That such descriptions completely contradict the Nicene polemic is perhaps not surprising, but they do lead us to ask what such a peculiar combination of prima-facie ascetical normalcy and violent polemical attack might mean.

The puzzle is only heightened when we discover that the Nicenes were not the only ones making accusations. The Christian discipline portrayed in most non-Nicene sources is indeed almost strikingly ordinary, but it is accompanied by a vigorous condemnation of another, more sinister asceticism. In the Pseudo-Ignatian *Epistles* for instance, we find that while the fourth-century editor's ostensible targets are the Docetists and Gnostics of the first century, his real interest lies in contemporaries of his own in the fourth. The latter are portrayed as practising an asceticism which denied the goodness of marriage, procreation, and ordinary family life—or at least the editor himself is at pains to establish the goodness of sexual intercourse²²¹ and the positive value of married life,²²² as well as that

²¹⁴ Cf. Philost., *HE* 10. 12 (GCS 131. 1–8), where Philostorgius is not only an advocate of rigorous fasting, he holds up one Eudoxius (not the bishop) as an exemplar of the ascetic life. In *HE* 10. 1 (GCS 126. 6–9), moreover, he portrays Eunomius as rejecting communion with Dorotheus and his followers on moral grounds (see below Ch. 8 n. 43).

²¹⁵ (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 2. 4. 52, 6. 67–7. 84 (SC 146. 98, 100–2).

²¹⁶ *Ibid.* 2. 2. 37–9 (SC 146. 98).

²¹⁷ Ar. Ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 11. 3. 65^v. 11–16 (CCL 87/i. 78).

²¹⁸ Ar. Ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 6: 1. 186^v. 3–6 (CCL 87/i. 223).

²¹⁹ Ar. Ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 15. 3. 74^v. 24–74^v. 6, cf. 15. 3. 75^v. 10–13 (CCL 87/i. 88–9, cf. 89).

²²⁰ *Ibid.* 10. 3. 63^v. 9–19 (CCL 87/i. 75).

²²¹ (Ps.-)Ignat., *Philad.* 6 (Lightfoot II. iii. 212. 13–16).

²²² (Ps.-)Ignat., *Tars.* 9 (Lightfoot II. iii. 186. 12–187. 21), *Phil.* 13 (Lightfoot II. iii. 201. 26–7), *Philad.* 4 (Lightfoot II. iii. 208. 12–14), *Ant.* 9 (Lightfoot II. iii. 238. 17–239. 24).

of consecrated virginity and widowhood.²²³ Indeed, he is careful to warn the latter not to consider their own consecrated state a denigration of marriage.²²⁴ Similar concerns are visible in the closely related *Apostolic Constitutions*: clergy who reject marriage, wine, or meat, as evil in themselves are to be excommunicated;²²⁵ those who refuse to eat meat on feast days are to be deposed,²²⁶ and none is to fast on a Saturday or Sunday.²²⁷ The sanctity of marriage is strongly affirmed,²²⁸ as is intercourse within its bounds.²²⁹ Widows and virgins must once again recognize that their state implies no denigration of marriage,²³⁰ while ascetics in general are warned that God has forbidden the misuse, not the use of the physical passions.²³¹ Finally, in his commentary on Job the 'anomoean' author Julian condemns Manichees, false ascetics (*Ψευδεγκρατίτας*), and all who deny the goodness of the body or reject procreation as evil.²³²

So many parallel condemnations are the signs of a specific rather than a general concern, and while the documents just mentioned are all Antiochene in origin, there are others from a little further afield that point to a more specific connection with Eunomius. The documents in question are all ascribed to a mysterious if influential council held at Gangra in Paphlagonia. This council's date is something of a puzzle. According to Socrates it took place after the Council of Constantinople in 360,²³³ according to Sozomen before that of

²²³ (Ps.-)Ignat., *Tars.* 9 (Lightfoot II. iii. 187. 1-2), *Phil.* 15 (Lightfoot II. iii. 202. 16-203. 1).

²²⁴ (Ps.-)Ignat., *Philad.* 4, 5 (Lightfoot II. iii. 208. 6-8, 208. 14-209. 28), *Polyc.* 5 (Lightfoot II. iii. 230. 17-22).

²²⁵ *Const. App.* 8. 47. 51. 252-7 (SC 336. 294).

²²⁶ *Ibid.* 8. 47. 53. 263-6 (SC 336. 296).

²²⁷ *Ibid.* 8. 47. 64. 297-9 (SC 336. 298), cf. Concilia, C. Gangr., *Ep. Syn.* (Mansi ii. 1097-8b, ad pedem), Soc., *HE* 2. 43. 5 (GCS 180. 14-15), Soz., *HE* 3. 14. 33 (GCS 123. 21-2).

²²⁸ *Const. App.* 6. 14. 3-4. 17-25, 26. 3. 13-15 (SC 329. 338-40, 376).

²²⁹ *Ibid.* 6. 28. 1-8. 1-61 (SC 329. 382-6).

²³⁰ *Ibid.* 4. 14. 1-13 (SC 329. 192-4).

²³¹ *Ibid.* 6. 23. 2. 11-14 (SC 329. 370).

²³² Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 67. 7-68. 7). Cf. the similar condemnation of Novatians and Manichaeans denying the goodness of creation in (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 2. 11. 129-37 (SC 146. 106), and of stylites and other extreme ascetics in the (Ps.-)Chrys., *Opus Imperf.* 48 (PG 56. 905C).

²³³ Soc., *HE* 2. 43. 2 (GCS 180. 5-8); perhaps Socrates has confused this denunciation of the much-condemned Eustathius with that of a later council.

Antioch in 341.²³⁴ Its *acta* give the names of the participants but not their sees,²³⁵ so the issue cannot be resolved on that basis.²³⁶ At any rate, while dates as late as 376 have been suggested, if Sozomen is right and it took place before 341, the 'Eusebius' who is said to have presided must have been Eusebius of Nicomedia,²³⁷ the disciple of Lucian, defender of Arius, and theological ancestor of Eunomius. But even if that was not the case, the council's primary target was one of Aetius and Eunomius' chief enemies, their old opponent Eustathius of Sebaste.²³⁸ That makes it all the more interesting that, when Eunomius describes him, his account is remarkably similar to that of the council: Eustathius is a false ascetic, 'pale with fasting and murderous with rage', a figure 'cloaked in black, a saint accursed'.²³⁹ A few literary echoes of the pagan polemic mentioned earlier are also visible,²⁴⁰ but more to the point, the doctrines condemned by the bishops at Gangra are closely parallel to those condemned in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and Pseudo-Ignatian *Epistles*: that no married person can be

²³⁴ Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 9 (*GCS* 180. 10-12). T. D. Barnes, 'The Date of the Council of Gangra', *JTS* 40 (1989), 122-3, has argued that Sozomen need mean no more than that the council took place before 360, not before 341. His preferred date is 'close to the year 355' (*ibid.* 124). If he is correct, of course, this places the council not long after Aetius and Eunomius' first hostile encounter with Eustathius.

²³⁵ C. Gangr., *Ep. Syn.* (Mansi ii. 1095-6); though the Greek *acta* list thirteen participants, the Latin versions give up to sixteen in a different order. There is general agreement on the thirteen (assuming that 'Hilarius' in one manuscript is a corruption of Aelianus), but the Latin versions give up to another three, Heraclius or Heracles, found in all the manuscripts, Bassianus (a doublet of Bassus?), and, somewhat surprisingly, 'Osius Cordubensis' (perhaps added because the council took place *μετὰ τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ σύνοδον*).

²³⁶ For a brief discussion of some of the alternatives, see Gwatkin, pp. 185-8.

²³⁷ Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 263. 3. 9-14 (Courtonne iii. 123), Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 9 (*GCS* 180. 7-10).

²³⁸ C. Gangr., *Ep. Syn.* (Mansi ii. 1098, post initium).

²³⁹ Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 32. 18-33. 1, cf. 32. 6-8). Accusations of an unnatural pallor were standard features of this polemic; cf. the similar descriptions of Basil the Great mentioned by Gr. Naz., *Or.* 43. 77 (*PG* 36. 600A). Note also that (in a story itself not without difficulties) Eustathius is said to have been deposed by his own father (a bishop) for dressing in a manner unbecoming a member of the clergy, Soc., *HE* 2. 43. 1 (*GCS* 180. 1-4), Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 9 (*GCS* 180. 5-7).

²⁴⁰ Cf. nn. 173-8 above.

saved;²⁴¹ that meat is forbidden a Christian;²⁴² and that there is no salvation without renunciation of one's goods.²⁴³ His followers' unconventional lifestyle, moreover (which included cross-dressing for the women²⁴⁴ and separate assemblies for all),²⁴⁵ gave additional cause for offence.

There is no doubt, then, that Aetius and Eunomius were as opposed to the kind of asceticism represented by Eustathius of Sebaste as any of their contemporaries. Their positive ideal, as revealed by a wider selection of non-Nicene sources, was one of studied moderation. In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, for instance, a review of the whole range of persons and practices that might loosely be called 'ascetic' reveals that they are almost all communal or 'domestic'—that is, they presuppose or are pursued within the context of a household or church.²⁴⁶ If such a collectivist orientation is not too surprising in what is, after all, a church order, the same assertion can be made about the portrait of Job found in the non-Nicene commentary by Julian. Unlike the rigorist portraits of many Nicene commentaries,²⁴⁷ the asceticism portrayed there is that of one living in the midst of others, of one who, like Zacharias and Elizabeth

²⁴¹ C. Gangr., *Can.* 1, cf. 4 (Mansi ii. 1102, cf. 1101b); cf. also Soc., *HE* 2. 43. 3 (GCS 180. 8–11), Soz., *HE* 3. 14. 33 (GCS 123. 19–21, 123. 26–124. 2).

²⁴² C. Gangr., *Can.* 2 (Mansi ii. 1102); cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 43. 3 (GCS 180. 9), Soz., *HE* 3. 14. 33 (GCS 123. 23–4).

²⁴³ C. Gangr., *Ep. Syn.* (Mansi ii. 1099b, ad initium); cf. Soz., *HE* 3. 14. 33 (GCS 123. 22–3).

²⁴⁴ C. Gangr., *Ep. Syn.* (Mansi ii. 1097b, post medium); the men also wore unconventional clothing, Soc., *HE* 2. 43. 4 (GCS 180. 12–13), Soz., *HE* 3. 14. 33, cf. 36 (GCS 123. 24–6, cf. 124. 5–8), cf. Basil, *Ep.* 223. 3. 4–8 (Courttonne iii. 11).

²⁴⁵ C. Gangr., *Ep. Syn.* (Mansi ii. 1097b, ante medium); cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 43. 3 (GCS 180. 10–11), Soz., *HE* 3. 14. 33 (GCS 123. 22).

²⁴⁶ Cf. *Const. App.* 2. 14. 26–32 (SC 320. 174), where strong emphasis is laid on not separating from the world; Christians are to be like their Father in heaven who causes his sun to shine on good and bad alike (Matt. 5: 45).

²⁴⁷ Especially John Chrysostom. If the great doctor was as ready as Pseudo-Ignatius to condemn a perverted Gnosis (*Virg.* 3. 1–9, cf. 4. 2. 22–3 (SC 125. 100–2, cf. 104)), his proposed alternative was strikingly different. He could agree that the condemnation of marriage was heretical (*Virg.* 8. 4. 47–9, cf. 8. 1. 3–11. 2. 26 (SC 125. 118, cf. 114–28)), but wedlock itself could never be more than a tolerated alternative to fornication. For Chrysostom it was only a consolation prize for those unable to embrace the full rigour and angelic joys of virginity (*Virg.* 19. 1. 2–2. 21, cf. 9. 1. 3–10, 10. 3. 22–11. 2. 26, 79. 1. 3–2. 37 (SC 125. 156–8, cf. 120, 124–8, 376–8)).

elsewhere,²⁴⁸ is a paradigm of *married* chastity. Job and his children are models of the right use of this world's goods,²⁴⁹ but their asceticism is comprehensible only in communal terms.²⁵⁰ Moreover, as we have already seen, ascetic women were as much a part of the non-Nicene²⁵¹ as of the Nicene churches. Non-Nicene sources, however, exhort them to be studiously moderate: the virgin, a living image of restraint,²⁵² is warned that severe fasting will unfit her for the service of her neighbour²⁵³ and that care of the body is a necessary part of 'philosophy',²⁵⁴ fasting is insignificant in itself,²⁵⁵ and the virgin must content herself with fulfilling the daily necessities of life.²⁵⁶ There is little enough, of course, in all this that is new, but that makes it all the more obvious that what is consistently absent is an intention to depart from traditional norms.

The drunken scoundrels of Nicene legend are thus the surviving ripostes in a war of rival asceticisms. It is true they are caricatures, but they are caricatures with certain basis in fact. In the contrast between the rhetorical profligate and the philosopher monk, we can catch a glimpse of some of the participants in the actual drama. For, having co-opted the monks doctrinally, the Nicenes now proceeded to use them polemically. The brickbats aimed at Aetius and Eunomius were only scenes from a wider battle. In the teeth of the known ascetic orientation of the historical Arius,²⁵⁷ for instance,

²⁴⁸ Ar. Ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 1: 6. 9^r. 19-20 (CCL 87/i. 201).

²⁴⁹ Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 10. 14-15, 10. 20-11. 2, 17. 19-21, 27. 14-18, etc.).

²⁵⁰ Note that even the week-long feasts of Job's children are schools of sobriety—opportunities to learn the exacting discipline of communal love, Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 17. 19-21, cf. 10. 14-11. 13), cf. Ar. Ign., *Job* 1 (PG 17. 393A, cf. 384D, 392A, D).

²⁵¹ e.g. Ar. Ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 15. 7. 77^r. 19-20 (CCL 87/i. 91), cf. C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 9 (CSEL 65. 55. 12-19).

²⁵² Basil Anc., *Virg.* 22 (PG 30. 716A).

²⁵³ Ibid. 11 (PG 30. 689B-692A).

²⁵⁴ Ibid. (PG 30. 692B-C).

²⁵⁵ Ibid. 12 (PG 30. 693A-B).

²⁵⁶ Ibid. 25 (PG 30. 721A).

²⁵⁷ He is said to have worn the *κολοβίωνα*, a garment frequently associated with ascetics (Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 3. 1 (GCS iii. 154. 15-16)), and Rufinus describes him as (albeit speciously) 'vir specie et forma . . . religiosus' (HE 1. 1 (GCS II. ii. 960. 5-6)). According to Alexander of Alexandria, moreover, *Ep. Alex.* 41 apud Thdt., HE 1. 4 (GCS 19. 15-16), Arius and his followers are

Nicene historians turned the heresiarch into a notorious glutton defeated by a fasting saint (James of Nisibis),²⁵⁸ or extolled the ability of uneducated ascetics to overcome (in fractured Greek) the specious arguments of the rhetors.²⁵⁹ The non-Nicenes responded with vigour. Monastic asceticism was by no means universally popular. The enthusiasm of a Theodoret or a Sozomen contrasted sharply with the more tempered response of their other contemporaries. Basil experienced considerable difficulty, for instance, in introducing monasticism into his diocese,²⁶⁰ and in the West Jerome found 'monk' almost a synonym for 'inposter et Graecus'.²⁶¹ To make any further headway monasticism would have to be either modified or rejected, and, if rejected, replaced with an ideal of comparable power. For Eunomius that replacement was a combination of the traditional spirituality of the urban churches, with the venerable and equally potent image of the God-touched rhetor.

However attractive to those outside, monasticism was and would always remain the movement of an élite, but it was an élite partly composed of those who in previous centuries had given the city its leaders. If non-Nicenes clung with particular tenacity to the domestic and urban asceticism of earlier centuries, they were as aware as their Nicene counterparts that they needed to provide that leadership with a new and compelling vision. It was in an effort to do so that they undertook the recreation of one of antiquity's most prestigious public figures, the rhetor. The physical descriptions of Eunomius give us a glimpse of the 'lofty brow' and 'winged eye' of the classical rhetor,²⁶² but the specifically religious dimension was added by the consciousness of a divine call. For as we saw earlier, both Aetius and Eunomius believed that they had been called by God for their work—that they belonged to a succession of *periti* who, like Lucian, bore witness to the 'teaching of the

said to have described themselves as *μόνοι σοφοί καὶ ἀκτῆμονες καὶ δογμάτων εὐπεραί*, though Opitz, following Jülicher, would conjecture, perhaps correctly, *ἐπιστήμονες* for *ἀκτῆμονες* (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 26. 11–12).

²⁵⁸ Thdt., *H. Rel.* 1. 10. 40–57 (SC 234. 180–2), cf. 2. 16. 1–21. 2 (SC 234. 230–40).

²⁵⁹ Ibid. 8. 2. 1–18 (SC 234. 376–8), cf. 27. 4. 2–4 (SC 257. 222).

²⁶⁰ e.g. Basil, *Ep.* 207. 2. 5–39 (Courtonne ii. 185–6).

²⁶¹ Hieron., *Ep.* 38. 5, cf. 54. 5 (CSEL 54. 293. 1–4, cf. 470. 11–12).

²⁶² Quoted below Ch. 8, p. 350.

saints'.²⁶³ Though as 'expert' interpreters of the divine word their authority depended more on skill than ecclesiastical rank, the wonder-working bishops of Philostorgius give us a glimpse of the 'divine man' in the flesh. As committed to celibacy (*μοναυλιον*) as any consecrated virgin,²⁶⁴ these personages are portrayed by the anomoean historian as consistently active in public life. Hence, like the martyr Lucian before him, Aetius is said to have used his skill in the service of the poor,²⁶⁵ while James of Nisibis, like his Nicene alter ego, saves his native city.²⁶⁶ The herald of an unconquerable faith,²⁶⁷ Theophilus and others were the recipients of an imperial veneration, revered as the very image of the apostles,²⁶⁸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν Μωσῆς,²⁶⁹ veritable statues in a shrine.²⁷⁰ As wonder-workers whose presence could be demanded even by emperors,²⁷¹ they were the natural

²⁶³ See Ch. 2, pp. 23-4 above.

²⁶⁴ Philost., *HE* 3. 4, 4a (*GCS* 33. 18-19, 36-9), cf. Anhang VI/2 (*GCS* 185. 1-24) for a similar portrait of Lucian.

²⁶⁵ See Ch. 2 nn. 71-2 above.

²⁶⁶ Philost., *HE* 3. 23, cf. Anhang VII (*GCS* 50. 8-12, cf. 211. 6-12, 23-6, 31-2).

²⁶⁷ Philost., *HE* 3. 4a, cf. 15 (*GCS* 34. 27-35, cf. 46. 16-23): Theophilus the Indian and Aetius.

²⁶⁸ Philost., *HE* 3. 6a (*GCS* 36. 29-31): Theophilus the Indian.

²⁶⁹ 'Moses in our midst', Philost., *HE* 2. 5 (*GCS* 18. 9-12): Wulfila.

²⁷⁰ Philost., *HE* 3. 6 (*GCS* 36. 1-3): Theophilus the Indian.

²⁷¹ Philost., *HE* 4. 7, cf. 2. 8, 3. 4, 6a, 5. 2, 9. 1 (*GCS* 61. 9-16, cf. 20. 1-4, 11-14, 34. 8-10, 36. 31-5, 68. 2-5, 116. 2-7): Agapetus of Synnada, Theophilus the Indian, Aetius, Eunomius, Leontius, Evagrius, Arrianus, and Florentius. Somewhat puzzlingly, Lim, pp. 146-7, sees stories of wonder-working as a 5th-cent. Eunomian attempt to remake their overly 'dialectical' 4th-cent. image. In point of fact, however, this picture extends to Philostorgius' view of their whole history. To be sustained, therefore, Lim's theory requires a dichotomy between the historical Eunomius and his admirer that is improbable, to say the least. Moreover, apart from Theophilus the only example cited by Lim is Agapetus, whom he identifies as among 'certain early fifth-century Eunomians who were known as rigorous ascetics and performers of miracles' (p. 147). Unfortunately, he seems to have confused the *Συνάδων* ἐπίσκοπος of Philostorgius (*HE* 2. 8, 8a (*GCS* 19. 11-20. 5, 19. 31-20. 14)), a contemporary of the Emperor Constantine (mentioned between the latter's post-Nicene recall of the exiles and the founding of Constantinople), with a Macedonian bishop of the same name said to be a contemporary of the Patriarch Atticus (AD 406-25). This second Agapetus is mentioned by Socrates, *HE* 7. 3. 3-13 (*GCS* 349. 19-350. 9), and appears to be different again from the roughly contemporary bishop of Apamea lauded by Theodoret, *HE* 5. 27. 3, cf. 4. 28. 1 (*GCS* 329. 1-3, cf. 268. 10-12). He is undoubtedly to

inheritors of the rhetor's magical aura.²⁷² The fact that almost all of them were associated with the imperial household was no accident;²⁷³ they were heirs of an activist tradition in which participation was a virtue.

The corresponding lay ideal was found in the patriarch Job,²⁷⁴ but, in a courtier, it is represented by the martyred layman Artemius. For though seen through 'a Nicene glass darkly' this martyr is presented as a consummate courtier. His commitment to Christianity is shown by his anti-pagan zeal,²⁷⁵ his fidelity to the house of Constantine by conveying the bodies of the apostles to the emperor's tomb.²⁷⁶ By no means a rhetor,²⁷⁷ he nevertheless manages to best the Emperor Julian with an array of secular learning.²⁷⁸ He is portrayed as a model member of the courts of Constantine and Constantius, as one truly gifted

be identified with the Confessor Agapetus, *ἐπίσκοπος Συνάων* (var. 'Synnadae', *AASS*, Feb. III. 53), celebrated in the Greek Menologion on 18 Feb. Like the 'Agapetus' of Philostorgius, the 'Agapetus' of the surviving *Life* is a soldier and wonder-worker (under Licinius) who raises the dead (*V. Agapet.* 4-11, 24 (*VGS* 115. 33-118. 13, 121. 9-12)). He is also said to have been a confidant of the Emperor Constantine and active at court (*ibid.* 14, 26 (*VGS* 118. 33-119. 7, 121. 26-122. 2)). As with Artemius, Lucian, and James of Nisibis, this appears to be another case of the two sides trying to appropriate the same heroic figure (for a possible reason why, see below Ch. 7 n. 197).

²⁷² Cf. e.g. Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32. 39.

²⁷³ Cf. e.g. Philost., *HE* 2. 5, 3. 6, 27, 4. 1 (*GCS* 18. 9-12, 36. 1-3, 52. 18-53. 9, 57. 2, 7-11), etc.

²⁷⁴ See Vaggione, *Monks*, 191-7.

²⁷⁵ Unfortunately, John Damascene did not elect to give us anything in his source prior to the reign of Julian (*Artem.* 8. 1-5 (*PTS* 29. 205)), but he earlier mentions Eusebius of Caesarea and Socrates as sources for his history (*ibid.* 4. 1-12 (*PTS* 29. 203-4)). Artemius is nowhere mentioned by name in what survives from either author, but the editor is probably right in calling attention to citations of the same works in the *De Imaginibus* (*PTS* 29. 203 ad loc.). In both cases, Eus., *DE* 5. 9. 7-8 (*GCS* vi. 232. 1-15), and Soc., *HE* 1. 18. 5-6 (*GCS* 58. 17-59. 2), the wider context contains an allusion to Mamre and/or the destruction of its pagan shrines. This may indicate that he believed that Artemius was involved in their destruction. Certainly his zeal in this regard is well known later from Egypt, Julian Imp., *Ep.* 21 (379A/B), Thdt., *HE* 3. 18. 1 (*GCS* 197. 3-6).

²⁷⁶ Philost., *HE* 3. 2-3, cf. 2a (*GCS* 31. 1-32. 4), Damasc., *Artem.* 9. 6-9, 17. 1-3 (*PTS* 29. 206, 211).

²⁷⁷ Damasc., *Artem.* 1. 14-17, 26. 8-18, cf. 27. 30-1 (*PTS* 29. 202, 216, cf. 217).

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 29. 1-30. 3, 46. 2-17, (*PTS* 29. 218, 228).

with both virtue and learning, an ardent lover of the Christian faith.²⁷⁹ The faith in question, however, was one of a most definite kind. This is the official, after all, charged by Constantius with evicting Athanasius from Alexandria, and later we find him leading the hunt for the Nicene archbishop.²⁸⁰

There is one final consideration, and that is the link to the non-Nicene Christ himself. We noted earlier that non-Nicenes generally needed to be assured that the voice they heard in Jesus was truly that of the instrumental cause of the universe, of God walking upon earth. If with that in mind we look at the closely related writings of some of Eunomius' western colleagues,²⁸¹ we find that there Christ himself, the very Word of the Father, has become 'mellifluous':

'[Christ] indeed preached so beautifully,' says our author, 'and spoke with such sweet and honeyed eloquence (*dulcius mellifluo sermone*) that the crowds not only approached him, they "pressed upon him", for SO IT WAS THAT THE PEOPLE PRESSED UPON HIM. Like bees swarming onto thyme or other flowers so they "pressed upon" the Virgin's saving Rose, the Father's sweetly smelling Lily—not just to see his graceful person, not just to admire the beauty of his countenance, but TO HEAR THE WORD OF GOD . . .'²⁸²

This divine eloquence is echoed by the apostles, Christ's earthly counterparts: St Paul is an 'oratore Christi',²⁸³ John a *θεορήτωρ*,²⁸⁴ and Peter has entered the lists as a rhetor, 'doing battle' for Christ.²⁸⁵ Aetius and Eunomius would have been glad to be counted among their number.

Mellifluous speaker, miracle-worker, inspired exegete—these were powerful symbols. Yet given the broad range of persons and ranks needing to be addressed by anyone who desired to influence the society as a whole, what was the effect? The leadership ideal articulated in non-Nicene sources is indeed a powerful one, but it is also severely limited. We find it

²⁷⁹ Damasc., *Artem.* 9. 2-3 (PTS 29. 206), cf. Philost., *HE* 1. 6a (GCS 7. 19-21).

²⁸⁰ Ath., *Index Fest.* 387-92 [XXXII] (SC 317. 260), cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 11. 2-3.

²⁸¹ See Ch. 3 n. 64 above.

²⁸² Ar. Ign., *Comm. in Lc.* 5: 1. 155^r. 22-155^v. 12 (CCL 87/i. 213).

²⁸³ Ibid. 5: 4. 138^v. 5-7 (CCL 87/i. 216).

²⁸⁴ (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 21. 301-2 (SC 146. 84).

²⁸⁵ Ibid. 1. 13. 167-8 (SC 146. 72).

in the surviving literature in three forms: that of the God-inspired bishop, the religiously oriented aristocrat, and the faithful urban laity with their ascetic male and female religious professionals. What we do not see is an attempt to address the people outside these categories, and they, of course, were the majority. The focus of the rhetor, whether lay or ordained, after all, was a middle- or upper-class audience with a settled stake in society. They were of course surrounded and supported by many others, but that influence tended to be defined by the traditional ties of patronage and locale. Outside those ties it was difficult to go. A wonder-working bishop might indeed do so, especially if, like Wulfila, they were willing to go among the people, but in practice, as we have seen, they tended to focus on the denizens of the court. One result of this imperial bias was a failure to capture what was arguably the most popular and vital lay movement of its day, monasticism. This in turn was to render a significant segment of their society opaque to their message.²⁸⁶

To begin with, this would probably not have seemed a handicap. After all, the most influential sections of society were being addressed directly, and by force or persuasion it might be possible to address the others less directly. In the end, however, it did not happen. The reason in part, at least, was that this was a strategy addressed to the Church that had been, not the Church that was coming to be. The 'Arians' addressed most of the components of the traditional Church, but they failed to address the very large new components that were starting to come into play. It was a fatal omission. The rhetor, with his up-scale interests, spoke almost exclusively to the Church's established structures; Aetius and Eunomius' own upper-class interests are only a specific instance. They did indeed have a strategic interest in the masses, but their tactical focus lay in those who ruled them. This was perhaps understandable enough under the circumstances—in a society as vertical as the Roman, access was life. Upper-class women and eunuchs were among those who had this in abundance, hence the enormous interest in recruiting them.²⁸⁷ And yet despite this, alone and without other means of reaching a mass audience, they were

²⁸⁶ Cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 10. 12 (*GCS* 152. 12–16).

²⁸⁷ e.g. Philost., *HE* 3. 12 (*GCS* 43. 1–5).

bound to doom any movement that depended exclusively on them. It was the success of the Nicenes in moving beyond this circle of visible power that prepared the way for their final victory.

Aetius and Eunomius were soon to experience some of these problems in person, for the reign of their imperial patron was drawing rapidly to an end. The conclusion of the civil war left a notoriously suspicious emperor free to consider the behaviour of his Caesar. He had been chosen as a place-holder, but had apparently failed to take the hint. Ironically, he was now vulnerable precisely because he lacked the ability to win the kind of loyalty that would have allowed him to attempt a revolt. In the three and a half years²⁸⁸ of his reign Gallus had managed to alienate the urban masses by mismanaging the food supply, the *honestiores* by arbitrary confiscation, and his staff by allowing them to take the blame.²⁸⁹ As a result, though he began with violence, when summoned to the imperial presence he really had no choice but to obey. The death of the emperor's sister, his wife, sealed his fate. After a journey during which any of the troops to whom he might have appealed were carefully removed from his path, he was stripped of the purple, removed to an island, and shortly thereafter executed—all allegedly before a counter-order could come from the emperor.

More significant for our purposes, perhaps, than the details of his death is the composition of his final entourage. For in addition to the emperor's flattering counsellor,²⁹⁰ he is said to have travelled with a religious adviser, Theophilus the Indian. Theophilus seems to have been removed before Gallus reached the island where he was to die,²⁹¹ but that does not change the role he is alleged to have fulfilled. According to Philostorgius, he was the original guarantor of the emperor's oaths to the Caesar, and therefore felt able to upbraid him for transgressing them. It is perhaps a sign of Constantius' esteem that he suffered only exile as a result. The emperor was in any case soon obliged to recall him because, again according to Philostorgius,

²⁸⁸ Ammianus Marcellinus 14. 11. 27 (counting inclusively) says four.

²⁸⁹ e.g. Ammianus Marcellinus 14. 7. 5-6.

²⁹⁰ Ibid. 14. 11. 11-12.

²⁹¹ For this and what follows, see Philost., *HE* 4. 1 (*GCS* 57. 2-58. 1).

his wife Eusebia fell seriously ill. Constantius had scarcely finished imploring the wonder-worker's forgiveness when by laying-on of hands his wife was healed.²⁹²

Aetius too escaped. To at least Gregory of Nyssa's intense disgust, he did not suffer in the general 'witch hunt' that followed his patron's death.²⁹³ It is not impossible that he was again protected by the ever nimble Leontius, but possible too that he had already acquired a new patron. Leontius was getting old, and like Louis XV was not blind to his own future. Pointing to his own white hair, he is said to have commented: 'When this snow melts, there will be plenty of mud.'²⁹⁴ Aetius was equally astute. Given his episcopal mentor's uncertain health and the precarious situation of anyone associated with the previous regime, he needed both a new sponsor and, ideally, a new location. George, erstwhile bishop of Alexandria, could offer both. Constantius had restored Athanasius only under duress, and now as victor looked forward to undoing his mistake.²⁹⁵ It is possible, too, there was a closer connection. Alleged by some to be of Cappadocian origin,²⁹⁶ George is also claimed as a countryman of Aetius,²⁹⁷ and was thus perhaps, like him, from Cilicia.²⁹⁸

Whatever the truth of that, the emperor's latest effort to unseat the pesky Athanasius was to turn Aetius once more into 'an Alexandrian':²⁹⁹ he became a member of George's staff. The latter had originally been chosen for his doctrinal zeal,³⁰⁰ but he is a good illustration of the limitations of the kind of tactics we

²⁹² Philost., *HE* 4. 7 (GCS 61. 9-16).

²⁹³ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 47 (J i. 38. 7-12), cf., *par contre*, Ammianus Marcellinus 15. 3. 1-11.

²⁹⁴ Soz., *HE* 3. 20. 9 (GCS 135. 15-19).

²⁹⁵ Cf. Ruf., *HE* 1. 20 (GCS II. ii. 987. 9-14)

²⁹⁶ Soc., *HE* 2. 14 (GCS 105. 9), Soz., *HE* 3. 7. 9 (GCS 110. 15-16), Philost. *HE* 3. 3, 12 (GCS 32. 7-8, 43. 13-14), Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 48 (J i. 36. 15-16), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 21. 16 (PG 35. 1097C). What exactly this means in fact is difficult to ascertain. It is possible our five sources are really only three (or perhaps two): Sozomen is dependent on Socrates, while Gregory of Nyssa and Philostorgius may both reflect something in Eunomius. That leaves Gregory of Nazianzen, who is frustratingly vague about his 'Cappadocian monster'. It may be that, as with Eunomius himself his estate was assumed to be his *πατρίς*.

²⁹⁷ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 48 (J i. 38. 16-18).

²⁹⁸ So Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 11. 4.

²⁹⁹ Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 48 (J i. 38. 15)

³⁰⁰ Soc., *HE* 2. 14 (GCS 105. 9-10), Soz., *HE* 3. 7. 9 (GCS 110. 15-16).

have been discussing. George did not start in complete isolation—he could count on at least some local acquiescence³⁰¹—but his goal was never to win 'hearts and minds'. His tactical goal was to achieve three things: physical control of the Alexandrine churches, the support of the hierarchy, and economic control of the Egyptian church. The former can be seen in a running battle with Athanasius' supporters, in which church buildings repeatedly changed hands;³⁰² the second in attempts to control the liturgy and gain declarations of support from individual bishops;³⁰³ the third in efforts to corner the trade in nitre, papyrus, and salt.³⁰⁴ Through it all we can presume Aetius and Eunomius were active.

We are not told exactly when they arrived in Alexandria. Given the delicacy of their situation in Antioch, however, it may be that they came with the advance party sent to seize the city churches in June of 356. Then again, they may have waited until their principal arrived himself in February of the following year.³⁰⁵ In any case, while George's enemies made much of his use of violence,³⁰⁶ doubtless with much justice, the latter was so endemic to the Alexandrian church that it seems to have differed from that of his enemies in degree rather than in kind. His real distinction lay in his imperial access. He was later to be accused of slandering the city to the emperor,³⁰⁷ and it was even said that the governor was more afraid of him than of Constantius.³⁰⁸ Others, indeed, claimed he was more comfortable with a magistrate's *fascēs* than a priest's robes.³⁰⁹ The result,

³⁰¹ This is the best way to read the popular reaction to George's excavations at the site of the Caesareum, which he was turning into a church. For some purposes his 'parishioners' were willing to ignore his uncertain legitimacy and co-operate—in this instance by parading pagan cult objects around the city, Soc. HE 3. 2. 6 (GCS 193. 21-4), Soz., HE 5. 7. 5-7 (GCS 202. 20-5).

³⁰² Hist. Aceph. 2. 1. 1-4. 34 (SC 317. 144-6), Soz. HE 4. 10. 8-11 (GCS 151. 16-152. 10), etc.

³⁰³ Soz., HE 4. 4. 1, 30. 1 (GCS 142. 4-5, 187. 9-10).

³⁰⁴ Epiph., Haer. 76. 1. 5 (GCS 3. 341. 12-15).

³⁰⁵ Hist. Aceph. 2. 2. 6-13 (SC 317. 144-6).

³⁰⁶ Soc., HE 2. 45. 16-17 (GCS 184. 19-22), Soz., HE 4. 10. 9 (GCS 151. 22-152. 3), Thdt., HE 2. 14. 1-3 (GCS 125. 1-13).

³⁰⁷ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 11. 5, Soz., HE 4. 10. 12 (GCS 152. 12-13).

³⁰⁸ Julian Imp., Ep. 21 (379B/C) = Soc., HE 3. 3. 12 (GCS 195. 10-12).

³⁰⁹ Ruf., HE 10. 24 (GCS II. ii. 989. 5-7) 'magis sibi iuris dicendi creditos fascēs quam sacerdotium ministrandum religiosiis officiis'.

however, was that he managed to alienate almost every segment of his society;³¹⁰ the moment imperial vigilance was removed, George was lynched. In 357 that was still some years in the future, but doubtless Ammianus Marcellinus was correct to remark that, while it was the pagans who actually hanged the bishop, it was the Christians who refused to rescue him who were really responsible.³¹¹ For Philostorgius all this was a direct result of his reluctance to support Aetius.³¹²

If so the latter was not there to rejoice in justice served; he was long gone. It is possible he left in the fall of 358 when George himself was forced to flee, but it is more likely that what took him back to Antioch was the news of Leontius' death in late 357.³¹³ A number of people had also arrived to take advantage of the situation, including a new would-be bishop, Eudoxius. It is Aetius' behaviour at his table that the young Theodore of Mopsuestia describes with such gusto.

In point of fact, neither Aetius nor his secretary are likely to have been very comfortable there, for they were indeed in a 'slippery place'. The volatile combination of a court appointment and pronounced theological opinions had already brought them enough notoriety to create both problems and opportunities. They had managed to evade the chief negative consequence of 'access'—association with the losing side—but they had also acquired a fixed place in the mind of a notoriously unpredictable and suspicious emperor. They might, like Hilary, hope to keep the emperor faithful to 'the teaching of the apostles', but they would not be able to achieve this without accepting at least some of his tactical goals. As we shall see, it was not a prospect likely to allow a 'precisianist' to sleep in peace.

³¹⁰ Soc., *HE* 3. 3. 3. (*GCS* 194. 13–15).

³¹¹ See Ch. 3 n. 9 above.

³¹² Philost., *HE* 7. 2 (*GCS* 77. 4–7).

³¹³ See Opitz ii. 68, Ath., *Fug.* 1. 1, note ad loc.

Prelate

The Emperor Constantius of tradition is almost always a doctrinaire bully, a committed 'Arian' unalterably opposed to Nicaea. But while it is certainly true that he was the only one of Constantine's sons to show real interest in theology,¹ the imperial 'Arian' of the historians is largely an echo of his last and most negative portraits in the pages of Athanasius and Hilary. In their eyes he was nothing less than a latter-day Nero or Decius.² Undoubtedly easily swayed and suspicious,³ his successive positions as ruler very often mirror a general perplexity,⁴ and still more frequently the needs of a practical politician. Then again, there was unquestionably a personal element in his twenty-five-year feud with Athanasius. Still, though he had no compunction about harrying 'Nicones', there is little to suggest the fanatic of legend. Hilary himself went so far as to call him *bonus ac religiosus*, and on at least one occasion did not think it wasted effort to address him as 'most pious emperor'.⁵ Even if this indicates no more than a good grasp of court style, it is not something that would have moved a real Nero or Decius.⁶ More telling still on a public level was the popular reaction to Athanasius' third deposition: the Alexandrians are portrayed as asking one another whether

¹ See the rather jaundiced assessment in Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 16. 18.

² Cf. Hilary, *Const.* 4. 4-5, 7. 1-5, 8. 1-2, 11. 16-17 (*SC* 334. 174, 180, 182, 190).

³ Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 16. 16.

⁴ They are effectively if anachronistically summarized by Sozomen in *HE* 3. 18. 1-2 (*GCS* 132. 6-14).

⁵ Hilary, *Lib. Const.* 1. 1-2 (*CSEL* 65. 196. 5, 11).

⁶ As Liberius of Rome hoped it would in his abject and embarrassing letters to the emperor from exile, Hilary, *Fr. Hist.* A. 6. 1-7. 6. 2 (*CSEL* 65. 89-93).

however, was that he managed to alienate almost every segment of his society;³¹⁰ the moment imperial vigilance was removed, George was lynched. In 357 that was still some years in the future, but doubtless Ammianus Marcellinus was correct to remark that, while it was the pagans who actually hanged the bishop, it was the Christians who refused to rescue him who were really responsible.³¹¹ For Philostorgius all this was a direct result of his reluctance to support Aetius.³¹²

If so the latter was not there to rejoice in justice served; he was long gone. It is possible he left in the fall of 358 when George himself was forced to flee, but it is more likely that what took him back to Antioch was the news of Leontius' death in late 357.³¹³ A number of people had also arrived to take advantage of the situation, including a new would-be bishop, Eudoxius. It is Aetius' behaviour at his table that the young Theodore of Mopsuestia describes with such gusto.

In point of fact, neither Aetius nor his secretary are likely to have been very comfortable there, for they were indeed in a 'slippery place'. The volatile combination of a court appointment and pronounced theological opinions had already brought them enough notoriety to create both problems and opportunities. They had managed to evade the chief negative consequence of 'access'—association with the losing side—but they had also acquired a fixed place in the mind of a notoriously unpredictable and suspicious emperor. They might, like Hilary, hope to keep the emperor faithful to 'the teaching of the apostles', but they would not be able to achieve this without accepting at least some of his tactical goals. As we shall see, it was not a prospect likely to allow a 'precisianist' to sleep in peace.

³¹⁰ Soc., *HE* 3. 3. 3. (*GCS* 194. 13–15).

³¹¹ See Ch. 3 n. 9 above.

³¹² Philost., *HE* 7. 2 (*GCS* 77. 4–7).

³¹³ See Opitz ii. 68, *Ath.*, *Fug.* 1. 1, note ad loc.

Prelate

The Emperor Constantius of tradition is almost always a doctrinaire bully, a committed 'Arian' unalterably opposed to Nicaea. But while it is certainly true that he was the only one of Constantine's sons to show real interest in theology,¹ the imperial 'Arian' of the historians is largely an echo of his last and most negative portraits in the pages of Athanasius and Hilary. In their eyes he was nothing less than a latter-day Nero or Decius.² Undoubtedly easily swayed and suspicious,³ his successive positions as ruler very often mirror a general perplexity,⁴ and still more frequently the needs of a practical politician. Then again, there was unquestionably a personal element in his twenty-five-year feud with Athanasius. Still, though he had no compunction about harrying 'Nicones', there is little to suggest the fanatic of legend. Hilary himself went so far as to call him *bonus ac religiosus*, and on at least one occasion did not think it wasted effort to address him as 'most pious emperor'.⁵ Even if this indicates no more than a good grasp of court style, it is not something that would have moved a real Nero or Decius.⁶ More telling still on a public level was the popular reaction to Athanasius' third deposition: the Alexandrians are portrayed as asking one another whether

¹ See the rather jaundiced assessment in Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 16. 18.

² Cf. Hilary, *Const.* 4. 4-5, 7. 1-5, 8. 1-2, 11. 16-17 (*SC* 334. 174, 180, 182, 190).

³ Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 16. 16.

⁴ They are effectively if anachronistically summarized by Sozomen in *HE* 3. 18. 1-2 (*GCS* 132. 6-14).

⁵ Hilary, *Lib. Const.* 1. 1-2 (*CSEL* 65. 196. 5, 11).

⁶ As Liberius of Rome hoped it would in his abject and embarrassing letters to the emperor from exile, Hilary, *Fr. Hist. A.* 6. 1-7. 6. 2 (*CSEL* 65. 89-93).

'Constantius too had become a heretic?'⁷ Such spontaneous incredulity is a reminder that, while at this point there were undoubtedly two streams of theology, there were as yet only just beginning to be two theological parties.

The verjuice that sped their separation was, as we have seen, the rejuvenation of the Nicene formula in the late 340s, and the concomitant attempts to find an alternative based on 'similarity'. *Homoiousios* and *anomoios* both reflect this. But the emperor's difficulties were not just theological. For one of the results of his father's enthusiasm for Christianity was the need to co-opt a pre-existing system of power relationships which was often parallel to and originally independent of the state. As a matter of pure politics, then, the emperor *had* to maintain control of this very large, very wealthy, semi-independent organization which defined allegiance in ideological terms. Constantius already had reason to know the difficulty of this in the fractious East, but his difficulties were compounded by increasing control of the theologically and culturally alien West.

Not surprisingly, his solutions reflected those of his father, in that he tried to make use of the existing system of Church councils. Indeed, his enthusiasm for the latter was so great that he moved several writers to issue treatises *de synodis* just to put the proper Nicene 'spin' on them. But it is still worth asking whether 'all councils are created equal' and what exactly the emperor hoped to gain by any of them. For with one exception none of them could really be considered 'ecumenical' (to the extent that there was such a category), and none of them tried to address the Christian community as a whole—rather, they were aimed at its leadership. Naturally, from a political point of view that was completely understandable. The leaders in question controlled enormous quantities of very valuable real estate and a great deal of disposable wealth—differences among them had a very real and very secular 'domino' effect which any emperor ignored at his peril. Then too, in a world without police or mass media, the bishop was often a necessary link between the *honestiores* directly amenable to imperial pressure, and the less identifiable masses who were prepared to riot on one side or the other. No matter what his personal convictions, then,

⁷ See Ch. 3 n. 203 above.

Constantius was required to find some means of at least officially reconciling these people.

That of course raises the question of what we mean by 'official' reconciliation. For to judge only from the results, these councils were not so much intended to define the faith *per se* as *quo ad*—that is, with certain very definite people and certain very definite policy goals in mind.⁸ This effort was by no means either venal or ignoble (indeed, under the circumstances it was essential), but it was undoubtedly derivative. Its purpose, after all, was to give a political answer to questions whose parameters were already determined by a pre-existing combination of people and events. But the purpose of theological formulae in such a context is not 'to inflame the imagination' or 'pierce the heart'; rather, it is to establish boundaries for those that do. This can be seen in the way these formulae were used in actual practice. Once adopted, their purpose was not to specify any particular 'realization' (though they might exclude several), but to enable individual bishops to establish communion with one another and, when at home, determine what they might (or might not) say in public. There is nothing to indicate that any bishop was ever required to introduce one of these formulae into a baptismal creed or to change the local liturgy to accommodate it—on the contrary, by and large it determined what he could *not* say in explaining them. If the emperor's aim was domestic tranquillity, he had no need 'to make windows into men's souls'.

Had he lived, it might just have worked! As it was, dying at the age of 45,⁹ there was no time for longevity to overcome the defects of policy. For defects there undoubtedly were. Even if we take it for granted that Constantius wrote off the two extremes (those who, like Aetius and Eunomius at one end, or Athanasius and Marcellus at the other, might insist on an awkward *akribeia*), he still had to appeal across a remarkably broad spectrum of opinion without being too clear about the basis for that appeal. To succeed, then, his policy had to come

⁸ Cf. Jerome's comments on the imperial zeal for 'unity' in *Lucif.* 17 (*PL* 23. 170B-C).

⁹ Soc., *HE* 2. 47. 6 (*GCS* 186. 17), Soz., *HE* 5. 1. 6 (*GCS* 189. 14-15); Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 15. 3 gives it with more precision as 'anno quadregesimo (quarto) et mensibus paucis'.

up with formulae capable of being rationalized by people using very different interpretative frameworks. A famous incident is a case in point. The confessor Hosius—the original ‘Nicene’ if there was one—signed one of Constantius’ formulae. He was then allowed to go home in peace,¹⁰ while, as the Nicenes said, the ‘Arians’ used his name like a battering ram.¹¹ His Nicene confrères went to considerable lengths to excuse him,¹² but the fact is, he *did* sign. Fifty years earlier, when brought before the pagan emperor Maximian, he had had a clear choice and he refused; it was precisely because Constantius did not leave him that choice that he acquiesced. For one thing, once he returned home the practical effects were not very great—he was limited in what he could say in public, and he had sometimes to admit people whom he did not entirely trust into communion, but he was not obliged to make any explicit change in the framework on the basis of which he decided to acquiesce.¹³ Thus, when successful the emperor’s policy did indeed allow persons using very different theological frameworks to live together peaceably—unfortunately, it was on the basis of a *modus vivendi*, not a synthesis.

In previous chapters we raised the issue of classification, and Constantius’ strategy raises it yet again. For to insist on a public reconciliation raises the question of what we mean by ‘party’. At least since the nineteenth century it has been common to describe the bishops who acquiesced in Constantius’ compromise as ‘Homoeans’, as members of a specifically ‘homoean’ party—primarily because they signed formulae which almost all contained some variation of the word *homoios*, ‘similar’. On one level, this seems straightforward enough, but the obvious utility of the term makes it easy to forget that neither Nicene nor non-Nicene ever used it. In a famously pungent phrase St Jerome reminds us of this—he acknowledges an imperial success by speaking of a world astonished to find itself

¹⁰ After a full year! Ath., *H. Ar.* 45. 4 (Opitz ii. 209. 20–3).

¹¹ Phoebad., *Ar.* 23 (*PL* 20. 30B): ‘quasi quemdam in nos arietem’, cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 3, 3b (*GCS* 60. 2–7, 32–5).

¹² Ath., *Fug.* 5. 3 (Opitz ii. 71. 14–18), *H. Ar.* 42. 1–45. 5 (Opitz ii. 206. 19–209. 29); Phoebad., *Ar.* 23 (*PL* 20. 30B–D); Soc., *HE* 2. 31. 2–4 (*GCS* 147. 5–12), Soz., *HE* 4. 6. 13, cf. 12. 6–7 (*GCS* 145. 14–15, cf. 155. 7–14).

¹³ According to Ath., *H. Ar.* 45. 5 (Opitz ii. 209. 27–9) he repented on his death-bed.

'Arian'.¹⁴ In point of fact, however, it was nothing of the kind. Large numbers of bishops did indeed sign a particular formula—'anomoeans' as well as 'homoiousians', conservatives as well as Nicenes—but their very diversity points to a tactical rather than strategic success. Hosius, after all, was not the only one who felt coerced—Eunomius too had to stretch. The problem in fact was inherent: success in such a context is only possible because the mediating formulae do not define the grounds on which they are to be accepted. Positively, then, this allows people from very different theological backgrounds to use them while keeping their own interpretative frameworks intact; negatively, the 'unity' which results is not based on any one framework as such, but only articulates what might not be said in explaining it. This cautious juxtaposition of elements can only be called a 'party' in a very limited sense; for, as Jerome himself implies, almost all these so-called 'Arians' were in fact sheep in wolves' clothing. True, they signed, but the frameworks that enabled them to do so were bent, not changed by the process. The source of this 'party's' identity, then, was the extremes it was designed to exclude. The many halted between the Scylla of *homoousios* and the Charybdis of 'Arianism' thus found they could indeed participate, but only by becoming components in an emulsion, not elements in a solution. Without something further to 'inflame the imagination' or 'pierce the heart', this would be a party some might indeed suffer to reject, but for which no one, perhaps, would be willing to die to see live.¹⁵

The procedural parallels between all this and Constantine's efforts thirty years before were by no means accidental:¹⁶ Constantius had chosen to go back to square one. But if the emperor hoped to follow his father's example in using a single formula to define the parameters of a limited public debate, he found the situation considerably changed. The decades of debate which followed Nicaea meant that one of the things that had been almost incidental to the original settlement was now

¹⁴ Hieron., *Lucif.* 19 (*PL* 23. 172C).

¹⁵ It is more proper to speak of the solution than the people as 'homoean'.

¹⁶ The story then current that Constantius acted at Constantine's behest may be a bit of imperial propaganda circulated to underscore this point, Soz., *HE* 3. 19. 5 (*GCS* 133. 14-18).

essential to the new—the need to ignore the interpretative frameworks. We can get a sense of why by looking back at some of the events that made such an approach a necessity, in other words, by examining its ‘prehistory’.

In 351, when we last saw Eustathius and Basil in Antioch, they were in such a rush that they were unable to stay around to be sure that Gallus punished Aetius. The reason, however, was that they needed to return for a council. The emperor, after a notable military success in September of that same year, had returned to Sirmium and was now free to address matters ecclesiastical; he therefore summoned a council. But while the bishops who attended the council were almost all eastern,¹⁷ their focus for once was not Arius, but a local, western bishop, now deposed, Photinus. This bishop, like his teacher Marcellus of Ancyra, was accused of modalism. He was known for a glib tongue,¹⁸ and his earlier defeat at the hands of Basil does not seem to have much daunted him for he was now ready to try once again. The council’s outcome may not have been in doubt, but its detailed format is interesting none the less. Following the example of the eastern minority at Serdica and the authors of the so-called ‘Macrostich’, these bishops began with the so-called ‘fourth’ Creed of Antioch.¹⁹ The latter had already signified one change in the controversy’s focus, an increasingly Trinitarian orientation;²⁰ and it was now adjusted once more to serve a new purpose, by adding a detailed series of anathemas.²¹ A few of these are directed at the Nicene caricature of ‘Arianism’,²² and still others at the ‘Arian’ portrait of

¹⁷ Socrates and Sozomen confuse this council with a later gathering at the same site, so their lists are suspect, to say the least. Though Socrates, *HE* 2. 29. 3 (*GCS* 144. 8–145. 12), followed by Soz., *HE* 4. 6. 6–12 (*GCS* 144. 8–145. 12), tells us that Hosius was present, as well as Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius, his list is probably at least partly that of 357. However, since the order of the documents is clear even where the historical details are not, in what follows we will concentrate on the former.

¹⁸ Epiph., *Haer.* 71. 1. 4 (*GCS* iii. 250. 3–5).

¹⁹ Athanasius treats it as a mere revision of the latter, *Syn.* 27. 1 (Opitz ii. 254. 14–16).

²⁰ Visible here in anathemas 19–23, *Symb. Sirm.* 1 *anath.* (Hahn, § 160, pp. 198–9); cf. Ch. 3, pp. 70–2 above.

²¹ Twenty-seven in all, *ibid.* (Hahn, § 160, pp. 197–9). In what follows references are to individual anathemas on these pages.

²² Numbers 1, 2, 23, 24. Gwatkin, 146–7, is surely wrong to see in

Nicaea;²³ but understandably, the majority are directed against Photinus. But since for Photinus the Christ only became a distinct, living, conscious being in the womb of the Virgin Mary, much of the discussion centres around the role of the pre-incarnate Logos in the drama of salvation. The bishops place particular emphasis on the fact that the actors in this drama are numerically distinct in the Old Testament theophanies.²⁴ For as against Photinus, this was something on which almost everyone could agree.²⁵ The non-Nicenes might be convinced that Nicene doctrine meant the same thing,²⁶ and Athanasius might grouse about frivolous doctrinal changes,²⁷ but their mutual antagonism was rooted in good deal of common ground. *Vis-à-vis* modalism, at any rate, there was some possibility of agreement.²⁸

After the council, however, Basil and Eustathius returned to the East,²⁹ and this gave others an opportunity to influence the

anathemas 12 and 13 'a direct denial of the Arian theory of the Incarnation'. These anathemas deny that the Logos was changed into flesh or that in his Godhead he suffered *φθοράν*. But neither of these was the non-Nicene position.

²³ Numbers 25, 26. Non-Nicene complaints about two *ἀγέννητα* are a continuing feature of their polemic, and equally a caricature, e.g. Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 3 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 16. 1), cf. Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 4 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 13. 12), *Const. App.* 6. 10. 10 (SC 329. 322), etc.

²⁴ Anathemas 14–18, p. 198.

²⁵ Positively on this issue Nicene and non-Nicene could often sound remarkably alike (cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 6. 3 (GCS 143. 22–4)). Where they differed was in the individuals to be included in the heresiological *damnatio memoriae*. Thus Chrys., *Hom. 2 in Heb.* 2 (PG 63. 22A), Thdt., *Trin.* 28 (PG 75. 1188C), Eunomius, *Apol.* 6. 12–13 (Vaggione 38) linked Photinus with Sabellius and Marcellus, while others included Paul of Samosata (Chrys., *Hom. 8 in Heb.* 4 (PG 63. 73D)). In a document published by Athanasius, Marcellus is pointedly omitted, *Tom.* 11 (PG 26. 809C).

²⁶ e.g. Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 557. 34–40 (SC 237. 298).

²⁷ Ath., *Syn.* 27. 1 (Opitz ii. 254. 13–16). Athanasius' opinion may have been influenced by the fact that he was condemned by the council himself! For the evidence, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, 109–10.

²⁸ Nicenes complained that Constantius' subsequent policies reversed his good work here (Hilary, *Const.* 23. 18–25 (SC 334. 214), cf. Ath., *Syn.* 28. 1 (Opitz ii. 256. 23–4)), but in fact the existence of a broadly based consensus on modalism was one of the things that made his subsequent efforts possible.

²⁹ It is not clear just when this happened. It may have been when the emperor left for Italy the year after Sirmium (since it is not clear that Marcellus had actually returned to his see), or it may have been during the general upheavals attendant upon the expulsion of Athanasius in 356. At any

court. A few years later, with Gallus dead and his brother established as Caesar in Gaul, the emperor too was free to return. In the fall of 357, after a unique visit to Rome, Constantius went into winter quarters at Sirmium and prepared for a campaign in the spring.³⁰ Athanasius was in hiding, the pope was in exile, and the West was pacified; Constantius could once again turn his mind to religion. Step one was in effect a 'trial balloon'. Not long after (and presumably with the emperor's permission³¹), a small group of bishops met at court³² and issued the manifesto known traditionally as 'the Blasphemy of Sirmium'.³³ Though it is reputed to be the work of Hosius of Cordoba and Potamius of Lisbon,³⁴ its real authors appear to have been Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius.³⁵ The aged Hosius doubtless supplied no more than a signature, but his presence is important nevertheless. For without necessarily accepting all of Athanasius' sinister implications,³⁶ it is difficult to see this as anything other than a call for a new beginning. For the substance of the document was quite simply a proposal to redo the work of the preceding thirty years and eliminate substance-language altogether—not only were *homoousios* and *homoiousios*³⁷ to be

rate, it is clear enough that after the latter date neither Basil nor Eustathius were still at court.

³⁰ Ammianus Marcellinus 17. 12. 1.

³¹ Constantius was undoubtedly responsible for the presence of Hosius, Ath., *H. Ar.* 43. 1 ff. (Opitz ii. 207. 3–5 ff.), but there is nothing to show that he actually attended the meeting. Indeed, it was in his interest not to do so, since this allowed some 'deniability'. Absence allowed him to assess the reaction from a distance, and then intervene without risking his own prestige. Indeed, by allowing the most radical solution to appear in other mouths at the beginning, he made any later proposals of his own seem mild by comparison, and therefore perhaps palatable.

³² Barnes, *Athanasius*, 232 is surely correct to doubt that this was a council in any formal sense. It seems more like an adumbration of the 'Home Synod' of later centuries.

³³ The phrase itself appears to be Hilary's, e.g. *Syn.* 11 (*PL* 10. 487A).

³⁴ Hilary calls it a 'deliramenta Osii' in *Const.* 23. 28 (*SC* 334. 214), cf. *Syn.*, 11 (*PL* 10. 487A).

³⁵ Phoebad., *Ar.* 3 (*PL* 20. 15B), cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 12. 6–7 (*GCS* 155. 7–14).

³⁶ e.g. Ath., *H. Ar.* 45. 1–5 (Opitz ii. 209. 5–29). Athanasius makes the assumption that to use anything other than *homoousios* is to affirm Arius. Not everyone, however, who was willing to do the former was necessarily prepared to do the latter.

³⁷ Pace T. Barnes, *Athanasius*, 139, 281 n. 26, there is no real reason to

eliminated, the word 'usia' itself was to be expunged.³⁸ That was indeed a radical proposal, but interestingly enough, though *homoousios* as a kind of linguistic *peccatum Adae* was clearly a target, it was side-stepped rather than rejected.³⁹ Even that, of course, was a change—until recently, it had been ignored. What made that impossible to do any longer was its growing popular acceptance. For between the missionary efforts of Athanasius and the debates of Basil and Aetius there were now 'many' who were 'disturbed' by it.⁴⁰ *Ousia* had left the realm of the *periti* and begun to enter the 'psalmody' of the streets.⁴¹

Inevitably, the emperor's 'trial balloon' provoked a response. Nicenes were particularly disturbed by the defection of Hosius. But while Hilary denounced the whole thing as a 'compulsory ignorance act',⁴² and others pointed out that no theologian, however venerable, could overrule the Councils of Nicaea and Serdica,⁴³ the 'Blasphemy' did succeed in changing the terms of the debate. For the rest of the decade substance-language was the issue. Moreover, not everyone was alarmed by its abolition. Among those who were not was the newly elected bishop of Antioch.

Leontius had died at last, and his initial replacement was exactly the kind of 'court bishop' Aetius aspired to be. This was Eudoxius bishop of Germanicia, a 'Lucianist'⁴⁴ noted for doubt the reading 'homoeousion' here. Athanasius had been speaking of the Son as ὁμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν as early as the 340s, e.g. *Ar.* 1. 20 (*PG* 26. 53A), and there seems no reason to doubt that the shorter form was also in use, even before its appearance in a conciliar format.

³⁸ *Symb. Sirm.* 2 (Hahn, § 161, p. 200): 'Quod vero quosdam aut multos movebant de substantia, quae Graece usia appellatur, id est, ut expressius intellegatur, homousion, aut quod dicitur homoeousion, nulla omnino fieri oportere mentionem. . .'

³⁹ In two later incarnations, *Symb. Sirm.* 3 (Hahn, § 163, p. 205), *Symb. Nic.* (359) (Hahn, § 164, p. 206), it was made clear that these words were introduced 'in all simplicity' (διὰ τὸ ἀπλούστερον).

⁴⁰ *Symb. Sirm.* 2 (Hahn, § 161, p. 200): 'multos'.

⁴¹ As the bishops at two other councils a year later made clear, the 'many' in question were the λαὼν who could not understand the terms and were thereby scandalized, *Symb. Sirm.* 3 (Hahn, § 163, p. 205), *Symb. Nic.* (359) (Hahn, § 164, p. 206).

⁴² 'Hoc ignorantiae decretum', Hilary, *Syn.* 10 (*PL* 10. 486C), as cleverly translated by E. W. Watson in *LNPF*, 2nd ser. 9. 6b.

⁴³ Phoebad., *Ar.* 23 (*PL* 20. 30B-C).

⁴⁴ Philost., *HE* 2. 14 (*GCS* 25. 14).

eloquence⁴⁵ and, like Basil of Ancyra himself, an imperial favourite.⁴⁶ Relying on friends at court,⁴⁷ this ambitious prelate had managed to get himself elected without feeling the need to consult any of the other Syrian bishops. Their enduring enmity⁴⁸ was not much lessened by the fact that, with the encouragement of a now returned Aetius,⁴⁹ Eudoxius called a local council (which included Acacius of Caesarea) and strongly supported the 'Blasphemy'.⁵⁰ If he thought this would ingratiate him with Constantius, he failed to take one thing into account—that he was not the only one who could call a council. Basil summoned one as well.

Philostorgius claims that he did this because he was interested in Antioch himself,⁵¹ but there was plenty to justify rivalry between the two men without any special provocation. Basil's council met early in the new year to dedicate one of Ancyra's churches,⁵² and was greeted almost immediately by a letter from George of Laodicea (a bishop *not* consulted by Eudoxius) attacking both Aetius and Eudoxius.⁵³ The letter made the general claim that if nothing were done the whole city would suffer shipwreck;⁵⁴ but its most specific charge was that Eudoxius was 'stacking' the clergy with his own partisans, Aetius chief among them.⁵⁵ Eunomius too was ordained to the

⁴⁵ Soz., *HE* 3. 14. 42 (*GCS* 125. 18).

⁴⁶ Thdt., *HE* 2. 25. 4 (*GCS* 156. 12–13), cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 9).

⁴⁷ Imperial *cubicularii*, Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 9 (*GCS* 153. 10–11), Soz., *HE* 4. 12. 4 (*GCS* 154. 30–1).

⁴⁸ Soz., *HE* 4. 12. 4 (*GCS* 154. 26–9). Philost., *HE* 4. 4 (*GCS* 60. 12–15), says he was urged on by his *ἀμώδοξοι* (Aetius and company?).

⁴⁹ Who remained canonically, however, a deacon of Alexandria rather than Antioch. Eudoxius tried to have him restored, but did not succeed, Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 10–11 (*GCS* 153. 12–16). Some years later a letter addressed to George of Alexandria by the Council of Constantinople referred to Aetius as 'his' deacon, Thdt., *HE* 2. 28. 1 (*GCS* 163. 2). ⁵⁰ Soz., *HE* 4. 12. 5–7 (*GCS* 155. 3–14).

⁵¹ Philost., *HE* 4. 6 (*GCS* 61. 6–8).

⁵² Concilia, C. Anc. (358), *Ep. Syn.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 2. 1 (*GCS* iii. 268. 30–1).

⁵³ For the text of the letter, see Soz., *HE* 4. 13. 2–3 (*GCS* 155. 21–156. 4). George and Basil give representative selections of Aetius' teaching, conveniently excerpted in Kopecek i. 184–6.

⁵⁴ Doubtless referring to Eudoxius' wholesale excommunication of his opponents, Soz., *HE* 4. 13. 1 (*GCS* 155. 15–16), cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 25. 2 (*GCS* 156. 2–5).

⁵⁵ Though George's primary complaint was about Aetius, the latter was not,

diaconate not long after, though for somewhat different reasons (see below). Significantly, he insisted on knowing his bishop's 'precise' theology before acceding to this.⁵⁶ Eudoxius after all, like Asterius the Sophist, was associated with that branch of the Lucianic school which taught the *κατ' οὐσίαν ὅμοιον*;⁵⁷ even if he and Eunomius could be sure they shared the same hermeneutical framework, they would be a good deal less likely to agree that *ἐτεροούσιος* was necessary to defend it. Characteristically, Eunomius felt obliged to be sure.⁵⁸

In the last chapter, we looked at Basil of Ancyra's doctrinal teaching.⁵⁹ His council's political ramifications, however, were almost as great as the theological ones. For one thing, as an experienced courtier, he saw no reason to rely solely on ecclesiastical censure, and set out immediately for court, taking with him at least one imperial chaplain.⁶⁰ As luck would have it, he arrived just *before* a delegation from Eudoxius was due to leave, bearing with it a confirmatory rescript.⁶¹ With the help of some influential women,⁶² Basil managed to get emergency access to the emperor. Thus, before the others could depart he not only got their rescript rescinded, but had the emperor issue a new one reversing it. The emperor now claimed he never had any intention of making Eudoxius bishop of Antioch, and laid all the blame on Aetius.⁶³ But interestingly, in the ensuing denouement, while Eudoxius was charged with an ecclesiastical offence (and sent home under house arrest to Armenia), the charges against Theophilus and Aetius were political—they were accused of complicity in the Gallus affair and exiled. Not long after, Eunomius (who had been ordained deacon and sent on a last-ditch embassy to Constantius) was

pace T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius*, 139, ordained priest about this time as he is still described as a 'deacon' a year later (see n. 49 above). The author made the same mistake in Vaggione, *Monks*, 182.

⁵⁶ Philost., *HE* 4. 5 (GCS 61. 3–5).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 4. 4 (GCS 60. 14–16).

⁵⁸ For the probable shape of their agreement, see Ch. 7, pp. 283–4 below.

⁵⁹ Ch. 5, pp. 161–3 above.

⁶⁰ Soz., *HE* 4. 13. 5 (GCS 156. 10–13): the priest was ἐκ θαλαμηπόλου βασιλικού.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 4. 13. 6 (GCS 156. 13–18).

⁶² Philost., *HE* 4. 8 (GCS 62. 5–7).

⁶³ For the text of the letter, see Soz., *HE* 4. 14. 1–7 (GCS 156. 19–157. 28).

also arrested and exiled along with about seventy others.⁶⁴ In the mean time, two of Basil's other episcopal supporters,⁶⁵ Macedonius of Constantinople and Eleusius of Cyzicus, made strenuous (and violent) efforts to gain possession of the churches in their jurisdiction, trying to induce bishops and other religious professionals there to enter into communion with them by force.⁶⁶

By allowing this rampage Constantius thus redressed the political balance and successfully chastened a presumptuous court faction, but he did not resolve either his theological or his political difficulties. He recalled the exiles soon enough in any case,⁶⁷ and even the victorious Basil knew he had to tread carefully—in public he might describe the Son as 'similar' to the Father 'in all respects' (*ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα*), but he scrupulously avoided the forbidden words.⁶⁸ Still, while the 'Blasphemy' had indeed generated some positive response, the majority reaction was negative. The reason was not that supporters of substance-language were especially interested in the philosophical issues,⁶⁹ but rather that they prized its role in the analogy of birth.⁷⁰ If Constantius hoped to achieve a lasting solution, he would have

⁶⁴ Philost., *HE* 4. 8 (*GCS* 61. 17–62. 10, 15–24). It is not impossible that the reason for Eunomius' elevation was that everyone else more senior had been arrested.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 4. 9 (*GCS* 62. 25–30).

⁶⁶ Soc., *HE* 2. 38. 1–43 (*GCS* 163. 24–168. 20) is particularly insistent on the use of violence and torture to seize churches (especially those of the Novatians) and to compel the reception of communion. Some of this violence appears to have been directed against ordinary folk (women and children kidnapped and required to be baptized, *HE* 2. 38. 8 (*GCS* 164. 20–165. 1), but the specific instances of violence seem to be primarily against ascetics and other religious professionals who, like Auxanon, were not ordained but leading a dedicated life (*HE* 2. 38. 11–14 (*GCS* 165. 8–20)). Another of Macedonius' supporters it may be noted, Marathionius of Nicomedia, was a zealous founder of monastic institutions (*HE* 2. 38. 4 (*GCS* 164. 6–7)) and 'Macedonian' religious are later mentioned in the vicinity of Constantinople, Ruf., *HE* 10. 26 (*GCS* II. ii. 990. 14–17). As with George and Athanasius, some of these efforts involved the (unofficial?) use of imperial troops, Soc., *HE* 2. 38. 20–31 (*GCS* 167. 6–16).

⁶⁷ Philost., *HE* 4. 10 (*GCS* 63. 1–5).

⁶⁸ Ibid. 4. 8 (*GCS* 62. 10–15). Basil, of course, was saying in code what he could not say directly; for *κατὰ πάντα* could be taken to exclude any partial similarity, cf. Germinius, *Ep. Ruf.* 1. 6 (*CSEL* 65. 162. 24–7) and n. 88 below.

⁶⁹ As wisely observed by Hieron., *Lucif.* 18 (*PL* 23. 171A/B), cf. Phoebad., *Ar.* 8 (*PL* 20. 18C).

⁷⁰ e.g. Phoebad., *Ar.* 2 (*PL* 20. 14C), Hilary, *Syn.* 71 (*PL* 10. 527B).

to address that issue. Tactically his response was to summon an 'ecumenical' council.

In the planning stages, at least, a united council was considered and a number of locations were suggested, including Nicaea itself.⁷¹ In the end, however, it was decided that East and West should meet separately.⁷² The western bishops were to gather at Ariminum, below Ravenna on the Adriatic coast, and the eastern bishops at Nicomedia in Bithynia.⁷³ Very tragically, however, on the morning of 24 August,⁷⁴ not long before the latter were due to convene, there was a severe earthquake in Bithynia followed by a fire and tidal-wave, and this devastated Nicomedia and all the surrounding countryside. Most of the bishops were still *en route*,⁷⁵ but the few who had already arrived were killed.⁷⁶ Theological explanations of that event tended to mirror the concerns of the narrator,⁷⁷ but it was soon apparent that in spite of the tragedy the council would have to

⁷¹ There is considerable confusion in the sources as to the government's original intent, doubtless representing some of the divisions at court. The western bishops met in July, and it is claimed that originally the eastern bishops were to meet with them, Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 1 (*GCS* 152. 13-16). Others, however (including Eudoxius, according to Thdt., *HE* 2. 26. 1 (*GCS* 156. 16-18)), proposed Nicaea, and so a decree to that effect was issued (note the *δεύτερον πρόσταγμα* in Ath., *Syn.* 1. 2 (Opitz ii. 231. 8-11)). But as Basil of Ancyra objected strenuously to this (Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 1-2, but cf. 16. 15 (*GCS* 159. 1-3, cf. 161. 10-16)), while Eudoxius and Aetius objected to Tarsus (Philost., *HE* 4. 11 (*GCS* 63. 19-21), cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 4 (*GCS* 169. 5-7)), and presumably also Ancyra (Hilary, *Syn.* 8 (*PL* 10. 485B)), the council ended up, first at Nicomedia, then Seleucia.

⁷² Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 22 (*GCS* 162. 20-5) claims that the idea of dividing the council came from Eudoxius through the eunuch Eusebius, and that the idea was to make the bishops easier to control.

⁷³ The city was thought to compare favourably with Rome itself, Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 9. 3.

⁷⁴ So Ammianus Marcellinus 17. 7. 2, who gives many details and the date '9th of the Kalends of September'; Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 3 (*GCS* 169. 3-4), cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 4 (*GCS* 159. 19) has 'about August 28th'.

⁷⁵ Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 3 (*GCS* 159. 8-12).

⁷⁶ The ecclesiastical casualties are variously estimated. Philost., *HE* 4. 10 (*GCS* 63. 11-13) claims fifteen plus Cecropius, the diocesan; Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 5 (*GCS* 159. 20-1) says only the latter plus one other.

⁷⁷ For Theodoret, *HE* 2. 26. 3 (*GCS* 156. 23-157. 3) divine providence was trying to prevent any confusion with Nicaea; Philostorgius, on the other hand, *HE* 4. 10 (*GCS* 63. 9-13), thought it was divine wrath on upholders of the *homoousion*!

proceed. Some of the participants had indeed returned home,⁷⁸ but a new decree was soon issued ordering them to assemble in a less devastated region, this time one without urban distractions.⁷⁹ The bishops were now to meet in an Isaurian city caustically described by Athanasius as 'Seleucia the rugged'.⁸⁰

Constantius did not intend that either section of the council should lack for guidance. Earlier in the same year he had summoned a 'steering committee' to meet at court and draw up what was essentially a draft agreement.⁸¹ Because it described itself as 'the Catholic Faith' promulgated on the eleventh before the kalends of June, consulate of Eusebius and Hypatius (22 May 359),⁸² it was known in hostile quarters as the 'Dated Creed'.⁸³ But though occasionally ascribed to Valens and Ursacius, its principal author seems to have been Mark of Arethusa.⁸⁴ Like the 'Blasphemy' which had been issued earlier, it rejected substance-language as such, but its positive content was mild by comparison⁸⁵—and, unlike its predecessor,

⁷⁸ Thdt., *HE* 2. 26. 3 (*GCS* 156. 23–4).

⁷⁹ The chosen locale was almost proverbially isolated (cf. Grg. Naz., *Ep.* 229. 1 (Gallay ii. 120)). Isauria had only two cities and was otherwise known primarily for the ferocity of its bandits, Ammianus Marcellinus 14. 8. 2, 19. 13. 1, cf. Pall., *V. Chrys.* 16. 123–4 (*SC* 341. 314). According to Thdt., *HE* 2. 26. 4 (*GCS* 157. 4–6) the location was suggested by enemies of Eudoxius; according to Soz., *HE* 5. 16. 20 (*GCS* 162. 8–10), by Valens.

⁸⁰ Ath., *Syn.* 1. 3. 8. 1, 12. 1 (Opitz ii. 231. 11, 235. 13–14, 238. 11), cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 29. 4 (*GCS* 169. 6–7), Epiph. *Haer.* 73. 23. 8 (*GCS* iii. 297. 2–3). These last are probably dependent on Athanasius, but Strabo 14. 5. 6 refers to the province in which it was found (then Cilicia) as 'rugged'.

⁸¹ Barnes, *Athanasius*, 232, is surely right that this was not a council in any proper sense. Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 19–20 (*GCS* 162. 4–12) lays considerable emphasis on the informal nature of the gathering.

⁸² Ath., *Syn.* 8. 3 (Opitz ii. 235. 21–3), Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 18 (*GCS* 154. 6–8). According to Socrates (*HE* 2. 37. 17 (*GCS* 154. 2–5) cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 17. 3 (*GCS* 163. 10–12)) this document was originally composed in Latin, but the reference is probably to the 'Blasphemy' and reflects his general confusion about all the Sirmian creeds, Soc., *HE* 2. 30. 1–4, cf. 41. 20 (*GCS* 141. 6–15, cf. 178. 25–179. 1).

⁸³ Cf. Ath., *Syn.* 3. 1–4. 4 (Opitz ii. 232. 23–233. 31), Soz., *HE* 4. 17. 10 (*GCS* 164. 14–20).

⁸⁴ Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 6 (*GCS* 172. 28–30). The ascription to Valens (and/or Ursacius) seems to come from the fact that they were legates and presented it to the council, Hieron., *Lucif.* 18 (*PL* 23. 171B), cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 15–17 (*GCS* 153. 24–154. 5), Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 20 (*GCS* 162. 8–12).

⁸⁵ For the text in what follows, see Hahn, § 163, pp. 204–5.

it did have imperial support.⁸⁶ It was variously assessed in antiquity. Some thought the proposal 'anomoean',⁸⁷ others 'homoiousian',⁸⁸ a range which is a testimony to its success. Subsequent interest, however, has centred almost exclusively around the two key phrases, 'similar in accordance with the scriptures' and 'similar in all respects' (ὅμοιον . . . κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, and ὅμοιον . . . κατὰ πάντα). These were undoubtedly the heart of the document, but its narrative content, which has been neglected as a result, is almost as revealing. From that perspective the 'Dated Creed' recapitulates the entire non-Nicene framework as clearly as any other. Among other things, unlike the first Creed of Sirmium, it is not a reiteration or expansion of the fourth of Antioch, but a document written for that occasion. Starting, then, from an inscrutable divine generation, it follows the Only-begotten from his role as instrumental Creator to that of incarnate Lord, and then, with an allusion to Job 38: 17,⁸⁹ starts from the terrified guardians of the infernal kingdom to rise with him to his Father's throne, thus completing 'the entire dispensation'.⁹⁰ The propositions which guard this vision are muted, and it is patient of other frameworks, but the general picture is unmistakable.

Constantius' hope, then, was to use the general agreement that there was only one God but two biblical actors⁹¹ to achieve a unity which excluded only Photinus (and Athanasius) at one extreme and Aetius and Eunomius at the other.⁹² With that

⁸⁶ One of the points of the consular year at the beginning of the creed, after all, was that it had been read in the presence of 'the most religious and gloriously victorious emperor'.

⁸⁷ Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 21 (*GCS* 162. 12–20).

⁸⁸ This is the sense in which George of Laodicea takes the τὸ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον (*Ep. Dogm.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 15. 2–6 (*GCS* iii. 287. 19–288. 14)).

⁸⁹ See Ch. 4 n. 386 above. In Eunomius, interestingly, the descent into hell is absent (at least from two passages where we might have expected to find it, *Apol.* 27. 7–9 and *EF* 3. 40–6 (Vaggione 70, 154–6)), but it is taken for granted in Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 267. 7–12).

⁹⁰ In Hahn, § 163 (pp. 204–5) the phrase πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκονομίαν πληρώσαντα occurs twice, once before and once after the *descensus*, following Ath., *Syn.* 8. 5 (Opitz ii. 235. 32–3, 236. 3); Soc., *HE* 2. 37 (*PG* 67. 305B) omits the second. This may simply be a mistake (some scribe either added or omitted a phrase), but it is not impossible that in Socrates' case someone was uncomfortable with the idea that the 'dispensation' was fulfilled only after the descent into hell.

⁹¹ *Symb. Sirm.* 2 (Hahn, § 161, p. 201), quoted above Ch. 4, n. 300.

⁹² This was not a forlorn hope, and represented the basis on which many

end in view, and in order to counter the sheer size of Constantine's original council, he tried to assemble as much of the western episcopate as possible at Ariminum. That made it almost a byword for crowding.⁹³ Up to 400 bishops found themselves camped out in a provincial Italian town to await, in varying degrees of discomfort, the imperial proposal.⁹⁴ Not surprisingly, when it did arrive it split the council in two, the majority continuing in the church, while the rest (about eighty) met in an abandoned temple.⁹⁵ The former then proceeded to reject the imperial formulary outright, denying that there was a need for a new creed and pointedly referring to the work of the emperor's pious father.⁹⁶ They also excommunicated Ursacius, Valens, and several other members of the rump.⁹⁷ It seems almost superfluous to add that as soon as that was done both sides sent delegations to the emperor,⁹⁸ but their reception was

schemes of comprehension would be undertaken in the following decades. When the Macedonians approached Pope Liberius a decade later, they did so on the basis of a common rejection of Anomoeans and Arius on the one hand, and Photinians and other modalists on the other, Soc., *HE* 4. 12. 6–12 (*GCS* 238. 22–239. 27), cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 11. 3 (*GCS* 250. 25–251. 4), Concilia, CCP (381), *Ep.* apud Thdt., *HE* 5. 9. 19 (*GCS* 294. 20–2). Later still, of course, Eunomians were linked with Photinians and Manichaeans as those most consistently excluded from imperial mercy, Soc., *HE* 5. 2. 1 (*GCS* 275. 22–3), cf. *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 65 (Mommson i. 2. 878).

⁹³ Hieron., *Ep.* 69. 2 (*PL* 22. 654D), cf. *Lucif.* 18 (*PL* 23. 171B).

⁹⁴ Ath., *Syn.* 8. 1 (Opitz ii. 235. 15), Soz., *HE* 4. 17. 2 (*GCS* 163. 5–6), though some claimed 600, Auxentius apud Hilary, *Auxent.* 13 (*PL* 10. 617A); elsewhere, however, Athanasius, *Ep. Afr.* 3 (*PG* 26. 1033B/C) reckons the Orthodox majority as approaching 200, which implies a total smaller than 400, while Philost., *HE* 4. 10 (*GCS* 63. 13–14) gives only 300. Augustine's opponent Maximinus has 330, which is probably the 'canonical' number, *Coll. Max.* 2 (*PL* 42. 710), while Soc., *HE* 2. 36. 1–37. 3 (*GCS* 151. 18–152. 18) further darkens counsel by supposing that 300 of the bishops had already been at a council in Milan (actually held in 355, see Barnes, *Athanasius*, p. 117). Some of the discrepancies are probably between those who were present for the initial sessions and then went home and those who stayed to sign the decrees. Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 41. 2–4 (*CSEL* 1. 94. 17–27) claims that all but the poorest bishops refused to accept imperial support.

⁹⁵ Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 41. 5 (*CSEL* 1. 95. 2–5).

⁹⁶ This is presumably the reason why this council could later be cited positively along with Constantinople I in *Cod. Theod.* 16. 1. 4 (Mommson i. 2. 834).

⁹⁷ C. Arim., *Decr.* apud CAP A. 5. 1 (*CSEL* 65. 78. 13–85. 5), Ath., *Syn.* 10. 1–113 (Opitz ii. 237. 1–239. 7).

⁹⁸ It is easy to take Soz., *HE* 4. 18. 1 (*GCS* 164. 23–4) to mean that the

by no means even-handed. That from the majority was allowed to wait,⁹⁹ while Ursacius and Valens were admitted with every honour.¹⁰⁰ When the emperor finally did address the synod, he asked them to wait until he was finished with his current military campaign so he could listen to them undistracted.¹⁰¹ When it became obvious that he was going to remain distracted, part of the council began to disperse,¹⁰² leaving their representatives in Adrianople to face the imperial wrath. Strongly pressed to conform,¹⁰³ these representatives met with others in the city of Ustodizo in Thrace, otherwise known as 'Nicaea', and there, on 8 October, subscribed to a revised form of the imperial creed they had come to reject.¹⁰⁴ The reference to the *descensus* was made less specific; the suspiciously 'substantialist' *κατὰ πάντα* was rejected in favour of a similarity *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* ('in accordance with scripture'), and the latter was emended to specify 'what the . . . scriptures say and teach'.¹⁰⁵ Modalism was specifically excluded by rejecting the idea of a single hypostasis.¹⁰⁶ The delegates did not mention either *homoousios* or *homoiousios*, but they salved their consciences by renewing the anathemas against all earlier heresies (including, presumably, the 'Arian'). Once back in Ariminum, moreover, they joined their remaining colleagues in anathematizing all the more

Nicene delegation numbered twenty, since the letter which immediately follows is from them. This is undoubtedly a false inference from the letter of Constantius to the council, which mentions twenty delegates, but is explicitly addressed to all the bishops, Ath., *Syn.* 55. 2 (Opitz ii. 277. 32-278. 2), Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 78 (*GCS* 161. 5-6). Hilary, *Fr. Hist.* apud *CAP A.* 5. 2 (*CSEL* 65. 85. 11-15), cf. Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 41. 6 (*CSEL* 1. 96. 7-9), is surely right to take this to mean two delegations of ten bishops each.

⁹⁹ Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 41. 7 (*CSEL* 1. 95. 11-12) does not have a high opinion of them.

¹⁰⁰ Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 76 (*GCS* 161. 1-2), Soz., *HE* 4. 19. 1 (*GCS* 167. 21-6).

¹⁰¹ Ath., *Syn.* 55. 2-3 (Opitz ii. 277. 30-338. 9), Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 78-81 (*GCS* 161. 5-19).

¹⁰² Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 88 (*GCS* 162. 14-15).

¹⁰³ According to Ath., *Ep. Afr.* 3, 4 (*PG* 26. 1033C, 1036A), this involved violence.

¹⁰⁴ Their rather abject letter to the emperor can be found at *CAP A.* 5. 3 (*CSEL* 65. 85. 19-86. 27).

¹⁰⁵ Maximinus makes clear in Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13, cf. 14. 11, 13, 20 (*PL* 42. 719, cf. 729, 730, 736), that at least in his eyes this implied specific doctrinal content.

¹⁰⁶ *Symb. Nic.* (359) (Hahn, § 164, pp. 205-6).

outrageous 'Arian' propositions to the clapping of hands and stomping of feet.¹⁰⁷ It was in this form (*with* the anathemas and a structure patient of their general framework) that Ariminum became the 'faith' of most western non-Nicenes.¹⁰⁸

The absence of any mention of Aetius or Eunomius, however, is proof (if any were needed) that East did indeed differ from West. For the bishops who gathered in the basilica of St Thecla¹⁰⁹ in Seleucia on 27 September¹¹⁰ were fully prepared to discuss the controversial Alexandrian deacon.¹¹¹ But while there were ultimately to be about 160 participants,¹¹² at this opening session several of the more illustrious (and controversial) had not yet arrived. Basil of Ancyra and Macedonius of Constantinople, for instance, had both pleaded ill health, while Patrophilus of Scythopolis was nursing a pair of ailing eyes in the suburbs.¹¹³ Hilary (who was actually present) tells us that there were at this session 105 homoeousians, 19 anomoeans, and that only the Egyptians (apart from George of Alexandria)

¹⁰⁷ Hieron., *Lucif.* 18 (PL 23. 171C-172A), cf. Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 44. 5-7 (CSEL 1. 97. 19-30), Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 18. 24-7 (CSEL 78. 51-2). There is at least one version of this event in which the bishops were coerced into signing after they returned home, Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 90-4 (GCS 162. 19-163. 11), cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 19. 5-8 (GCS 168. 15-169. 3), but this seems to be an inference from a number of individual depositions, notably that of Liberius. Philost., *HE* 4. 10 (GCS 63. 13-16) and Aug., *Coll. Max.* 2 (PL 42. 710) clearly imply formal subscription, as perhaps does Hilary, *Auxent.* 8 (PL 10. 614C-615A), with reservations. According to Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 43. 4 (CSEL 1. 96. 32-97. 2) only twenty finally refused.

¹⁰⁸ Auxentius, Hilary, *Auxent.* 15 (PL 10. 618B-C); Germinius of Sirmium apud *Heracl.* (PLS 1. 345A); the Empress Justina, Soz., *HE* 7. 13. 2, cf. 5, 7 (GCS 316. 20-4, cf. 317. 4-7, 13-16); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 2, 13, cf. 4 (PL 42. 710, 730, cf. 711). Note that in *Coll. Max.* 13, Maximinus is at pains to cite the anathemas.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 21. 22 (PG 35. 1105C).

¹¹⁰ This is the date given in Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 7 (GCS 169. 13-15) based on the *Acta* published by Sabinus, and is surely correct. The alternative date of 16 Thoth (14 Sept.) given by Athanasius, *Syn.* 12. 1 (Opitz ii. 239. 11-13) may perhaps represent the proposed date in the imperial letter of summons.

¹¹¹ Soz., *HE* 4. 16. 1 (GCS 158. 32-159. 2).

¹¹² Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 5 (GCS 169. 5), Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 1 (GCS 172. 8), Ath. *Syn.* 12. 1 (Opitz ii. 239. 14); Thdt., *HE* 2. 26. 9 (GCS 158. 9) rounds this off to 150.

¹¹³ Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 10 (GCS 169. 23-170. 1), Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 3 (GCS 172. 15-19). The latter had been instrumental in recalling the exiles, Aetius and Eunomius among them, Philost., *HE* 4. 10 (GCS 63. 1-4).

supported the *homoousion*.¹¹⁴ This assessment is generally correct and supported by others,¹¹⁵ but it ignores some of the other fault lines that marked this deeply divided council.¹¹⁶ Some were geographical: a significant number of Hilary's 'anomoeans' were from Syria, Palestine, or Libya,¹¹⁷ while by and large his 'homoeousians' represented Constantinople and its environs with selected portions of Asia Minor.¹¹⁸ All these alignments were complicated by personal or political difficulties. The imperial officer who presided over this fractious assembly was the *comes* Leonas, assisted by Lauricius, the local *dux*.¹¹⁹ The former was alleged by some to be a 'closet' anomoean,¹²⁰ but in fact his instructions were clear—he was to try to preside over a united assembly.¹²¹ Any attempt to be even-handed in such an environment would have led to the same charge.

An attendant issue was seating, and hence voting. Several bishops therefore insisted the council begin with discipline, not doctrine: Acacius of Caesarea had charges to bring against Cyril of Jerusalem, while Eustathius of Sebaste was, as usual, also

¹¹⁴ Hilary, *Const.* 12. 11–16 (*SC* 334. 192–4). It is worth pointing out, however, that at least three Egyptians, Apollonius of Oxyrynchus, Ptolemaeus of Thmuis, and Elisha of Diocletianopolis, signed the Creed of Acacius later in the council, *Epiph.*, *Haer.* 73. 26. 4, 7, 8 (*GCS* iii. 300. 19, 301. 5, 10); a couple of others must be considered borderline, Theoctistus of Ostracina and Pancratius of Pelusium (*GCS* iii. 300. 20, 30).

¹¹⁵ e.g. Philost., *HE* 4. 11 (*GCS* 63. 19–27).

¹¹⁶ Cf. *Epiph.*, *Haer.* 73. 27. 3–9 (*GCS* iii. 301. 23–302. 14).

¹¹⁷ In the list of the thirty-nine signatories of the Acacian Creed in *Epiph.*, *Haer.* 73. 26. 2–8 (*GCS* iii. 300. 1–301. 12), ten are from Palestine or Phoenicia, eight from Syria, and five from Libya. Epiphanius assumes that Basil and his supporters also signed though they are not found on the list he reproduces, which gives him his total of forty-three, *Haer.* 73. 26. 1, 8 (*GCS* iii. 299. 26–8, 301. 13).

¹¹⁸ Except for George of Laodicaea, those who are named were all from Constantinople or its environs (Macedonius and Eleusius), or Asia Minor and Armenia (Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, Silvanus of Tarsus), *Soc.*, *HE* 2. 39. 17, 19 (*GCS* 170. 17–19, 170. 23–171. 3).

¹¹⁹ *Soc.*, *HE* 2. 39. 5–6 (*GCS* 169. 9–12). Doubtless, like their western counterpart Taurus, they had been promised some suitable reward in the event of success, *Sulp. Sev.*, *Chron.* 2. 41. 1 (*CSEL* 1. 94. 11–14).

¹²⁰ *Soz.*, *HE* 4. 22. 13, 24, 25 (*GCS* 173. 24–7, 175. 20–2, 25–7).

¹²¹ *Soc.*, *HE* 2. 40. 36 (*GCS* 175. 14–16).

under indictment.¹²² Aetius too may have been mentioned at this point, though since the issue was one of official representation, the real target in that event can only have been his episcopal sponsor Eudoxius. Acacius, however, could only find thirty-five willing to support a discussion of discipline, and the council moved on to doctrine.¹²³ The supporters of Acacius and Eudoxius were opposed to Nicaea root and branch (presumably citing the draft document from Sirmium), while most of the rest seem to have accepted the authority of Nicaea, including its anathemas, while rejecting *homooousios*. This seems to have been the point at which Eudoxius introduced some ill-advised remarks about *anomoios*,¹²⁴ and the majority responded by insisting on the so-called 'Creed of the Dedication' (the second of Antioch) which, as we have seen, was associated with the name of the martyr Lucian.¹²⁵ Acacius and his supporters then walked out.

On the following day the majority met 'behind closed doors' (presumably without Leonas¹²⁶), and collectively signed the Dedication Creed.¹²⁷ Acacius bitterly protested this private gathering and spent the rest of his day lobbying against it while preparing another document for the president's consideration.¹²⁸ Thus when Leonas tried to bring the two parties

¹²² Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 12 (*GCS* 170. 6-7), cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 26. 9-10 (*GCS* 158. 3-11). Cf. also Vaggione, *Fragments*, 456-7.

¹²³ Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 13-16 (*GCS* 170. 7-17), Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 7 (*GCS* 173. 1-5). The former presumably represent the 'few' of Ath., *Syn.* 12. 2 (Opitz ii. 239. 14-18).

¹²⁴ Hilary, *Const.* 13. 4-15 (*SC* 334. 194-6). Since at *Const.* 14. 1-5 (*SC* 334. 196) it is stated that the Acacians composed their creed after Eudoxius had spoken, it must have happened the first day. The reaction in favour of the 'Dedication' would then be a response.

¹²⁵ Soc., *HE* 2. 39. 19-22 (*GCS* 170. 23-171. 10), cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 3. 1 (*PG* 28. 1204A-C). See above, Ch. 3 n. 190.

¹²⁶ The *comes*' willingness to consider another document the following day shows that he cannot have been officially present at the closed session.

¹²⁷ Except as noted, the following is based on Socrates' résumé of Sabinus' *Acta* in *HE* 2. 40. 1-48 (*GCS* 171. 11-176. 21).

¹²⁸ The entire document with signatures can be found in Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 25. 1-26. 8 (*GCS* 3. 298. 1-301. 15), the text only in Soc., *HE* 2. 40. 8-17 (*GCS* 172. 4-173. 20), and an abbreviated version in Ath., *Syn.* 29. 1-9 (Opitz ii. 257. 28-258. 20) which is reproduced as Hahn, § 165, pp. 206-8. The general contents and reference to the events of the 27th as $\chi\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ (*Haer.* 73. 25. 1 (*GCS* iii. 298. 5)) show the date of composition.

together the following morning, he knew this document was in the wings (indeed, Hilary claimed it was more a product of the palace than the Church¹²⁹). It was deliberately conciliatory.¹³⁰ the Creed of the Dedication was not condemned, but treated rather like that of Nicaea at Sirmium—as something well-meant to begin with, but subject to abuse and no longer really suitable. The *anomoion*, on the other hand, was rejected outright, though only generally and not as specifically applied to the essence.¹³¹ Substance-language is not condemned as such, but it is worth noting that while *homoousios* is rejected explicitly, *homoiousios* is simply overlooked. The similarity of the Son to the Father is once again ‘in accordance with the scriptures’ but this time it is made a little clearer by specifying that this means he is the ‘image of the invisible God’ (Colossians 1: 15). The entire document then concludes with a general review of the *oikonomia*. Acacius’ price for ending the walkout (presumably influenced by the simultaneous arrival of Basil and Macedonius) was a return to his original demand of ‘discipline first’. Some suspected this was merely in an attempt to avoid condemning Aetius,¹³² but this is unlikely to have been his primary goal. Aetius, after all, was a mere deacon, and in a disciplinary context his condemnation made sense only as a stalking-horse for one of his principals (Eudoxius or George); at this stage it could not be a goal in its own right. Once discussion *did* turn to doctrine, of course, that would change, but there is nothing to indicate that Acacius ever held a personal brief for Aetius.¹³³ Acacius’ request might have led to a confrontation,

¹²⁹ Or, more literally, as the product of bishops who were more of the palace than the church, Hilary, *Const.* 14. 1–5 (*SC* 334. 196): presumably the reference is to the incident described in Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 24 (*GCS* 175. 20–2), wherein Acacius and company are discovered at the president’s house presenting (or composing?) the document.

¹³⁰ Epiphanius calls it ‘crafty’, *Haer.* 73. 27. 1 (*GCS* iii. 301. 16–18).

¹³¹ Cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 16 (*GCS* 174. 10–14).

¹³² Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 12 (*GCS* 173. 21–4).

¹³³ Cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 12–15, 65. 18–22). In *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 65. 26–8), Philostorgius comments on Acacius’ general slipperiness in managing to convince those who previously held the *heteroousion* (i.e. the Gospel) to accept the imperial formula, ‘similar in accordance with the scriptures’. Athanasius further reports that once back in Antioch unspecified ‘Arians’, whom he connects with Euzoius and the dying Constantius, repudiated this formula and espoused a radical form of the *anomoion*, *Syn.* 31. 1–3 (Opitz ii.

but at this point Eudoxius himself intervened and convinced Cyril of Jerusalem to withdraw for the time being.¹³⁴ That allowed the doctrinal discussion to go forward, though it is hard not to echo one bishop's *cri de cœur*: 'If to proclaim personal opinions day after day is to confess the faith, we will never express the truth with accuracy!'¹³⁵ And with that the session came to a close.

That which reconvened the following day was scarcely less tumultuous. Acacius claimed that since the Nicene Creed had been changed many times before, there was no reason not to do so again; others, however, continued to insist on the Dedication Creed. Doctrinally, the main issue was the meaning of 'similarity', even though this led more to acrimony than unanimity. Acacius, moreover, was hoist with his own petard when an opponent produced one of his earlier works in which he supported the ὁμοίος κατὰ πάντα! A descent into personalities did nothing to improve the atmosphere, and may have included an exchange between Basil and Aetius.¹³⁶ Leonas thereupon

259. 21–260. 6). Socrates, in a passage partly based on this material (*HE* 2. 45. 9–11 (*GCS* 183. 14–184. 6)) connects these 'exoukontians' with Meletius and Euzoius' consecrator, Acacius, and assumes there was some kind of synodical pronouncement on the subject (see n. 215 below). This is certainly based on a false inference, though Acacius would undoubtedly have been willing to 'sugar-coat' the imperial formula to the best of his (very considerable) ability.

¹³⁴ Thdt., *HE* 2. 26. 11 (*GCS* 158. 14–18).

¹³⁵ Soc., *HE* 2. 40. 20 (*GCS* 173. 25–174. 2).

¹³⁶ Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 20–65. 6). Philostorgius' chronology is considerably disordered here, and it is not quite clear when he thought this discussion took place. The context is clearly conciliar because Aetius' opponents protested against his participation in a doctrinal discussion on the grounds that he was a mere deacon (64. 23–6). Philostorgius takes the setting to be Constantinople (64. 1–3) and places it immediately before Aetius' expulsion by Constantius (65. 7–28). Philostorgius, however, apparently had only two sources for these events: Eunomius' *Apologia Apologiae* and a collection of synodical letters prepared by Acacius of Caesarea (64. 17–19). Since Philostorgius tells us the latter was extensive (πολλὰ δέ ἐστιν) and believed that all the bishops had been present at Constantinople, it seems likely that Acacius treated the events in Constantinople as continuations of those at Ariminum/Ustodizo/Seleucia (see n. 157 below). Philostorgius thus missed the change of venue in the *acta*, and conflated an encounter on the floor at Seleucia with another before the emperor at Constantinople. His account of Basil's defeat may be wishful thinking, but in a conciliar context this first encounter makes better sense during the last exchange of personalities at Seleucia than at any later time.

dissolved the assembly and refused to attend at all the following day. The 'Dedicationist' majority therefore settled down without him to the task of excommunicating its enemies, including, naturally, Acacius, Eudoxius, and George. Eudoxius was to be replaced at Antioch by a priest named Anianus (or Adrianus),¹³⁷ but that unfortunate worthy was no sooner ordained than arrested, and the council dispersed. Once again, both sides sent delegations to the emperor.

Inevitably, Aetius and Eunomius were condemned along with the rest, but neither waited around to be arrested. Eunomius later complained that he was condemned 'by default',¹³⁸ and soon left for home.¹³⁹ Aetius accompanied Eudoxius to Constantinople, and there launched a letter-writing campaign.¹⁴⁰ For the moment, the emperor's attention was still elsewhere—he was concentrating on the western delegates, most of whom had stayed in the East.¹⁴¹ Eudoxius and Acacius, however, managed to arrive before the others, and they immediately set about lubricating the levers of

¹³⁷ In Soc., *HE* 2. 40. 46 (*GCS* 176. 14–17), Philost., *HE* 4. 11 (*GCS* 63. 25), and Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 23. 4 (*GCS* iii. 296. 17) the name is 'Anianus'; Soz., *HE* 4. 22. 27 (*GCS* 176. 7) has 'Adrianus' and at 4. 24. 15 (181. 9) 'Annianus'.

¹³⁸ Eun., *AA* 1 (*J* i. 44. 4–7), cf. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 2. 56–9 (*SC* 299. 152). On the date and general sequence of events, see Vaggione, 5–9, 100 n. 14, and the literature there cited.

¹³⁹ Eun., *AA* 1 (*J* i. 49. 19–22). The sequence is difficult to follow amid Gregory's patch-work of phrases, but it is difficult to see this as anything but a reference to the final day at Seleucia (note that Eunomius leaves his *τάξις* only after the other side has won the day). On the other hand, the reference to being 'coerced by intermediaries' in *AA* 1 (*J* i. 51. 23–6) may mean that he had to be summoned to Constantinople.

¹⁴⁰ Philost., *HE* 4. 11 (*GCS* 63. 25–7). Athanasius describes Aetius' role at this time as being a 'companion' of Acacius and a teacher of Eudoxius, *Syn.* 38. 4 (Opitz ii. 265. 2–6). Kopecek i. 202–3 places the letter-writing campaign earlier, during the council itself, in view of its proposed condemnation of *anomoioi*s (see n. 131 above). But that effort was too nuanced to require an emergency response, and in Philostorgius these efforts follow the various depositions and the consecration of Anianus at the end of the council. On the other hand, it is possible that Aetius did issue (or reissue) the *Syntagmation* about this time (as Kopecek suggests i. 225–7), since its original literary form was that of a letter, cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 6 (*PG* 28. 1165A/B).

¹⁴¹ Soz., *HE* 4. 23. 1 (*GCS* 176. 15–17). Some of them must have accompanied Ursacius and Valens on their return to the West in the previous month, but by Oct. we find them again in the East, Soc., *HE* 2. 37. 88–97 (*GCS* 162. 14–163. 21).

power.¹⁴² It was at this point presumably that, as Eunomius later put it, 'an expectant world' waited upon the outcome.¹⁴³ It was not to be a short wait—the whole process took nearly a month.

The initial stage began on 11 December, when Honoratus became 'Prefect' of Constantinople (its first).¹⁴⁴ He was charged with the task of bringing the Seleucian majority to heel.¹⁴⁵ Some thought was given to summoning the entire council, but in the event only a delegation was received, one composed, naturally, only of the most prominent. Among them were Basil and Eustathius, Silvanus of Tarsus, and Eleusius of Cyzicus.¹⁴⁶ This was the point at which the emperor intervened in person, and assisted by a number of secular officials, heard the case himself.¹⁴⁷ He was in no mood for *παρηγορία*: when Basil of Ancyra tried to bring a charge against Eudoxius, he was immediately rebuked.¹⁴⁸ Eudoxius, on the other hand, came off no better, for his letter-writing campaign produced an unexpected result—Eustathius was able to come up with a letter supporting the *anomoion*!¹⁴⁹ When the emperor demanded an explanation, Eudoxius indicated that Aetius was the real author. Aetius was summoned in his turn, and some were afraid he might sway the emperor,¹⁵⁰ but for once his glib tongue was

¹⁴² Soz., *HE* 4. 23. 1–2 (*GCS* 176. 14–22), cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 1 (*GCS* 158. 19–23), Philost., *HE* 5. 1 (*GCS* 66. 1–3), Basil, *Eun.* 1. 2. 63–6 (*SC* 299. 154). Honoratus was presumably one of those ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις δυναμένους said by Sozomen to have been influenced or bribed by Acacius.

¹⁴³ Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 50. 7–9).

¹⁴⁴ Soc. *HE* 2. 41. 1 (*GCS* 176. 22–4), *Consularia Constantinopolitana* ad annum 359 (Mommsen, *Chronica* 239).

¹⁴⁵ Soz., *HE* 4. 23. 3–4 (*GCS* 177. 3–10).

¹⁴⁶ Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 3–4 (*GCS* 159. 9–13). Philostorgius claims in *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 1–3) that all were summoned, but this seems to represent a misunderstanding of the *acta* as published by Acacius of Caesarea (see n. 136 above).

¹⁴⁷ Soz., *HE* 4. 23. 3–4 (*GCS* 177. 3–10). Cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 5 (*GCS* 179. 16–17), where Sozomen distinguishes clearly between *ἱερεῖσαν* and those who, like Leonas and Lauricius in Soc., *HE* 2. 40. 2 (*GCS* 171. 15) are definitely *ἀρχοῦσι*.

¹⁴⁸ Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 4–7 (*GCS* 159. 13–160. 7).

¹⁴⁹ Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 6 (*GCS* 160. 1–4). What is effectively the same quote is given in what appears to be a more accurate form by Basil in *Spir.* 4. 8–18 (*SC* 17bis. 260), where it is ascribed to Aetius.

¹⁵⁰ Soz., *HE* 4. 23. 4 (*GCS* 177. 12–14).

his downfall.¹⁵¹ Deciding to answer before he knew the context of the question, he readily acknowledged authorship; but, he claimed, in point of fact, so far from teaching the *anomoion*, he asserted the ἀπαρἀλλάκτως ὅμοιον!¹⁵² The emperor was disgusted and chose not to wait for an explanation. Aetius was expelled from the palace.¹⁵³ Constantius then spent the rest of the day and most of that night trying to win the bishops over,¹⁵⁴ even meeting with them again the next day (New Year's) despite his scheduled induction as consul.¹⁵⁵ Imperial attention eventually led to an expanded council numbering about fifty to which bishops from neighbouring Bithynia were invited.¹⁵⁶ The council's chief business was to approve a new form of the Creed of Ariminum.¹⁵⁷ That done, the bishops settled down to the much more congenial task of excommunicating those who disagreed with them.¹⁵⁸ The alleged reasons were non-dogmatic,¹⁵⁹ but the practical result was that a large number of bishops from the capital and its surrounding region were deposed. Among the more prominent were Macedonius the archbishop, Eleusius of Cyzicus, Dracontius of Pergamum, Silvanus of Tarsus, Cyril of Jerusalem, and inevitably, Basil and Eustathius.¹⁶⁰ At the urging of Eustathius, however, the emperor extracted a price:

¹⁵¹ Cf. Philost., *HE* 8. 18 (*GCS* 115. 23-6).

¹⁵² 'Exactly similar': Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 10-12 (*GCS* 160. 19-161. 3), cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 65. 7-18). For the sense in which he probably meant this, see below Ch. 7, pp. 283-4.

¹⁵³ Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 65. 15-22). He was excommunicated and exiled only later.

¹⁵⁴ His methods were none too gentle; those who held out were informed that they were eligible for financially ruinous service on their city councils, Soc., *HE* 2. 41. 3-4 (*GCS* 176. 25-177. 3).

¹⁵⁵ Soz., *HE* 4. 23. 8 (*GCS* 178. 4-8).

¹⁵⁶ Soc., *HE* 2. 41. 5-6 (*GCS* 177. 4-7), Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 1 (*GCS* 178. 9-14).

¹⁵⁷ So described in Soc., *HE* 2. 41. 6 (*GCS* 177. 7-8), Philost., *HE* 4. 12, cf. 5. 1 (*GCS* 65. 22-6, cf. 66. 8-10).

¹⁵⁸ Accomplished in at least two sessions, cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 12 (*GCS* 180. 24): αἰθῶς.

¹⁵⁹ Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 4-11 (*GCS* 179. 5-180. 24). Acacius is said to have been the chief instigator, Soc., *HE* 2. 42. 1-3 (*GCS* 179. 8-15), Philost., *HE* 5. 1 (*GCS* 66. 2-5). The same group was deposed for doctrinal reasons in the reign of Jovian, see below Ch. 7, p. 283.

¹⁶⁰ See, with slight differences, Soc., *HE* 2. 42. 1-43. 1 (*GCS* 179. 8-180. 4), Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 3-25. 1 (*GCS* 178. 20-181. 23), Philost., *HE* 5. 1 (*GCS* 66. 2-11), cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 17-21 (*GCS* 161. 20-162. 18).

he insisted on the condemnation of Aetius.¹⁶¹ A formal letter announcing this was therefore composed, and sent to George of Alexandria, his bishop.¹⁶² Eudoxius (who was now bishop of Constantinople) may have been reluctant, but he signed, as did all but ten of the others.¹⁶³ The latter were given six months to reconsider, while Aetius himself was sent first to Mopsuestia, and then (when the local bishop proved too accommodating) to Amblada in Phrygia, where he is said to have miraculously halted a plague.¹⁶⁴

Significantly, Eunomius was not with him. A year earlier, when Basil of Ancyra had arranged for Aetius' arrest, Eunomius had stayed with Eudoxius;¹⁶⁵ now once again he distanced himself from his teacher.¹⁶⁶ While Aetius went into exile, Eunomius not only remained with his bishop but a few days later was ordained bishop himself.¹⁶⁷ He did this, however, with the express understanding that Aetius would be restored within three months.¹⁶⁸ Some years later Basil the Great described this elevation as a 'reward for impiety' (*ἀθλον τῆς ἀσεβείας*),¹⁶⁹ and claimed that Eunomius' still extant written *Apology* was a mere literary fiction never actually given. Eunomius was quick to seize on the contradiction.¹⁷⁰ He points out that no one obtains a

¹⁶¹ Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 13–16 (*GCS* 161. 4–20).

¹⁶² Text in Thdt., *HE* 2. 28. 1–8 (*GCS* 163. 1–165. 8).

¹⁶³ Cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 25. 5 (*GCS* 182. 11–16); the four named in the synodical letter are Serras of Paractonium, Stephen of Ptolemais, Heliodorus of Sozusa, and Theophilus (the Indian?), Thdt., *HE* 2. 28. 3 (*GCS* 163. 17–22), cf. Philost., *HE* 7. 6 (*GCS* 84. 1–6), *Hist. Aceph.* 4. 27–9, 36–7 (*SC* 317. 154).

¹⁶⁴ Philost., *HE* 5. 2 (*GCS* 67. 10–68. 5), cf. Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 12 (*GCS* 161. 1–3).

¹⁶⁵ See n. 64 above.

¹⁶⁶ Thdt., *HE* 2. 29. 12 (*GCS* 167. 12–16), cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 26. 13 (*GCS* 274. 16–20).

¹⁶⁷ At this time he is said to have been closely associated with both Acacius and Eudoxius, Thdt., *HE* 2. 29. 1, cf. 12 (*GCS* 165. 9–12, cf. 167. 14–16). His consecration must have taken place almost immediately, for we find him preaching in his own church a few days later on Epiphany (6 Jan.), Philost., *HE* 6. 2 (*GCS* 71. 3–6). The 'Epiphany' in question must be that of 360, not 361, because the latter leaves too little time for Eunomius to be accused, summoned, and tried at the emperor's winter quarters in Antioch (see below). Socrates and Sozomen, on the other hand, assign Eunomius' rule at Cyzicus to the reign of Valens; they may not be entirely mistaken. For this, see below, Ch. 7, pp. 292–4.

¹⁶⁸ Philost., *HE* 5. 3 (*GCS* 68. 6–69. 4).

¹⁶⁹ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 2. 73 (*SC* 299. 154).

¹⁷⁰ Eun., *AA* 1 (*J* i. 60. 12–16, cf. 6–11).

reward for not competing, and claims that the *Apology* attacked by Basil was a written form of the defence which led to his ordination. There seems no real reason to doubt this, and if so, the Council of Constantinople remains the most likely possibility.¹⁷¹ But that still leaves us to ask just what Eunomius hoped to accomplish, and who his original audience were. For if, as Basil and Eunomius both imply, this presentation resulted in a reward, it was a political document, and if so, a highly successful one.

The extant *Apology* gives us some clues as to why. A few years later Eunomius claimed that intermediaries (*μεσιτών*) forced him to make a defence, and this shows that at least he knew he was in danger.¹⁷² But since he also speaks of a 'packed jury',¹⁷³ a bill of indictment,¹⁷⁴ an arrogant and noble audience,¹⁷⁵ and minority status¹⁷⁶ (*before* his consecration), this sounds very much like the period after the expulsion of Aetius but before the bishops arrived to ratify the deposition.¹⁷⁷ This corresponds with what we know happened elsewhere: Eunomius' audience is exactly like that which listened to Photinus and Basil of Ancyra ten years earlier—a combination of high clerical and lay officials in a quasi-judicial setting.¹⁷⁸ Since the wider context was Constantius' efforts to get the bishops to accept Ariminum,¹⁷⁹ this was bound to govern what Eunomius could say himself. He had to show that, despite his master's condemnation, his own teaching was compatible with that of the council, and since, not long after, it issued a revised version of the creed published at Ustodizo/Nicaea in October,¹⁸⁰ it is not surprising to find Eunomius alluding to its

¹⁷¹ For Basil's claims and a discussion of this and other possibilities, see Vaggione 5–9.

¹⁷² Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 51. 23–6).

¹⁷³ Ibid. 1 (J i. 44. 15–18). Cf. also *Apol.* 27. 18–19 (Vaggione 72), where only a few are in communion with him.

¹⁷⁴ Eun., *Apol.* 6. 16 (Vaggione 38): τῶν ἐπενεχθέντων ἐγκλημάτων.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. 2. 3–4, 7–8, cf. 27. 31–6 (Vaggione 36, 72).

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. 2. 2–3, 4. 5–6, 27. 23–8, 34–6 (Vaggione 36, 72),

¹⁷⁷ Since he mentions 'earlier speakers', this may have been toward the close of the proceedings, *Apol.* 2. 4–6 (Vaggione 36).

¹⁷⁸ See above, Ch. 5 n. 44.

¹⁷⁹ Soz., *HE* 4. 23. 8 (*GCS* 178. 4–8).

¹⁸⁰ Hahn, § 167, pp. 208–9.

central formula at least twice.¹⁸¹ Moreover, the principal negative focus of the work is the party most often condemned by these councils, that of Eustathius and Basil.¹⁸² The Nicenes are rejected as well, but only in passing—at this point they were hardly to be taken seriously.¹⁸³

That still leaves another, more delicate issue unresolved. Eunomius had to establish his credibility in the matter of substance-language. Ever since the publication of the 'Blasphemy' this kind of language had been repeatedly rejected; yet in the *Apology* the forbidden words, especially *ousia* and *hypostasis*, occur on almost every page. That seems impolitic to say the least. It is only gradually that one comes to realize that many of these occurrences are negative. Eunomius does not reject substance-language—far from it—but in this work he uses it tactically in many instances to show the falseness of the opposing position.¹⁸⁴ His enemies noted this but, like Basil the Great, they presumably ascribed it to hypocrisy.¹⁸⁵ Still, the *Apology* contains any number of more positive examples; what about them? The Maker of all, for instance, is said to be 'unbegotten essence',¹⁸⁶ while the hypostasis of the Son is described as uniquely and properly his own.¹⁸⁷ Yet significantly, as we shall see, the context of almost all these examples is linguistic, and in the latter case (which is almost formulaic) the author even feels obliged to apologize for *τόλμα*.¹⁸⁸ *Anomoios* itself, needless to say, is nowhere to be found,¹⁸⁹ but the ontological and linguistic implications of the scriptural passages

¹⁸¹ 'Similar in accordance with the scriptures': Eun., *Apol.* 22. 4–5, cf. 12. 6–7 (Vaggione 62, cf. 48).

¹⁸² Ibid. 11. 4–9, 18. 9–13, 20. 1–5, 21. 4–5, 22. 1–4, 24. 23–4, cf. 26. 24 (Vaggione 46, 56, 58, 60, 62, 66, cf. 70), etc.

¹⁸³ Ibid. 11. 8–12, 26. 24 (Vaggione 46, 70). The reference to the arch-heretics Sabellius, Marcellus, and Photinus in *Apol.* 6. 12–15 (Vaggione 38) is also probably a coded reference, as well as a sign that Eunomius could be counted on to condemn earlier heresies.

¹⁸⁴ e.g. ibid. 10. 1–6, 13–11. 3, 14. 15–17, 23. 5 (Vaggione 44, 46, 50, 62).

¹⁸⁵ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 4. 43–55 (*SC* 299. 164–6).

¹⁸⁶ Eun., *Apol.* 7. 10–11 (Vaggione 40), cf. Aetius, *Synt.* 18 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 18 (*GCS* iii. 355. 21–2).

¹⁸⁷ Eun., *Apol.* 12. 9–12, cf. 25. 16–17 (Vaggione 48, cf. 68).

¹⁸⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 8. 14–18, 12. 6–13. 2 (Vaggione 42, 48).

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Philost., *HE* 6. 1 (*GCS* 70. 15–18).

underlying it are strongly emphasized,¹⁹⁰ as is the impossibility of comparison in any real sense.¹⁹¹ Toward the end of his argument Eunomius summarizes his position by appealing to substance-language as a necessary guarantee of the order and subsistence of the entities, and then presents the Son as the image and seal of the totality of the Father's power (*not* his essence).¹⁹² He concludes by recapitulating the story of salvation (including the Son's pre-incarnate mission but not his *descensus*), and then moves into his closing paragraph. The nervousness that is plainly visible there was abundantly justified—it must have been a near thing.¹⁹³ It just so happened, however, that at this point Eudoxius and his allies were in desperate need of 'sound' men to replace the departing homoiousians;¹⁹⁴ political reliability was therefore almost as important as doctrinal.¹⁹⁵ As a result Eunomius was appointed bishop of Cyzicus, one of the great cities lying across the Sea of Marmora from Constantinople. It was as well-known for its mint and imperial wool factories as for the volatility of their workers.¹⁹⁶ The outgoing bishop, Eleusius, was a former government official¹⁹⁷ closely associated with Macedonius and Basil of Ancyra,¹⁹⁸ but, more to the point, had been in place for some years,¹⁹⁹ possessed a good reputation,²⁰⁰ and was a staunch

¹⁹⁰ Eun., *Apol.* 12. 1-4, 18. 5-9, 21. 1-5 (Vaggione 46-8, 54-6, 60), etc.

¹⁹¹ Ibid. 9. 1-15, 11. 4-9, 20. 11-14 (Vaggione 42-4, 46, 58-60), etc. See above, Ch. 5, pp. 163-6.

¹⁹² Eun., *Apol.* 26. 9-10 (Vaggione 68), cf. *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 11. 6 (GCS ii. 106. 12-15). The corresponding passage in the *Apology* a couple of chapters earlier (24. 4-28; 64-6) is a painstaking exegesis of Col. 1: 15-16. This may have been aimed at Acacius, whose support at best was lukewarm, and who used this passage to explain his understanding of 'similar' at Seleucia (Hahn, § 165, p. 207).

¹⁹³ Eun., *Apol.* 27. 25-31 (Vaggione 72).

¹⁹⁴ Effectively the same group, numbered at fifteen, were excommunicated in the reign of Jovian, *Hist. Aceph.* 4. 29-34 (SC 317. 154).

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Soc., *HE* 2. 42. 2-3 (GCS 179. 10-15).

¹⁹⁶ Soz., *HE* 5. 15. 6-7 (GCS 214. 12-20). Basil the Great was not above relying on the loyalty of such workers, Grg. Naz., *Or.* 43. 57 (PG 36. 569A).

¹⁹⁷ Soz., *HE* 4. 20. 2 (GCS 170. 6-7).

¹⁹⁸ Ibid. 4. 13. 5, cf. 22. 7 (GCS 156. 10-13, cf. 173. 3-5), Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 23. 4, cf. 73. 27. 6, 75. 2. 6 (GCS iii. 296. 15-18, cf. 301. 4-7, 334. 13).

¹⁹⁹ Probably since the return of Macedonius, nearly a decade earlier, Soc., *HE* 2. 38. 3-4 (GCS 164. 2-7).

²⁰⁰ Hilary, *Syn.* 63, cf. 90 (PL 10. 522C-523A, cf. 542B), Soz., *HE* 4. 20. 2 (GCS 170. 7-8).

supporter of the *homoiousion*.²⁰¹ As a patron of virgins, widows, and the poor,²⁰² therefore, his chief legacy to Eunomius was a congregation that shared his zeal.²⁰³ Whether or not the expendable Eunomius was ever intended to be anything more than a sacrificial lamb, there is no doubt he had been given a difficult job—one made no easier by the fact that his exiled²⁰⁴ opponent was not above violence.²⁰⁵

Eunomius' troubles did not wait for him to arrive to begin. Some of his prospective clergy immediately protested his election, and claimed he believed the Son was unlike the Father in all respects, not just in essence.²⁰⁶ This allowed the clergy of Constantinople (led by the inappropriately named Hesychius) to protest as well, for it gave them an excellent excuse to make trouble for their own bishop. Eunomius was required to give a public account of himself: he did not mean, he said, that the Son was unlike the Father in *all* respects, but only in essence, and he also accepted the formula 'similar in accordance with the scriptures'. This allowed a relieved Eudoxius to send him off with an appropriate biblical tag,²⁰⁷ and a recommendation of caution.²⁰⁸ The bishop could have saved his breath, however,

²⁰¹ Even his enemies could admire his steadfastness, Thdt., *HE* 2. 27. 21 (*GCS* 162. 12–15).

²⁰² *Soz.*, *HE* 5. 15. 5 (*GCS* 214. 8–12).

²⁰³ *Philost.*, *HE* 9. 13 (*GCS* 120. 12–15).

²⁰⁴ This seems to be what is implied by *ibid.* 5. 1 (*GCS* 66. 2–8), in contrast to what may have been a somewhat different situation five years later. See Ch. 7, pp. 291–4 below.

²⁰⁵ *Soc.*, *HE* 2. 38. 28, cf. 3. 11. 3 (*GCS* 167. 2–5, cf. 206. 7–11).

²⁰⁶ This, presumably, is part of what Acacius meant when he later claimed that Eunomius was ordained 'without the common consent', *Philost.*, *HE* 6. 4 (*GCS* 71. 23–4).

²⁰⁷ *Philost.*, *HE* 6. 1 (*GCS* 70. 2–71. 2). The protest of the Cyzican clergy must have taken place almost immediately after Eunomius' election, because nothing else accounts for the fact that the primary response was from the clergy of Constantinople. Kopecek (ii. 395) places this in May 360, while Bernard Sesboüé and his collaborators place it at the end of 360 or in 361 (*SC* 299. 25–6). In *Philostorgius*, however, this episode comes before the sermon on Epiphany, and it is very unlikely that Eunomius celebrated two Epiphanies at Cyzicus (see n. 214 below). Moreover, since in 361 Constantius left Antioch sometime in Mar. or Apr., to place the offending sermon in Jan. of that year does not leave a lot of time for him to hear of the problem, summon Eunomius, wait for him to arrive, and then hear the case.

²⁰⁸ Thdt., *HE* 2. 29. 2–3 (*GCS* 165. 17–166. 2), cf. *Philost.*, *HE* 6. 3 (*GCS* 71. 15–19).

for the inexperienced Eunomius was soon tempted into 'precision' and undone.²⁰⁹ Not long after his arrival, on the feast of the Epiphany, he preached a sermon in which he did not trouble to disguise his beliefs, claiming among other things that Mary had borne children to Joseph after the Saviour's birth.²¹⁰ The uproar caused by this and other sermons finally led to a series of formal protests, first to the archbishop and then to the emperor. The latter rebuked Eudoxius' hesitation,²¹¹ and Eunomius was obliged to return to Cappadocia.²¹² He was not, however, formally deposed,²¹³ and this in its turn led to another appearance before Constantius. By that time, however, the emperor was already in winter quarters at Antioch,²¹⁴ and so it was there, in January or February of 361, that the charges were finally heard. But since Acacius, the chief accuser, failed to present a case, the whole matter was remanded to a church council.²¹⁵ That was still its status when in November of the same year Constantius died, and Eunomius was reprieved. At that time he had been a bishop just a little under two years.²¹⁶

²⁰⁹ According to Thdt., *HE* 2. 29. 3-7 (*GCS* 166. 2-19), he was urged to speak out by members of his congregation.

²¹⁰ Philost., *HE* 6. 2 (*GCS* 71. 3-9). On the background of this teaching, see Ch. 4 n. 251 above.

²¹¹ Thdt., *HE* 2. 29. 3-12 (*GCS* 166. 2-167. 19).

²¹² Philost., *HE* 6. 3 (*GCS* 71. 19-22).

²¹³ Cf. *ibid.* 9. 13 (*GCS* 120. 11-12).

²¹⁴ There is some confusion in Philostorgius' account. Both he and Socrates (*HE* 2. 47. 1-4 (*GCS* 186. 8-15)) seem to place these episodes in the spring of 360 in connection with Julian's revolt. But Ammianus Marcellinus 20. 11. 4 shows that the emperor was journeying across the Anatolian plateau at that time, and did not enter Antioch until the campaigning season was over. It seems, then, that these authors (or their source) have confused events from the end of the campaign with those at its beginning.

²¹⁵ Philost., *HE* 6. 4 (*GCS* 71. 23-72. 6). Kopecek ii. 407-10 assumes that Acacius' accusation took place at a council mentioned by Socrates as taking place in Antioch in 361, at a point when Constantius was in residence, and after Euzoius had been elected bishop (*HE* 2. 45. 9-10 (*GCS* 183. 14-184. 2)). Since Socrates also describes the synod as 'small' (ὀλίγοι τινες), and Philostorgius portrays Constantius as referring the matter to a μέγιστον συνέδριον, this may be correct. We are, however, under no obligation to accept Socrates' inferences about the doctrinal orientation of this council (see n. 133 above). About this same time Acacius also complained about Auxentius of Mopsuestia's humane treatment of Aetius, so the charges laid against Eunomius may have been part of a co-ordinated attack on master and pupil, cf. Philost., *HE* 5. 2 (*GCS* 67. 10-12).

²¹⁶ The following scenario seems to account for the data: Eunomius is

At some point during those years (probably during his stay at Oltiseris), Eunomius edited his *Apology* for publication and issued it in written form. This was almost certainly his first published work,²¹⁷ and thus marks the point at which he began to step out from the shadow of his teacher and become a public figure in his own right. The ostensible reason for taking this step was 'a lying allegation' that had now been 'trumped up against' him 'by words and deeds' and believed by the simpler sort.²¹⁸ This may be a reference to his recent expulsion from Cyzicus. And yet, while he was unable to return to his bishopric in Constantius' lifetime, the mere fact that he was not deposed points to some measure of success. The work itself was still in circulation some years later, and was thought worthy of refutation by no one less than Basil the Great himself. For like Eunomius Basil too had been present at the council as a deacon,²¹⁹ though he chose not to speak out.²²⁰ When he finally

ordained Bishop at the Council of Constantinople (2 or 3 Jan. 360). Clergy from Cyzicus are present and protest, and this leads to a wider protest by the clergy of Constantinople. Eunomius addresses them and is allowed to go to Cyzicus. His inaugural sermon on 6 Jan. causes an uproar, which is only worsened by later ones. Repeated protests are made to Eudoxius and the emperor, and the latter then orders Eudoxius to expel Eunomius (Mar. or Apr. 360), himself leaving for the East. Eunomius leaves Cyzicus (after Easter? 23 April 360), in part because the stipulated three months have passed and Eudoxius has not recalled Aetius, Philost., *HE* 6. 3 (*GCS* 71. 15-22). At Caesarea in Cappadocia Constantius learns of Julian's revolt, but continues his campaign against the Persians. Once in winter quarters (Dec. 360) he summons Eunomius (Jan. or Feb. 361), and hears the case against him.

²¹⁷ See Vaggione 14-15.

²¹⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 1. 7-15 (Vaggione 34), That *Apol.* 1 is the introduction to the published version and *Apol.* 2 the beginning of the original speech, is shown not only by the ἔγγραφον of 1. 15 but by the fact that all the parallels at the close of the document (27. 16-42) are with *Apol.* 2 and 3, not *Apol.* 1 (see Vaggione 13-14). Pace Kopecek ii. 368-9, this shows that in its final form Basil of Caesarea's reply cannot be as early as '360 or very early 361' because it cites this preface to the published edn., *Eun.* 1. 2. 22-8 (*SC* 299. 150).

²¹⁹ Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 5-7).

²²⁰ Presumably he represented his bishop, the aged Dianius of Caesarea, who signed later 'in all simplicity', Basil, *Ep.* 51. 2. 1-12 (Courtonne iii. 132-3). In *AA* 1 (*J* i. 63. 2-10; 66. 1-3; 68. 17-20; 70. 11-13) Eunomius mocks him for his silence, something that Gregory of Nyssa apparently could not deny, Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 82 (*J* i. 50. 18-23), cf. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 1. 5-6 (*SC* 299. 140). For Basil's role at the council, see S. Giet, 'Saint Basile et le concile de Constantinople de 360', *JTS* 6 (1955), 94-9.

did do so, it was (as Eunomius pointed out) only some years later and in writing; moreover, the stenographers were supplied by Eustathius of Sebaste.²²¹ For this Basil, though by all means sympathetic, was not necessarily an unqualified admirer of the *homoousion*,²²² and was at that point, as he put it later, very nearly Eustathius' slave.²²³ One effect of his work, however, was to change the terms of the debate. For Eunomius' original purpose, after all, had been a limited one—to keep a firm grip on *akribeia* while treading lightly through the political minefields—and that focus is visible in his work.²²⁴ Basil, on the other hand, addressed a much wider theme, Eunomius' theological method as a whole, and that shifted the way his enemy's treatise had to be read. Basil forced the debate outside the deliberately narrow boundaries of Eunomius' original treatise to the meaning of 'God-language' itself.

It is easy to see why he did this. One of the difficulties faced by almost all the participants in this controversy was the dissonance between the comparatively univocal technical vocabulary of doctrine and the polyvalent language of scripture.²²⁵ The word 'beget' itself is a case in point. In most cases it is 'of [this] earth earthy' and refers to the male generative act in procreation;²²⁶ in other instances it is used metaphorically,²²⁷ while in still others it is applied directly to God.²²⁸ Because there seemed no other way to escape the sexual and mythological

²²¹ Basil, *Ep.* 223. 5. 5–9 (Courtonne iii. 14).

²²² Philostorgius, *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 1–6), classifies him as a 'shield bearer' of Eustathius and Basil of Ancyra, and in *Ep.* 9. 2. 26–7, 3. 1–4 (Courtonne i. 38, 39), τὸ ὁμοιον κατ' οὐσίαν seems to be a synonym for τὸ ὁμοούσιον. In the *Adversus Eunomium* the latter occurs only once with respect to the Trinity (*Eun.* 1. 20. 11 (*SC* 299. 244)); all the other instances are to human beings, *Eun.* 2. 4. 33, 40, 10. 5, 19. 64 (*SC* 305. 22, 38, 80).

²²³ Basil, *Ep.* 244. 1. 7–8 (Courtonne iii. 74).

²²⁴ Basil, *Eun.* I. 1. 37–9, cf. 2. 9–13 (*SC* 299. 146, cf. 148) alleges that the work was published to make Eunomius ἀρχηγός and προστάτης of his own group, but at this point he needed rehabilitation more than advancement.

²²⁵ See Ch. 3, pp. 58–60 above. In some ways this is what lies behind Basil's complaint in *Eun.* 1. 4. 43–55 (*SC* 299. 164–6) that Eunomius hides his real teaching under traditional forms.

²²⁶ Gen. 5: 4, 7, 10; Isa. 45: 10, etc.

²²⁷ e.g. John 3: 3–5, 7; 1 John 5: 10; 1 Cor. 4: 15, etc.

²²⁸ e.g. Deut. 32: 18; Prov. 8: 25; Ps. 2: 7, 109 (110): 3; John 3: 16, 18, etc.

overtones inherent in this word,²²⁹ many authors taught that it was applied to God only in a strictly unique sense,²³⁰ that is, in a consistently 'odd' way. As a result there was a general agreement as to what the word did *not* mean (sexual intercourse or anything like it), but very little as to what it did. That is why the councils of Sirmium, Nicaea/Ustodizo, and Constantinople all tried to cut the Gordian knot by insisting on a kind of 'reverent agnosticism',²³¹ in effect they said, 'we just don't know'. Their solution, however, scarcely outlived its publication. There were a number of reasons for this, but one is obvious: 'beget' is not unique. It is only one of a large number of words, equally problematic, that are applied by scripture to God or to Christ.²³² Contemporary lists of such words include such examples as 'Shepherd', 'King', 'Physician', 'Bridegroom', 'Way', 'Door', 'Fountain', 'Bread', 'Axe', and 'Rock', among others.²³³ Like 'beget', each of these words has an ordinary, earthy meaning which can be applied to Christ or to God only in a very special, 'odd', or non-normal sense. Basil and Eunomius both agreed that this was so. Where they could not agree was in precisely what that meant.

This will not be easy for us to understand, and in order to do so we need to step back from some of our own presuppositions. Centuries of Greek learning and Christian theology have so accustomed us to hear phrases like 'God the Father' or 'Only-begotten Son' in a bodiless, non-material sense that we scarcely realize how very strange that is. Yet even a little consideration forces us to recognize that such a usage can only result from a

²²⁹ e.g. Justin, *Apol.* 1. 21. 1-6 (Krüger 17. 25-18. 24), *Dial.* 67. 1-2 (Goodspeed 174), etc.

²³⁰ e.g. Athenag., *Leg.* 21. 1 (Schoedel 44), Or., *Princ.* 1. 2. 4 (GCS v. 32. 5-33. 3), Eun., *Apol.* 16. 1-9, 17. 4-6 (Vaggione 52, 54), *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 11. 1 (GCS ii. 105. 17-18), Cyril H., *Catech.* 7. 5 (Reischl i. 212-14), etc.

²³¹ *Symb. Sirm.* 2 (Hahn, § 161, p. 200), *Symb. Nic.* (359) (Hahn, § 164, p. 206), *Symb. CP* (360) (Hahn, § 167, p. 208).

²³² Cf. Or., *Princ.* 1. 2. 1 (GCS v. 28. 1-12).

²³³ Basil, *Spir.* 17. 27-9 (SC 17bis. 304), *Ep.* 8. 8. 5-8 (Courtonne i. 32), cf. Or., *Princ.* 1. 2. 4 (GCS v. 32. 5-9), Ath., *Gent.* 47. 4-6 (Thomson 130), *Ar.* 2. 37 (PG 26. 225A), Grg. Nyss., *Conf.* 124 (J ii. 365. 14-17), *Symb. Ant.* (341) 2 (Hahn, § 154, p. 185), Germinius, *Ep. Ruf.* 2. 1-2 (CSEL 65. 162. 28-163. 9), Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 46. 22-5), etc. A similar problem cropped up *vis-à-vis* the titles of the Holy Spirit as soon as its coequality became an issue, cf. Damasus, *De Explanatione Fidei* (PL 13. 373B-374A).

really enormous act of abstraction. That is, we start with some ordinary word like 'son', 'father', or 'beget', and then take from it almost everything we usually mean by it. In effect we have established a privileged context—'God language'—wherein we are able to use words in a way consistently different from the way we use them in almost every other context. This was a long-standing problem,²³⁴ and one the authors we have been studying were certainly aware of, but it was also one whose ramifications were beginning to take on a new urgency at just this time. We have already noted that Aetius and Eunomius worked within a smaller theological arena than their predecessors.²³⁵ One reason for this was that, by the mid-fourth century, the combination of a consolidated canon of scripture and earlier theological work had made exegesis (the interpretation of a large, uniformly authoritative body of literature) more central to the theologian's task.²³⁶ To further complicate matters, this task was being carried out by people using different and not entirely explicit hermeneutical frameworks when they selected and interpreted evidence. One result was a 'cognitive dissonance' of the kind we have already discussed,²³⁷ but another was that exegetical issues tended to become the primary point of contact between the two sides. This in its turn raised the issue of the meaning of biblical language itself and what it can and cannot tell us about God. Basil, in fact, made this one of the central focuses of his work. The reason was not that his opponent denied the authority of scripture (he thought it was inerrant²³⁸); nor again, that he did not think it necessary to take some parts of it in an 'odd' sense (he did);²³⁹ but rather that working within a very different interpretative framework, he had to put the 'oddness' in a different place.²⁴⁰

The reason for this is rooted in something that would have

²³⁴ e.g. Or., *Princ.* I. praef. 8–9 (*GCS* v. 14. 14–15. 27), Didymus, *Spir.* 167. 1–7 (*SC* 386. 296), etc.

²³⁵ See Ch. 4 n. 147 above.

²³⁶ Cf. Williams, *Arius*, 148.

²³⁷ See above Ch. 4, pp. 94–8.

²³⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 17. 13–14 (Vaggione 54).

²³⁹ Eun., *Apol.* 18. 4–5, cf. 12. 4–5, 16. 1–6, 9–14, 22. 8 (Vaggione 54, cf. 48, 52–4, 62); cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* I. 21 (*PG* 28. 1148D).

²⁴⁰ Cf. e.g. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (*PG* 29. 752A/B), (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 3. 11, 12 (*PG* 28. 1217C–D, 1220C).

been at issue in any case—the location of the ‘break’. If the ‘break’ separating contingent from non-contingent being does indeed come between Father and Son (as the non-Nicenes claimed), then that has to be taken into account in explaining the many words used by scripture of both. For instance, if the Father is ‘Almighty’ and ‘only wise God’,²⁴¹ in what sense is the Son ‘the power and wisdom’ of God?²⁴² Arius’ answer (to the great scandal of his enemies) was ‘in a sense peculiar to himself’. For while Arius was perfectly prepared to admit that there was a ‘wisdom’ proper to God *qua* God which was inherent to his nature, the hermeneutical framework which governed how he took the story as a whole forced him to read other instances differently. Thus when scripture used the word ‘wisdom’ to describe the Son, it must be doing so in the same reflexive sense that it calls him ‘image’ (in other words, *καταχρηστικῶς*, or ‘using poetic licence’²⁴³). That is why so much non-Nicene controversial exegesis is an attempt to show that scripture does just that—uses the same words to refer to God and to other entities. What the word means in any given instance can only be established from context.²⁴⁴ Thus the children of Israel are described as God’s ‘sons’,²⁴⁵ while the palmer-worm is his ‘great power’,²⁴⁶ and all contingent being is said to be ‘from God’.²⁴⁷ In each case the same word is applied to God and to something else, but each in its own sense. For Aetius and Eunomius, then, as for the rest of their school, even when scripture does use the same word of both God and Christ, the ontological status of the being to which it refers is what determines the meaning, not the word itself. This is how Eunomius puts it in his *Apology*:

²⁴¹ Rom. 16: 27 (for occurrences see Appendix).

²⁴² 1 Cor. 1: 24 (see Appendix).

²⁴³ ‘Not in the proper sense’, Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 7 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 7. 23–8. 2).

²⁴⁴ Cf. Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 6 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 16. 17–17. 1). There is nothing to show that these passages were much used outside a controversial context, but (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 6. 4 (PG 39. 521A), complains that they were used inconsistently.

²⁴⁵ Isa. 1: 2 (see Appendix).

²⁴⁶ Joel 2: 25 (see Appendix).

²⁴⁷ 1 Cor. 11: 12 (see Appendix).

'But perhaps someone who has been goaded by all this into responding will say, "Even granting the necessity of paying attention to the names and of being brought by them to the meanings of the underlying realities, still, by the same token that we say that the unbegotten is different from the begotten, we also say that 'light' and 'light', 'life' and 'life', 'power' and 'power' are alike with respect to both." Our reply is not to substitute the rod for an answer in the manner of the admirer of Diogenes (for the philosophy of the Cynics is far removed from Christianity), but rather to emulate the blessed Paul who said that we must correct our opponents with great patience. Our response, then, to such a person is to say that the one "light" is unbegotten and the other begotten.'²⁴⁸

In other words, the *taxis* is always primary.²⁴⁹ Most of Eunomius' opponents would have agreed that the subject determined the meaning,²⁵⁰ but not that the *taxis* did so,²⁵¹ and still less that its members were all ontologically distinct. Thus while the two sides agreed as to the 'oddness' of God-language in general, they could not agree as to its specific application. In each case their understanding of some of this 'oddness' reflected where they placed the 'break' between contingent and non-contingent being. Detailed discussion of this tended to centre around the language of generation.

This was language everyone could agree was 'odd', if only because it was so obviously necessary to exclude its sexual content.²⁵² What caused the conflict was the fact that, even after that content was removed, the different interpretative frame-

²⁴⁸ Eun., *Apol.* 19. 1-9 (Vaggione 56).

²⁴⁹ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 296. 7-9, 297. 2-13), cf. *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 6. 1 (*GCS* ii. 100. 20-2), Or., *Princ.* 1. 2. 6 (*GCS* v. 36. 7-13, 37. 2 ff., apparatus). This is generally what is meant when Nicenes complain that their opponents pervert scripture *τροπικώτερον* to make it refer to some different person (*εἰς ἕτερον πρόσωπον*), as e.g. in Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 50. 1, cf. 51. 3 (*GCS* iii. 196. 20-5, cf. 197. 26-30).

²⁵⁰ Ath., *Decr.* 10. 6 (Opitz ii. 9. 27-32), cf. *Ar.* 2. 3, 44 (*PG* 26. 152C, 241A-C), Hilary, *Trin.* 3. 22. 16-21 (*CCL* 62. 67), Gr̄g. Naz., *Or.* 29. 13. 21-2 (*SC* 250. 204), Aug., *Trin.* 5. 7. 11-14 (*CCL* 50. 213). See also Ch. 4 n. 42 above.

²⁵¹ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 20. 12-19 (*SC* 299. 244), cf. (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 29 (*PG* 39. 948A).

²⁵² Hilary, *Trin.* 9. 37. 1-10 (*CCL* 62A. 411), Aug., *Trin.* 5. 8. 23-31 (*CCL* 50. 215-16), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 443. 15-28 (*SC* 231. 300), Eun., *Apol.* 16. 6-9, 18. 4-9 (Vaggione 52, 54-6), etc.

works required the excision of different parts. Alexander of Alexandria for instance, like other Nicenes, was convinced that transmission of essence was an inherent part of the concept of begetting, and that it was nonsense to describe the Logos as 'Son' and yet deny he was 'from the essence'.²⁵³ The non-Nicenes, on the other hand, were equally convinced that it was nonsense to speak of a 'begetting' which did not include the priority of parent to child:²⁵⁴ if the Logos really were God's 'Son', there had to be a sense in which it was begotten 'when as yet it did not exist'.²⁵⁵ The alternative was to say that it was begotten when it *did* exist, which was at best incoherent,²⁵⁶ at worst blasphemous—it brought in ideas of flowing, division, or separation.²⁵⁷ Both sides were thus able to agree on two things: that in this context generation-language is 'odd', and that the begetting itself was 'real'.²⁵⁸ What they could not do was admit that, when others tried to say the same thing from within a different interpretative framework, they were not wilfully distorting its meaning.²⁵⁹

²⁵³ Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 18 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 22. 15–17), cf. Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 2 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 2. 2–3), Hilary, *Syn.* 35 (PL 10. 507C–508A), etc. Aetius, interestingly, admits the premiss but not the conclusion in *Synt.* 6 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 6 (GCS iii. 353. 17–18).

²⁵⁴ Cyril, *Thes.* 5 (PG 75. 57B–C, 69C–D), cf. Aug., *Trin.* 6. 1. 10–17 (CCL 50. 228), Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 201. 3–5).

²⁵⁵ Eun., *EF* 3. 2–4 (Vaggione 152), cf. *Apol.* 12. 10–12, 15. 7–8, 24. 12–13 (Vaggione 48, 52, 64), *AA* 3 (J ii. 248. 25–7), Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 4 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 3. 3), *Ep. Alex.* 3, 4 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 13. 4–5, 8–10), etc.

²⁵⁶ Eun., *Apol.* 13. 4–7, 14. 4–5 (Vaggione 48, 50), cf. *AA* 3 (J ii. 220. 5–8). Despite claims that this issue came up later ([Ps.-]Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2 (PG 29. 677B)), according to Arius it had already been condemned by Alexander of Alexandria, Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 3 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 13. 1–4).

²⁵⁷ Eun., *Apol.* 17. 4–5, 22. 9 (Vaggione 54, 62), *AA* 3 (J ii. 61. 7–14), *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 8. 1 (GCS ii. 101. 23–102. 3), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 8. 21–4 (SC 250. 192), (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 15 (PG 39. 332A–B), etc. The concern was perhaps not wholly incomprehensible; cf. Athanasius' ἐνοῦσιος ἐνέργεια in *Ar.* 2. 2 (PG 26. 152A).

²⁵⁸ Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 7–9), *Symb. Ant.* (345) 3 (Hahn, § 159, p. 193), Aetius, *Synt.* 37 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 37 (GCS iii. 359. 24–360. 1), cf. Eun., *EF* 3. 2, *Apol.* 7. 7–8 (Vaggione 152, 40); *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 10. 1 (GCS ii. 104. 8–10), Concilia, C. Sel., *Ep. Legat.* 2 (CSEL 65. 174. 18–19), Cyril, *Thes.* 19 (PG 75. 316C–D), etc.

²⁵⁹ e.g. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 24 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 23. 20–2), Ath., *Decr.* 16. 1 (Opitz ii. 12. 19–21), Hilary, *Trin.* 11. 2. 13–15 (CCL 62A. 531), *Const.* 13. 10–12 (SC 334. 196); and for the other side: Aetius, *Synt.* 8 apud

This helps us understand why the reference of names was so relevant, and why there was so much interest in the reference of the divine names in particular—scripture, after all, is full of such names. It could be assumed that some of them referred to the Being of God more or less directly, others to that Being in action, and still others had some kind of unique sense of their own. But that still left two further questions: which was which and how did they relate to the entities they were thought to designate? Since this last question was obviously of more than theological interest, it reached Basil and Eunomius accompanied by a long prehistory and an established terminology. The portion of that history that is relevant here is the attempt by some philosophers to understand how nouns (as opposed to verbs and predicates) relate to their objects.²⁶⁰

Plato's theory is the most immediately relevant. He defined names as a kind of tool intended to tell us what things are,²⁶¹ and thus introduced a functional orientation that long remained a feature of the debate.²⁶² In his view, then, behind the sounds that make up an audible word lies an individual object or *πράγμα* to which it refers, together with the essence or nature in which the latter inheres.²⁶³ It is important therefore, to recognize that names as sounds must be distinguished from names as vehicles of meaning, so that even 'barbarian' words have genuine meaning. The reason for this is that meaning is determined by the object and/or essence to which the name refers,

Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 8 (*GCS* iii. 354. 2-4), Eun., *Apol.* 11. 15-12. 6, 14. 6-10, 17. 12-17 (Vaggione 46-8, 50, 54), cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 19 (*PG* 28. 1185D-1188A), etc.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Plato, *Cra.* 431B-C. This means among other things that this terminology did not develop as part of an attempt to explain language as a dynamic system (as a whole); it was an attempt to understand how one element of language—names—related to the objects it was supposed to represent.

²⁶¹ Plato, *Cra.* 388C, cf. 422D, 428E.

²⁶² According to Grig. Nyss., *Eun.* 2. 404 (J i. 344. 13-17), Eunomius' theory actually came from Plato's *Cratylus*. This may or may not have been true as a matter of fact, but in more general terms it was certainly correct, as already noted in Cardinal Daniélou's classic essay, 'Eunome l'Arien et l'exégèse platonicienne du *Cratyle*', *REG* 69 (1956), 412-32.

²⁶³ This is a polarity abundantly present in Eunomius, e.g. *Apol.* 14. 6, 18. 7-8 (Vaggione 50, 54-6), name/object; *Apol.* 12. 3-4, 9, 18. 13-14 (Vaggione 48, 56), name/essence, etc.

not by the sounds that make it up.²⁶⁴ So far, all this is fairly straightforward. But if it is really true that names as sounds must be distinguished from names as vehicles of meaning, in what sense do the latter relate to the things they are supposed to represent? Are they pure conventions developed by some human inventor, but without any necessary link to their supposed objects (*θέσει*)? Or do they in fact connect us in some real way to the essences in which they inhere (*φύσει*)?²⁶⁵ Plato taught that only in the latter case could we really speak of 'knowing' anything. This remained a fundamental principle even after the issue was taken up by Christians. To be 'real', knowledge must somehow link us to the essence.²⁶⁶

As long as discussion was confined to concrete individuals, or to specific essences like 'horse' or 'human being',²⁶⁷ this approach was more or less adequate. However, as soon as an attempt was made to try to deal with the polyvalent world of ordinary language (especially as it is found in so complex a work as the Christian Bible), these categories proved inadequate. This was especially true of words like 'Father', 'Son', or 'beget', that could not be literally applied to an immaterial God (i.e. *θεοπρεπώς*);²⁶⁸ that was the reason so many of them had to be taken in a consistently 'odd' sense (*καταχρηστικώς*),²⁶⁹ and why allegory retained its attraction. None of this, of course, was unique to Christians, but what did make their situation more acute was their increasing insistence on two biblical actors in the Old Testament, which increased the number of parties to which the words might refer. This was compounded in the New Testament by the presence of an authoritative copula in such

²⁶⁴ Plato, *Cra.* 389D–390A, cf. 393D. This is, of course, an oversimplification in that Plato also considered the possibility that sounds apply more or less appropriately by nature, and thus represent their object well or badly, e.g. *Cra.* 421C–423B. For a much more elaborate working out of this distinction by a Christian, see Aug., *Trin.* 14. 7. 48–51, 15. 10. 64–8, 76–83, 15. 14. 32–9, 21. 14–21, 37–40, 278. 94–7 (*CCL* 50A. 434, 485, 486, 497, 518, 532).

²⁶⁵ Plato, *Cra.* 383A, cf. 433D–434B.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 385E–386E.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 385A.

²⁶⁸ e.g. Philo, *Deus* 69 (Cohn and Wendland ii. 72. 10–12), Clement, *Strom.* 7. i. 2. 1 (*GCS* iii. 3. 27–4. 1), Or., *Jo.* 6. 4. 19 (*GCS* iv. 110. 19–23), cf. Eun., *AA* 3 (*J* ii. 47. 4–6).

²⁶⁹ Philo, *LA* 2. 10, cf. 19–20 (Cohn and Wendland i. 92. 15–16, cf. 94. 24–95. 4).

phrases as 'I *am* the bread of life', 'I *am* the light of the world', or 'I *am* the good shepherd'.²⁷⁰ The difficulty of taking these phrases (especially the first two) in any literal sense would have caused epistemological problems in any case, but in an inspired document, where no phrase could be considered accidental, they were particularly troubling. If it was clearly impossible that the divine essence could 'be' any of these things, then in what sense did they refer to it at all? Were they pure conventions? Or did they refer to something which was 'real' in some other sense?

One attractive line of argument was at least hinted at by a group with a similar problem. These were the Stoics. In their philosophy only things that are material can be considered 'real', and these are divided into two categories: *ποιούν* and *πάσχον* (that which acts and that which is acted upon).²⁷¹ Unfortunately this made it somewhat difficult to know what to make of things that did not fit clearly into either category: were they 'real' or not? Mathematical objects were particularly troublesome (triangles, squares, tetragons, and the like). Because they were not inherently material they could not be considered 'real', and yet it was hard to deny they could be recognized in 'real' things. This opened up the possibility that there were things or aspects of things that could not be said to 'exist' in the proper sense of the word and yet had 'real' cognitive force.²⁷² Some philosophers tried to resolve the difficulty by speaking of some things as 'existing' in two ways: as 'real', concrete, physical objects, and as objects possessing certain 'real' marks or qualities that can be discerned as independent even though they do not 'exist' independently. Thus, for those who take this approach, there exists in any given case a 'real', material object (a rock, say, or a piece of wood); this object 'really' exists. On the other hand, there is also something which is 'real' in the object which can be discerned by our minds (such

²⁷⁰ John 6: 35, 48; 8: 12, 9: 5; 10: 11, 14, etc. The use of verb 'to be' can be taken to imply that in each case we are being told something about what the entity is.

²⁷¹ DL 7. 134.

²⁷² Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* 8. 453 (Mutschmann ii. 206). We do in fact seem to recognize that there is something real designated 'triangle' in each individual thing that is triangular, and yet we never encounter a triangle apart from a concrete instance.

as triangular or tetragonal shape), and of this we can form a 'concept' or *epinoia*. The *epinoia* does not 'exist' in the strict sense, but it does represent something that is 'real'. This made it possible to speak of some things as existing in two ways: as concrete physical realities (*καθ' ὑπόστασιν*), and as reflecting distinct aspects discerned by the human mind (i.e. 'conceptually' or *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν*).²⁷³ The aspects do not 'exist' outside the mind in the proper sense, because they are not material; but on the other hand, they do not lack 'reality', because they reflect something which is 'real' in their object.

This is a rather subtle approach (and on some levels merely shows that philosophers are not immune to the general human desire to 'eat your cake and have it too'), but it was a useful one. It gave philosophers (even materialist philosophers) a way of dealing conceptually with single objects considered under differing aspects. Moreover, its usefulness did not stop there. Because the recognition of such aspects is an act of the human mind (*epinoia*), it was possible to use such language of anything apprehended this way, even in systems that did not consider everything that is 'real' to be material.²⁷⁴ In an extended sense, therefore, it became possible to speak of any such differentiated perception, human or divine,²⁷⁵ as an *epinoia*, and therefore as 'real' in a secondary sense.²⁷⁶ Since this made it possible to speak of a single entity apprehended under multiple *epinoiai*, it was very useful in dealing with ordinary language, and particularly useful in exegesis. A theologian like Origen, for instance, was constantly being confronted by words or phrases in the Bible which clearly referred to God in some way, and yet equally clearly could not refer to God's essence. With this kind

²⁷³ Posidonius apud DL 7. 135, cf. Proclus, *Hypotyposis Astronomicarum Positionum* 7. 52 (Manitius 236. 18–22), *In Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii*, definitio 14 (Friedlein 139. 25–6).

²⁷⁴ e.g. Plotinus 2. 9. 1. 40–50, 4. 2. 1. 17–21, 5. 8. 7. 40–4 (Henry and Schwyzler i. 225, ii. 4, 396), cf. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 6. 19–26 (*SC* 299. 184).

²⁷⁵ e.g. Clem., *Strom.* 6. 11. 86. 1, 6. 17. 156. 6, cf. 157. 4 (*GCS* ii. 474. 23–5, 512. 21–2, cf. 513. 2–5). Aetius (and presumably Eunomius) on the other hand, would have denied most emphatically that God knew anything at all *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν*, see n. 338 below.

²⁷⁶ It could also, like *τέχνη*, be taken refer to logical trickery or intellectual scheming, as e.g. in *Hom. Clem.* 1. 3. 1, 21. 5, 3. 17. 6 (*GCS* i. 23. 23–5, 34. 13–14, 62. 27–9), etc.

of terminology, he could say that the reference was always to a single underlying entity (*ὑποκείμενον*), but that in each case the different names reflected a different *epinoia*.²⁷⁷

By the time the 'Arian' controversy began, this way of speaking was already firmly rooted in Christian exegesis. It is not very surprising, therefore, to learn that it early became a matter of controversy. After all, to assign a name or attribute to one category or the other was to make it either a primary or a secondary characteristic.²⁷⁸ The Nicenes thus claimed that when the 'Arians' said the Son was 'Word', 'Vine', 'Door', or 'Wisdom' *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν*, what they really meant was that he possessed these qualities only *κατὰ θέσιν*, 'fictitiously' or 'in name only'.²⁷⁹ That was certainly not the case,²⁸⁰ but, since they did believe the *taxis* was always primary, and that this applied to words as well as things, it was a distortion rather than a fabrication.²⁸¹ A tendency to distinguish between the way words like 'wisdom' or 'word' apply to God or to Christ is characteristic of non-Nicene theology as a whole. Circumstances obliged Eunomius, however, to develop a much more specific theory of his own.

As we have seen, the *bête noire* of almost all those who heard Eunomius speak at Constantinople was the modalism of Sabellius, Marcellus, and Photinus.²⁸² This was often portrayed as a Trinity of names not Persons.²⁸³ Because of this, one focus

²⁷⁷ Or., *Hom. in Jer.* 8. 2 (GCS iii. 57. 5-21), *Comm. in Mt.* 17: 6 (GCS x. 596. 7-11), cf. *Princ.* 1. 2. 1 (GCS v. 28. 1-12), Basil, *Eun.* 1. 7. 12-17 (SC 299. 190). Interestingly, in Origen this allowed the same entity to be perceived in different ways by different people simultaneously, *Cels.* 2. 64 (GCS i. 185. 26-186. 30).

²⁷⁸ Cf. Or., *Jo.* 1. 31. 223 (GCS iv. 39. 25-6).

²⁷⁹ Ath., *Decr.* 16. 1 (Opitz ii. 12. 19-21), *Sent.* 23. 1 (Opitz ii. 62. 27-63. 2), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12, 13 (PG 25. 565A, 569A), *Ar.* 2. 37 (PG 26. 225A), cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Ar.* 4. 8 (PG 26. 477D-480A). Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 7 (Opitz iii. 7. 21-8. 2) has him using these words only *καταχρηστικῶς*, but in the *Thalia*, apud Ath., *Syn.* 15. 3 (Opitz ii. 243. 5-7), cf. *Decr.* 16. 3 (Opitz ii. 13. 28-30), he describes Christ as apprehended in *μυρίαὶς ὅσας ἐπινόαις*.

²⁸⁰ See Ch. 5, pp. 172-4 above.

²⁸¹ What may be a fabrication is the statement ascribed to Aetius in *Ep. Mazona*, fr. 2 (Diekamp 311. 10, 13-14) that the Son was Creator *θέσει μόνον*. This sounds more like a Nicene interpretation of his meaning than anything he might have said himself.

²⁸² Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 6. 12-13 (Vaggione 38).

²⁸³ e.g. Epiph., *Haer.* 72. 9. 5 (GCS iii. 263. 22-6), Hilary, *Syn.* 20, 32 (PL

of anti-modalist polemic during the preceding decade was an insistence on the 'reality' of the divine names and on the genuineness of the divine begetting.²⁸⁴ This is clearly visible, for instance, in the efforts of Hilary of Poitiers to open the eyes of the western episcopate to the real situation in the East. When Hilary tried to unpack the 'faith of the Easterns' on the very eve of Seleucia, he did so in terms which any reader of Eunomius will recognize: time, name, essence, dignity, and dominion.²⁸⁵ Hence when Eunomius told his audience that where 'the names [were] different, the essences [were] different' too, he was speaking within a pre-existing polemical context, and in terms that they could understand.²⁸⁶

Yet while the terminology itself was familiar, its elements frequently were not. Let us look at how Eunomius' personal concerns affected this traditional structure. We have already noted the inherited distinction between scriptural words used *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν* and those used *κατ' οὐσίαν*. Because the former were more numerous and not considered quite 'real', they were applied primarily to the Logos and to contingent being in general, not to the causeless Source of all things. Eunomius, indeed, went so far as to say that if any word did apply to that Being *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν* it would mean that the divine Being existed 'in name and utterance only'; its nature, in other words, would be to be 'dissolved along with the sounds' that made it up.²⁸⁷

10. 496A, 504B), Ruf., *HE* 10. 30 (*GCS* II. ii. 992. 24–993. 2), Hieron., *Lucif.* 12 (*PL* 23. 166D), Phoebad., *Ar.* 13 (*PL* 20. 22D), etc.

²⁸⁴ e.g. Hilary, *Trin.* 7. 11. 34–6, 12. 19–20, 13. 1–4 (*CCL* 62. 271, 272, 273).

²⁸⁵ Hilary, *Syn.* 33 (*PL* 10. 508B) = *χρόνος, ὄνομα, οὐσία, ἀξίωμα, ὑπεροχή*. Hilary consistently interprets Basil's teaching at Ancyra in linguistic terms, *Syn.* 20, 24, 25 (*PL* 10. 496A–B, 499A, B–C), etc. At Ariminum, too, the delegates claimed not to have changed the name of God, but to have held to the Catholic faith, *Ep. Syn.* 2. 1, 2, cf. 3. 1 (*CSEL* 65. 87. 21–5, 88. 3–4, cf. 88. 14).

²⁸⁶ Eun., *Apol.* 18. 13–14, cf. 9. 12–15, 12. 3–4, 17. 8–9 (*Vaggione* 56, cf. 44, 48, 54), *AA* 3 (J ii. 166. 11–16, 174. 18–22).

²⁸⁷ Eun., *Apol.* 8. 3–5 (*Vaggione* 42). K.-H. Uthemann, in his article 'Die Sprache der Theologie nach Eunomius von Cyzicus', *ZKG* 104 (1993), 153 proposes to emend this to read: τὰ γάρ τοι κατ' ἐπίνοιαν λεγόμενα (τὰ) ἐν ὀνόμασι μόνοις καὶ προφορᾷ τὸ εἶναι ἔχοντα, but this implies the existence of another class of ἐπίνοιαι which is not ἐν ὀνόμασι μόνοις, and that is contradictory (see n. 288). The same objection need not apply, of course, to his two other suggestions, (καὶ) ἐν ὀνόμασι μόνοις and (ἐν τῷ) ὀνόμασι μόνοις, but as the passage in question is quoted directly by Basil without either addition this is at the least problematic,

That is of course, as so often, deliberately provocative, but it does reflect the way most people understood *epinoia*. Because an *epinoia* does not exist as a separate reality, but is discerned by the perceiving mind as an aspect of an entity that does, it cannot be said to have *ὑπόστασις* or *ὑπαρξίς* (concrete existence), despite the fact that it possesses genuine cognitive value.²⁸⁸ Sounds, on the other hand, do possess concrete existence, but as Eunomius goes on to say, God is real whether they are 'silent, sounding, or have even come into existence'.²⁸⁹ His point is that God is among those things which must be known (if at all) *κατ' οὐσίαν*—in their genuine and authentic being. A 'god' known in any other way (by privation, say, or by means of a contrast with something else) would have to be composite and therefore could not really be the utterly simple Source of all things.²⁹⁰

That is not a conclusion which seems very obvious to us, and yet Eunomius' hearers would have found it familiar. The reason is that almost all of them shared a world-view in which ideas were considered to be real things existing externally to those who think them. That enabled them to use a kind of logic which we would have to describe as 'contentual'—logic, in other words, that does not merely summarize the rules of thinking, but mirrors the structure of reality. The reason is that the 'reality' they were discussing was considered to be immaterial. They would not have been able to use such a logic in a material environment. That is because where matter is present it is a limiting factor which determines how far the immaterial realities can be expressed; we may know the meaning of an idea in itself, but we do not necessarily know how much of that idea can be expressed in any given material matrix. Where that matrix is wholly absent, however, and intelligible realities are considered only in themselves, ontology really does become the

Eun. 1. 5. 127–9 (*SC* 299. 180; Basil, however, reads *μόνον*, not *μόνοις*). Variants did, of course, sometimes creep in quite early (as in the *Adversus Eunomium* itself, see Ch. 1 n. 12 above), but in this instance there seems no real reason to suppose that one did.

²⁸⁸ Porph., *Cat.* (*CAG* IV. i. 75. 27–9), Proclus, *Parm.* 6 (Cousin 1054. 27–31), see n. 272 above. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 5. 134–7 (*SC* 299. 182) deliberately distorts Eunomius' meaning when he claims that for him an *epinoia* lacks meaning as well as *hypostasis*.

²⁸⁹ *Eun.*, *Apol.* 8. 5–7 (Vaggione 42).

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 8. 7–18 (Vaggione 42).

'projected shadow of logic',²⁹¹ in that case, to know intelligible realities intelligibly is to know them in actual fact. Now, if that is the way things are, and we say that there is a word which applies uniquely to God ('Unbegotten', say, or 'Only true God'), but we also say that this word is an *epinoia* (a product of human thought), we are in effect saying that 'God' is an idea we construct, not a reality we apprehend.²⁹²

These are the general considerations that lie behind Eunomius' interest in the divine Name. He was working within a religious tradition that made the 'real' reference of names polemically important, and a philosophical tradition that understood 'reality' in terms of essence.²⁹³ But if Plato's theory is correct, and names are tools whose purpose is to tell us what things are, then the purpose of God's name is presumably to tell us who God is. Moreover, if names as vehicles of meaning are not necessarily identical with names as collections of sounds, then God's name (whether from scripture or innate ideas) does not have to be unique as a sound, even though it must be unique in terms of meaning (because it refers to a unique object).

From Eunomius' point of view the best written or vocal form of the divine Name was *agennetos*, 'Unbegotten' or 'Ingenerate'. Grammatically this word is privative in form ('unbegotten', 'ingenerate'), but according to Eunomius it is not privative in meaning. The reason is that, if that were indeed the case, it would mean we had first taken one idea—'begetting'—and then eliminated some part of it to produce a new idea, 'not the

²⁹¹ The phrase is taken from Proclus, *The Elements of Theology*, ed. E. R. Dodds (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. xxv; for a general discussion of this kind of logic, see *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Medieval Philosophy*, ed. A. H. Armstrong, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 68.

²⁹² As in Philost., *HE* 10. 2 (*GCS* 125. 14–127. 2), cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 18, 20, 25 (*PG* 28. 1185A/B, 1188C, 1196A), where the fact that we apprehend God in a particular way makes *him* πολυσύνθετος. That is why 'the debt which above all others is most due God' is to acknowledge 'that he is what he is', Eun., *Apol.* 8. 1–3 (Vaggione 40–2). For if what we acknowledge is something made up by ourselves, we are worshipping a fiction, and not a reality. This is one element in the noticeable increase in non-Nicene interest in John 4: 22–4 about this time ('you worship what you know not; we worship what we know'); for instances see Appendix ad loc.

²⁹³ And with that even Augustine would have agreed, Aug., *Trin.* 10. 10. 62–3 (*CCL* 50. 328).

product of begetting' or 'unbegotten'. In other words, God's name would be the product of human thought or an *epinoia*,²⁹⁴ and that is impossible. But then, why this word? Why *agennetos*? *Agennetos* is attractive because it is singularly unique; it is one of the very few words that can be applied to God and to no other Being. 'Father', 'I am', or even 'god' can be used in other senses of other entities—only *agennetos* can be applied only to the Source of all things and to nothing else. That is the reason why 'Unbegotten' can be considered the 'name' of God—not because it is privileged as a collection of syllables, but because it is the one human word that can be applied to no one else but him.

Those who 'came across this work' later might have been scandalized by the short shrift given 'Father', but Eunomius' original audience was less likely to be disturbed. They agreed that the priority of parent to child was essential to the idea of 'begetting' in general, and that therefore paternity could only be something God did, not something God was. Then again, (as the Nicenes never ceased to remind them²⁹⁵) 'father' is incomprehensible without 'son', so if God is 'Father' because he has a 'Son', and 'son' implies the priority of parent to child, 'Father' must be more recent than God's other names;²⁹⁶ it has to refer to his being in action, not that being in itself.²⁹⁷ Most of Eunomius' audience would have found this unexceptionable, and, partly for that reason, it does not altogether explain what he means by *agennetos*, or why he thought it unique. To understand that, we need to start with a distinction he does not make.

²⁹⁴ i.e. we would have started with one concept, 'begotten', and then removed something from it ('begottenness') to form a different concept, 'not-begotten': Aetius, *Synt.* 19, 20 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 19–20 (GCS iii. 355. 25–356. 13), Eun., *Apol.* 8. 7–14 (Vaggione 42), *AA* 2 (J i. 391. 19–27, 399. 3–8). *Sterēsis* ('privation' or 'removal') differs from *epinoia*, however, in that the latter is an entity apprehended under a particular aspect, while the former is an actual product of reasoning or *logos*.

²⁹⁵ Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 2 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 2. 1), Basil, *Eun.* 1. 5. 68–9, (SC 299. 176), etc.

²⁹⁶ Eun., *AA* 2 (J i. 370. 14–19).

²⁹⁷ This is the point of Eunomius' *reductiones ad absurdum* in *AA* 1 (J i. 192. 20–193. 1, 201. 26–202. 5, cf. 186. 3–10). 'Father' and 'Unbegotten' cannot be used interchangeably. 'Father' and 'Son' were relational; 'begotten' and 'Unbegotten' could be used absolutely, cf. Aug., *Trin.* 5. 6. 8–12, cf. 3. 6–11 (CCL 50. 211, cf. 208).

Almost everyone agreed that, as an idea, *agennetos* was self-evident.²⁹⁸ Unfortunately, it was also frequently confused in speaking and writing with another, nearly identical word: *agenetos* (with only one 'n').²⁹⁹ Though the two words look almost identical, they come in fact from different roots and (at least in principle) mean different things. *Agennetos* comes from γεννάω, 'to bear or beget', while *agenetos* is from γίγνομαι, 'to come to be or become'. Adam could therefore be described *agennetos* because he had no father, but not as *agenetos* because he began to be.³⁰⁰ Some Nicene authors described the Son and Holy Spirit as *agenetos*, but only the Father as *agennetos*.³⁰¹ Yet in contrast to the many who wanted to distinguish them,³⁰² Eunomius and other non-Nicenes considered these words equivalent, at least in the context of the divine. The reason for this was that in much Greek thought the universe is considered to be divided into things that are caused and do have a beginning (*genetoi*), and other things that are uncaused and do not have beginning, things that never came 'into' existence at all (*agenetoi*).³⁰³ Pagan authors could include among the latter not only souls as self-moving entities,³⁰⁴ but even the universe

²⁹⁸ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 5. 27–30 (SC 299. 172). Even Epiphanius agreed, arguing that as his opponents had already accepted one (true) non-scriptural term (*ἀγέννητος*), there was no reason why they should not also accept another (*ἀμοούσιος*), *Haer.* 69. 73. 1 (GCS iii. 221. 13–19), cf. Ath., *Syn.* 36. 4–6, 46. 2 (Opitz ii. 263. 14–28, 271. 15–19).

²⁹⁹ Thus at *Eun.*, *Apol.* 7. 11 (Vaggione 40, apparatus) where the word occurs twice, MSS G and B read the first as *ἀγέννητον* against the *ἀγένητον* of C and I, while later in the same line C reads *ἀγέννητος* along with G and B and only I has *ἀγένητος*. See Vaggione 29.

³⁰⁰ Grg. Nyss., *Fid.* (J III. i. 65. 12–20), cf. *Eun.* 3. 1. 73 (J ii. 30. 1–7). Note the rather startling parallelism between the 'first family' and the persons of the Trinity in (Ps.-)Ath., *Quaestiones Aliae* 15 (PG 28. 785C), Adam is *ἀγέννητος*, Seth is *γεννητός*, and Eve is neither *γεννητή* nor *ἀγέννητος* but *ἐκπορευτή*!

³⁰¹ Son: (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 15, 27, 3. 3, 5 (PG 39. 300A, 396A, 825A, 841A); Spirit: *Trin.* 2. 3, 25 (PG 39. 477A, 748A/B).

³⁰² e.g. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 13, 18, 3. 25 (PG 28. 1137C–D, 1145A–B, 1241A–B), Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 72. 6 (GCS iii. 220. 31–221. 1), Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 531. 1–2 (SC 237. 218).

³⁰³ As in Athenag., *Leg.* 19. 1. 4–5 (Schoedel 40).

³⁰⁴ Plato, *Phaedrus* 245C–246A. Christians could accept the soul as self-moving, but not, of course, as unoriginate, e.g. Ath., *Gent.* 33. 7–18, cf. 4. 8–9, 14–15 (Thomson 90, cf. 10).

itself.³⁰⁵ Christians and Jews,³⁰⁶ on the other hand, felt obliged to restrict this word to God, the absolutely sourceless Maker of all things. Christian authors, therefore, who said that the Son and Spirit were *agenetos*, were saying that these entities were somehow connected ontologically with the *agenetos* (and *agennetos*) Origin of reality. For Eunomius and the non-Nicenes in general, that was as blasphemous as it was illogical, for in their view only a God who was ontologically simple and utterly unique could possibly be *agen(n)etos*.³⁰⁷ The positions of the two sides thus mirrored their different understandings of the 'break' and of the distinction between contingent and non-contingent being: Nicenes needed to distinguish between the general sourcelessness of the several Persons (*agenetos*) and the Unbegottenness proper to the Father (*agennetos*); non-Nicenes, on the other hand, had to guarantee the unique causelessness of a single divine Source, and to distinguish between a general and a specific causelessness as the Nicenes did would make that impossible—*agenetos* and *agennetos* for them had to be identical. One of the things Eunomius was trying to do, then, was to show how an utterly Sourceless Entity could be said to have an Only-begotten Son.

This was not easy. Both Aetius and Eunomius, as we have seen, insisted that essence *qua* essence could not be compared, and that the Divine Essence therefore is also unrelated ontologically to anything else. Yet an ontological relationship between progenitor and offspring is usually assumed to be inherent in the concept 'father-son'. Eunomius' solution was to say that the divine Son was the exact image of an *action* unbegottenly stored up in the divine foreknowledge, and thus the reflection of the entire power of the Father.³⁰⁸ But that leaves us asking whether, if the Son indeed reflects the Father's power but not his essence, he can 'know' what the essence is.³⁰⁹ Arius, of course, had already addressed the same issue, and concluded that the Son did *not* know it. Since Eunomius con-

³⁰⁵ e.g. Aristotle, *De Caelo* 270^a12–22.

³⁰⁶ Cf. Philo, *Op.* 171 (Cohn and Wendland i. 59. 24–6).

³⁰⁷ Eun., *Apol.* 9. 7–8 (Vaggione 42–4).

³⁰⁸ Ibid. 24. 10–15 (Vaggione 64), *EF* 3. 31–3 (Vaggione 154).

³⁰⁹ As Basil was quick to point out, *Eun.* 1. 17. 23–30, cf. 26. 34–7 (*SC* 299. 234, cf. 266); indeed, in that sense it was difficult to see how he could be God's image at all, *Eun.* 1. 18. 24–9 (*SC* 299. 236–8).

sidered this virtually equivalent to apostasy,³¹⁰ he had to find some way to bridge the gap.

His efforts to do this were made more difficult by the polemical situation in which he found himself. Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste had claimed that his theory undermined the (biblical) metaphor of birth because it put the Son's generation on the level of action rather than essence (*energeia*, not *ousia*).³¹¹ Eunomius therefore devoted a good deal of space to showing that this criticism was groundless, and to developing an alternative theory of his own. Unfortunately, there was at least one feature of his theory that made the epistemological situation worse. This was the contention that, while the Son reflected the Father's action rather than his essence, it was improper to identify the action *with* the essence. To say that was the same as embracing paganism because it would imply that the world produced by the essence was as eternal as the essence itself.³¹² Unlike his teacher,³¹³ then, Eunomius was forced by circumstance to try to develop a full-fledged theory of the way action relates to essence. In doing this he chose to use a causal sequence which included the elements, essence, action, product.³¹⁴ This usage was already traditional, but there is one significant respect in which Eunomius' use of it differs from that of others. Most examples of this causal sequence include another element: *dunamis* or 'capacity', which comes between essence and action, so that the sequence as a whole reads essence, *capacity*, action, product. 'Capacity' or *dunamis*, however, is only marginally present in Eunomius' works, and seems

³¹⁰ See above, Ch. 3, pp. 63-4, Ch. 5, pp. 167-71.

³¹¹ Geo. Laod., *Ep. Dogm.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 13. 2, cf. 15. 1 (GCS iii. 285. 30-286. 5, cf. 287. 16-19), Basil, *Eun.* 1. 24. 13-15 (SC 299. 256-8). From this point of view any birth (even a divine one) which did not occur on the level of *ὑπαρξίς*, *ὑπόστασις*, or *τὸ εἶναι* was effectively fictitious, *Haer.* 73. 15. 5 (GCS iii. 288. 7-10).

³¹² Eun., *Apol.* 22. 10-12, cf. 23. 15-16 (Vaggione 62, cf. 64), cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 9 (PG 28. 1169C).

³¹³ In what survives of Aetius *ἐνέργεια* occurs only in the suspect *Ep. Mazona* (Diekamp 311. 4, 15, 22).

³¹⁴ i.e. *οὐσία*, *ἐνέργεια*, *ἔργον*, as in Eun., *Apol.* 23. 4-8 (Vaggione 62). For this causal sequence and its missing element in detail, see Michel R. Barnes, 'The Background and Use of Eunomius' Causal Language', in Barnes and Williams, pp. 217-36; as well as the same author's 'Δύναμις and the Anti-Monistic Ontology of Nyssen's *Contra Eunomium*' in Gregg, *Arianism*, 327-34.

often equivalent to *energeia*.³¹⁵ One reason for this may be that since Christ himself was considered God's actual *dunamis*,³¹⁶ listing it in the traditional order might leave an opening for Basil—he might take this as a sign that the Logos was somehow internal to or 'part' of God, not really subsistent, or existing independently.³¹⁷ Yet whether or not that is the case, Eunomius certainly did have a number of reasons, theoretical as well as religious, for insisting that action and essence were separate. That led to still another difficulty. For God's actions were usually considered one of the principal means by which we come to know him.³¹⁸ And yet, if 'real' knowledge is knowledge of the essence, and no action can ever bring us near the essence, how can we ever really say we 'know' God?³¹⁹

At first sight, it looks as though Eunomius addressed this issue himself. In a section of the *Apology* which is structurally significant,³²⁰ he outlines two methods for discovering 'what we seek':

'... one is that by which we examine the actual essences and with clear and unadulterated reasoning about them make a judgement on each, the other is an enquiry by means of the actions, whereby we distinguish the essence on the basis of its products and completed works—and neither of the ways mentioned is able to bring out any apparent similarity of essence.'³²¹

Because Eunomius then goes on to speak of an 'action' which is conformed to 'the dignity of its nature', and to the possibility of approaching the [divine] essence through 'the things that have

³¹⁵ e.g. Eun., *EF* 3. 31–2 (Vaggione 154). The principal exception appears to be the so-called *Confessio Eunomiana*, appended to MSS of the *Apology* (*Apol.* 28. 6–7, 15–16, 26 (Vaggione 74)), where a distinction does seem to be made. Such variations do not reflect the school's lack of interest in the problem, but only the fact that in less conflicted circumstances it was unnecessary to be *ἀκριβής*.

³¹⁶ As in Eun., *Apol.* 12. 2–3, 19. 3–4 (Vaggione 46–8, 56), *AA* 3 (J ii. 10. 25–11. 8), *Fr.* 4. 3 (Vaggione 179), citing 1 Cor. 1: 24.

³¹⁷ Eun., *EF* 3. 6 (Vaggione 152): *δύναμιν ὁφειστώσαν*.

³¹⁸ e.g. Ath., *Gent.* 16. 25–32 (Thomson 44), Grg. Nyss., *Trin.* (J III. i. 11. 2–11), (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 3 (*PG* 39. 473C).

³¹⁹ A difficulty already pointed out by Basil, *Eun.* 2. 32. 18–37 (*SC* 305. 134).

³²⁰ See Vaggione 11–12.

³²¹ Eun., *Apol.* 20. 5–10 (Vaggione 58).

been made',³²² it almost sounds as though what is being 'sought' is knowledge of the essence through its products (the product bringing us to the action, the action bringing us to the essence). A closer look, however, shows that this is not the case. The problem Eunomius was addressing was not how we might come to know the essences, but rather—given that we *did* know them—how might we compare them? His contention is that neither of the two available ways shows any similarity of essence. His argument, in other words, is directed against Basil of Ancyra, and never really addresses the issue of how we come to know the essences in the first place; rather, it starts by assuming that we do know them. Thus while we can indeed approach an essence through its 'products and completed works', this does not tell us what it is, only what it does.³²³ This left Aetius and Eunomius, however, with a significant problem. They had made the ability to know God's essence fundamental to Christianity,³²⁴ and yet they had so widened the gap between the essence and what it did that it was difficult to see how anyone could know it at all. They were sorely in need of a bridge.

The one they found was the 'tool' identified by Plato as a means of finding out what a thing is, its name. We have already seen that Eunomius was convinced that to make God unboundaried was to make him impossible to know at all.³²⁵ It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that one of the things that marks the divine 'boundary' and thus enables us to establish its definition and identity (*ὅρος ἡ ἰδιον*) is the word *agennetos*.³²⁶ As with other words, however, this boundary is

³²² Ibid. 20. 14–19 (Vaggione 60).

³²³ Thus in Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 232. 7–20, cf. 229. 1–18, 238. 2–9), while it is true enough that we can ἀναλόγισαι from God's marvellous works, and the author freely cites two of the foundation texts of 'natural theology' (Wisdom 13: 5 and Romans 1: 20), we are able to discern the works' meaning only because we all possess an 'inner knowledge' of our Creator (τῇν τοῦ δημιουργοῦ αὐτοῦ γνώσων). Presumably something similar lies behind the statement in *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 8. 8 (*GCS* ii. 102. 17–103. 1) that as bodies can be known from their shadows, so the 'ingenita substantia' may be known from the generate.

³²⁴ Cf. Aetius, *Synt.* 16 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 16 (*GCS* iii. 355. 10–14).

³²⁵ See Ch. 5, pp. 167–9 above.

³²⁶ (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 3 (*PG* 29. 688B–C), cf. Cyril, *Thes.* 2, 31 (*PG* 75. 29B, 445B). The word most often used by Eunomius himself for this concept is διαφορά, 'distinguishing characteristic', *Apol.* 12. 3–4, 17. 16–17, 21. 2–3, cf. 23. 1–3 (Vaggione 48, 54, 60, cf. 62), etc.

determined by who God is, not by anything that we think about him, so it is neither an *epinoia* nor a privileged collection of syllables. In its various verbal forms ('I AM' or 'Only True God') the latter is the 'outward and audible' expression of a unique inner vehicle of meaning.³²⁷ Yet that still leaves us to ask whether the vehicle conveys content—that is, whether when we know it we possess data about God. The answer to that is less obvious. Eunomius tells us quite clearly what the content is not (it is not an *epinoia*); he also tells us that its positive role is to bring us to the essence; the question is, in precisely what sense?

Here Aetius and Eunomius actually seem to have made it harder for us, for we are brought up against one of their bad habits. Both of them seem to have possessed a very personal (and very costly) need to *épater le petit bourgeois*. This is particularly visible in their statements about how we know God. At least according to their scandalized contemporaries they claimed that they knew the essence of God exactly as God knows it himself:

'God does not know anything more about his own essence', says Eunomius, 'than we do, nor is that essence better known to him and less to us; rather, whatever we ourselves know about it is exactly what he knows, and, conversely, that which he knows is what you will find without change in us.'³²⁸

The historian Socrates, who is the source of this passage, took pains to tell us that these were Eunomius' *ipsissima verba* (they are probably the one remaining fragment of his *Commentary on Romans*³²⁹). But while they were intended to startle (and do), the idea they represent is attested by other authors. There is a similar passage in Theodoret,³³⁰ and, in his *Syntagmation* Aetius himself mentions the divine self-knowledge,³³¹ as does

³²⁷ Eun., *Apol.* 17. 1–3 (Vaggione 54). Note the intriguing analogy in Aug., *Trin.* 15. 11. 5–12 (CCL 50A. 487) between the incarnation and the word present in our minds and only later expressed on our tongues.

³²⁸ Eun., *Fr.* 2. 3–6 (Vaggione 170).

³²⁹ Mentioned earlier in the same chapter, Soc., *HE* 4. 7. 7 (GCS 234. 6–7).

³³⁰ Thdt., *Haer.* 4. 3 (PG 85. 421A).

³³¹ Aetius, *Synt.* 11, cf. 32 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 11, cf. 32 (GCS iii. 354. 16–19, cf. 358. 20–4), cf. also Cyril, *Thes.* 19 (PG 75. 313A–B). A passage in Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 4. 2 (GCS iii. 344. 18–21) in which Aetius claims not to understand himself better than he knows God, appears to have been garbled in transmission, see Vaggione 167–9. It may be that this grew out of some such

the author of the pseudo-Athanasian *Dialogues*. The latter, indeed, makes his 'Anomoean' claim that to know God as God knows himself is essential to knowing him at all.³³²

At least according to their enemies, then, Aetius and Eunomius claimed to know the essence of God exactly (ἀκριβῶς), just as God knows it himself.³³³ This seemed bizarre in antiquity, and it still seems bizarre today; but at least part of the difficulty is our own. Centuries of implicit nominalism have made it very difficult for most of us to imagine what it is really like to say that an idea exists outside our own minds as a 'thing', and that we share in it but do not originate it. But that, of course, is exactly what Aetius, Eunomius, and most of their contemporaries did say. They believed that ideas are things; that essences exist in their own right, and that to the extent that they are in our minds at all, it is because *we* participate in them, not the other way around. To say, then, that names are 'tools' in that context is to say that, when they tell us what things are, they do so by putting us *in actual contact* with the essence. What is true in general is true also of God: to know God's Name is to acknowledge the presence in our minds of the Essence it represents. Our knowledge is thus 'real' because in this, as in other instances, the name brings us into contact with a really existing non-material essence whose existence does not depend upon whether or not we are thinking it. To know the name, therefore, is to gain 'real' access to an intelligible reality that really exists independently of ourselves.

It is in their role as bridges to this reality that *agennetos* and *gennetos* are essential to the Christian hope:³³⁴ they make it possible for us to claim that our knowledge of God is 'real'. To that extent, of course, they are like other words; but in so far as the essences to which they refer are unique, so too are the words

comment as that in Hilary, *Trin.* 2. 9. 10–20 (CCL 62. 46–7), where we are mocked for trying to understand God, when we are 'aequinamiter inperitus' about ourselves.

³³² (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 1 (PG 28. 1117A–B). Note that in *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 7. 4, cf. 10. 51. 1, 3 (GCS ii. 101. 10–14, 358. 2–5, 9–11) this is connected with the idea that creatures know him 'sola apellatione' or 'sola opinione' (ὀνόματι μόνον, κατ' ἐπίνοιαν), but his own knowledge is immediate and direct: 'a se ipso autem comprehenditur', cf. Eun., *Apol.* 8. 1–3 (Vaggione 40–2).

³³³ Cyril, *Thes.* 31 (PG 75. 449A–B).

³³⁴ (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 19 (PG 28. 1185D–1188A).

that refer to them. God's self-knowledge is bound up with this uniqueness. According to Aetius and Eunomius *agennetos* meant that God had no cause at all;³³⁵ that he is neither *autopator* nor *autogenes*—caused by himself nor any other.³³⁶ Such self-sufficiency, however, implies a total absence of need,³³⁷ which in its turn determines the sense in which the Divine can be said to 'know'. For knowledge, after all, is a kind of need, and if God is without need, then God can know nothing discursively, that is as individual pieces of knowledge individually acquired (*κατ' ἐπίνοιαν*).³³⁸ God's knowledge, therefore, must be immediate, and its object cannot be anything less than himself. For God, knowledge and being are identical (he is *ἀναρχος γνῶσις*, 'knowledge that does not have a beginning'³³⁹). That is

³³⁵ Aetius, *Synt.* 2–3 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 2–3 (*GCS* iii. 353. 1–6), Eun., *Apol.* 7. 1–11 (Vaggione 40), cf. *EF* 2. 16–17 (Vaggione 152) and the comments of Gregory of Nyssa in *Conf.* 63 (J ii. 27–338. 5) cf. also (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 12 (*PG* 28. 1176C).

³³⁶ *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 4. 3, cf. 3. 8, 11. 3 (*GCS* ii. 98. 9–10, cf. 97. 9–10, 106. 5). *Αὐτογενής* in this passage is presumably not to be confused with *αὐτογέννητον* which is a synonym for *ἀγέννητον* in both *Hom. Clem.* 16. 16. 1, 3 (*GCS* i. 225. 20, 24), and Aetius himself, *Synt.* 37 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 37 (*GCS* iii. 359. 23). Presumably the *αὐτο-* in the latter is to be taken in an intensive rather than a reflexive sense, as in the translation of Aetius by L. R. Wickham, 'The Syntagmation of Aetius the Anomean', *JTS* 19 (1968), 549 ('He who is *per se* ingenerate'). Other writers were more comfortable with the idea of self-origination, as in the 'macrostich', *Symb. Ant.* (345) 4 (Hahn, § 159. p. 193), where the Unbegotten is *τὸν μόνον . . . ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχοντα*. (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 15, 30 cf. 2. 1, 3. 2. 20 (*PG* 39. 300A, 417A, cf. 448C, 793C) felt able to describe the Father as *αὐτογενής. Ἀβτοπάτωρ* as applied to the One is found in Iamblichus, *Myst.* 8. 2. 261. 13, 262. 3 (Des Places 196), and in Porphyry, *Fragmenta Historica* apud Cyril, *Contra Iulianum* 1 (*PG* 76. 552B). Among Christians it is found in this sense primarily among Gnostics, e.g., Epiph., *Haer.* 29. 10. 4, 31. 5. 3 (*GCS* i. 287. 11, 390. 10), though there is a favourable allusion in (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 5 (*PG* 39. 493D), and (of course) in the ever idiosyncratic Synesius, *Hymni* 2. 146 (*PG* 66. 1596). For Aug., however, those who made such a claim were in greater error than others, *Trin.* 1. 1. 32–6 (*CCL* 50. 28).

³³⁷ He is *ἀπροοδής*: Eun., *Apol.* 18. 3, *EF* 2. 18–19 (Vaggione 54, 152).

³³⁸ Aetius, *Synt.* 12 apud Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 12. 12 (*GCS* iii. 354. 20–2), *Exp.* 4. 40–1 (*SC* 317. 154), Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 233. 13–234. 15), Philost., *HE* 10. 2 (*GCS* 125. 14–127. 2), *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 7. 7 (*GCS* ii. 101. 19–20), cf. Ar. Ign., *Sermo* 33 (*PL* 42. 682): God knows nothing *διὰ . . . ἐπίνοιαν*, for that would make him composite, cf. Plotinus, 2. 9. 1. 40–5 (Henry and Schwyzer i. 225).

³³⁹ Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 89. 10–12, 233. 13–14, cf. 199. 3), *Const. App.* 8.

why it is possible for us to speak of knowing God 'as God knows himself',³⁴⁰ for with God that is the only kind of knowledge that is possible. To know God in any other way would be to possess individual pieces of knowledge about him, that is, to know him *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν*. But if that is the way we know him, then 'contentual logic' would force us to say that that is what God is in point of fact: the sum total of certain discretely discernible parts. And yet a God composed of parts would not be 'God' at all. If our knowledge of God is 'real', then, the only way we *can* know him is the way 'he knows himself', immediately and non-discursively. Thus, for Eunomius, the divine Name which is present in our minds like every other as a tool to reveal essence does in fact do so—it enables us to achieve a genuine knowledge of God. But just because this is the case, then, to the extent that we know the name of God, we know 'exactly what he knows, and, conversely, that which he knows is what you will find without change in us'.

Aetius and Eunomius were looking to shock, and they succeeded. What they did, however, was in effect break with the received wisdom that made it impossible for one nature to know the essence of another exactly—and especially for those lower in the chain of being to 'know' the essence of those that are higher.³⁴¹ On the contrary in their view, any creature capable of knowing God's name at all thereby possesses a genuine knowledge of God and must know him 'as he knows himself'. That is clear enough in one sense, but it still leaves us asking whether there is any difference between God's inherent knowledge and our participated knowledge. How does God's self-knowledge differ from ours? The Nicenes thought they knew: it did not. They understood Aetius and Eunomius to mean that our knowledge of God is exactly like our knowledge of anything else—discursive and natural. Thus in their eyes Aetius and

12. 37 (*SC* 336. 180). In some authors there is a parallel with the self-knowledge of the soul, as in e.g. Aug., *Trin.* 10. 10. 28–45, cf. 15. 12. 18–32 (*CCL* 50. 327–8, cf. 50A. 491).

³⁴⁰ Cf. Cyril, *Theos.* 31 (*PG* 75. 445B). Indeed, if even he knew himself discursively, he would be ignorant of his own essence! (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 27 (*PG* 28. 1197B–C), cf. *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 7. 7 (*GCS* ii. 101. 19–20).

³⁴¹ (Ps.-)Didymus, *Trin.* 1. 26, cf. 2. 7. 8 (*PG* 39. 385D–388A, cf. 584B), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 1 (*PG* 29. 673C), cf. Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 5. 249–50 (*SC* 28bis. 292), Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 7, cf. 9 (*PL* 42. 727–8).

Eunomius meant that it was possible to know God exactly the way one might know something 'visible' to the eye or 'touchable with the hand', or as one might 'pick up a stone, or piece of wood'.³⁴² That accounts for one of their more prominent polemical themes. They were constantly asking their enemies how, if we scarcely understand what is right in front of our eyes here on earth, we can hope to understand the One who made them?³⁴³ That is one of the reasons why they so frequently described them as *μετεωρολόσχας*, 'cloud gatherers':³⁴⁴ they were fools who blundered in quite literally where angels fear to tread,³⁴⁵ and who, in their zeal for *τόλμα* and *πολυπραγμοσύνη*, were unable to recognize that there were limits set upon human nature.³⁴⁶

That, of course, is the accusation of *τέχνη* all over again. But like *τέχνη*, it to some extent misses the point. For the Nicenes assumed that what their enemies meant when they claimed to have an 'exact' knowledge of the divine nature was that they had a 'complete' knowledge—that is, that they knew all *about* it.³⁴⁷ But while there can be no doubt that Aetius and Eunomius claimed the former, they explicitly rejected the latter. They were in fact quite as willing as their adversaries to admit their ignorance of earthly phenomena,³⁴⁸ but that really is beside the point. What they claimed was that their knowledge of God was *exactly* like his: that is, not *κατ' ἐπίνοιαν*, not discursive.³⁴⁹ Thus,

³⁴² Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 54. 17 (GCS iii. 411. 22–8), cf. Grg. Nyss., *Eun.* 2 (J i. 253. 28–254. 13), Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 2. 294–5 (SC 28bis. 166).

³⁴³ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 12. 30–13. 24 (SC 299. 214–8), 3. 6. 5–28 (SC 305. 166–8), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 28. 28. 41–2, cf. 29. 5–14 (SC 250. 164, 166), etc. This picked up a theme present almost from the beginning of the controversy, cf. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 20 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 22. 26–23. 5).

³⁴⁴ Non-Nicenes: Philost., *HE* 10. 1 (GCS 126. 10–13), cf. Theognius Nicaenus apud Ar. Ign., *Fr. Theo.* 4, 5 276. 17–20 (CCL 87/i. 235); Nicenes: Basil, *Eun.* 1. 21. 7–8 (SC 299. 246), Grg. Naz., *Or.* 28. 29. 3–4, cf. 29. 11. 15–16 (SC 250. 166, cf. 200).

³⁴⁵ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 308–12, 321–5, 3. 73–4, 5. 265–6 (SC 28bis. 126–8, 192, 294), Ath., *Hom. in Matt.* 11: 27 6 (PG 25. 217C).

³⁴⁶ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 4. 18–20 (SC 28bis. 230). See Ch. 4, pp. 93–4 above.

³⁴⁷ Hence they were frequently portrayed as failed polymaths who claim to know everything, e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 21. 2 (SC 299. 246), Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 168–9, cf. 175–6, 241–71 (SC 28bis. 112, cf. 114, 120–4).

³⁴⁸ Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 84. 12–18, cf. 162. 11–163. 7, 171. 13–21).

³⁴⁹ This applies, naturally, only to our knowledge of God. The divine name

while they certainly said it was our plain duty to acknowledge God 'in conformity with reality',³⁵⁰ the best way to honour the reality communicated by ἀγέννητος is silence;³⁵¹ for such knowledge, however 'exact', does not take away the danger of approaching so great a mystery.³⁵²

This combination of reticence and knowledge³⁵³ is visible in the little that remains of the liturgical formularies of this community. Because of the intimate link between faith believed and faith proclaimed, especially in baptism, those who are said to have changed the one are also alleged to have changed the other. So it is here. In their calmer moments Aetius and Eunomius' enemies recognized that many of their accusations were not literally true,³⁵⁴ but non-Nicenes in general and Eunomians in particular are often said to have changed the baptismal formula. That is, they are said to have baptized in the name of 'a Creator and Creature, Maker and Made',³⁵⁵ or still more probably, of 'the Unbegotten and Begotten'.³⁵⁶ From this unsympathetic description of what might be implied by their teaching, it was an easy step to say they did so in actual practice. Hence it could even be said they baptized 'in the name of the uncreated God . . ., the created Son, and . . . the sanctifying Spirit created by the created Son'.³⁵⁷ As so often, and in spite of its improbability

mediates a nature whose knowledge is as unique as itself, so that while we know it 'as it knows itself' (there is no other way), we do not know anything else in that way. Our knowledge of other things comes from experience (πείρα); God's knowledge is immediate and invisible and he knows everything before it ever came to be, Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 147. 14-16, 148. 1-5).

³⁵⁰ Eun., *Apol.* 8. 1-3 (Vaggione 40-2).

³⁵¹ *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 7. 8 (*GCS* ii. 101. 20-2), an anomoean interpolation; cf. *ibid.* 1. 23. 1 (*GCS* ii. 20. 22-5).

³⁵² *Ibid.* 3. 7. 2 (*GCS* ii. 101. 5-7).

³⁵³ Cf. *ibid.* 3. 7. 3-4 (*GCS* ii. 101. 9-14), where the two ideas are expressed together (see above, n. 332); we ourselves, however, are not to 'quaerere' but 'tantummodo audire desiderare'.

³⁵⁴ Ath., *Ar.* 2. 42, cf. 43 (*PG* 26. 236C-237B, cf. 237B-240A), Thdt., *Haer.* 4. 1 (*PG* 83. 413A-B).

³⁵⁵ Ath., *Syn.* 36. 3 (Opitz ii. 263. 11-12).

³⁵⁶ Ath., *Decr.* 31. 3 (Opitz ii. 27. 23-5), *Ep. Serap.* 2. 7, cf. 1. 30, 3. 45 (*PG* 26. 620A, cf. 597C, 600C, 632B), *Ar.* 1. 34 (*PG* 26. 620A), (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 11, cf. 12 (*PG* 28. 1176A/B, cf. 1176C-1177A), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4. 2. 2 (*PG* 29. 685A).

³⁵⁷ Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 54. 33 (*GCS* iii. 414. 3-5). For another, and more plausible change in the formula, see Ch. 8, pp. 343-4 below.

as liturgical fact, this is a distortion rather than invention; but it does bring us back to the much more important question of what role, if any, ἀγέννητος played in devotion.

Of the three sets of titles used in the baptismal formulae quoted above, two (as we saw earlier) functioned primarily in apologetic rather than religious contexts, that is, 'Creator and Creature', 'Maker and (Thing) Made'.³⁵⁸ The same, however, is not true of the final pair, 'Unbegotten' and 'Begotten'.³⁵⁹ In the one liturgical work probably edited by a Eunomian, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, we find a number of tantalizing hints as to how these were used. We find, for instance, that the rite of baptism is duly administered 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit', but that then the candidates describe themselves as having been initiated 'into the one, unbegotten, only true God Almighty, the Father of Christ, from whom are all things'.³⁶⁰ This is followed by a creed which, like Eunomius' own, is based on 1 Corinthians 8: 6.³⁶¹ The function of ἀγέννητος, then, is not to replace the traditional formula but to establish its meaning. This presumably represents the reality behind the accusations of the Orthodox. But if it was used in baptism to explain rather than replace the scripture, we must still ask whether it was also used directly in prayer? The evidence suggests that it was. For one of the more intriguing features of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is the extent to which the technical language of transcendence is used in devotion. Ἀγέννητος is repeatedly linked with such words as ἀδέσποτος³⁶² and ἀβασίλευτος,³⁶³ and occurs in the *Gloria in*

³⁵⁸ See Ch. 4, pp. 124-7 above.

³⁵⁹ Usually in the biblical form, *Μονογενής*, e.g. Eun., *Apol.* 5. 3, 12. 1, 15. 8 (Vaggione 38, 46, 52), etc.

³⁶⁰ *Const. App.* 7. 40. 11-15, 41. 8-11 (SC 336. 96, 98): εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον μόνον ἀλήθινον Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ἀπάντων, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα. Cf. (Ps.-)Ignat., *Philad.* 4 (Lightfoot III. ii. 207. 40-2).

³⁶¹ *Const. App.* 7. 41. 11-33 (SC 336. 98-100), cf. Eun., *Apol.* 5. 1-7 (Vaggione 38), a connection already noted in William Whiston's *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd* (London, 1711), i. 4. The two are printed in parallel columns in M. Albertz, *Untersuchungen über die Schriften des Eunomius* (Wittenberg: Herrosé und Ziemsen, 1908), 37-8.

³⁶² 'Unmastered', *Const. App.* 7. 44. 4, cf. 8. 12. 32-3 (SC 336. 104, cf. 180).

³⁶³ 'Free from rule', *Const. App.* 8. 5. 2 (SC 336. 144).

excelsis together with ἀπρόσιτον.³⁶⁴ God's readiness to hear, moreover, is also ἀγέννητος, and like the rest of his uniquely singular perception is ἀναρχος, αἰδιος, ἀδίδακτος, πρῶτος, and μόνος.³⁶⁵

But more important perhaps for our purposes is the fact that the one 'only Unbegotten God' to whom the faithful are told to bow their heads in prayer³⁶⁶ is also the Unbegotten God who is the source of Christ's saving journey. The framework of salvation is reiterated once again. The baptized must learn that it was not the Unbegotten God who died for them,³⁶⁷ but rather, as another preacher puts it, the Son who came at his behest.³⁶⁸ This same Unbegotten, who is identified elsewhere as the 'Most High' who overshadowed Mary,³⁶⁹ is also our Physician,³⁷⁰ Guardian,³⁷¹ Lover,³⁷² and the One in whom alone we may safely give our body to be burnt.³⁷³ More to the point, he is the 'First' whom we encounter with and through his great high priest.³⁷⁴ For when Basil the Great pointed out that Eunomius had placed an impassable barrier between the Begotten and the Unbegotten light, Eunomius could claim that

'... the mind of those who have believed in the Lord, overpassing every sensible and intelligible essence, is by nature unable to stop even at the generation of the Son, but shoots beyond even that in its yearning for everlasting life, striving to encounter the First.'³⁷⁵

³⁶⁴ 'Unapproachable', *Const. App.* 7. 47. 4-5, cf. 8. 6. 44 (*SC* 336. 112, cf. 154), (Ps.-)Ignat., *Eph.* 7 (Lightfoot III. ii. 255. 36-7).

³⁶⁵ 'Beginningless, Everlasting, Taught by none, First, and Only', *Const. App.* 8. 12. 37-8 (*SC* 336. 180).

³⁶⁶ Ibid. 8. 6. 37-8 (*SC* 336. 154).

³⁶⁷ Ibid. 8. 47. 209-13, cf. 48. 5-6 (*SC* 336. 292, cf. 308), cf. (Ps.-)Ignat., *Phil.* 7 (Lightfoot III. ii. 195. 18-20).

³⁶⁸ (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 70-1, cf. 141-2 (*SC* 146. 54, cf. 70).

³⁶⁹ Ar. Ign., *Anmunt.* 5. 23 (Leroy, *Epektasis*, 350).

³⁷⁰ (Ps.-)Ignat., *Eph.* 7 (Lightfoot III. ii. 255. 35-6).

³⁷¹ (Ps.-)Ignat., *Her.* 6 (Lightfoot III. ii. 248. 3-5).

³⁷² (Ps.-)Ignat., *Ant.* 14 (Lightfoot III. ii. 243. 16-18).

³⁷³ Ar. Ign., *Job* 1 (*PG* 17. 380D-381A).

³⁷⁴ (Ps.-)Ignat., *Magn.* 7 (Lightfoot III. ii. 171. 17-18), *Const. App.* 7. 47. 3-4 (*SC* 336. 112), cf. Ar. Ign., *Sermo* 32 (*PL* 42. 682). We encounter God 'through' him in that there we encounter the complete expression of the Father's power; we encounter God 'with' him in that like ourselves he 'knows' the Unbegotten.

³⁷⁵ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 243. 23-28).

This is not a mystical journey, but an epistemological one. For to Basil's claim that nothing can be known prior to the generation of light,³⁷⁶ Eunomius opposed a light which was indeed unapproachable (*ἀπρόσιτον*), but knowable nevertheless, because Unbegotten.³⁷⁷

There is a sense, then, in which this knowledge *is* natural—because we know it in the same way we know other intelligible things—but it is not natural in the sense that we know it the way we know individual pieces of wood or stone, because it is not experiential. This is clear from one of the things Aetius and Eunomius do *not* say. They both claimed that God's really existing essence was made present to our minds through a name ('Unbegotten' or one of its synonyms); but they do not say that we *see* the essence.³⁷⁸ The reason for this was that they accepted a distinction long since made by Origen. Origen noted that scripture never describes the Son as 'seeing' the Father, and he takes this to mean that, as 'seeing' is really a function of bodies, the Son can 'know' but not 'see' his Progenitor.³⁷⁹ Aetius and Eunomius would have agreed.³⁸⁰ The *agennetos* is invisible by nature (*ἀόρατος φύσις*),³⁸¹ and he can therefore be seen by none of those who come from him,³⁸² even though he has made it possible for all to know him.

Needless to say, the reaction of those who believed God to be unknowable in the strict sense was pronounced. What they took Aetius and Eunomius to mean was that they understood God's essence in itself (*τὸ τί ἐστι κατ' οὐσίαν*), and denounced them for subjecting the divine essence to human reason.³⁸³ On the con-

³⁷⁶ Basil, *Eun.* 2. 16. 15–23 (SC 305. 62).

³⁷⁷ Cf. *Eun.*, AA 3 (J ii. 297. 2–13). This was, of course, the exact opposite of the more traditional view as e.g. in Ath., *Inc.* 11. 2–7 (Thomson 158), where *ἀγέννητος* is what makes any *ἐννοίαν* impossible.

³⁷⁸ If for no other reason, because names themselves are invisible, Cyril, *The.* 19 (PG 75. 321A/B).

³⁷⁹ Or., *Princ.* 2. 3, cf. 1. 1. 8, (GCS v. 130. 27–131. 23, cf. 25. 2–14).

³⁸⁰ (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 2, cf. 2. 26 (PG 28. 1117C, cf. 1197A). Arius, on the other hand, would probably have disagreed most emphatically, see Ch. 3 nn. 171–5.

³⁸¹ *Const. App.* 7. 35. 9. 55–6, 8. 5. 1. 5, cf. 8. 15. 7. 35–6 (SC 336. 78–80, 144, cf. 214), Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 301. 3–7).

³⁸² *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 7. 5 (GCS ii. 101. 15–16).

³⁸³ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 189–90, 196–8, cf. 303–4, 2. 308 (SC 28bis. 116, cf. 126, 166).

trary, they said, while we can know *that* God is (ὅτι ἔστι), we cannot know *what* he is (τί ἔστι).³⁸⁴ When they spoke this way they were using a set of categories originally associated with the definition of names (ὀρισμός),³⁸⁵ and in a Christian context these are already found in Clement of Alexandria.³⁸⁶ It is significant, however, that as originally used it was induction—reasoning from experience, ἐπαγωγή—that told us *whether* a thing is, but contrast and definition, διαίρεσις and διορισμός—deduction—that told us *what* it is. Stoics³⁸⁷ and Platonists³⁸⁸ had long since used this to say that from the former we can know *that* God is (ὅτι ἔστι), but never *what* he is (τί ἔστι), while the latter did not apply at all. That certainly seemed to leave Aetius and Eunomius vulnerable. For they really did say, after all, that God was not unboundaried, and so in the hostile eyes of John Chrysostom seemed to boundary the essence without bounds.³⁸⁹ They were prying and poking, in other words, trying to apply the method of contrast and definition to things human beings should acknowledge, not question.³⁹⁰ Yet this criticism misses the point. For Aetius and Eunomius denied that we can know *anything* about God by διαίρεσις;³⁹¹ indeed, they rejected discursive knowledge in that context altogether. The presence of ἀγέννητος in our minds does indeed mean that we know God, but that presence is neither imaginative nor discursive. ‘Unbegotten’ does not tell us what God is, but only that God is without source.³⁹² That is why ‘Peter’, in an interpolated passage in the *Clementina*, can caution us not even to try to

³⁸⁴ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 28. 5. 16–18 (SC 250. 110), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (PG 29. 752B/C), Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 291–4 (SC 28bis. 126).

³⁸⁵ Cf. e.g. Aristotle, *Analytica Priora* 90^b. 38–91^a2, cf. 92^b4–11.

³⁸⁶ Clement, *Strom.* 8. 6. 17. 7–8 (GCS iii. 90. 26–91. 3).

³⁸⁷ Chrysippus, *De Natura Deorum* 2. 1010 (SVF ii. 300. 41–5).

³⁸⁸ Porph., *Parm.* 10. 11–35 (Hadot 82–4).

³⁸⁹ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 223–4 (SC 28bis. 120).

³⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 2. 75–80, 312–26 (SC 28bis. 148, 168).

³⁹¹ *Eun.*, *Apol.* 9. 7–9 (Vaggione 42–4).

³⁹² *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 3. 8 (GCS ii. 97. 8–9): ‘ingeniti autem appellatio non quid sit, nobis intellegere dat, sed quod non est factus’ (but not, of course, by privation). Significantly, Basil denies that even a κοινή ἔννοια can tell us the τί εἶναι of God, Basil, *Eun.* 1. 12. 8–9, cf. 1. 14. 43–5 (SC 299. 212, cf. 224). This is a direct attack on Eunomius’ idea of a φυσικὴν ἔννοιαν, for according to the latter the idea mediated by the word is present in our minds with its objective content even though it is not discursively available.

know what God is, only to acknowledge *that* he is.³⁹³ The 'apostle' is able to speak thus in his anomoean guise because, like Eunomius, he is convinced that names are present in our minds as genuine vehicles of meaning, but that they are 'really' and not discursively present.

That still leaves the question, of course, as to how they got there. The *Apology* is too tightly focused to tell us directly, but in a successor work written a little under a decade later we are given a much clearer picture. The reason is that Basil of Caesarea had attacked Eunomius for denying the cognitive value of ἐπίνοιαι, and then claimed, not just that human thought could indeed lead to real knowledge,³⁹⁴ but that the word ἀγέννητος is itself an ἐπίνοια.³⁹⁵ Basil tried to show how the mind attains new knowledge by analysing existing ideas, using the word 'grain' as an example. He pointed out that it is possible to analyse this seemingly simple concept into subcategories such as 'fruit', 'seed', or 'food'.³⁹⁶ Eunomius assumed that he was referring not just to language in general, but specifically to the text of scripture, and so pointed out that in that context God is portrayed as using these very words in the creation narrative. But if, as Basil claimed, these words were ἐπίνοιαι, and yet *God* used them then, they must have been in existence before there was anyone to invent them!³⁹⁷ That, of course, is a *reductio ad absurdum*, but Eunomius then goes on to accuse Basil of using pagan philosophy to undermine providence, ending with a more or less *pro forma* claim that he was influenced by Epicurus and Aristotle.³⁹⁸ His point is that, since Adam and Eve are shown communicating with God in paradise and were able to make use of their environment immediately,³⁹⁹ God must have given them the necessary tools to communicate (names) at the same time he gave them the knowledge and use of things.⁴⁰⁰ To

³⁹³ *Recogn. Clem* 3. 7. 3 (GCS ii. 101. 9-10): 'moneo autem vos, fratres et conservi, non quid sit quaerere, sed quia est tantummodo audire desiderare'.

³⁹⁴ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 6. 19-26, 39-44 (SC 299. 184, 186).

³⁹⁵ Ibid. 1. 7. 34-44 (SC 299. 192).

³⁹⁶ Ibid. 1. 6. 44-54 (SC 299. 186).

³⁹⁷ *Eun.*, AA 2 (J i. 282. 1-14, cf. 284. 30-285. 3, 303. 1-6), referring to Gen. 1: 11-12.

³⁹⁸ *Eun.*, AA 2 (J i. 345. 25-9, 346. 4-11). The two together were considered symbolic of the denial of providence.

³⁹⁹ Ibid. (J i. 348. 6-10).

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid. (J i. 346. 20-347. 1, cf. 342. 21-9), cf. Thphl. Ant., *Autol.* 2. 13.

say, then, as Basil does that they invented these names for themselves is to reject not merely the text of scripture, but the efficacy of God's providence as well.⁴⁰¹

When we combine this picture with what we know of Eunomius' understanding of the premundane creation in general,⁴⁰² we get a picture of the main outlines of his theory. Since human souls, like all other intelligible beings, are the result of a single divine act of creation prior to the existence of material reality, the creation narrative in Genesis 1: 1-2: 3 can be assumed to refer to this pre-temporal world; its realization in the material order is what is described in Genesis 2: 4 and later human history. Eunomius assumes, then, that when we read in the former that God said, 'Let there be light', 'Let there be a firmament', 'Let the dry land appear', and 'Let the earth bring forth grass', we are being made privy to God's use of language (considered as a vehicle of meaning) in the pre-temporal world of the *αἰών*. Later, like the souls themselves, it would become incarnate in an earthly, audible guise,⁴⁰³ but as a vehicle of knowledge it was none the less already 'foreordained from before the foundation of the world'.

This helps us understand how and why Aetius and Eunomius thought as they did, but before we can leave their theory of language, we need to raise another, more general issue. Eunomius' theory was undoubtedly intended to explain the way all nouns relate to their objects, but its primary focus was the 'privileged language' of revelation.⁴⁰⁴ That is one of the reasons why Eunomius criticized Basil for relying on a 'perverted' linguistic usage (*συνήθεια*),⁴⁰⁵ and why his criticism

30-2 (Grant 48). Julian, in his *Commentary on Job* (Hagedorn 266. 18), goes so far as to say that humanity is a *λαλητὸν* . . . ζῶον.

⁴⁰¹ Eun., *AA* 2 (J i. 346. 12-15, cf. 311. 24-8).

⁴⁰² See Ch. 4, pp. 117-21 above.

⁴⁰³ Possibly in Hebrew; at least this would explain Gregory of Nyssa's extensive arguments against the position in *Eun.* 2. 255-61 (J i. 300. 27-302. 24), see Vaggione 107 n. 12.

⁴⁰⁴ Presumably he would have agreed with Augustine that when considering words applied to God we do not start with ordinary usage ('quid uel sinat uel non sinat dici usus sermonis nostri'), but rather from the nature of the things themselves ('sed quis rerum ipsarum intellectus cluceat'), *Trin.* 5. 7. 11-14 (CCL 50. 213).

⁴⁰⁵ Eun., *AA* 2 (J i. 282. 26-7, 302. 26-7).

calls attention to one of the important differences between them. In point of fact, Basil placed considerable value on the use of ordinary language in trying to understand scripture or approach God.⁴⁰⁶ He was not entirely straightforward about this,⁴⁰⁷ nor was he entirely alone,⁴⁰⁸ but he was undoubtedly among the more consistent. Such an approach is of course not itself without difficulties, but a willingness to use the language of ordinary discourse coupled with a positive estimate of the value of human thought created a number of new opportunities. One is obvious. An appeal to the language of ordinary people made it that much more difficult for theology to become the exclusive preserve of the 'expert'.⁴⁰⁹ But that is not all. As we noted in an earlier chapter, Basil was one of the most insistent that the divine being was boundless over against mortal experience.⁴¹⁰ Negatively this tended to diminish the value of human language, since it left one to ask how it could refer to God at all; positively, however, an insistence on the imprecision of all human 'God-language' rescued theology from the tyranny of *akribeia*. Basil and his successors could use the polyvalent language of scripture and ordinary discourse with comfort because the relative incapacity of all human speech made it less necessary to insist on an impossible 'precision'.

Constantius alive laid the groundwork for a new settlement in Church and State which (had he lived) might have significantly altered the theological and political balance established by his father.⁴¹¹ Constantius dead created a new situation altogether.

⁴⁰⁶ Basil, *Eun.* 1. 6. 19-33, 7. 1-3, 8. 33-4 (*SC* 299. 184-6, 188, 194), 2. 8. 33-5, 46-7, 10. 29-32, 13. 19-20, 20. 9-13, 24. 13-15 (*SC* 305. 34, 40, 48, 80-2, 98).

⁴⁰⁷ He does not distinguish clearly between ecclesiastical usage and the ordinary usage of everyday language; thus while it is clear that he means to appeal to both, his approach is not altogether unconnected with his later and better known appeal to unwritten tradition in e.g. *Spir.* 22. 1-4, 25. 9-15, 66. 17-21 (*SC* 17bis. 322, 334, 480).

⁴⁰⁸ Or., *Princ.* 1. 2. 6, cf. 1. 6-7 (*GCS* v. 34. 10-18, cf. 22. 4-24. 21), cf. *Ath., Ar.* 1. 22, 3. 18 cf. 1. 26, 28 (*PG* 26. 57C, 185A, cf. 65B, 69C) for non-Nicene appeals to ordinary experience.

⁴⁰⁹ e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 1. 1. 13-14, 4. 65-7, 9. 30-1, though cf. 5. 83-4 (*SC* 299. 142, 166, 200-2, cf. 176), etc.

⁴¹⁰ See above Ch. 5, pp. 167-71.

⁴¹¹ Cf. Hieron., *Lucif.* 19 (*PL* 23. 172C-173A): 'nihil jam superat spei'.

He had managed to gather most committed non-Nicenes and others who were unhappy with the Nicene formula into a somewhat precarious alliance. Time might have made this more solid, but he was not to have that time. As a result, there was another, unintended consequence: he had destroyed almost all the middle ground. By systematically eliminating the supporters of the *homoiousion* he had left those who were unhappy with his own approach nowhere to go except the Nicenes and Athanasius. Without an accommodation of some kind of course such a move was impossible, but Constantius' death meant that the middle was now Athanasius' to lose rather than Eudoxius' to gain. Aetius and Eunomius themselves, naturally enough, could breathe easier—for them it was a reprieve: whatever the new emperor might do, he was not going to call a council and condemn them. Yet as Aetius considered the prospect of a return from exile, he was bound to reflect that, whatever the world he returned to, it would certainly be one that was drastically changed—and in many ways a much less hospitable place.

Exile

Any change of times and states is bound to unsettle, and for Christians in particular it was difficult to say what the new reign might bring. Some, indeed, rejoiced that 'the beast' (Constantius) was dead,¹ and looked forward to the new ruler's justifiable reputation for mildness.² It is not clear how soon they realized he was a committed pagan. In hindsight they said that Julian had been dissembling for years, and that his youthful piety was a fraud. But while it is certainly true that he later celebrated a childish fascination with the sun-god's rays,³ the reality is that he was baptized as an infant,⁴ educated in the Church, and like his brother, had been a lector in the church at Nicomedia.⁵ Indeed, as a teenager he is said to have dressed (a little ambiguously) as an ascetic,⁶ and helped, with his brother, to build a *martyrium*.⁷ The ancients, with their belief in fixed

¹ Hieron., *Lucif.* 19 (*PL* 23. 173A).

² Julian Imp., *Ath.* 278C, Ammianus Marcellinus 16. 1. 4, 5. 12, cf. 18. 1. 4, 21. 5. 12, 21. 12. 20, 22. 9. 16–17, 22. 10. 5, 14. 22. 5. Soc., *HE* 3. 11. 1 (*GCS* 206. 3–4), cf. Soz., *HE* 5. 1. 1 (*GCS* 188. 5–7), admits the virtue, but then in 7. 22. 7–8 (*GCS* 379. 7–12) commends him only back-handedly as compared with Theodosius II.

³ Julian Imp., *Or.* 4. 130C–D, Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 5. 1, but cf. *Or.* 4. 131A, 5. 174B/C.

⁴ Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 7 (*GCS* 191. 17–18).

⁵ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 4. 23 (*PG* 35. 552A–B), Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 10 (*GCS* 192. 6–7), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 20 (*GCS* 189. 2–4), Thdt., *HE* 3. 1. 2 (*GCS* 177. 10–13). He must have had a genuine affection for the city itself, for in later life he shed tears when he beheld its desolation, Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 9. 3–4.

⁶ Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 17 (*GCS* 193. 13–16), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 9 (*GCS* 188. 4–5): τὸν μοναχικὸν ἐπλάττετο βίον. It would be interesting to know just what he did wear; Cynics and monks would have been physically almost indistinguishable, cf. Julian Imp., *Or.* 7. 224A/B (as an adult Julian disapproved of some contemporary Cynics but not of their ideal, *Or.* 6. 202C, cf. 180C–189D).

⁷ Thdt., *HE* 3. 1. 2 (*GCS* 177. 13–17). The shrine was to St Mamas; some people claimed only Julian's half fell down! Grg. Naz., *Or.* 4. 24–7 (*PG* 35. 552B–553C), Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 12–13 (*GCS* 192. 11–20).

'character', found it difficult to believe people ever really changed, but in Julian's case there seems no real reason to doubt his early piety;⁸ it was only later he became 'the Apostate'. An early acquaintance with the philosopher Maximus may have had something to do with it,⁹ but other Christian pupils seem to have come to no harm,¹⁰ and even some of his friends thought Julian changeable.¹¹ One remarked tellingly that in many ways he was superstitious rather than religious,¹² more interested in divination than worship. Still, whatever the truth, by the time he became Caesar in 355,¹³ the transformation was complete: in his own eyes he was a 'Hellene'—a worshipper of the gods of his ancestors. His public stance, on the other hand, was of necessity more complicated.

For one thing he was called upon to lead troops, many of whom were Christian (St Martin among them¹⁴). His crack that their one talent was for prayer¹⁵ shows that he recognized the need for caution, if nothing else.¹⁶ That makes it all the more significant that in addressing his soldiers he used the studied ambiguity so characteristic of his house.¹⁷ Gallus may have

⁸ Thdt., *HE* 3. 1. 2 (*GCS* 177. 7–9), Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 11 (*GCS* 192. 7–11).

⁹ Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 16–17 (*GCS* 188. 20–5), Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 16 (*GCS* 193. 8–13), cf. Eunapius, *VS* 473.

¹⁰ Soc., *HE* 5. 21. 2, cf. 5. 10. 10 (*GCS* 295. 5–7, cf. 283. 7–9).

¹¹ Ammianus Marcellinus 16. 7. 6, cf. 22. 7. 3, 25. 4. 16.

¹² Ibid. 25. 4. 17: 'superstitiosus magis quam sacrorum legitimus obseruator'. Doubtless we will never know the truth, but a number of things are relatively clear. One is that he had no personal experience of the old religion. Thus the excessive interest in sacrificial practice which later caused people to consider bulls an endangered species is exactly what might be expected from someone whose youth had been spent offering literary hecatombs to Fardarting Apollo or Olympian Zeus. On the other hand, the alleged interest in 'superstitio' also fits; for as Ammianus also points out (21. 1. 6, cf. 2. 1–2), Julian was a skilled interpreter of omens and dreams, and deeply focused on knowing the future. For someone whose life had been as unpredictable as that of this young prince, the certainty offered by Maximus and theurgy must have been well nigh irresistible, cf. Julian Imp., *Or.* 5. 180B–C, Eunapius, *VS* 474–5.

¹³ Eunapius, *VS* 475–6, cf. Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 5 (*GCS* 191. 6–7).

¹⁴ Sulp. Sev., *Mart.* 2. 2. 4. 1–9 (*CSEL* 1. 111. 29–112. 2, 114. 7–115. 2).

¹⁵ Zosimus 3. 3 (*CSHB* 47. 125. 3–5), cf. Julian Imp., *Ath.* 277D.

¹⁶ Only one of his servants knew of his change of religion, Julian Imp., *Ath.* 277B/C.

¹⁷ Ammianus Marcellinus 16. 12. 12, 13, cf. 62. 21. 5. 3, 5, 24. 6.

been privately afraid of apostasy when he sent Aetius to speak with him in 351, but in public Hilary was still prepared to identify him as 'dominum meum religiosum Caesarem tuum Iulianum' as late as 359.¹⁸ He himself thought it politic to attend church in January 360,¹⁹ even though at the same time engaged in an intense private effort to ascertain the will of the gods toward his revolt.²⁰ By November, of course, he was worshipping them openly²¹ and there could no longer be any question as to his loyalties. What might still be negotiable, however, was how these loyalties were expressed in public. It was still possible he might consider Constantinople 'worth [half] a Mass'.

The Constantinopolitans who rushed out to see him on 11 December 361 as he approached their city might thus be pardoned their curiosity,²² even if they were not to be left in suspense long. The dying Constantius had precluded another civil war by naming Julian his successor,²³ but if the latter was still somewhat hesitant about entering his capital,²⁴ he was abundantly justified in feeling when he did, that, as he later put it, it was as 'on dragons' wings'.²⁵ And yet he was in some ways (as a friend remarked) as stubborn as his brother, even if he lacked his savagery.²⁶ He demonstrated the latter by walking behind Constantius' bier uncrowned,²⁷ but the former by offering public sacrifice without any delay.²⁸ Christian Con-

¹⁸ Hilary, *Lib. Const.* 2 (CSEL 65. 198. 5-7), cf. Eunapius, *VS* 476.

¹⁹ Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 2. 4-5, cf. 5. 1.

²⁰ He brought the hierophant of the Eleusinian mysteries from Greece to assist in doing so, Eunapius, *VS* 476.

²¹ Julian Imp., *Ep.* 8. 415C, to Maximus. In his missionary fervour Julian sounds very much like St Francis Xavier reporting to St Ignatius.

²² Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 2. 4, cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 2 (GCS 187. 6-8).

²³ Ammianus Marcellinus 21. 15. 2, 5.

²⁴ It is not clear just when he received the news, Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 42 (GCS 191. 9-11), cf. Soz., *HE* 5. 1. 7 (GCS 189. 16-18). Constantius died 3 Nov. 361. The people of Alexandria were formally notified only on 30 Nov., *Hist. Aceph.* 2. 37-42 (*SC* 317. 148). Even allowing a week for the news to arrive, this seems to point to an official hesitation on one side or the other before the acknowledgement of the new sovereign.

²⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 2. 3.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 22. 14. 2.

²⁷ Philost., *HE* 6. 6, 6a-7a (GCS 74. 3-5, 74. 16-75. 15).

²⁸ Soc., *HE* 3. 11. 4 (GCS 206. 12-13), Soz., *HE* 5. 4. 8 (GCS 198. 6-7).

stantinopolitans were already proud that their city had no functioning temples, and if they were forced to endure them during Julian's lifetime, they were equally glad to be free of them on his death.²⁹ But he did, however, reckon their city as 'home',³⁰ so they were presumably more pleased with the sumptuous harbour,³¹ library, and porticoes he built for them, as well as the increase in rank he afforded their senate.³²

Still if sacrifice would not wait, nor would religion. The emperor took his title of *Pontifex Maximus* seriously,³³ and quite apart from anything else had by now formally renounced his baptism,³⁴ leaving some Christians with more anxiety than if he had proclaimed a new persecution.³⁵ His policy in fact proved to be the mirror image of Constantius', even if more subtle.³⁶ Not long after his arrival,³⁷ he summoned the bishops without distinction of allegiance to his palace and informed them that they were all free to go their own way, though he suggested they remain in harmony.³⁸ He is said to have commented in private afterward that he had little reason to fear they might do it, as there are no beasts so hostile to humankind as Christians to one another.³⁹ He made doubly sure by recalling the majority⁴⁰ of Constantius' religious exiles, while some-

²⁹ Soz., *HE* 2. 3. 7 (*GCS* 52. 27-53. 2). Theodosius I closed or demolished the three existing temples, Jo. Mal., *Chron.* 13 (*CShB* 38. 345. 12-21), though cf. Evagrius, *HE* 2. 13 (*PG* 86. 2540C). Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 62. 307^c. 35 (*SC* 267. 248) calls the city 'Cr(ist)ianopolim'.

³⁰ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 9. 2.

³¹ Cf. Evagrius, *HE* 2. 13 (*PG* 86. 2540C).

³² Zosimus 3. 11 (*CShB* 47. 139. 20-140. 4).

³³ Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 39 (*GCS* 191. 2-4), cf. Julian Imp., *Or.* 2. 90A.

³⁴ Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 2. cf. 5. 5. 1 (*GCS* 190. 13-18, cf. 198. 19-199. 1).

³⁵ Soz., *HE* 5. 2. 1 (*GCS* 190. 9-13).

³⁶ Like Constantius (Hilary, *Const.* 5. 1-12 (*SC* 334. 176), cf. *Auxent.* 3 (*PL* 10. 611A)) he was accused of 'killing with kindness', denying Christians the right to be martyred by a specious forbearance, Grg. Naz., *Or.* 7. 11, 21. 32 (*PG* 35. 768C-769A, 1120C), Soc., *HE* 3. 12. 5-6 (*GCS* 206. 23-302. 4), Soz., *HE* 5. 4. 6-7, cf. 6. 6. 6 (*GCS* 197. 20-198. 5, cf. 244. 125-16), Thdt., *HE* 3. 15. 1 (*GCS* 192. 15-18).

³⁷ This must have been very shortly before or after the appointment of the new consuls, cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 7. 1.

³⁸ Ibid. 22. 5. 3.

³⁹ Ibid. 22. 5. 4.

⁴⁰ There must have been some selectivity, because Jovian found still others to recall a year and a half later, Soc., *HE* 3. 24. 4 (*GCS* 225. 8-9).

what ingenuously restoring their property⁴¹ or giving them leave to recoup it.⁴² This latter step, of course, was almost tailor-made to cause dissension,⁴³ but it was accompanied by another of still greater moment: the subsidies granted the churches by previous emperors were withdrawn and in some cases had to be repaid.⁴⁴ The money thus made available was to be used to support the Hellenic cult, whose traditional rites and ceremonies were now restored.⁴⁵ The sheer amount of money involved can be gathered from the fact that, a few years later, when Jovian decided to reverse the situation, he could only afford to restore a third.⁴⁶ Julian is said to have been 'polite' to the bishops (*ciuilius*), but his appeal for tolerance unleashed a social upheaval unparalleled before the late twentieth century in Eastern Europe.

Julian was understandably nervous.⁴⁷ A few of these changes were undeniably popular: Constantius' eunuchs, for instance, were so hated that even Socrates and Numa Pompilius could not have put in a good word for them;⁴⁸ their dismissal was almost universally applauded.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, it did not require an encounter with one of 'Arianism's' grand old men⁵⁰ to tell Julian how deeply he had offended many others. The friendly

⁴¹ Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 48 (*GCS* 191. 27), cf. Thdt., *HE* 3. 4. 1 (*GCS* 179. 17-21).

⁴² Philost., *HE* 7. 4 (*GCS* 81. 9-13).

⁴³ Somewhat hypocritically, when the expected dissension did occur, Julian complained that he had expected the bishops only to return to their *πατρίς*, not resume their sees, Soz., *HE* 5. 15. 2 (*GCS* 213. 22-214. 1).

⁴⁴ Thdt., *HE* 1. 11. 3, 3. 6. 5 (*GCS* 47. 3-8, 182. 8-9), cf. Soz., *HE* 5. 5. 2, 6. 3. 4 (*GCS* 199. 3-5, 239. 24-240. 2). A generation later the receipts were still being shown.

⁴⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 5. 2, Soz., *HE* 5. 3. 1-2 (*GCS* 195. 3-10), Philost., *HE* 7. 1, 1b (*GCS* 76. 2-77. 3, 76. 15-19), cf. Eunapius, *VS* 493. News of the restored subsidies reached the temples of Alexandria on 4 Feb. 362, *Hist. Aceph.* 3. 1-5 (*SC* 317. 148-50).

⁴⁶ Thdt., *HE* 4. 4. 1-2 (*GCS* 216. 8-16).

⁴⁷ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 3. 9-10, cf. 7-8 ('timidus').

⁴⁸ Ibid. 16. 7. 4, cf. 22. 4. 2-5.

⁴⁹ Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 46-50 (*GCS* 191. 19-192. 8), cf. Soz., *HE* 5. 5. 8 (*GCS* 200. 7-10). Ammianus Marcellinus, on the other hand (22. 4. 1-5, 9-10), while agreeing that the expulsions were justified, thought them too wholesale, and Socrates (*HE* 3. 1. 58 (*GCS* 193. 1-3)) considered the dismissal of the cooks more suitable to a philosopher than an emperor.

⁵⁰ Maris of Chalcedon, Soc., *HE* 3. 12. 1-4 (*GCS* 206. 13-22), Soz., *HE* 5. 4. 8-9 (*GCS* 198. 6-15).

summons he issued about this time to Christian acquaintances may have had a calculated as well as a personal dimension, but while Basil the Great is said to have refused,⁵¹ Aetius accepted. As one who had been a companion of the emperor's brother and suffered for his sake, he was very much *persona grata*; so much so, indeed, that he was not only recalled and received at the imperial palace but transported there at public expense.⁵² Moreover he was handsomely rewarded, being given an estate on Lesbos near Mytilene⁵³ (perhaps one of those confiscated at the treason trials⁵⁴); but significantly, though reunited with Eunomius, in favour, and still at Constantinople,⁵⁵ he did not become the emperor's confidant. There were now other powers in the land.

It is said that when he was summoned by Constantius a few years before to be made Caesar, Julian arrived still wearing a student cloak (*palliatum*).⁵⁶ That same cloak was now much in evidence.⁵⁷ The eunuchs who were the instruments of Aetius' original rise were gone, as were the women.⁵⁸ There were indeed still Christians at court,⁵⁹ even some ecclesiastics, but influence was now the prerogative of those like Maximus who were zealous for the old religion.⁶⁰ Even if they were soon as

⁵¹ The extant correspondence between Julian and Basil (*Epp.* 39-41; Courtonne i. 93-8) is plainly spurious. It may, however, be an attempt to reconstruct a situation known to have obtained.

⁵² Soz., *HE* 5. 5. 9 (*GCS* 200. 10-13), Philost., *HE* 6. 7, 7b (*GCS* 75. 1-4, 33-5).

⁵³ Philost., *HE* 9. 4 (*GCS* 117. 36). Eunomius had a property near the sea-wall at Chalcedon, but we are not told that it was a gift of the emperor (*GCS* 117. 6-9).

⁵⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 3. 1-12.

⁵⁵ Philost., *HE* 7. 6 (*GCS* 84. 1-2). We are not told, however, how Eunomius got there. He may have been in the imperial train when Constantius died, or he may have stayed at Antioch and only gone up to Constantinople later.

⁵⁶ Ammianus Marcellinus 15. 8. 1.

⁵⁷ Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 55-6, cf. 24. 6 (*GCS* 192. 18-22, cf. 225. 11-12): *τηβαν*.

⁵⁸ See above, Ch. 5, pp. 196-7, Ch. 6, pp. 211-12. One of Julian's reasons for dismissing the eunuchs was that he had no wife, Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 58 (*GCS* 192. 5-7).

⁵⁹ Lay courtiers were clearly under considerable pressure. Gregory Nazianzen's brother Caesarius considered remaining, to Gregory's horror, *Ep.* 7 (Gallay i. 8-10), *Or.* 7. 12-14 (*PG* 35. 769B-772B). There were doubtless others with fewer scruples.

⁶⁰ Eunapius, *VS* 478.

overweening as their predecessors,⁶¹ this left little opening for others. Julian might 'persecute with honour', as the saying was,⁶² but remaining Christian hopes were dashed that summer when he issued a decree forbidding them to teach or study the classics.⁶³ Even some pagans thought that unjust;⁶⁴ Christians were outraged.⁶⁵ It was a reminder, however, if any were needed, that in this new world the emperor had left only one course open.

As we saw earlier, Constantius followed his father in aiming at an ecclesiastical unity based on a limited public debate around a single official formula.⁶⁶ Julian's policy of allowing everyone to go their own way while he went his meant that debates which might otherwise have been internal and private were now carried out in public in the context of a very significant political and financial challenge. As usual Athanasius was among the first to get the point. He waited nearly two weeks after being amnestied before appearing in public, and had to leave again eight months later,⁶⁷ but in the mean time he managed to lay the foundations of what proved to be an ultimate Nicene victory. Many of the twenty or so bishops who met with him at Alexandria that summer were exiles from 'Italy, Arabia, Egypt and Libya',⁶⁸ and eager to return home;⁶⁹ but the synodical letter addressed by them to the sharply divided Nicene community at Antioch remains a remarkable and delicately balanced

⁶¹ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 7. 3-4; Eunapius, *VS* 477.

⁶² Ruf., *HE* 10. 33 (*GCS* II. ii. 994. 23-5). Hieron., *Chron.* ad annum 362 (*GCS* VII. i. 242. 12-13) calls it a 'blanda persecutio'.

⁶³ Soc., *HE* 3. 16. 1 (*GCS* 210. 5-8), Soz., *HE* 5. 18. 1 (*GCS* 222. 2-4). Interestingly, Julian is said to have used a quote from Aristophanes also found in Eunomius, *Thdt.*, *HE* 3. 8. 1-2 (*GCS* 185. 7-13), cf. Eun., *AA* 3 (*J* ii. 205. 19-20), Vaggione 121 n. 28.

⁶⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 10. 7, 25. 4. 20, cf. Eunapius, *VS* 493, 494.

⁶⁵ Ambrose, *Ep.* 72. 4. 25-34 (*CSEL* 82/iii. 12-13).

⁶⁶ See above, Ch. 3, pp. 60-1, Ch. 6, pp. 204-6.

⁶⁷ *Hist. Aceph.* 3. 11-21 (*SC* 317. 150), 21 Feb. to 24 Oct. 362.

⁶⁸ Ath., *Tom.*, praef. (*PG* 26. 796A). Twenty names are listed, but note of λοιποί ad loc.

⁶⁹ Cf. *ibid.* 2 (*PG* 26. 797B). The emperors considered the Thebaid, 'on the frontiers of Egypt', an excellent place of exile, *Thdt.*, *HE* 3. 4. 2 (*GCS* 179. 23-180. 2), Philost., *HE* 8. 5 (*GCS* 107. 3-4).

piece of work.⁷⁰ Its main theme is reconciliation, emphasizing the need to come together, not just to come home.⁷¹ Those from the former imperial church under the leadership of Euzoius are to be welcomed on the same basis as those meeting with Meletius in the so-called 'old' church.⁷² They are to acknowledge the Nicene faith (including the anathemas), but once they have done so, they are to be received in their orders without additional penance.⁷³ The further provisos, however, are more nuanced.

For one thing the Holy Spirit, which scarcely needed to be considered at all at Nicaea, was now an integral part of the 'Nicene' faith,⁷⁴ though in this document there is more about what we should not say than what we should. True, the Holy Spirit is indeed *homoousios*, but the really crucial point is not to call it 'creature' or to separate it from Christ's essence;⁷⁵ it is nowhere called 'God'.⁷⁶ 'Substance-language', on the other hand (though admittedly dangerous⁷⁷) is indeed to be used, but primarily as excluding modalism.⁷⁸ The proposed settlement thus rests on a triple foundation: the entities as real subsisting *hypostaseis*, that is, things that genuinely exist (*ἀληθῶς οὐσαν καὶ ὑφ'εστῶσαν*); the 'Trinity' as a single *ousia*, not divided ontologically;⁷⁹ and the person of Christ possessing a human soul as well as a body.⁸⁰ But what surely must be almost as interesting

⁷⁰ Athanasius himself was obviously the chief author, e.g. Ath., *Tom.* 9 (PG 26. 808A).

⁷¹ There is, however, at least one side-long glance at the Parable of the Prodigal Son, doubtless aimed at Paulinus and the so-called 'old' Nicenes, Ath., *Tom.* 3 (PG 26. 797C).

⁷² Ath., *Tom.* 1, 3 (PG 26. 796B-797A, C).

⁷³ Ibid. 3 (PG 26. 797B/C-800B).

⁷⁴ Denying that the Spirit is a *κτίσμα* is specifically linked to what is confessed *ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν* in ibid. 3 (PG 26. 800A), cf. Basil, *Ep.* 258. 2. 15-20 (Courtonne iii. 101-2).

⁷⁵ Ath., *Tom.* 3, 5, 6, cf. 11 (PG 26. 800A, 801B, C, cf. 809B).

⁷⁶ A generation later in hindsight the terminology would be more explicit, Soc., *HE* 3. 7. 2 (GCS 197. 15): *θεολογήσαντες*.

⁷⁷ Ath., *Tom.* 5 (PG 26. 801A).

⁷⁸ And in the form most frequently claimed to be implied by *homoousios*, ibid. 3, 6 (PG 26. 800A, 801C, 804A), Soz., *HE* 5. 12. 4 (GCS 211. 13-18), Ruf., *HE* 10. 30 (GCS II. ii. 992. 21-993. 2), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 7. 11-15 (GCS 198. 13-199. 2), *μη ἀπορία ὀνομάτων ταῦτὸν δόξη τις τρισὶ προσηγορίαις καλεῖν*.

⁷⁹ Ath., *Tom.* 3, 5 (PG 26. 800A, 801A, B).

⁸⁰ Ibid. 7 (PG 26. 804B-C), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 7. 2-10 (GCS 197. 16-198. 12),

as anything else is the fact that none of this terminology (λέξεις) is to take precedence over the narrative structure to which it bears witness:⁸¹ all are to confess that there is a single Son of God before and after Abraham, one really existing entity who spoke to the prophets, and who, 'in the form of a servant', raised Lazarus; the very same again who suffered in the flesh and was raised for our salvation.⁸² The *akribeia* of some Nicene fanatics⁸³ might make immediate success impossible, but the vision itself was already present. The Nicene tumblers were starting to fall into place.

The bishops who made this possible left for home before they had time to sign the letter,⁸⁴ but significantly there were other bishops who did not return at all. Eunomius for one, did not return to Cyzicus. There were good reasons for this. For one thing, the strongly entrenched Eleusius was already back with his unruly flock, so there was no need to buy trouble. Then again, any bishop of Cyzicus was going to have trouble with this emperor over confiscated temple land.⁸⁵ Eleusius had caused the problem; let Eleusius solve it. And in point of fact, he did have to rebuild the Novatian church he had destroyed,⁸⁶ while all his 'foreign' associates were expelled.⁸⁷ Eunomius was thus perhaps wise to remain at Constantinople. He was certainly not left idle; for the ecclesiastical situation there was as complex as any place in Julian's dominions.

Eudoxius and his adherents retained physical control of the churches (though the Novatians were allowed to rebuild theirs⁸⁸). Aetius, on the other hand, was still excommunicated, and (to add insult to injury) was obliged to accept his secretary as a bishop while he himself remained a deacon.⁸⁹ Still, Soz., *HE* 5. 12. 3 (*GCS* 211. 11-13). Socrates feels obliged to demonstrate at length that this is not an innovation.

⁸¹ Ath., *Tom.* 8 (*PG* 26. 805A-B).

⁸² Ibid. 7 (*PG* 26. 804A-805A).

⁸³ Notably Lucifer of Cagliari: Ruf., *HE* 10. 31 (*GCS* II. ii. 993. 6-26), Soc., *HE* 3.6. 1-3, 9. 18 (*GCS* 197. 1-11, 203. 24-204. 21), Soz., *HE* 5. 12. 2, 13. 1-5 (*GCS* 211. 1-7, 211. 21-212. 17), Thdt., *HE* 3. 5. 1-3 (*GCS* 180. 23-181. 9).

⁸⁴ Ath., *Tom.* 9, cf. 2 (*PG* 26. 805C, cf. 797B).

⁸⁵ Soz., *HE* 5. 15. 5-6, 10 (*GCS* 214. 8-16, 215. 5-6).

⁸⁶ Soc., *HE* 3. 11. 3 (*GCS* 206. 7-11), cf. Soz., *HE* 5. 5. 10 (*GCS* 200. 14-18).

⁸⁷ Soz., *HE* 5. 15. 6 (*GCS* 214. 12-13).

⁸⁸ Soc., *HE* 2. 38. 23-5 (*GCS* 166. 16-22), Soz., *HE* 4. 20. 6 (*GCS* 170. 25-8).

⁸⁹ Cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (*GCS* 64. 25-6, cf. 9).

Eudoxius was not one to ignore the favour even of a pagan emperor and, not surprisingly, began to remember what he had promised. He therefore wrote to Euzoius at Antioch and asked him to restore Aetius. When Euzoius pointedly observed that he had yet to do this himself, he merely repeated the request.⁹⁰ As a result, the reluctant Euzoius was obliged at least to compose a 'tome' absolving Aetius and some of those who supported him. Later that year he gathered together nine other bishops with an eye to implementing it.⁹¹ Julian's turbulent arrival in Antioch about the same time interrupted the process,⁹² but in the summer of 362 it was still possible to believe that Aetius would shortly be restored. Thus, while Aetius was still officially under the ban and Eudoxius could not afford to take part in person, he could allow others to act on his behalf. So it was that, at much the same time that Athanasius and his supporters were meeting in Alexandria, a group of his bitterest foes were coming together at Constantinople.

They were a remarkably diverse lot. The largest identifiable group is said to have been *τοῖς περὶ Σέρραν*, the supporters of

⁹⁰ Cf. Philost., *HE* 7. 5, cf. 8. 7 (*GCS* 83. 3-10, cf. 107. 13-15).

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 7. 6, 8. 2, cf. 9. 3 (*GCS* 85. 4-86. 4, 105. 1-3, cf. 116. 14-19). Its terms, presumably, were similar to those found in the so-called *Expositio Patricii et Aetii* discussed below, pp. 283-4.

⁹² This, of course, is a guess, but it seems to account for the evidence. From what remains of Philostorgius' account (n. 91) it seems clear that the 'tomes' were at least in preparation, but also that they were never actually issued. The reason given is that at this time the Christians were being persecuted 'beyond all endurance', *HE* 7. 6 (*GCS* 86. 2-4). Then comes the account of the expulsion of the future Emperor Valentinian and the disturbances which accompanied Julian's arrival at Antioch, 7. 7, 8 (*GCS* 86. 5-91. 2). The former event is difficult to date, except that it came early in the reign. Soz., *HE* 6. 6. 3-6 (*GCS* 243. 23-244. 18), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 13. 3-4 (*GCS* 207. 12-16), places the incident that provoked this in Gaul before Julian entered Constantinople, and the expulsion after. Thdt., *HE* 3. 16. 2-5 (*GCS* 194. 15-195. 7), puts it in the *Τυχαῖον* at Constantinople a year and some months before Valentinian became emperor (i.e. late summer or early autumn 362). It is possible, then, that the 'unendurable' persecution in question is connected with the expulsion of military officers and the restoration of temple subsidies that summer. However, in view of Euzoius' own prominence in the events that followed ('Thdt., *HE* 3. 12. 3 (*GCS* 189. 7-12)), the reference is more likely to be to something in Antioch itself. In which case, the 'tome' would have been prepared over the summer, with a council meeting to discuss it in Nov. or early Dec. when the emperor arrived, and gave them an excuse to disperse.

Serras of Paraetionium.⁹³ This bishop was one of Aetius' most ardent supporters and had, along with ten other bishops, refused to condemn him at Constantinople;⁹⁴ fifteen years before that he had been ready to make him a bishop in Libya.⁹⁵ The rest included Heliodorus of Sozusa, also a Libyan, the notoriously crusty Mysian, Leontius of Tripolis,⁹⁶ Theodulus from Chaeretapa in Phrygia, and Theophilus the Indian.⁹⁷ To these we may add Eunomius and, shortly thereafter, Aetius himself. For Aetius too was now a bishop, although one without a see. Like Theophilus the Indian he was presumably now a 'general bishop' (κοινὸς δέ τις),⁹⁸ and not bound by geographical boundaries.⁹⁹ For his part, Eunomius was 'retired' (σχολαῖος).¹⁰⁰

This was a committed, but not particularly homogeneous group. Aetius, Eunomius, and the supporters of Serras might perhaps be considered the most committed ideologically, with Theophilus the Indian and Theodulus a close second;¹⁰¹ Heliodorus, on the other hand, had signed the Acacian declaration at Seleucia,¹⁰² while Leontius was literally a 'law unto himself'.¹⁰³ At this point they still had the backing of Eudoxius, though that was not to last long. The collapse of Euzoius' synod

⁹³ Philost., *HE* 7. 6, 8. 2 (*GCS* 85. 6–86. 2, cf. 84. 3, 105. 22–3). 'Largest' assuming that some, if not all, of the ten who refused to sign are included.

⁹⁴ See Ch. 6 n. 163 above. Since the six-month time-limit was still waiting to be rescinded, it is clear that this bishop and at least some of his supporters had never signed at any time since, Philost., *HE* 7. 6 (*GCS* 85. 6–7).

⁹⁵ See above Ch. 2 n. 86.

⁹⁶ Philost., *HE* 7. 6a (*GCS* 84. 16–85. 30).

⁹⁷ Ibid. 7. 6 (*GCS* 84. 2–4).

⁹⁸ Ibid. 3. 6a, cf. 6 (*GCS* 36. 24–6, cf. 2–3).

⁹⁹ On the proliferation of such *episcopi vagantes*, cf. Basil, *Ep.* 265. 2. 22–8 (Courtonne iii. 129), where the Apollinarians appear to be meant; for some Nicene examples, cf. Barses, Eulogius, and Lazarus in Soz., *HE* 6. 34. 1 (*GCS* 290. 2–5). Eusebius of Samosata at times seems to have functioned similarly, Thdt., *HE* 4. 13. 4 (*GCS* 233. 16–21).

¹⁰⁰ Soc., *HE* 4. 7. 11 (*GCS* 234. 15–16). The difference presumably is that, once expelled from his diocese, Eunomius did not feel able to function sacramentally, Philost., *HE* 9. 4 (*GCS* 117. 11–14). If so he was probably *not* one of Aetius' consecrators (note that in Philost., *HE* 7. 6 (*GCS* 84. 1–85. 1) he is twice listed separately).

¹⁰¹ Theodulus was deposed at Seleucia along with Eudoxius and the rest, Ath., *Syn.* 12. 5, cf. 2 (Opitz ii. 240. 7–9, cf. 239. 14–18), Soc., *HE* 2. 40. 43 (*GCS* 176. 3–8).

¹⁰² Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 26. 7 (CS iii. 301. 4).

¹⁰³ Philost., *HE* 7. 6a (*GCS* 84. 16–17): *κάνονα . . . τῆς ἐκκλησίας*.

in December¹⁰⁴ forced them to recognize that the status quo was likely to continue indefinitely, and since Aetius' restoration was a *sine qua non* of their policy, they felt obliged to take action. As it was now possible to act without government interference they addressed the matter institutionally: they ordained bishops to serve the communities loyal to them. Within a year this gave them an episcopal 'bench' of fourteen, though only four were diocesans.¹⁰⁵ Of the rest, seven were set to oversee broad geographical regions: Candidus and Arrian over Lydia and Ionia, Theodulus in Palestine, Poemenius and then Florentius at Constantinople, Thallus on Lesbos, Euphronius over Pontus, Galatia, and Cappadocia, and Julian in Cilicia.¹⁰⁶ That left Aetius and Theophilus, who were 'general', and Eunomius who was 'retired'.

Even at first sight this is a remarkably diverse group in both personal and jurisdictional terms, which leaves us to ask what they thought they were doing. For they were pretty clearly not trying to found a new 'church'—the structure they laid down would not support it. But if not that, then what? Our clue lies in the precipitating event, the failure to restore Aetius: they were not trying to establish a new break, they were trying to deal with the consequences of an old one. Theophilus' mission to

¹⁰⁴ That is, assuming that this was roughly contemporary with Julian's arrival in Antioch (see n. 92 above). Philostorgius gives us two partially overlapping accounts of what are apparently the same events, one in 7. 5–6, the other in 8. 2–4 (*GCS* 83. 3–86. 4, 105. 1–106. 27). Since the latter deals with the consequences of the earlier events in the reign of Jovian and the change in Eudoxius' attitude is clear, the independent ordinations must have taken place after the precipitating event, Euzoius' synod. If we then assume that Aetius was ordained in the summer with Eudoxius' acquiescence, most of the others must have taken place during the winter and early spring of 363 without it (i.e. while Julian was at Antioch).

¹⁰⁵ That is, those who were at the council which consecrated Aetius, and those who were listed as exercising some kind of local jurisdiction, Philost., *HE* 7. 6, 8. 2 (*GCS* 84. 1–86. 4, 105. 6–23). Only Serras, Stephen, and Heliodorus and Leontius of Tripolis were diocesan bishops. To this we might add Theodulus of Chaeretapa, but he was moved shortly thereafter. Eunomius, of course, had started as a diocesan bishop.

¹⁰⁶ This may well be the author of the surviving *Commentary on Job*, and therefore presumably also the editor of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the longer form of the Ignatian *Epistles*. A Cilician bishop would have been well within the Antiochene orbit, but just distant enough to call his exegetical opponents 'Syrians', Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 80. 7–10, 115. 7–8, 155. 3–6, 158. 7–11), etc.

Antioch is a good example. His aim was to win over Euzoius, the diocesan, or failing that, to minister to the faithful *sur place*.¹⁰⁷ The creation of a parallel hierarchy was thus an attempt to respond to a specific theological and pastoral need pending a more general settlement. This accounts for the tolerance of Eudoxius. Poemenius and Florentius were no more intended to replace him than Theophilus was Euzoius. Their purpose, rather, was to minister to a community which, for the moment at least, could not hope for official reconciliation. Thus years later it was still possible to hope that Eudoxius was going to restore Aetius—an expectation that would have been incomprehensible if he had tried in the mean time to ordain a rival bishop!¹⁰⁸ The new heteroousian bishops of Julian's reign were thus only potentially the start of a Eunomian 'church'. At this point, they were still an expedient, not the goal.

Geographically at least the new hierarchy was a kind of 'looking-glass' version of the fertile crescent. It stretched around the shores of the Mediterranean from Constantinople to Libya (with the significant omission of Egypt). One of the reasons why such a hierarchy was set up, however, was because its members had a very specific understanding of its authority. We have already seen that Aetius and Eunomius believed that their role as *periti* or experts was God-given, and that the source of their authority lay in their commission to defend the authentic faith.¹⁰⁹ This defence, however, could not be limited to argument. Like Theophilus the Indian (the very 'image of the apostles') these bishops were, to a man, workers of wonders.¹¹⁰ Their chance to play such a role at court may have diminished with the departure of Constantius and his eunuchs, but their claim to authority was not based on official jurisdiction or imperial favour; it was the prerogative of those who, preaching everywhere, could expect to have their word confirmed 'with signs following'.¹¹¹ It was also a view which a

¹⁰⁷ Philost., *HE* 8. 2 (*GCS* 105. 17–21).

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 9. 3 (*GCS* 116. 11–14).

¹⁰⁹ See above Ch. 3, pp. 45–7.

¹¹⁰ Philost., *HE* 9. 1 (*GCS* 116. 2–7). On the wider context of all this, see Ch. 5, pp. 179–97 above.

¹¹¹ Though he does not mention miraculous confirmation, Lim, pp. 129–30, argues that this characteristic 'anomoean' view of authority points to a 'philosophical coterie' rather than a 'religious community'. But while there is some

community under pressure and visibly in the minority was bound to find comforting.

Julian left for Persia in March, but it was Jovian who returned in August.¹¹² It was said that Julian, *en route*, removed the body of James from the walls of Nisibis and thus left the city defenceless;¹¹³ but it was a Christian, Jovian, who traded it to the enemy for the safety of the field army. In fact the inhabitants made a point of taking the saint's body with them when they left.¹¹⁴ The new emperor himself had only eight months to live, but this allowed plenty of time for religious controversy, and from the beginning he was claimed by almost everyone.¹¹⁵ Though he found Athanasius waiting to see him when he arrived at Hierapolis,¹¹⁶ anomoean members of his own family had already caught up with him at Edessa.¹¹⁷ He is said to have honoured the philosophers who accompanied Julian,¹¹⁸ and even permitted a sacrifice,¹¹⁹ but by September he had started restoring the Constantinian subsidies.¹²⁰ As he pointed out truth to his contention that Eunomius presided over 'a broad confederation of like-minded people', it is not true to say that this meant establishment of a hierarchy was not 'a central preoccupation'. What Lim sees as 'either/or' is better understood as 'both/and'.

¹¹² Julian left Antioch 5 Mar. 363 and was killed on 26 June, Ammianus Marcellinus 23. 2. 6, Soc., *HE* 3. 21. 17 (*GCS* 217. 24-6). News of his death reached Alexandria on 19 Aug., *Hist. Aceph.* 4. 1-4 (*SC* 317. 152).

¹¹³ Gennadius, *Vir. Inlus.* 1 (*TU* 14. 1. 61. 27-62. 7).

¹¹⁴ Cf. P. Pecters, SJ, 'La Légende de saint Jacques de Nisibe', *AB* 38 (1920), 312.

¹¹⁵ Soc., *HE* 3. 24. 1-2 (*GCS* 224. 26-225. 3), cf. Soz., *HE* 4. 4. 1 (*GCS* 240. 11-14). Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 10. 15 is probably closest to the truth in describing him as merely 'Christianae legis . . . studiosus et nonnumquam honorificus'.

¹¹⁶ *Index Fest.* 432-5 (*SC* 317. 264). Not, however, as later alleged by Thdt., *HE* 4. 2. 4 (*GCS* 212. 4-7), cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 5. 1 (*GCS* 242. 12-13), at Jovian's own invitation.

¹¹⁷ Philost., *HE* 8. 6 (*GCS* 107. 5-7). They are said to have been in the entourage of Candidus and Arrian (οἱ περὶ Κανδίδου καὶ Ἀρριανόν). According to Damasc., *Artem.* 70. 6-9 (*PTS* 29. 244), he actually became an Anomoean.

¹¹⁸ Eunapius, *VS* 478.

¹¹⁹ In Persia, Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 6. 1.

¹²⁰ News of this reached Alexandria 16 Sept. 363, *Hist. Aceph.* 4. 4-8 (*SC* 317. 152), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 24. 3 (*GCS* 225. 3-7), Soz., *HE* 6. 3. 3-4 (*GCS* 239. 20-240. 2), Thdt., *HE* 4. 41-2 (*GCS* 216. 8-16), Philost., *HE* 8. 5 (*GCS* 106. 28-107. 2).

himself, that gave the contending parties an entirely new focus.¹²¹ By February he was extremely eager to leave Antioch,¹²² and sent Athanasius home with honour,¹²³ but otherwise kept his own counsel.¹²⁴ A flat statement to the effect that he abominated contention and honoured unanimity fell on deaf ears.¹²⁵ The Macedonians demanded the condemnation of those who asserted the *anomoion* (meaning Eudoxius),¹²⁶ while an 'Acacian' synod met to throw in its lot with Meletius.¹²⁷ The Nicenes (especially those for whom 'Athanasius' and 'Nicaea' were more or less synonymous) hastened to claim the emperor as their own.¹²⁸ But the 'Nicaea' he supported, however, was clearly the newly tolerant Nicaea of Meletius, not the more restrictive one of Paulinus and Lucifer of Cagliari.¹²⁹ The Acacians in these circumstances might be accused of hypocrisy, but it is worth noting that they too found it possible to accept the cautious *homoousios* of Meletius, though they made a point of rejecting any narrowly philosophical definition.¹³⁰

Anomoean efforts to set up a 'sound' parallel hierarchy did not, of course, go unchallenged. Probably late in the reign of Julian (spring 364?), Aetius went to Asia Minor to settle Candidus and Arrian in their places. A number of Lydian bishops who had supported him earlier now complained on canonical grounds.¹³¹ Two, Theodosius of Philadelphia and

¹²¹ Ath., *Ep. Jov.*, *petitio Arianorum* 3 (PG 26. 821B).

¹²² Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 10. 4.

¹²³ *Hist. Aceph.* 4. 18-24 (SC 317. 152-4), cf. *Ep. Jov.*, *praef.* (PG 26. 813A-B).

¹²⁴ Philost., *HE* 8. 6 (GCS 107. 7-9), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 25. 19 (GCS 227. 13-16).

¹²⁵ Soc., *HE* 3. 25. 4 (GCS 225. 22-5).

¹²⁶ Soz., *HE* 6. 4. 3-5 (GCS 240. 17-241. 4), cf. Soc., *HE* 3. 25. 2-3 (GCS 225. 17-22).

¹²⁷ Soc., *HE* 3. 25. 6-18 (GCS 225. 27-227. 18), Soz., *HE* 6. 4. 6-11 (GCS 241. 4-242. 8). H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988), 173-6, may be right to question whether the 'Acacius' in question was really Acacius of Caesarea, but it is worth noting that Hieron., *Chron.* ad annum 364 (GCS VII. i. 243. 21-4) claims that this synod rejected the *homoousion*, which may be more than just a sign of Jerome's well-known anti-Meletian bias.

¹²⁸ Cf. Theodoret's perplexity on his death, *HE* 4. 5. 1-2 (GCS 216. 17-217. 2).

¹²⁹ Soc., *HE* 3. 25. 4-5 (GCS 225. 22-7).

¹³⁰ *Ibid.* 25. 14-15 (GCS 226. 19-27).

¹³¹ Philost., *HE* 8. 4 (GCS 106. 3-14).

Phoebus of Polychalandus, had signed the Acacian declaration at Seleucia and been excommunicated for their trouble;¹³² now, however, they got together Auxidianus and six other regional bishops and formally complained to Maris and Eudoxius. As the latter had now definitely begun to cool toward Aetius, he suggested they focus on him—on the consecrators rather than the ordinands.¹³³ The accession of Jovian and the possibility of a connection between Candidus and Arrian and the imperial house seem to have stopped all this in its tracks. But, significantly, discipline was not the only issue; there was also an argument over doctrine. In an organization where self-identity and *akribeia* were so closely linked, this did not bode well for the future. Theodosius himself seems to have taught that the Logos was by nature capable of (moral) change, but that, like the saints,¹³⁴ he achieved moral stability (τὸ ἀτρεπτον) through virtuous behaviour.¹³⁵ He also seems to have questioned whether God could really have used language to communicate (presumably in a premundane context¹³⁶). Philostorgius was probably right to see both these points as aimed at Aetius personally.

The advent of Jovian naturally changed this dynamic once again, and not just for Candidus and Arrian. Eudoxius could no longer afford the luxury of a squabble with Aetius since he was

¹³² Epiph., *Haer.* 73. 26. 5 (GCS iii. 300. 22–3), Ath., *Syn.* 12. 5 (Opitz ii. 240. 8–10), Soc., *HE* 2. 40. 43–5 (GCS 176. 3–13), cf. Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 42. 6 (CSEL 1. 96. 9–11), In Philost., *HE* 8. 4 (GCS 106. 7–10) the second bishop's name is given as Φοβφ, but given the rest of Philostorgius' information and the close connection between the two men, this must be the Φοῖβος of the other sources.

¹³³ Philost., *HE* 8. 4 (GCS 106. 22–7). This shows, incidentally, that Eudoxius' animus was directed at Aetius in person rather than at the consecration of parallel bishops in particular. The 'Aetian' synod which met at Puza in Phrygia about this time may have had some connection with these events, but its only recorded action had to do with the date of Easter (Mansi iii. 452A).

¹³⁴ Cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 24. 20, 106. 1–10, cf. 15. 1–5, 248. 18–20).

¹³⁵ Philost., *HE* 8. 3 (GCS 105. 29–31), cf. Aetius, *Exp.* 4. 48 (SC 317. 156), Eun., *EF* 3. 23–5 (Vaggione 154). There seems to have been no suggestion, however, of any ontological change. On the possibility that Theodosius and his party are the mysterious Χρῶντας of the *Syntagmation*, see Ch. 4 n. 396 above.

¹³⁶ Philost., *HE* 8. 3 (GCS 105. 31–106. 2). The reference must be to the premundane 'language' used in creation since speech used in the Old Testament theophanies (beginning with Adam) would have to be referred to the Logos, as would that of the incarnate Christ.

under attack himself: Macedonius and his allies were among the first to address the new emperor.¹³⁷ Moreover, the mere fact that the latter had made a point of communicating with Meletius and *not* with Euzoius sent a message which was heard in the capital long before the emperor could arrive there. This made unification of all sympathetic parties a matter of political if not theological necessity, and it is almost certainly in this context that we must place a rather mysterious document which appeared about this time, called the *Expositio Patricii et Aetii*.¹³⁸ What survives of the text is excerpted in the Alexandrian chronicle known as the *Historia Acephala*, and is said to have been produced at the behest of Eudoxius ('per Eudoxium'). Once it was accepted by Euzoius, however, it led to the formal deposition of Macedonius, Hypatian of Heraclea, and fifteen others on grounds of doctrine, not just discipline.¹³⁹ Its primary authors are said to have been Aetius and an otherwise unknown Patricius 'of Nicaea', supported by two of the Libyans who had consecrated Aetius a year earlier. In itself it represents a kind of *eirenikon* which was about as far to the right as a 'precisianist' like Aetius was likely to be able to come.

The controlling framework is pretty clearly that of Eudoxius. The archbishop had originally been a supporter of Asterius the Sophist and here insists on the *απαράλλάκτως ὅμοιον* (*inuariabilem . . . similitudinem*).¹⁴⁰ Aetius had already shown a willingness to say this when confronted by Constantius,¹⁴¹ but here he tries to make it clear that such similarity does not extend either to his nature or to his Godhead. As against Theodosius Christ's goodness is immutable, but similarity of nature is again ruled out using a number of deliberately grotesque images to portray such a being as in effect parasitic. A similarity based on

¹³⁷ See n. 126 above.

¹³⁸ *Hist. Aceph.* 4. 36–77 (*SC* 317. 154–8). The general context in the reign of Jovian seems inescapable from what precedes and follows, *ibid.* 4. 11–34, 78–84 (*SC* 317. 152–4, 158). The 'Aetius' in question is almost certainly the heresiarch, though it is a little peculiar to describe him as 'in communion with Eunomius'. In the discussion below, all references are to this text.

¹³⁹ *Hist. Aceph.* 4. 24–34 (*SC* 317. 154). They were condemned because they would not receive "non similem" neque "facturam non facti". For the earlier condemnation, see above Ch. 6 n. 159.

¹⁴⁰ See above Ch. 3 nn. 189–90, Ch. 6 n. 57.

¹⁴¹ See above Ch. 6 n. 152.

shared qualities is also excluded. Perhaps the most delicately balanced section is that which deals with how God is known. This had always been a point at issue between Aetius and Eudoxius. At Seleucia the latter had taught that, even as the Son strives to know the Father, so the Father extends beyond him so as not to be known; Aetius' partisans were as shocked as the rest.¹⁴² But here, while the members of the intelligible hierarchy do not possess discursive knowledge of those above them (they do not *comprehendere uel intellegere*),¹⁴³ God's own knowledge is immediate (*sine prouisione*) and the Son shares in that (*omnia uidet quod . . . Pater*). That is the sense, as we have seen, in which contingent being can be said to know God 'as [God] knows himself': God has given a genuine knowledge of himself to intelligible beings by implanting his Name within them; but this knowledge, like his own, is immediate and non-discursive.¹⁴⁴ Things known discursively, on the other hand, are known only in accordance with the capacity of the knower. Those lower in the intelligible hierarchy can know or understand those above them only to the extent that their nature permits. Thus angels, archangels, and cherubim, though they all possess an inherent knowledge of God, also have a differentiated discursive knowledge.¹⁴⁵ The same principle applies to Spirit and Son. The latter's discursive knowledge exactly corresponds to his nature—it is the greatest possible for any contingent being—yet even he knows 'neither the day nor the hour'.¹⁴⁶

The compromise that had alienated so many of Aetius' disciples four years earlier was obviously still in effect; yet within months it was to prove entirely unnecessary. In February of 364, with-

¹⁴² Hilary, *Const.* 13. 12–14. 3 (SC 334. 196).

¹⁴³ Not, as at Seleucia, 'cognoscere'.

¹⁴⁴ That is why, in Chrysostom's hostile version, we are able to 'know' *μετὰ ἀκριβείας* things that are not seen by the bodiless powers, *Incomprehens.* 3. 73–4 (SC 28bis. 192).

¹⁴⁵ As even Ambrose would have agreed, *Fid.* 4. 1. 50–4 (CSEL 78. 161). Anomoean teaching here both parallels and critiques the similar teaching of Arius, cf. Ath., *Ar.* 1. 6 (PG 26. 24A).

¹⁴⁶ (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 696B), cf. (Ps.-?)Basil, *Ep.* 8. 6. 1–2, 12–13 (Courtonne i. 29).

out ever having reached his capital, Jovian died,¹⁴⁷ leaving a son who, though consul, was nevertheless only a child.¹⁴⁸ The death of three emperors in just under two and a half years had left the state once again leaderless;¹⁴⁹ and yet in religious terms these few chaotic years mark one of the turning-points in the whole process: Constantius' settlement never had the ten or fifteen years it needed to achieve equilibrium, while the sudden disenfranchisement of all Christians under Julian forced them to consider new possibilities; Jovian's nascent restoration never had the time it needed to take effect. The result, of course, might very easily have been exactly what Julian wanted: a descent into full-fledged sectarianism, with no single group achieving dominance. That is what makes Athanasius' attempt at a solution such a master-stroke. For by allowing some flexibility in technical language he was able to reach out to Meletius and others who shared a similar narrative theology, and to give *homoousios* that 'healthful' sense¹⁵⁰ which would allow it to become the symbol of a comprehensive settlement. Thus a word originally chosen for its precise univocal meaning was able to leave the realm of the *periti*, and become the symbolic vehicle of a religious vision truly capable of 'inflaming the imagination and piercing the heart'.

The contrast between this approach and that taken by Aetius and Eunomius could not be more dramatic. They too were trying to achieve a more comprehensive settlement, but their tactical assumptions were still those of the reign of Constantius—that is, they were trying to work through the power structure of the preceding reign, those who, like Eudoxius and Euzoius, remained in physical control of the churches. The latter did share their religious vision, but the vehicle they used

¹⁴⁷ There is some mystery about the cause of death. Soc., *HE* 3. 26. 5, cf. 4. 1. 1 (*GCS* 228. 9–11, cf. 229. 4–6) and Zosimus 3. 35 (*CSHB* 47. 173. 3–7) ascribe it to disease. Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 10. 13 and Soz., *HE* 6. 6. 1 (*GCS* 243. 16–21), give two possibilities: overeating or the fumes of a newly plastered wall, a version also found in Philostorgius, *HE* 8. 8 (*GCS* 107. 19–108. 8).

¹⁴⁸ Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 10. 11, 17: 'admodum paruulo'. Philost., *HE* 8. 8 (*GCS* 107. 17–18) mentions another son, presumably only an infant.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 1. 3.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Ath., *Deccr.* 23. 2 (Opitz ii. 19. 17–19), *Syn.* 42. 1–2 (Opitz ii. 267. 27–268. 14).

to achieve *rapprochement* was *akribeia*, technically exact theological language. If negotiating this allowed them to come to the very edge (as in Aetius' adoption of ἀπαρλλάκτως ὅμοιος), it did not allow them to lay the foundations of any new common identity. Indeed, in many ways it continued the situation that brought Nicaea to such grief: much agreement as to the words to use, but little as to their use in context. The result was an almost inevitable slide into sectarianism. As self-professed *periti* Aetius and Eunomius were increasingly relegated to clerical circles or to the realm of the interested amateur—those in court or mansion who appreciated 'precision'. But *akribeia* by itself was too analytical to inflame the heart or become an easy vehicle of 'real' apprehension. Thus in some respects their method betrayed their formulae. For though they certainly did share the passionately held 'apostolic' vision of their other non-Nicene contemporaries, the tools with which they chose to defend it limited its effect. It was only where the vision was *primary* that non-Nicene Christianity broke out of its 'expert' matrix and could take root and flourish. Thus in their approach to technical language the contending groups laid the groundwork of their respective futures. We can see why by considering the contrasting results of two of them.

The anomoean historian Philostorgius, whose surviving fragments tell us so much of what we know about Eunomius, also tells us about himself and how his own family came to join the church. Thus we are told that his father Carterius was already a Eunomian when he married his Nicene mother Eulampia. The latter came from a clerical Cappadocian family and, once won over, gradually converted her father, brothers, and other relatives. This was sometime during the reign of Valens.¹⁵¹ This close-knit clerical community is almost the exact parallel of Eunomius' own, for Lucian, his sister's son, became head of the Eunomian community at Constantinople at about this time.¹⁵² What we get, then, is a glimpse of a tightly gathered professional circle whose identity is centred on 'pre-

¹⁵¹ Philost., *HE* 9. 9 (*GCS* 119. 19–26). The date is implied by the context, since the information is sandwiched in amidst a discussion of the accession of Demophilus. This fits with what is known of Philostorgius' later history—since he was 20 when he saw Eunomius in 387 or 388, he must have been born sometime around 367 or 368 (see below, Ch. 8, p. 350).

¹⁵² Philost., *HE* 12. 11 (*GCS* 148. 1–8). He later went into schism.

cision' and ties of blood. It is not a combination which could easily spark a popular movement.

This is confirmed by the results of another, very different venture. For at much the same time another personage of Cappadocian descent¹⁵³ admired by Philostorgius was beginning a new venture in the hinterland. This was Wulfila bishop of the Goths, who, like Eunomius himself, had been a participant in the council at Constantinople.¹⁵⁴ Described by Philostorgius as a very 'Moses in our midst',¹⁵⁵ this bishop was sent by Eudoxius and Valens in response to a request for missionaries from Fritigern, the Gothic king.¹⁵⁶ The origins of Christianity among the Goths were of course diverse, and many of the details of Wulfila's own mission are obscure,¹⁵⁷ but the only thing that is significant for our own purpose is its manifest success. Wulfila managed to establish the Christianity of an entire society on a solidly non-Nicene basis; so much so that several centuries later Vigilius was obliged to provide Justinian's missionaries with arguments that would have been familiar to the contemporaries of Constantius and Valens.¹⁵⁸ But while the Christianity established by Wulfila was undoubtedly non-Nicene,¹⁵⁹ it was not (at least by Eunomius' standards) particularly ἀκριβής.¹⁶⁰ Eunomius and his followers could honour it for much the same reasons it attracted so much attention from Nicenes: it was difficult to deny the zeal of so many willing martyrs.¹⁶¹ But when Nicenes claimed that these

¹⁵³ Philost., *HE* 2. 5 (*GCS* 17. 3-17).

¹⁵⁴ Soz., *HE* 4. 24. 1 (*GCS* 178. 9-11).

¹⁵⁵ Philostorgius, *HE* 2. 5 (*GCS* 18. 9-12), says it was by 'Constantine', but this is probably an error for 'Constantius', cf. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep. apud Maximinus*, *Comment.* 59. 307. 38-307. 4 (*SC* 267. 244-6).

¹⁵⁶ Soc., *HE* 4. 33. 4-7 (*GCS* 269. 11-22), Thdt., *HE* 4. 37. 1-5 (*GCS* 273. 16-274. 15).

¹⁵⁷ See Joseph Mansion, 'Les Origines du christianisme chez les Gots', *AB* 33 (1914), 5-30; Peter Heather, 'The Crossing of the Danube and the Gothic Conversion', *GRBS* 27 (1986), 289-318.

¹⁵⁸ Vigilius, *Mariv.* 1, praef. (*PL* 62. 351C-354B). The work as a whole is a kind of missionary's vade-mecum.

¹⁵⁹ Sozomen, *HE* 6. 37. 8-9 (*GCS* 295. 24-296. 6), tries to make him initially Nicene, but this tribute to his merits is on a par with Philostorgius' efforts to co-opt James of Nisibis.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Thdt., *HE* 4. 37. 4 (*GCS* 274. 8-11).

¹⁶¹ See H. Delehay, SJ, 'Saints de Thrace et de Mésie', *AB* 31 (1912), 277-9.

barbarians embraced the faith with more simplicity than their 'Arian' mentors,¹⁶² they were telling at least part of the truth. For the main content of the Gospel they received was the non-Nicene framework itself, and to the end of their existence as a separate body it was visible in their teaching and writing. But while the framework proclaimed by Wulfila was substantially that defended by Eunomius, and both were convinced that theirs was the 'Gospel of the apostles and prophets', their interest and therefore their tactics differed sharply. In the end it was Wulfila who was able to make 'Christians really look like Christians' and thus increase their number.¹⁶³ The ensuing reign was the arena which determined the future of both.

The death of Jovian without any obvious adult heir left the army in a quandary. Julian had intended his maternal cousin Procopius to succeed him,¹⁶⁴ but when the end came the latter was not present and Jovian was elected.¹⁶⁵ When Jovian died in his turn, Procopius was in hiding.¹⁶⁶ Since Jovian died on the borders of Bithynia, the army moved to Nicaea to consider the succession. Relatives of Jovian were considered,¹⁶⁷ as was, briefly, Julian's friend the praetorian prefect Sallustius.¹⁶⁸ Finally, at the recommendation of the patrician Datian and with the support of the influential general Dagalaifus, as well as of Sallustius and the master of the horse,¹⁶⁹ the choice fell on Valentinian, an officer from Pannonia.¹⁷⁰ The latter

¹⁶² Soc., *HE* 4. 33. 9 (*GCS* 269. 25-6).

¹⁶³ Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 57. 307^r. 34-6 (*SC* 267. 246).

¹⁶⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus 23. 3. 2, cf. 26. 6. 1, 7. 16, Zosimus 4. 4, cf. 7 (*CSHB* 47. 177. 13-17, cf. 180. 17-19).

¹⁶⁵ He was left with Sebastianus in Mesopotamia, Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 2, cf. Philost., *HE* 9. 5 (*GCS* 117. 19-23).

¹⁶⁶ Zosimus 4. 4 (*CSHB* 47. 177. 17-178. 3) portrays Procopius as peacefully residing in Cappadocia during the reign of Jovian, only going into hiding later. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 3-4 is undoubtedly more accurate in saying that Jovian 'hunted him like a hare', and that after conveying Julian's body to Tarsus, he disappeared and went into hiding, Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 9. 12-13.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. 26. 1. 4, cf. 6.

¹⁶⁸ Zosimus 3. 36 (*CSHB* 47. 173. 8-11). This may have been wishful thinking on the part of Zosimus' pagan source.

¹⁶⁹ Philost., *HE* 8. 8 (*GCS* 108. 9-109. 5).

¹⁷⁰ Soc., *HE* 4. 1. 1-2 (*GCS* 229. 7-11), Philost., *HE* 8. 16 (*GCS* 115. 13-14), Zosimus, 3. 36 (*CSHB* 47. 173. 17-18).

was actually in Ancyra at the time, but waited ten days before going to Nicaea to accept.¹⁷¹ Much is then made of his masterly presence, but the complex currents that greeted him are sufficient to explain any hesitation.¹⁷² Indeed, under the circumstances, one of the army's earliest demands was perfectly understandable—that he choose a colleague and thus guarantee the succession. Valentinian took the matter under advisement.¹⁷³

He was right to hesitate. He did indeed have a brother, Valens, but that worthy was in Pannonia¹⁷⁴ and none too popular with the army.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, the emperor may have had doubts himself, for on 1 March when his brother finally did arrive, he made him only tribune and master of the stables. It was some weeks later, on 28 March (more than a month after his own accession), that he made him emperor,¹⁷⁶ even then leaving him very much the junior partner.¹⁷⁷ Still, in the division of responsibilities that followed, Valens was given the wealthy and populous East while Valentinian took responsibility for the difficult and militarily troubled West. Thus when the brothers parted at Sirmium late in the summer of 364, the junior Augustus turned east to pass the winter at Constantinople.¹⁷⁸

This fourth set of rulers in just under three years changed the religious situation once more. For while it was true enough that both brothers had been brought up as Christians, they were not (at least in retrospect) Christians of the same kind.¹⁷⁹ Julian had

¹⁷¹ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 1. 5, Zosimus, 3. 36 (CSHB 47. 173. 19–21).

¹⁷² Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 2. 1–11.

¹⁷³ Soz., HE 6. 6. 8 (GCS 244. 22–6), Thdt., HE 4. 6. 2–3 (GCS 217. 8–15), Philost., HE 8. 8 (GCS 109. 6–12). According to Zosimus 4. 1, cf. 12 (CSHB 47. 174. 3–18, cf. 186. 21–187. 6) the request was sparked by an imperial illness, but in fact the incident in question occurred later at Constantinople and affected both emperors, cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 4. 4.

¹⁷⁴ Thdt. HE 4. 6. 3 (GCS 217. 15–18).

¹⁷⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 4. 1.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. 26. 4. 2–3, Philost., HE 8. 6a (GCS 109. 29–31), cf. Soc., HE 4. 1. 4 (GCS 229. 12–14).

¹⁷⁷ According to Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 5. 1 he was indeed emperor, but only 'honori specie tenus adiunctus'.

¹⁷⁸ Philost., HE 8. 8 (GCS 109. 14–110. 1), cf. Cod. Theod. 5. 15. 15 (Mommson i. 2. 234), issued from Sirmium on 30 July 364.

¹⁷⁹ Soc., HE 4. 1. 5–6 (GCS 229. 15–19), Soz., HE 6. 6. 10 (GCS 245. 3–4). Thdt., HE 4. 6. 3, cf. 12. 1, 13. 1 (GCS 217. 15–17, cf. 232. 1–2, 233. 1–3) tries

put their commitment to the test,¹⁸⁰ and if Valentinian was later claimed to be the more determinedly anti-pagan,¹⁸¹ there was no reason to doubt the sincerity of either. Still, their wives seem to have been more doctrinally attuned than they were. Justina, Valentinian's second wife,¹⁸² supported the Creed of Ariminum,¹⁸³ while Dominica, Valens' wife, was a devotee of Eudoxius,¹⁸⁴ an affection she apparently shared with her husband—even this early in the reign Philostorgius was bitter that Eudoxius had not used the opportunity to restore Aetius.¹⁸⁵

to make Valens start as a Nicene, but his only evidence is a pro-Nicene decree issued from Illyricum a year later, where his name appears along with the other Augusti, *HE* 4. 7. 7 (*GCS* 219. 24–220. 4). He may be right, however, in thinking that he did not start with a strongly pronounced doctrinal position. According to Soz., *HE* 6. 12. 14 (*GCS* 253. 28–254. 5) the 'Arians' were afraid Athanasius might convert him.

¹⁸⁰ See n. 92 above.

¹⁸¹ By Thdt., *HE* 5. 21. 3 (*GCS* 317. 18–22), though with what justification is unclear. The only evidence that either emperor persecuted the pagan *cult* is *Cod. Theod.* 9. 16. 7 (Mommsen i. 2. 462), which prohibits nocturnal sacrifices and is dated early in the reign (9 Sept. 364); but that is more likely aimed at divination than anything else. On the other hand, there is a good deal of evidence of hostility to the philosophic paganism of Julian. According to Soc., *HE* 3. 1. 16 (*GCS* 188. 22–3) Valentinian was responsible for the death of Maximus (Zosimus 4. 15 (*CSHB* 47. 189. 9–10) says it was Valens), and though this may have been only an attempt to even an old score (cf. Zosimus 4. 2 (*CSHB* 47. 175. 7–11)), Valens' own animus was against politically active philosophers, not pagans in general, Zosimus 4. 14, cf. 15 (*CSHB* 47. 188. 16–18, cf. 189. 9–21), cf. Eunapius, *VS* 478.

¹⁸² At this point, however, the lady would not have been available to influence the emperor. Valentinian is said to have married her later, while still married to his first wife, Gratian's mother. The latter, who is called variously Marina or Severa is said to have been banished, *Chron. Pasch.* ad annos 369, 378 (*CSHB* 22. 559. 4–10, 560. 17–18). According to Soc., *HE* 4. 31. 10–19 (*GCS* 267. 18–268. 12) Valentinian took Justina when still a virgin after the death of her father, while according to Zosimus she had earlier been the wife of Magnentius, 4. 19, 43 (*CSHB* 47. 193. 9–12, 226. 17–18). If Zosimus is right, Socrates' story (which fits better in the reign of Constantius than twelve or fifteen years later under Valentinian) may be a piece of pro-Magnentian propaganda which has been set in a new context. All agree that Justina was very beautiful,

¹⁸³ Soz., *HE* 7. 13. 2, cf. 5, 7 (*GCS* 316. 20–4, cf. 317. 4–7, 13–16). Thdt., *HE* 5. 13. 1 (*GCS* 303. 6–11) claims that she kept this secret during Valentinian's lifetime.

¹⁸⁴ Thdt., *HE* 4. 12. 4 (*GCS* 232. 11–16).

¹⁸⁵ Philost., *HE* 9. 3 (*GCS* 116. 11–14). The reference is to a time when

Yet from Eudoxius' point of view, if a hostile imperial power under Jovian had encouraged *rapprochement*, a more positive one under Valens undid the necessity. Euzoius too now found it politic to forget his promises, and both bishops made a point of criticizing Aetius and Theophilus the Indian in public.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, for the time being their primary focus was bound to lie elsewhere, for at least in the Hellespont it was Macedonius and his supporters who were the real danger.¹⁸⁷

The emperors were too occupied with other matters to take up the matter of religion right away. Nevertheless, before his departure for the West Valentinian set in motion a number of events which were bound to make things more difficult for Valens. In April or May of 364,¹⁸⁸ while passing through Thrace, he gave a number of local bishops permission to hold a synod. As a result, when Valens returned from seeing his brother off some months later he was met by a delegation of these same bishops, hoping to forestall criticism and leave him with a *fait accompli*. Over the preceding two months they had met at Lampsacus on the Hellespont and, since they were all supporters of Macedonius, repudiated everything that had been done at Constantinople in 360, including the depositions that put Eunomius and others in office. Since the bishops in question had originally been deposed for disciplinary reasons, they made some provision for judicial review, but only after the incumbent was reinstated. For the moment at least the practical effect, however, was by and large nil, since this merely canonized the status quo—most of the incumbents were already in place. The emperor, then, could buy time by exhorting them to be reconciled with Eudoxius,¹⁸⁹ but, since he could not really Valens had returned from Illyricum, thus presumably from seeing his brother off at Sirmium, not later during his campaign against the Goths in Thrace.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid. (GCS 116. 14-21).

¹⁸⁷ Soc., HE 4. 1. 17 (GCS 230. 20-2), cf. Soz., HE 6. 10. 2-3 (GCS 249. 11-15).

¹⁸⁸ Cf. *Cod. Theod.* 7. 1. 5, 11. 7. 9, 12. 1. 58 (Mommsen i. 2. 310, 587, 677), all from Adrianople in April or May.

¹⁸⁹ This is the sequence of events found in Soz., HE 6. 7. 1-9 (GCS 245. 9-246. 24). Socrates, HE 4. 12. 10 (GCS 239. 11-13, 240. 19), has Valens give the permission and places the synod in the following year, HE 4. 4. 2 (GCS 232. 2-4). Barnes, *Athanasius*, 291 n. 63 is probably right in suggesting that Socrates has confused the bishops' report with their request for permission to meet. The confusion in date may derive in part from the fact that these meet-

leave it at that, his substantive response came in the spring.¹⁹⁰ Interestingly, it was more legal than doctrinal.¹⁹¹ For while preparing to move to Antioch to forestall a Persian invasion,¹⁹² he decreed that the bishops banished by Constantius and restored by Julian should leave once more. He gave the decree teeth by threatening to fine local magistrates 300 pounds of gold for failure to comply.¹⁹³

This raises the interesting question of what, if anything, Eunomius was doing at this time. Two of our ecclesiastical historians put his dominion at Cyzicus during this reign, and seem to know nothing of anything earlier. True, they put it in the year following (*after* the revolt of Procopius), which is manifestly impossible; but this still leaves us to ask whether their very circumstantial accounts may not have some basis in fact despite their mistaken chronology.¹⁹⁴ For according to these authors Eleusius of Cyzicus bore the brunt of the imperial wrath after Lampsacus, and was browbeaten by the emperor into communion with Eudoxius. His repentance, however, lasted only slightly longer than his journey back to Cyzicus, and ended in his expulsion and replacement by Eunomius. Eleusius is said to have retired to the suburbs while Eunomius took control of the city churches.¹⁹⁵ If our authors have not simply

ings were part of a series and not limited to the one place or the 'two months' between Valentinian's departure and Valens' return, cf. Soc., *HE* 4. 12. 10, 18 (*GCS* 239. 11-13, 240. 19). There is no question but that throughout this section Socrates' chronology is seriously dislocated.

¹⁹⁰ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 11: 'consumpta hieme'.

¹⁹¹ This allowed him to turn a blind eye to those who, like Athanasius, were too difficult to dislodge under the guise of strict legality, *Hist. Aceph.* 5. 10-27, 37-41 (*SC* 317. 160, 162), cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 12. 8-9, 13 (*GCS* 252. 25-253. 6, 22-3).

¹⁹² Soc., *HE* 4. 2. 4 (*GCS* 231. 3-6), Soz., *HE* 7. 7. 10 (*GCS* 246. 25-247. 1), Zosimus 4. 4 (*CSHB* 47. 177. 6-12).

¹⁹³ *Hist. Aceph.* 5. 1-10 (*SC* 317. 158-60). The decree was received at Alexandria, 5 May 365.

¹⁹⁴ It is generally conceded that Socrates' date for Lampsacus is a year late (see n. 187 above); since his information about Eunomius is linked to that and Sozomen did not have any additional information, it is not difficult to believe he has erred here as well.

¹⁹⁵ Soc., *HE* 4. 6. 1-7. 2 (*GCS* 233. 1-23), Soz., *HE* 6. 8. 5-8 (*GCS* 247. 19-248. 11). Socrates is obliged to place this whole episode after the revolt of Procopius because he has placed Lampsacus itself so late. If he is wrong about

confused the events of an earlier with a later time, Eunomius' restoration in the summer of 365 does make a certain amount of sense, for Valens was intent upon the restoration of the legal *status quo ante*. Thus at Antioch he had applied the same principle to Meletius and Euzoius and gave the latter control of the churches (simply ignoring Paulinus).¹⁹⁶ To have returned Eunomius to Cyzicus at this point, then, would have been consistent with his policy elsewhere, and need imply nothing more than recognition of the fact that he had never been formally deposed.

Such an assumption creates a plausible scenario: Eleusius was one of those affected by Valens' original expulsion order in May; he may or may not have been given an opportunity to recant, but his early repentance led to his ejection from his see. The civil authorities, threatened with a ruinous fine, then turned the churches and their revenues over to Eunomius while Eleusius retired to the suburbs.¹⁹⁷ Eunomius continued his troubled reign for a few months, but then was driven out when

that (as he certainly must be) then these events, in which Sozomen copies him, must be placed earlier, presumably then before the revolt.

¹⁹⁶ Soc., *HE* 5. 5. 1-2 (*GCS* 276. 27-277. 2).

¹⁹⁷ In Philost., *HE* 5. 1 (*GCS* 66. 2-8) it is implied that Eleusius was exiled; in Sozrates and Sozomen he continues to function in the suburbs. The proposed reconstruction accounts well for the available data: Eleusius was exiled with the others in 361 and then returned after the accession of Julian. He was again expelled under Valens, but this time was too powerful to dislodge and was thus allowed to function *extra muros*. It also explains why Philostorgius' information about what happened after Eunomius left Cyzicus is set in the reign of Valens, and why Demophilus is the one who tried to rectify the situation, *HE* 9. 13 (*GCS* 120. 11-23). We may also mention another, more speculative possibility. In this passage Philostorgius states that after Eunomius left Cyzicus no new bishop was appointed, his point presumably being that Eunomius and not Eleusius was the legitimate bishop. Elsewhere Philostorgius discussed the life of St Agapetus (Ch. 5 n. 271 above). In the extant Life of that saint he is shown attending a synod at Cyzicus during the reign of Constantine (*V. Agapet.* 16 (*VGS* 119. 24-9)); the assembly then asks him to pray and then appoint a bishop. His choice is not named, but something seems to have dropped out in l. 29—perhaps the name Ascholiu or Achillius, bishop about that time (*Vita S. Parthenii*, *AASS* Feb. II. 39A, E). Philostorgius' version does appear to be related to this Life, and if it too included such an episode, then it may be that among Philostorgius' purposes in telling it was a desire to draw attention to a great and holy (i.e. 'anomoean') bishop of Cyzicus before Eleusius.

unrest associated with the revolt of Procopius forced him to flee¹⁹⁸ (Cyzicus remained loyal to Valens, but was besieged early on, soon falling to the usurper¹⁹⁹). This reconstruction has a number of attractions, not the least of which is that it seems to allow us to account for some otherwise unconnected facts. Thus it explains, for instance, why Socrates and Sozomen thought an imperial decree installed Eunomius in Cyzicus only *after* Lampsacus, and why Eunomius was not present when Procopius hid on his property at Chalcedon later in the summer (see below); it also explains why Eunomius had to leave Cyzicus so soon and why after the city fell, he felt obliged to try to intercede for some of the citizens (he was their bishop). It seems at least probable, then, that Eunomius did return to Cyzicus in the summer of 365, only to be driven out again a few months later. Procopius' challenge was a serious one, and both Aetius and Eunomius were caught up in it.

Procopius was, as we have seen, a maternal relative of Julian and perhaps his designated heir. He had been in hiding for some time—according to some, at Caesarea in Cappadocia, according to others in the Tauric Chersonnese.²⁰⁰ At any rate, he is said to have been reduced to such extreme poverty that when he did arrive in Constantinople he looked wasted and gaunt.²⁰¹ He had in fact been waiting at Chalcedon for some time, in part on property belonging to Eunomius.²⁰² His principal patron was another resident of the same city, the prominent senator, Strategius.²⁰³ This was by no means a carefully planned conspiracy, and Procopius is said to have acted out of desperation. Nevertheless, he managed to mount a significant challenge to the unpopular and inexperienced

¹⁹⁸ See n. 210 below.

¹⁹⁹ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 8. 6–10, Zosimus 4. 6 (*CSHB* 47. 180. 10–13).

²⁰⁰ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 4 speaks merely of 'deuiis itineribus'. Zosimus 4. 5 (*CSHB* 47. 178. 3–16) is more specific and has him flee from Valentinian to the Goths ('Scythians') in the Chersonnese, and then from them by boat to Chalcedon. If the latter account is true, this is presumably where he made the contacts that later permitted him to ask for Gothic help.

²⁰¹ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 15, cf. Philost., *HE* 9. 5 (*GCS* 117. 21–3).

²⁰² Philost., *HE* 9. 5 (*GCS* 117. 23–6), cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 4.

²⁰³ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 5, cf. Zosimus 4. 5 (*CSHB* 47. 178. 16–20).

Valens.²⁰⁴ His chance came when the latter, *en route* to Syria,²⁰⁵ decided to send troops back to reinforce the Thracian frontier.²⁰⁶ The soldiers were given their usual two-day furlough in Constantinople, and during that time Procopius managed to win over some of their officers. As a result, on 28 September they proclaimed him Augustus, though he was said to be more their prisoner than their leader.²⁰⁷ He tried to bolster his legitimist claims by co-opting the widow and daughter of Constantius, who were present in the city,²⁰⁸ and, of course, could count on support from Chalcedon.²⁰⁹ Some cities, such as Cyzicus, did indeed resist, but soon fell none the less. It was at this point that Eunomius, acting as bishop, seems to have intervened and rescued some of the more prominent prisoners.²¹⁰ But while Procopius managed to seize most of Thrace and part of the Aegean littoral, Valentinian's officers kept him out of Illyricum.²¹¹ Yet the latter was in no position to help his brother, for he was fully occupied in Gaul and could not leave the frontier.²¹² The result was that the capital and its environs

²⁰⁴ Eunapius, *VS* 479, cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 7-9, 17, 27. 5. 8.

²⁰⁵ Probably in mid-Sept. After visiting Syria in the spring Valens must have come at least part of the way back, since we find him at Caesarea-Mazaca in July (*Cod. Theod.* 12. 6. 5 (Mommson i. 2. 714)). He was still there in early Oct. when he received news of the revolt, Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 7. 2-3. Since he was then waiting for the heat to drop in order to cross the Cilician plains, he was going toward Syria. Gwatkin, pp. 267-8, assumes, on the somewhat shaky ground of *Cod. Theod.* 12. 6. 8 (Mommson i. 2. 715) that he had in the meantime returned to Constantinople; it is equally possible, however, that with the lessening of the Persian threat, he decided to wait at Caesarea so as to be able to respond to a threat from either direction. At the end of the summer, then, he would have sent back some of his troops to reinforce Thrace, while he himself went on to winter at Antioch. He had not yet left when news reached him of the revolt. Zosimus 4. 7 (*CSHB* 47. 181. 3-5) must be mistaken in having the news reach him in Phrygian Galatia.

²⁰⁶ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 6. 11-14.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 26. 6. 14, cf. 16, compares him to Didymus Julianus. For the date, see the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* in Mommson, *Chronica* i. 240.

²⁰⁸ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 7. 10.

²⁰⁹ Soc., *HE* 4. 8. 1, 12-14 (*GCS* 234. 27-235. 2, 236. 5-10), cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 8. 1-3.

²¹⁰ Philost., *HE* 9. 6 (*GCS* 118. 7-12), cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 8. 11.

²¹¹ *Ibid.* 26. 7. 11-12, cf. 8. 14.

²¹² He got the news on 1 Nov. at Paris, *ibid.* 26. 5. 8. Ammianus is surely right that Valentinian was constrained primarily by the local military situation

remained in the usurper's hands until the campaigning season began again in the spring.

It goes without saying that all this had a significant impact on Aetius and Eunomius. We have already noted Eunomius' intervention at Cyzicus, but Aetius too was involved, though in a different way. The old man (now in his seventies) had retired to the property given him by Julian on Lesbos; while he was there he was arrested by one of Procopius' officers, allegedly for supporting Valens. He was in some danger of being executed, but—significantly—as a favour to Eunomius, one of Procopius' other officials rescued him along with two relatives of his own.²¹³ This second intervention, needless to say, was not likely to do Eunomius much good unless Procopius won. Pending that outcome, Aetius went back to Constantinople to live with Eunomius and Florentius, but survived only a short time. Late that winter or in early spring 366 he died in Eunomius' arms, and received all the honours due his rank and years of struggle.²¹⁴ Indeed, he died during the only period when such a ceremony might have been possible, for Eunomius' breach with Eudoxius was almost complete, and the reign of Procopius was not to last much longer.

For despite some initial success, this last of Julian's male relatives was betrayed by his officers and captured alive by Valens.²¹⁵ The gruesome details of his execution are probably fictional,²¹⁶ but by the end of June the war was over,²¹⁷ and the survivors were left to face the victor. He was in no very forgiving mood. There were a large number of executions and confiscations, said to have spared neither age nor class,²¹⁸ but (26. 5. 9–13, cf. 7. 11–12), and not, as in Zosimus 4. 7 (*CSHB* 47. 181. 8–10) by a reluctance to help someone too weak to stand alone.

²¹³ Philost., *HE* 9. 6 (*GCS* 118. 13–22).

²¹⁴ *Ibid.* (*GCS* 118. 23–8).

²¹⁵ Zosimus 4. 8 (*CSHB* 47. 181. 15–182. 5), Soc., *HE* 4. 5. 3 (*GCS* 232. 22–4); Soz., *HE* 6. 8. 2 (*GCS* 247. 8–10), Philost., *HE* 9. 5 (*GCS* 117. 26–118. 2).

²¹⁶ Soc., *HE* 4. 5. 4 (*GCS* 232. 26–9), Soz., *HE* 6. 8. 3 (*GCS* 247. 10–14), but Zosimus 4. 8 (*CSHB* 47. 182. 5–10) knows nothing of it, and according to Philost., *HE* 9. 5 (*GCS* 118. 2–3) and Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 9. 9, cf. 10. 6, he was beheaded.

²¹⁷ *Chron. Pasch.* ad annum 366 (*CSHB* 22. 556. 20–557. 2) puts it at 20 June; Soc., *HE* 4. 9. 8 (*GCS* 237. 1–3) has it in late May.

²¹⁸ Ammianus Marcellinus 26. 10. 6–14, Zosimus 4. 8 (*CSHB* 182. 10–19).

among those with a particular reason to worry was the erstwhile bishop of Cyzicus, whose actions were at best ambiguous, at worst deeply complicitous. Still, for the moment, he was left in peace. Valens was occupied with more important conspirators, and Eunomius was not, after all, a particularly big fish. Moreover the defeat of the usurper had not ended hostilities. Procopius had concluded a treaty with the Goths, and as the latter were still in the field, that meant there was still a military crisis.²¹⁹ After devoting the winter to retribution, therefore, the emperor was obliged to spend the summer on campaign.²²⁰ Matters were sufficiently serious, however, that before doing so he summoned Eudoxius to Marcianopolis, and was there, probably on Whitsun-eve 367,²²¹ baptized a Christian.²²²

The results were soon visible in his ecclesiastical policy. In June all clerics not in communion with Eudoxius were banished,²²³ including, somewhat later, Eunomius. For while the latter had managed to remain inconspicuous through the winter,²²⁴ and thus to avoid the initial onslaught, imperial leisure and the proximity of Eudoxius meant that he was unlikely to be overlooked again; all that was needed was an accuser. The absence of detectives as well as police in ancient

²¹⁹ Ammianus Marcellinus 27. 5. 1-2, cf. 26. 10. 3, Zosimus 4. 10 (*CShB* 184. 8-17).

²²⁰ Ammianus Marcellinus 27. 5. 3-4. Unfortunately, he was unable to get them to engage.

²²¹ This, of course, is a guess, but Easter that year was 1 April, with Pentecost falling on 20 May, cf. *Index Fest.* 479-80 (*SC* 317. 270). Valens was in Marcianopolis from 10 to 30 May 367 (see n. 220), and except in emergencies such a ceremony would have been performed on a major festival. Then too, this date fits with Theodoret's assertion that the baptism took place during the first Gothic campaign, *HE* 4. 12. 1-2 (*GCS* 232. 2-6) and with the information in Philostorgius, *HE* 9. 7 (*GCS* 118. 29-30) that Eudoxius was present at some point in Marcianopolis. The scribe of O in Hieron., *Chron.* (*GCS* VII. i. 245. 4-5) puts this in 366, but it is listed immediately after the election of Damasus, which took place in Oct.; the scribes of A and P put it (correctly) in the year following.

²²² Soc., *HE* 4. 1. 6 (*GCS* 229. 18-19), Soz., *HE* 6. 6. 10 (*GCS* 245. 4-7). Thdt., *HE* 4. 12. 1-13. 1 (*GCS* 232. 2-19), cf. Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 13. 1 (*GCS* iii. 163. 9-13).

²²³ Soc., *HE* 4. 11. 2 (*GCS* 237. 9-11).

²²⁴ Probably at Constantinople. Chalcedon, where he had property, was a particular focus of the emperor's wrath, cf. Soc., *HE* 4. 8. 1, 12 (*GCS* 234. 27-235. 2, 236. 5-6).

society meant that private informants bulked large in the economy of retribution. Thus it happened that when, not long after, the clergy of Constantinople demanded Eunomius be expelled, a subsequent return to Chalcedon and appeal to Eudoxius only made matters worse.²²⁵ Moreover, the fact that in May the aged Sallustius was replaced by Auxonius as praetorian prefect²²⁶ meant there would be no lack of energetic prosecution. Indeed, Eunomius was arrested very soon thereafter and brought before the prefect; execution was considered, but exile was eventually chosen instead. Thus, as winter closed in, Eunomius found himself beginning a lengthy journey to Mauritania in North Africa.²²⁷ However, as luck would have it his route took him through Illyria, and at Mursa he was received most cordially by the emperor's aged episcopal namesake, Valens.²²⁸ Since further travel was impossible before the spring in any case, the latter took the opportunity to appeal directly to the emperor, and, with the help of Domninus of Marcianopolis, managed to get Eunomius recalled.²²⁹ Eudoxius was temporarily foiled, but saw to it that there was at least no personal interview with the emperor.²³⁰

The spring of 368 thus found Eunomius back in Chalcedon,²³¹ but he was not to be left in peace for long. Eudoxius might be willing to ignore him, but there were certain to be others who were more energetic. Thus when Eudoxius died a year and a half later Eunomius found himself once more in trouble.²³² For this time there was not only a new praetorian

²²⁵ Philost., *HE* 9. 7 (*GCS* 118. 29-119. 2): *Ἀέτιον* in 118. 31 must be an error for *Εὐνόμιον*, picked up from 118. 23. Kopecek ii, 428-9 accepts 'Aetius' and places the appeal to Eudoxius at Marcianopolis in 367; but that gives him only a twenty-day 'window of opportunity' (see n. 221), and by that time Aetius was already dead.

²²⁶ Zosimus 4. 10 (*CShB* 47. 185. 1-3, cf. 184. 3-185. 1).

²²⁷ Philost., *HE* 9. 8 (*GCS* 119. 3-8). Presumably the threatened 'attempt on his life' was official rather than private.

²²⁸ For once, apparently, without Ursacius.

²²⁹ Philost., *HE* 9. 8 (*GCS* 119. 8-12).

²³⁰ *Ibid.* (119. 13-14). An interview would have been difficult to arrange in any case, as Valens was about to depart for a campaign on the Danube, cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 27. 5. 5.

²³¹ It is unlikely, given the attitude of the clergy and the hostility of Eudoxius, that he returned to Constantinople.

²³² Philost., *HE* 9. 8 (*GCS* 119. 14-18). He died in the spring of 370 shortly

prefect, Modestus,²³³ there was also a new bishop of Constantinople. The latter, Demophilus, had been translated from Syria at the behest of Theodore of Heraclea, and lacked any easily discernible doctrinal orientation.²³⁴ He was indeed non-Nicene, but controversial enough that his enthronement was accompanied by riots and a minority attempt to ordain a Nicene.²³⁵ Both were ruthlessly suppressed, but they did not leave the bishop much room to manoeuvre.²³⁶ The situation in the surrounding hinterland was equally complex, not least at Cyzicus. It was true that Eunomius had not returned and that Eleusius was officiating in the suburbs, but it was also true that there was no

after the emperor had set out for Syria, Soc., *HE* 4. 14. 1-2 (*GCS* 244. 2-9), Soz., *HE* 6. 13. 1 (*GCS* 254. 15-19). At the time he was trying to arrange for a successor to Eugenius, bishop of Nicaea, a prelate who is a good example of the difficulties of neat categorization: he opposed Athanasius and supported Macedonius (Soz., *HE* 4. 8. 4 (*GCS* 147. 23), cf. Soc., *HE* 4. 12. 22 (*GCS* 241. 5)), but was also present for the consecration of Eudoxius, *Chron. Pasch.* ad annum 360 (*CSHB* 22. 544. 2).

²³³ Zosimus 4. 11 (*CSHB* 47. 186. 5-9).

²³⁴ Basil, *Ep.* 48. 17-20 (Courtonne i. 129), Philost., *HE* 9. 10 (*GCS* 119. 27-120. 3, cf. 119. 17-18). His sponsor, Theodore, originally supported Eusebius of Nicomedia and then Macedonius (Soc., *HE* 2. 12. 2-3 (*GCS* 103. 11-17)) and was part of the delegation sent to examine the case against Athanasius (Soz., *HE* 2. 25. 19, cf. 3. 10. 4 (*GCS* 87. 2-7, cf. 113. 14-17)). Philostorgius, *HE* 8. 17 (*GCS* 115. 15-18) claims that, like George of Laodicaea (!), he was a supporter of the *homoousion*, but this is either an error for *homoiousios*, or more likely the result of a conviction that their meaning was identical. Presumably Theodore supported Demophilus on the grounds that his none-too-precise theology would allow others a certain amount of latitude, cf. Philost., *HE* 9. 14, 14a (*GCS* 121. 1-2, 10-13).

²³⁵ Soc., *HE* 4. 14. 3-15 (*GCS* 244. 9-23), Soz., *HE* 6. 13. 1-4 (*GCS* 254. 15-255. 3). The riots and the rival ordination, however, were only loosely connected. The 'Nicenes' in this case were the so-called 'Aitnikäner' headed by Eustathius of Antioch, and were a very small minority, cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 10. 2 (*GCS* 249. 11-13). We can assume, therefore, that the motives behind these riots and the shouts of 'unworthy' at Demophilus' inauguration (Philost., *HE* 9. 10 (*GCS* 120. 1-3)) were more complex, and had more to do with local politics than doctrinal orientation—most of the rioters probably supported Macedonius!

²³⁶ It is clear that an attempt was made at this point to take the ecclesiastical situation firmly in hand, and that much violence was involved, but the story of the murder of eighty clerics in Soc., *HE* 4. 16. 1-6 (*GCS* 245. 5-23), Soz., *HE* 6. 14. 1-4 (*GCS* 255. 4-22), cf. Thdt., *HE* 4. 24. 1 (*GCS* 262. 4-9), appears to be the extension of an event that happened to one person to many, cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 25. 10 (*PG* 35. 1212B-C).

functioning 'official' bishop. Thus when Demophilus arrived with Dorotheus, later bishop of Antioch²³⁷ (probably in the entourage of the emperor²³⁸), he appears to have concluded that the situation was intractable. At any rate, his solution was twofold: on the one hand, he allowed the populace to elect a bishop acceptable to Eleusius; on the other, he at least connived at the exile of Eunomius. For Modestus had decided that the latter was a 'troubler of the churches' and, in the course of bringing the local ecclesiastical establishment to heel, exiled him to Naxos,²³⁹ where he was to spend the greater part of the next decade.²⁴⁰

Naxos is commodious as Aegean islands go, but in the life of Eunomius it marks the end of a process of marginalization which almost everything since his ordination had tended to make more pronounced. Like Aetius before him, he had acquired a fair amount of notoriety and some respect, but very little in the way of direct influence. This was in obvious contrast to some of his persecutors, since Demophilus for one was later to be remembered by his community as the 'sancto et omni reverentia digno ac fidelissimo doctore Demofilo',²⁴¹ while Eunomius, like Aetius and Arius, was assessed more ambivalently. The reasons for this were not unrelated to those that earned Demophilus the contempt of Philostorgius:²⁴² no *akribeia*. The Gospel presented by Demophilus and his church was aimed at winning maximum popular support, and to some

²³⁷ This tour must have taken place long before Dorotheus went to Antioch in 376, Soc., *HE* 4. 35. 4, cf. 5. 3. 2 (*GCS* 270. 21-4, cf. 276. 10-12). It is likely enough, none the less, that this is the same person, for he was originally from Thrace (an ally of Theodore?), Philost., *HE* 9. 19 (*GCS* 125. 15-17).

²³⁸ Valens was in Cyzicus in June 370 as shown by *Cod. Theod.* 11. 36. 17 (Mommsen i. 2. 651). If Demophilus was there at the same time, we have a good explanation of the linking of state and ecclesiastical authority visible in Eunomius' exile. Kopecek ii. 430-1 makes the interesting suggestion that Modestus may have been motivated in part by encouragement from his correspondent, Basil of Caesarea.

²³⁹ Philost., *HE* 9. 11 (*GCS* 120. 4-7). The name of the island is given as *Ναοξίαν*, but cf. the medieval forms of the island's name, Naxia, Nacsia, Nicsia, etc., P-W 16. 2081. 3-9.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Gr. Nyss., *Eun.* 2. 127, cf. 1. 13 (J i. 263. 3-6, cf. 26. 6-8), eight in actual fact.

²⁴¹ Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 249^r. 1-2 (*SC* 267. 324).

²⁴² See n. 234 above.

extent did so (especially among the Goths), but we may still question whether it was any longer a growing or dynamic movement—in many ways it was in stasis.

The reasons for this lie partly in the nature of the Valentinian settlement, and partly in the point at which it was introduced. For if one of Valens' aims was to revive the Constantian legal settlement, it was a great deal more difficult to revive the Constantian theology. If Constantius had died in 381 and not 361, and if Julian had never been born, it is just possible that the disparate elements he brought together might have been able to form a synthesis. As it was, the dialogue was interrupted before it began, and with two changes of religion since, a number of new combinations had begun to grow. Thus while there was some political advantage in imposing the older tactical solution on this yeasty mix, it was unlikely that even enforced proximity would lead to dialogue.²⁴³ Indeed, if anything, the forces that led Constantius to define his own settlement in terms of opposing extremes were more visible now than ever. In the decade after Seleucia–Ariminum almost every party had some experience of independence, and a few (including that of Eunomius) had begun to express this institutionally. Thus the practical result of any attempt to reimpose the Constantian settlement was bound to be twofold: on the one hand, since the official Church necessarily had to focus on preferment and who possessed what see, institutional loyalty tended to be defined in terms of formulaic orthodoxy and a willingness to reject the extremes; on the other hand, the nascent sectarian identities created during the *interregnum* meant that it was less and less likely that an enforced encounter would lead to theological engagement. What Valens achieved, then, was to freeze the process. The few years between the death of Constantius and the accession of Valens had so rearranged the political and religious landscape that first the initiative, and then the victory, fell ultimately into other hands.

Eunomius himself, of course, was doubly outcast. For if the

²⁴³ In many ways it was the course of least resistance, since it is predicated on support of an already existing structure. It does not necessarily follow that, because the formulae and some of the people were the same, it meant the same thing to be 'homoean' in the reign of Valens as in the reign of Constantius. The political and theological context had changed dramatically.

official Church was only a marginal participant in the theological debate of the next decade, Eunomius was isolated even from that. He was undoubtedly in contact with friends and supporters,²⁴⁴ but it is symptomatic that he devoted his exile to resolving an earlier quarrel. For it was only now, with his teacher dead and middle age on the horizon, that he chose to reply to his critics, and in particular to his old nemesis, the newly elected bishop of Caesarea-Mazaca, Basil.²⁴⁵ Eunomius' first *Apology*, as we saw earlier, was probably worked up into publishable form during the summer of 361,²⁴⁶ with Basil's answer appearing not long after.²⁴⁷ Eunomius must have felt the sting at the time, but was not then in a position to give an answer, and (just possibly) did not think the Cappadocian presbyter worth the effort. Now, however, his critic was bishop of a major see, while he himself was forced to watch a successor installed from exile.²⁴⁸ Eunomius decided to 'defend his defence', and began writing what is usually known as 'the *Apology for the Apology*' or *Apologia Apologiae*.

This second defence of his position was much more extensive than the first, and did not appear as a unit; indeed, portions of it were still appearing in the next decade. Ultimately five books were completed, but only two were finished on Naxos. Substantial fragments of these and of one other are available in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa, but Gregory never addressed the last two books at all, and so they are not preserved.²⁴⁹ It is clear

²⁴⁴ As implied in Gr. Nyss., *Eun.* 1. 6 (J i. 24. 7-8), where 'threats' (presumably from exile) precede Eunomius' reply to Basil.

²⁴⁵ The date of Basil's election, like much else toward the end of his life is linked to the date of his death. His episcopate lasted just under nine years (cf. Gr. Nyss., *V. Macr.* 14. 7-10 (SC 178. 188)), and is thus placed in the autumn of 370, or nine years before the traditional date of his death on 1 Jan. 380 (see below). If that is changed, so too must the election. Alan D. Booth, 'The Chronology of Jerome's Early Years', *Phoenix* 35 (1981), 252-4, argues for a date 'late in 368 or early in 369'. As far as Eunomius' motivation goes, not too much depends on the answer as Basil himself thought it worth drawing attention to Demophilus' election early in his own episcopate, *Ep.* 48. 14-16 (Courtonne i. 129).

²⁴⁶ See Ch. 6, p. 232 above.

²⁴⁷ See Vaggione, 5-6.

²⁴⁸ See n. 238 above.

²⁴⁹ See Vaggione 79-127, where the size, date, and occasion of this work are discussed and the fragments are listed in their original order (so far as this can be determined) together with an English summary and notes.

enough from what we do possess, however, that Eunomius was merely continuing an earlier conflict. Basil is treated more as a camp-follower of Eustathius of Sebaste and his namesake at Ancyra than as a figure in his own right.²⁵⁰ This suggests that, as before, there is a political agenda. Macedonius and Eleusius, after all, had replaced Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius as the principal *bêtes noires* of the bishop of Constantinople, and it is difficult to believe that at least one of Eunomius' goals was not to remind him that 'the enemy of my enemy is my friend'. Still another would have been to set the record straight on Cyzicus. Demophilus had just been obliged to allow the election of a very unsatisfactory bishop for that city, and Eunomius may have felt the need to point out that it was not his fault.

Nevertheless, the bulk of the work is theological. Eunomius would not have expected to convert anyone as lost in *kakonoia* as Basil, but while we have already looked at some of his polemic and his theology of names,²⁵¹ here we can emphasize that this was one of the few times Eunomius was obliged to take a (neo-)Nicene writer seriously. Moreover, it had an effect. This can be seen most clearly if we compare the way the theology of language is presented in the second apology as opposed to the first. Certainly, there is nothing in the second that contradicts the first, but just as Basil refuted his earlier work in sequence, so now (so far as we can reconstruct it) Eunomius did the same. Among the effects of this were that Eunomius was forced to face Basil's issues directly. Thus while in the first *Apology* Eunomius rarely goes beyond his immediate purpose, in the *Apologia Apologiae* we find a full-fledged theory of revelation. Even if it was present earlier *in nugo*, it seems difficult not to believe that the combination of Basil's challenge and enforced leisure helped to bring it out. Something else is clear as well: while on some levels the engagement was a fruitful one, in neither contender does it ever reach the governing framework. Basil and Eunomius were still ships passing in the night.

If the composition of this work was a response to Basil in life, its publication was connected almost as intimately with his

²⁵⁰ Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 30. 14-31. 2, 32. 6-9, 32. 18-33. 1), cf. Philost., *HE* 4. 12 (GCS 64. 5).

²⁵¹ See above, Ch. 6, pp. 233-65.

death. Gregory of Nyssa tells us that he received a copy of the first two books about that time,²⁵² while Philostorgius says that when he read them Basil died of despair!²⁵³ At any point in the last 250 years that would have fixed the date fairly precisely at on or before 1 January 379, the date of Basil's death proposed by the great Maurist scholar, Julien Garnier (1670-1725), in his famous edition.²⁵⁴ The calendar date is that of St Basil's feast in the Greek Church, as confirmed by Gregory of Nyssa.²⁵⁵ The year, however, was established by more general criteria. Thus, Gregory of Nyssa mentions that he attended a synod at Antioch not long after Basil's death at which there is reason to believe some recalled bishops were present.²⁵⁶ These bishops are usually thought to be ones recalled by Gratian after the death of Valens in 378.²⁵⁷ Since Basil's last letters can all be dated to 377 or 378, a letter addressed to the widow of Arintheus shows that Basil was still alive after Valens' death in 378, because Theodoret says that Arintheus was still alive just before the battle in which the emperor was killed.²⁵⁸ All this led Garnier to conclude that Basil died after Valens (late in 378) and that if the day of his feast marked the day of his death, he died on 1 January 379.

Garnier's argument for the year is obviously much stronger than his argument for the day, but in recent years the former too has come under attack. In particular it is asserted that Basil died a year and a half earlier than Garnier supposed, in mid-summer 377.²⁵⁹ As so often happens, it is easier to show that

²⁵² Grg. Nyss., *Ep.* 29 (J VIII. ii. 87. 22-88. 8).

²⁵³ Philost., *HE* 8. 12 (GCS 114. 2-4, 24-6). There is no need to take this too literally; Philostorgius rather liked such things to reflect doctrine, e.g., *HE* 3. 15, 7. 12 (GCS 47. 2-8, 98. 12-15).

²⁵⁴ *Sancti Patris Nostri Basilii Caesareae Cappadociae Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia Quae Exstant . . .*, ed. Julianus Garnier (Paris, 1721), 3 vols. As reprinted by Migne, the relevant passages are found in PG 29. clvi, clx-clxi.

²⁵⁵ Grg. Nyss., *Laud. Bas.* (J X. i. 109. 4-110. 18), given almost certainly between Christmas and Epiphany. Garnier assumes that the feast is the *dies natalis*.

²⁵⁶ Grg. Nyss., *V. Macr.* 15. 1-15 (SC 178. 190-2).

²⁵⁷ Garnier places this on 9 May 378; it was in fact on 9 Aug.: Soc., *HE* 4. 38. 7 (GCS 272. 25-273. 2).

²⁵⁸ Basil, *Ep.* 269 (Courtonne iii. 139-41), cf. Thdt., *HE* 4. 33. 3 (GCS 272. 2-5). The incident mentioned by Theodoret is presumably understood to be connected with that described in Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 11. 1.

²⁵⁹ Booth, 'Chronology', 254-5. proposes 14 June as the actual day, the date

Garnier's arguments are vulnerable than that the alternative is correct,²⁶⁰ but since Basil's death is rather like a piece in a mobile—move one, and everything else shifts as well—a good deal of the argument centres around the relative position of the pieces. Our own interest, however, is in only one (when Eunomius started publishing), so what we need to determine is whether Basil died before or after Valens. For on 9 August 378 the latter, now senior Augustus, lost his life in the greatest Roman military disaster since Cannae, six hundred years before. His body, indeed, was never found.²⁶¹ The repercussions of that tragedy were more than enough to affect an Aegean island, and it is difficult not to connect Eunomius' release with it. What is more uncertain is whether it had anything to do with the appearance of his book.

Military disasters and changes in leadership were frequently accompanied by a recall of exiles. This had happened under Jovian, and it happened now under the surviving emperor, Gratian.²⁶² The latter recalled the religious exiles, and then allowed freedom of assembly to everyone except Manichaeans, Photinians, and Eunomians.²⁶³ There is no reason to doubt such an edict was issued, since it is mentioned in the decree withdrawing it,²⁶⁴ but what was withdrawn is freedom of assembly—return from exile was not affected, and so, presumably, is not mentioned. This would make little difference by itself, but it so happens that three of our ecclesiastical

of his feast in Usuard's Martyrology. Pierre Marval, 'La Date de la mort de Basile de Césarée', *Revue des études Augustiniennes*, 34 (1988), 31, places it slightly later, in Aug. In a paper presented at the Patristic Conference of 1995, 'The Collapse of the Homoeans in the East', *SP* 29 (1997) pp. 6-13, T. D. Barnes argued cogently for the traditional date. Apart from the general considerations discussed below, Barnes also argued that Basil, *Ep.* 268 (Courtonne iii. 137-8) shows that Basil was still alive in 'April or early May 378'.

²⁶⁰ As recognized by Marval, 'La Date', 38.

²⁶¹ Zosimus 4. 24 (*CSHB* 47. 199. 20-200. 9), Soc., *HE* 5. 1. 1 (*GCS* 275. 8), Soz., *HE* 6. 40. 4-5 (*GCS* 301. 17-28), cf. Philost., *HE* 9. 17 (*GCS* 124. 5-10), Thdt., *HE* 4. 36. 2, cf. 5. 4. 10 (*GCS* 273. 11-15, cf. 284. 5-6).

²⁶² His colleague, Valentinian II, was a boy of 13.

²⁶³ Soc., *HE* 5. 2. 1 (*GCS* 275. 19-24), Soz., *HE* 7. 1. 3 (*GCS* 302. 10-15), cf., Thdt., *HE* 5. 2. 1 (*GCS* 278. 15-9), where this is connected with the return of property and restricted to adherents of Damasus.

²⁶⁴ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 5. (Mommsen i. 2. 856). It is said to have been a *rescriptum* issued from Sirmium.

historians speak of a general recall under Gratian, while one, Rufinus, powerfully seconded by Jerome, mentions a Nicene recall under Valens.²⁶⁵ A careful reading of the sources, however, shows that they refer to different events, and there is really no need to choose between them. For one thing, Jerome's *Chronicle* ends before the reign of Gratian and so does not cover this period, while Rufinus (whose carelessness was in any case recognized at the time²⁶⁶) never says there was *no* recall under Gratian. That leaves us to ask whether we have enough information to determine what did happen.

We can start by noting that whatever Rufinus and Jerome were referring to, it happened at Antioch. According to Jerome (the more reliable of the two) in the third year of the 288th Olympiad, the fourteenth year of the Emperor Valens (AD 378), while the emperor was preparing to leave the city to fight the Goths, he had a tardy (*sera*) repentance and recalled 'nostros de exilis'.²⁶⁷ It is not said, however, that there was any general recall, nor is there any sign that its application was other than local. That fits in well with what we know of Valens' policy in other cases; for on a number of occasions he is said to have overlooked individual dissidents when required, even though this went against his general policy.²⁶⁸ What is being described here, then, is presumably a change in the ecclesiastical arrangements at Antioch or its environs on the eve of the emperor's final journey to Constantinople; and indeed, we are told elsewhere that such an event actually occurred.

Valens left Antioch at the start of May 378, and by 30 May had reached Constantinople.²⁶⁹ That means the events we are to look for must be set in the autumn and winter of 377 or the spring of 378. The bad news from Thrace over that winter meant that the emperor had to settle civil and religious matters on the Persian frontier as quickly as he could,²⁷⁰ and hasten to

²⁶⁵ Ruf., *HE* II. 13 (*GCS* II. ii. 1019. 15-1020. 4), Hieron., *Chron.* ad annum 378 (*GCS* VII. i. 249. 3-5). ²⁶⁶ Soc., *HE* 2. 1. 1-4 (*GCS* 12. 4-19).

²⁶⁷ The fact that both Jerome and Rufinus ascribe the emperor's actions to 'repentance' suggests either some literary connection, or that their information derives from a common local (presumably Nicene) source.

²⁶⁸ Soc., *HE* 4. 11. 8 (*GCS* 238. 1-3), Soz., *HE* 6. 12. 16 (*GCS* 254. 10-14), Hieron., *Jo. Hier.* 4 (*PL* 23. 358D-359A).

²⁶⁹ Soc., *HE* 4. 38. 1 (*GCS* 272. 7-9), allowing two to three weeks in transit.

²⁷⁰ Zosimus 4. 21 (*CSHB* 47. 195. 22-196. 3).

meet the new threat. This still required some months of preparation,²⁷¹ even though the emperor travelled as early as possible in the spring. He was forced to buy peace at Alexandria by tolerating the expulsion of George's successor, Lucius, but by that time he was already *en route*.²⁷² The situation at Antioch, however, was more difficult still, for there the emperor was so unpopular that the populace threatened to burn the baths he had just built for them,²⁷³ while at Edessa (now a frontier city) he was reviled as the persecutor of its popular bishop, Barses. We know, in fact, that the latter was allowed to return from exile, probably at the end of 377.²⁷⁴ That fits in well enough with what we know of the situation in general and of Valens' approach elsewhere:²⁷⁵ in response to a specific crisis the emperor countenances an *ad hoc* easing up of persecution in selected locations, accompanying it in at least two instances by a recall from exile. In other words, just exactly the kind of 'loosening up' actually reported by Socrates for Antioch and Constantinople at this period.²⁷⁶ Where this leaves Eunomius, however, is almost certainly still on Naxos. For whatever bishops Valens might have been willing to recall for the sake of

²⁷¹ Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 7. 1.

²⁷² Soc., *HE* 4. 37. 2-3 (*GCS* 272. 1-5), Soz., *HE* 6. 39. 1-2 (*GCS* 300. 10-16). The implication seems to be that he got the news *en route*.

²⁷³ Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 1. 2 (eventually someone succeeded, cf. Evagrius, *HE* 1. 20 (*PG* 86. 2476B)).

²⁷⁴ As shown by Rochelle Snee, 'Valens' Recall of the Nicene Exiles and Anti-Arian Propaganda', *GRBS* 26 (1986), 397-402, who has convincingly argued that there is no real reason to reject the date given for this event in the *Chronicon Edessenum* (Dec. 377); cf. Booth, 'Chronology', 253-4. Barnes, 'Collapse', 5-6, 13-14 places Barses' return a year later, under Gratian, but this seems to leaves us with Barses dead virtually on the morrow of his recall; he was replaced not long after by a fellow exile (putatively) recalled at the same time (see n. 287 below). This is not impossible, but it does seem unlikely.

²⁷⁵ Cf. his very similar response to the revolt of Procopius a decade earlier, Soc., *HE* 4. 3. 2 (*GCS* 231. 17-18).

²⁷⁶ Soc., *HE* 4. 35. 1-4 (*GCS* 270. 14-24). It is clear enough from the general context that Socrates means 378, but by mentioning the death of Euzoius just after, he shows that he has confused Valens' second consulate with Valentinian II (378) with his first (376). Still, *pace* Snee, 'Valens' Recall of the Nicene Exiles', 405-10, this does seem to eliminate a need to suppose that the Nicenes suppressed information about this particular recall (as opposed to embroidering or inventing suitable edifying encounters for the emperor). Socrates alludes to it (perhaps on the basis of Rufinus), while Sozomen hastens on to the more interesting encounters that follow.

peace on the eastern frontier, Eunomius would not have been one of them. His release from exile must have come later.

None of this, of course, tells us when Eunomius started issuing his book, since that could have been done *before* his release, but it does bring us back to Basil's death, said to have occurred at approximately the same time. We would be on fairly firm ground if we could be sure that Theodoret was right and Arintheus was still alive on the eve of Adrianople; because that would mean that Basil was active enough to dictate a reply at least as late as September 378, or the early months of 379. Unfortunately, his information on this point cannot be verified. Two of the others he places at the battle (Victor and Trajan) were certainly there;²⁷⁷ but Arintheus is not mentioned by any other source. It is clear from Basil's letter that he did not die by violence, and if his death was somehow connected with Adrianople in any case, it is strange that Basil did not mention it.²⁷⁸ Theodoret's story, then, is probably based on a false inference. Arintheus is regularly linked with Victor in many of our sources,²⁷⁹ and Theodoret probably supposed that that was also the case here. But in fact he was the one surviving Roman negotiator of the original peace treaty with Persia;²⁸⁰ and that makes it at least possible that he was sent to deal with them while Victor and Trajan accompanied the emperor to the West.²⁸¹ In any case, what Theodoret says cannot help us with our own case, because it does not allow us to specify *when* Basil would

²⁷⁷ Victor was present at Adrianople, but managed to escape, Zosimus 4. 24 (CSHB 47. 200. 10–15), cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 13. 9. Trajan, who was also present according to Theodoret, was killed, Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 13. 18, cf. 7. 5, 8. 3, 11. 1, 12. 1, 13. 8.

²⁷⁸ Basil, *Ep.* 269. 2. 24–6 (Courtonne iii. 141): he was baptized on his deathbed. In a paper presented at the Patristic Conference in Oxford in 1999, Dr David Woods argued on other grounds that Arintheus was dead by 377 and that Basil's letter must therefore be dated to that period.

²⁷⁹ Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 5. 2, 26. 5. 2, Zosimus 3. 13. 4. 2 (CSHB 47. 143. 11–13, 175. 15–19), cf. Thdt., *HE* 4. 33. 3 (GCS 272. 2–3).

²⁸⁰ He was one of the negotiators sent by Jovian in 364 to arrange peace with the Persians, Ammianus Marcellinus 25. 7. 7, Zosimus 3. 31 (CSHB 47. 167. 16–18). His frequent collaborator Victor, had already been sent on just such an expedition somewhat earlier, Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 7. 1, cf. 27. 12. 13–15.

²⁸¹ He was certainly still young enough for such a mission, Basil, *Ep.* 269. 20–1 (Courtonne iii. 141).

have been in a position to mention Arintheus' death.²⁸² That leaves only the council which Gregory of Nyssa is said to have attended 'nine months' after his brother's death.

Two things are evident about this council right away: it was important enough to supersede formal mourning,²⁸³ and it was not small. This is already suggested by the fact that in 382, when a Constantinopolitan council wanted to demonstrate its orthodoxy to Pope Damasus, it cited this council as a witness along with one that met in 381, which it pointedly described as 'ecumenical'.²⁸⁴ This is confirmed by information from a surviving western collection in which 152 bishops are said to have been present at the earlier council, including several returned exiles: Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicaea, Zeno of Tyre, Eulogius of Edessa, Bematius of Malle, and Diodore of Tarsus.²⁸⁵ Since at the council of 382 the participants were still emphasizing the short time since their return (*χθές*),²⁸⁶ they must have been referring to something fairly recent. But when exactly? If we assume that they listed the councils in order, then we know that it was before 381, but not long before. On the other hand, if the list of participants is correct, we also know that it was after a fairly widespread return from exile. That is not unlikely. As we have seen, Valens allowed selected bishops to return to buy tranquillity while he dealt with the Goths. The question is whether the bishops who are said to have attended this council were among them?

We have already noted that the predecessor of one, Barse of Edessa, was back in his see by December 377; but we are also told that by the time this council met he was dead and had been replaced by Eulogius, ordained by Meletius to succeed him.²⁸⁷

²⁸² The other letters would provide ancillary information if we could be sure of this one, but they are not much help by themselves.

²⁸³ Gregory was rebuked by Gregory of Nazianzus for attending, *Grg. Nyssa., V. Macr.* 15. 1-12 (*SC* 178. 190-2).

²⁸⁴ *Concilia*, CCP (381), *Ep.* apud Thdt., *HE* 5. 9. 13 (*GCS* 293. 4-10), cf. CCP (381), *Can.* 6 (Mansi iii. 561A).

²⁸⁵ Damasus, *Ep.* 2 (*PL* 13. 353C-354A). This information was apparently added by an early editor of these letters, with the implication that its source is the 'archivis Romanae Ecclesiae'.

²⁸⁶ CCP (381), *Ep.* apud Thdt., *HE* 5. 9. 3 (*GCS* 289. 19-22).

²⁸⁷ Thdt., *HE* 4. 18. 14, 5. 4. 6 (*GCS* 242. 16-18, 283. 5-9). Eulogius had also been in exile, at Antioch in the Thebaid, Thdt., *HE* 4. 18. 6, cf. 5. 4. 6 (*GCS* 241. 2-3, cf. 283. 6-7).

Something similar can be said of Diodore of Tarsus. The latter had by this time been ordained priest, and spent the intervening period while Meletius was away encouraging the growth of 'antiphonal psalmody' with his friend Flavian.²⁸⁸ His reward when his diocesan returned was to be consecrated bishop of Tarsus, and it is in that capacity that he was present at the council.²⁸⁹ This means that the pivotal figure from our point of view is Meletius. At whatever point we think he returned, we have to allow him enough time to reach his see and start filling vacancies in his province before summoning 151 other bishops to a regional council.²⁹⁰ The logistics of such a task would be formidable even today. Gregory of Nyssa seems to indicate the invitation was both sudden and peremptory, but when exactly was Meletius free to begin? Here, for once, our information is explicit. both Socrates and Sozomen tell us that Meletius returned under Gratian, not Valens.²⁹¹ And that is not at all unbelievable. Any emperor whose tactical requirements placed a great premium on tranquillity would have been foolish indeed to let Meletius return to Antioch. Valens may not have been Rome's greatest general, but he was by no means a political fool. And, as far as that goes, the process of return was by no means a straightforward one. Gratian did allow the exiles to return, but he also allowed them to worship freely, something which caused a great deal of confusion.²⁹² To begin with, for instance, Meletius was obliged to worship in the suburbs,²⁹³ and it was only later, with the arrival of an imperial emissary, that he was able to take possession of the city churches.²⁹⁴

This seems to give us a convincing scenario. Some few bishops did indeed return under Valens, as the necessary price of peace, and there was a general easing of pressure on dissidents. On the other hand, there was no general recall—that had to wait for the chaos of the following year. Meletius in parti-

²⁸⁸ As implied by the allusion to Ps. 136[7]: 1-4 in Thdt., *HE* 4. 251-2 (*GCS* 263. 8-16).

²⁸⁹ Thdt., *HE* 5. 4. 2 (*GCS* 282. 15-18).

²⁹⁰ It is not impossible, of course, that the bishops were ordained at the council; but the sources make Meletius personally responsible, and if they were, it is surprising no one says so.

²⁹¹ Soc., *HE* 5. 5. 2 (*GCS* 276. 29-277. 3), Soz., *HE* 7. 3 (*GCS* 304. 1-2).

²⁹² Fortunately recognized by some of the participants, Soz., *HE* 7. 2. 5-6 (*GCS* 303. 18-30).

²⁹³ Soz., *HE* 7. 3. 3 (*GCS* 303. 8-11).

²⁹⁴ Thdt., *HE* 5. 39-16 (*GCS* 280. 22-282. 8).

cular would not have been able to come back to Antioch before the early part of 379 and certainly was not in a position to summon a major council before the spring. That puts Basil's death (and hence his encounter with Eunomius' book) either very late in 378 or very early in 379. It seems, then, that Garnier's original argument must stand, and that there is no need to place Basil's death before that of Valens.

This allows us to understand more clearly what happened to Eunomius. After very nearly nine years on Naxos, he was set free along with many others in the chaos following Valens' death. Like others again, he made his way home and tried to resume his life, taking up residence probably on his property in Chalcedon. At any rate it is there we find him not long after, reading his works to an admiring crowd—it is not unreasonable to think that the new *Apology* was among them.²⁹⁵ This leaves us with the following sequence of events: Eunomius left Naxos, probably in September or October 378 (allowing a certain amount of time for the dissemination of Gratian's decree). He arrived in the capital in November or early December, and there published (at first to sympathetic circles) the initial books of his *Apologia Apologiae*. In that way, a copy (or at least a rumour of its appearance) had reached Gregory of Nyssa by the time of Basil's death in December or early January. Eunomius would have continued to issue the work in instalments over the next few years, finally completing it in the early 380s.

The city and home to which he returned in the winter of 379, then, was physically unchanged. Urged on by Valens' wife Dominica, the people of Constantinople had turned the Goths back from their almost undefended city, assisted by the guards of the visiting Arabian queen, Mavia.²⁹⁶ A few suburbs were burnt, but Chalcedon was not one of them. Yet despite this visible continuity, the world to which Eunomius returned after so many years in exile was by no means identical to the one he had left. New configurations offered both opportunities and challenges, and Eunomius, like others, was determined to take advantage of them. It would not be long before he knew whether or not it was to be to any purpose.

²⁹⁵ Soz., *HE* 7. 6. 2 (*GCS* 307. 17–19). See Vaggione 82–5.

²⁹⁶ Soc., *HE* 5. 1. 1–5 (*GCS* 274. 8–17), Soz., *HE* 7. 1. 1–2 (*GCS* 302. 3–10), cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 16. 5–7.

Troglodyte

Tacitus portrays the Rome of the early principate as the common sink into which 'all things infamous and shameful pour like a torrent' from every quarter of the world,¹ and he was referring specifically to Christians. From a somewhat different point of view, the New Rome of the first few years after Adrianople could have been described in similar terms. Indeed, even before there was any sign of who, if anyone, would replace Valens, it was clear that the equilibrium of the previous reign had been disrupted. And, just as the Emperor Jovian fifteen years before had scarcely had time to adjust to his new status before finding Athanasius camped at his doorstep, so now too the leaders of the competing factions converged on Constantinople.² The scope of Gratian's decree of toleration had given almost all of them cause for hope.³

The religious situation, however, could clearly not be addressed until the military situation was stabilized, and that was going to be extraordinarily difficult. The soldiers of Queen Mavia and the citizens organized by Dominica had managed to prevent the invaders from taking Constantinople that autumn, but it cannot be said the barbarians tried very hard, and a really determined push in the spring might succeed. The task that superseded all others, then, was to regain military control. Gratian had been moving in the direction of Thrace when the disaster occurred, and he was now in headquarters at

¹ Tacitus, *Annals* 15. 44.

² Soz., *HE* 7. 4. 4 (*GCS* 305. 8-12). See Ch. 7, pp. 280-1 above.

³ Soc., *HE* 5. 2. 1 (*GCS* 275. 18-24), Soz., *HE* 7. 1. 3 (*GCS* 302. 10-15), see Ch. 7, pp. 305-6 above. The emperor continued the policy of earlier reigns in excluding the extremes (Photinians and Eunomians in one category; Manichaeans in another), but at least for Eunomius this did not preclude a reconciliation similar to that with Eudoxius.

Sirmium.⁴ He rallied any forces he could, and recalled such officers as were available. One of these was a young Spaniard who had been notably successful earlier,⁵ but who had been cashiered after his father was executed in 376.⁶ Gratian may or may not have had something specific in mind when he did this, but he did give the young man a chance to prove himself. More to the point, Gratian was in desperate need of an adult colleague:⁷ Valentinian II, the only other surviving male member of the imperial house, was still a child, and a military commander was needed immediately. Any of Gratian's remaining doubts were erased by a military success, and on 16 January 379 Theodosius, the officer in question, was named Augustus and put in charge of the East.⁸ Posterity has confirmed the choice by informing us that, when a search was made for an imperial robe, the only one which could be found to fit was the one that belonged to Constantine!⁹

That, however, was hindsight. In the most uncertain present the emperor's primary job was to survive. By early summer he had won at least one victory and set up headquarters at Thessalonica.¹⁰ Since after the destruction of the field army

⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus 31. 10. 3, 10. 11, 11. 6, Zosimus 4. 24 (*CSHB* 47. 200. 10-15).

⁵ Still with his first beard on his cheeks, Ammianus Marcellinus 29. 6. 15, cf. Zosimus 4. 24 (*CSHB* 47. 200. 21-3), Soz., *HE* 7. 2. 1 (*GCS* 303. 2-5).

⁶ Hieron., *Chron.* ad annum 376 (*GCS* VII. ii. 248. 5-6), Pacatus 9. 1-4 (Baehrens 96. 29-97. 14). It is possible this saved his life, since he was not available to be killed with so many others at Adrianople. As his father was named Theodosius like himself, he may have been a victim of the attempted necromancy plot which led to the destruction of many with similar names, Soc., *HE* 4. 19. 1-7 (*GCS* 247. 12-26), Soz., *HE* 6. 35. 1-6 (*GCS* 291. 23-292. 12), Philost., *HE* 9. 15 (*GCS* 122. 4-14).

⁷ That Gratian had not already made up his mind is shown by the fact that on 1 Jan. the new consuls were Ausonius and Olybrius, not as would have been usual, the two Augusti (that happened the following year). This is confirmed by a story told in parallel versions in Thdt., *HE* 5. 5. 1-6 (*GCS* 284. 7-285. 8) and Geo. Mon., *Chron.* 4. 97. 2 (*PG* 110. 692C-693A). Both versions are at some remove from their original, but there does not seem to be any literary dependence, and the sequence of a military command before appointment as emperor is likely in itself, since it exactly parallels what happened in the case of Valens, see above Ch. 7, p. 289.

⁸ Soc., *HE* 5. 2. 2-3 (*GCS* 275. 24-276. 6).

⁹ Geo. Mon., *Chron.* 4. 97. 2 (*PG* 110. 693A).

¹⁰ Soc., *HE* 5. 6. 2 (*GCS* 277. 20-4), cf. Zosimus 4. 25, 26 (*CSHB* 47. 201.

barbarian auxiliaries were the most likely source of recruits, the new emperor was noted to be especially friendly to them.¹¹ He also seems to have become acquainted with the local bishop, Ascholius, who himself may have had dealings with the Goths.¹² In any event, somewhat later he chose him to administer one of the more important and intimate transitions in his own life, his baptism. For Theodosius, like so many others, had been brought up a Christian, but never been baptized. Thus, when later that summer he fell seriously ill and needed to be baptized *in articulo mortis*, it was this bishop he asked.

Much has been made of the choice. Theodosius' own background was Nicene¹³ and those were the grounds on which he presumably chose to be baptized by Ascholius. But as we have seen already, when identifying someone as 'Nicene' (especially at this stage), it is still necessary to ask: 'What kind?' Ascholius himself gave a somewhat equivocal reply. For when Theodosius asked the bishop to specify his faith, he merely called attention to the record of his see, untainted, as he said, by 'Arianism' of any kind.¹⁴ Yet we may still ask what he meant; for presumably he did not mean what some others—say, Lucifer of Cagliari—meant when they said exactly the same thing.¹⁵ There is no doubt, after all, that Ascholius was a Nicene, but it is equally obvious that he was a Nicene of a definite kind—one whose links were with Basil of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzen, and Meletius of Antioch.¹⁶ Interestingly,

4-5, 203, 19-20), Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1001-4 (PG 37. 1098). He issued *Cod. Theod.* 10. 1. 12 (Mommson i. 2. 529-30) from Thessalonica on 17 June.

¹¹ Zosimus 4. 25, cf. 27, 34, cf. 56 (CSHB 47. 201. 4-12, 213. 1-8, 241. 3-5).

¹² See n. 16 below.

¹³ Soc., *HE* 5. 6. 3 (GCS 277. 25-6), Soz., *HE* 7. 4. 3 (GCS 305. 4-5).

¹⁴ Soc., *HE* 5. 6 (GCS 278. 2-7), Soz., *HE* 7. 4. 3 (GCS 305. 7-8).

¹⁵ Cf. Hieron., *Chron.* ad annum 370 (GCS VII. i. 246. 1-4).

¹⁶ Basil, *Epp.* 154, 164, 165 (Courtonne ii. 78-80, 97-101) are all addressed to 'Ascholius', though it is by no means clear that the 'monk and priest' of 154 is the 'bishop of Thessalonica' in 164-5. H. Delehay, 'Saints de Thrace et de Mésie', *AB* 31 (1912), 288-9, cautiously, and J. Mansion, 'Les Origines du christianisme chez les Gots', *AB* 33 (1914), 14-20, emphatically question the addressee of 165 and therefore 164. It is not difficult to believe that 154 and 164-5 are addressed to different parties, but the question frequently raised *vis-à-vis* the latter—what a bishop of Thessalonica would have to do with transporting the relics of Gothic martyrs—ignores the very large Gothic presence in

he was also at least on speaking terms with the supporters of Macedonius and Eustathius,¹⁷ and a correspondent of Pope Damasus.¹⁸ Yet while, as regards his city's official succession, his claims were probably justified (one predecessor corresponded with Alexander of Alexandria,¹⁹ another was exiled by Constantius²⁰); once outside the walls of his chancery Ascholius would have had to take account of a much broader range of opinion—for if Paul of Constantinople was a native of Thessalonica,²¹ so too was Demophilus.²² Presumably then, as at Cyzicus, the latter had bought peace in his home town by winking at the presence of one Nicene sympathizer,²³ though in this case it was definitely a 'new', and not an 'old' Nicene.

In point of fact, the situation at Thessalonica gives us a very general picture of some of the opinions Theodosius needed to address simply as ruler. For if we assume that, like Constantius before him, he began by excluding the extreme left and the extreme right (Eunomius and Photinus), he still had to satisfy a very broad range in what might roughly be called 'the middle'.²⁴ On the one hand, there were the western Nicenes and their eastern supporters, symbolized by Ascholius and Meletius;²⁵ to whom we must add the so-called 'old Nicenes' under Paulinus at Antioch, and the spiritual descendants of his predecessor Eustathius at Constantinople.²⁶ Then, especially in the Helles-

¹⁷ Soz., *HE* 7. 7. 4 (*GCS* 309. 1-6), cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 8. 4-7 (*GCS* 279. 21-280. 1).

¹⁸ Damasus, *Epp.* 5-6 (*PL* 13. 365A-370B). By 382 he was also in Rome himself, presumably as an envoy of the Council of Constantinople in 381, cf. CCP (381), *Ep.* apud Thdt., *HE* 5. 9. 1 (*GCS* 289. 6).

¹⁹ Ath., *Apol. Sec.* 16. 1, 28. 1, 65. 5, 80. 1-3 (Opitz ii. 99. 10-11, 107. 30-2, 144. 21-3, 160. 19-161. 4), cf. Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 19-29).

²⁰ Heremius, Ath., *Apol. Const.* 27 (*PG* 25. 629B).

²¹ Soc., *HE* 2. 16. 6 (*GCS* 108. 4-6), Soz., *HE* 3. 9. 2 (*GCS* 112. 8-9).

²² Philost., *HE* 9. 14 (*GCS* 122. 1-2).

²³ See Ch. 7, p. 300 above. Whether or not the 'Ascholius' to whom Basil writes in *Ep.* 154. 12-15 (Courtonne ii. 79) was in fact the bishop of Thessalonica, the image of isolated stars in a darkened heaven is equally applicable.

²⁴ Cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 20. 4-6 (*GCS* 294. 17-24).

²⁵ Note that in the passage cited in n. 20 above, Athanasius obviously considers Heremius a western bishop.

²⁶ Cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 10. 2 (*GCS* 249. 11-13).

pont, there was a very much larger group who would originally have been considered 'Macedonians', but who were now worshipping with the Nicenes.²⁷ Some of them, it is true, had just met at Antioch and abrogated the 'concordat', but the habit of common worship was not so easily overcome, and the schism was only partially successful.²⁸ The most difficult situation was at Constantinople itself. There the former imperial church headed by Demophilus was large and popular, and retained physical control of the churches.²⁹

The emperor had in any case begun to give some thought to the situation even before his baptism.³⁰ On February 27th he issued a decree which was intended to apply to his entire realm but which was pointedly addressed to the people (and not the prefect) of Constantinople:

We desire all peoples governed by our moderation and clemency to follow that religion given by the divine apostle Peter to the Romans and proclaimed there to this day. Its current illustrious representatives are Pope Damasus and that man of apostolic piety, Peter of Alexandria. Let us believe, therefore, in accordance with apostolic precept and gospel teaching, that the Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is one, under an equal majesty and holy threeness. Those who obey this law have the right to be called 'Catholic Christians'. Any others we consider either foolish or insane, and they must bear the shame which results from heretical teaching. We do not allow congregations of this kind to be called 'churches'. Rather, they are to be left to suffer, first, the divine punishment, and then such penalties as the authority heaven has given us may deem appropriate.³¹

After issuing this decree, of course, the emperor became sick and recovered. But since the military situation still required him to remain at Thessalonica,³² for the time being the practical

²⁷ Soc., *HE* 5. 8, cf. 4. 12. 1-4 (*GCS* 280. 1-4, cf. 238. 6-243. 11), Soz., *HE* 6. 10. 3-12. 4 (*GCS* 249. 13-252. 12).

²⁸ Soc., *HE* 5. 4. 2-4 (*GCS* 276. 20-6), Soz., *HE* 7. 2. 2-4 (*GCS* 303. 5-17).

²⁹ Soz., *HE* 7. 5. 1-2, 6. 1 (*GCS* 306. 1-11, 307. 9-13).

³⁰ For the decree before the baptism, see N. Q. King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 1961), 30 n. 3.

³¹ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 1. 2 (Mommmsen i. 2. 833).

³² The last law issued from there is *Cod. Theod.* 14. 17. 8 (Mommmsen i. 2. 794-5), dated 14 July 380.

effect of this decree was nil.³³ Still, it did indicate which way the wind was blowing, and the representatives of almost every competing group immediately hastened to Constantinople to strengthen their position before the emperor could arrive. Thus, apart from Eunomius himself, and others who were already *sur place*, we find the Apollinarians,³⁴ and—most famously—Gregory of Nazianzus, who arrived some time during the winter to encourage the Nicene remnant.³⁵

It is very easy to misunderstand this situation in hindsight, especially as it laid the foundations for what ultimately became the medieval Byzantine state. At this point, however, that was by no means a certainty. For one thing, Theodosius' legislation was no mere reversal of Valens'—indeed, its continuities are more obvious than its differences. The real contrast was with the approach of Constantine and Constantius. The difference from Valens lay primarily in the names of the beneficiaries. For Constantius, as we have seen, and to some extent Constantine were active participants in the attempt to find a theological solution. Valens, on the other hand, was primarily interested in enforcing an existing solution in legal terms.³⁶ He was therefore prepared to tolerate dissidents 'outside the walls', as at Cyzicus, or even within them, as at Caesarea-Mazaca and Thessalonica, when expediency required. Valens' God, then, may have been to some extent a *deus ex machina*, but the controlling mechanism had plenty of space between the gears. The same could be said (and perhaps with greater intentionality) of that of Theodosius.

Valens had made communion with a specific bishop (Eudoxius) a touchstone of ecclesiastical preferment, and so too now did Theodosius. The faith handed on to the Romans by Peter is that represented by two specific bishops, to wit, those of Rome and Alexandria. There is a third, not named but implied (perhaps as mediated by Ascholius) in the person of Meletius, the restored bishop of Antioch, for the theological formula accompanying the two persons explicitly named would have

³³ This may be one of the reasons why the decree is addressed to the people rather than to a specific official; the emperor knew that it was unenforceable.

³⁴ Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 609–51 (*PG* 37. 1071–4).

³⁵ *Ibid.* 2. 1. 11. 562–82 (*PG* 37. 1068–9).

³⁶ See Ch. 7, pp. 291–3.

been highly acceptable to that rather supple prelate. Legend confirms the connection by showing us a dreaming Theodosius receiving the crown at Meletius' hand.³⁷ Moreover, it is also worth noting that, for the moment, though civil penalties are implied, the principal avenger is God.

In point of fact, the people to whom this decree was addressed were those least likely to obey it without compulsion, for it was to their city that many of those ejected elsewhere had immediately fled.³⁸ Implementation would therefore have to await the emperor's own arrival, and that was clearly a number of months in the future. Eunomius himself used the available time to tour the eastern provinces with surviving members of his episcopal bench in an attempt to reconstitute the 'shadow hierarchy' set up so many years before.³⁹ The focus this time, however, was clearly Antioch and Palestine. Theodulus of Chaeretapa, who had been in charge of the latter was now dead, as was his short-lived successor, Carterius (perhaps the father of Philostorgius).⁴⁰ That meant that in this delegation the Palestinian representative was his successor John, who, together with Arrianus the wonder-worker⁴¹ and Julian of Cilicia went to Antioch to confer with Theophilus the Indian. Some time later, with Dorotheus gone⁴² and Meletius in charge of the churches, a group of local clergy spearheaded by Asterius and Crispinus called a council and offered to enter into communion with Eunomius. The latter's price was still the same, however—the posthumous restoration of Aetius—and so negotiations collapsed.⁴³ Philostorgius does not *quite* tell us that Julian succeeded Theophilus at Antioch, but as the latter was now

³⁷ Thdt., *HE* 5. 6. 1–2, cf. 7. 2–3 (*GCS* 285. 9–15, cf. 286. 14–287. 2).

³⁸ Soc., *HE* 5. 7. 9 (*GCS* 279. 7–9), Soz., *HE* 7. 5. 6 (*GCS* 307. 1–2), Lucius of Alexandria.

³⁹ Philost., *HE* 9. 18 (*GCS* 124. 20–125. 6).

⁴⁰ Cf. *ibid.* 9. 9 (*GCS* 119. 19–23).

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 9. 1 (*GCS* 116. 2–6).

⁴² Philost., *HE* 9. 19 (*GCS* 125. 15–17), says that after his expulsion Dorotheus returned to his native Thrace. Soc., *HE* 5. 12. 8, cf. 7. 6. 1 (*GCS* 287. 1–2, cf. 351. 22–4) and Soz., *HE* 7. 14. 4, 17. 9 (*GCS* 318. 27–319. 3, 326. 10–13) portray him as coming from Antioch some years later, but this is almost certainly an inference from the name of his see. Like his rival Marinus, he was probably already in Thrace.

⁴³ Philost., *HE* 10. 1 (*GCS* 126. 2–13). Simonetti, p. 454 n. 53, doubts the veracity of this.

quite aged, it seems very likely that he did.⁴⁴ Eunomius, at any rate, seems to have returned to Constantinople in fairly short order, for not long after we find him in residence there, addressing the crowds and reckoned the hope of the 'Arian' party.⁴⁵

This is the situation which greeted Theodosius when he finally did enter Constantinople on 24 November 380.⁴⁶ There was some complaint about the extravagance of his *adventus*,⁴⁷ but the emperor could hardly be blamed for wanting to enter with some *éclat*, if for no other reason, because it held the attention of the many who were not eager to see him⁴⁸ while he dealt with the ecclesiastical situation. Indeed, within a day and a half⁴⁹ he had met with Demophilus and, characteristically, given him a chance to submit. When he refused, he was deposed and ejected from the churches but *not* exiled. After making a very public appeal to the populace, he was allowed to carry on in a chapel outside the walls.⁵⁰

This, however, left the emperor himself in a pickle. Demophilus had rejected his 'peace', and he urgently needed a bishop. The only one immediately available who was likely to be acceptable to Ascholius and Meletius was Gregory, the ex-bishop of Sasima, now in charge of the city's fractious⁵¹ Nicene congregation.⁵² The decree issued in February by Theodosius had accomplished this much: Gregory and his followers met

⁴⁴ Philost., *HE* 9. 18 (GCS 125. 3-5): τὸν τε Ἰουλιανὸν ἐκ τῆς Κιλικίας ἄξοντες . . . Obviously there is no way of really knowing, but if this is indeed the 'Julian' of the *Commentary on Job* and hence of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and Pseudo-Ignatian *Epistles*, such a move would fit in very neatly with the Antiochene orientation of those works.

⁴⁵ Soz., *HE* 7. 6. 2 (GCS 307. 13-15).

⁴⁶ Soc., *HE* 5. 6. 6 (GCS 278. 8-11).

⁴⁷ Zosimus 4. 33 (CSHB 47. 210. 23-211. 3).

⁴⁸ Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1314-17 (PG 37. 1119).

⁴⁹ Soc., *HE* 5. 7. 10 (GCS 279. 9-12), cf. Soz., *HE* 7. 5. 7 (GCS 307. 6-8).

⁵⁰ Soc., *HE* 5. 7. 11 (GCS 278. 12-279. 13), Soz., *HE* 7. 5. 5-7 (GCS 306. 21-307. 5). Contrast Constantius' treatment of Paul forty years earlier (see Ch. 1, p. 10 above).

⁵¹ Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 589, 679-89 (PG 37. 1069, 1076).

⁵² Earlier that summer another candidate, Maximus the Cynic, presumably with the backing of Peter of Alexandria and assisted by Egyptian sailors from the corn fleet, tried to take over. Gregory tars him with a heavy brush as a street loungeur of debatable sex, a false philosopher with curly hair and endearing curls, Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 750-8, 764-72, 912-38 (PG 37. 1081, 1082, 1092-4). By this time he was thoroughly discredited.

within the walls, in a house church named by its hopeful pastor Anastasia, 'resurrection'.⁵³ Not long before it had been the scene of one of the most classic expressions of 'neo-Nicene' doctrine, the so-called 'theological orations' that have given their author ever since the title of 'Theologian'. We can gauge the effect of such teaching on less sympathetic ears by noting that at Easter a year earlier Gregory had been mobbed by a combined crowd of ascetics and townspeople.⁵⁴ Gregory himself has left us a vivid description of his inauguration in his new dignity: he was escorted into his cathedral between lines of soldiers, watched by sullen crowds from the tenements.⁵⁵ It was not an auspicious beginning.

We may well ask what part Eunomius played in all this. The answer is that it was strikingly similar to that played by his teacher in a previous crisis. Fifteen years earlier, with the reputedly Nicene Jovian bearing down on the city, the then

⁵³ Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1079-83 (PG 37. 1103), Soc., *HE* 5. 7. 1 (GCS 278. 12-14), Soz., *HE* 7. 5. 1-4 (GCS 306. 1-20). By the mid-5th cent. the original house church stood next to a much larger church adorned by the emperors and renowned for miracles of the Virgin, with an attached monastery and guest house, Pall., *V. Chrys.* 7. 87-91 (SC 341. 150), perhaps the clergy-house described by Grg. Naz. in *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 898-9 (PG 37. 1091). Geo. Mon., *Chron.* 4. 198, 209 (PG 110. 705A/B, 757A/B) identifies this with an Anastasia (re-)constructed by 'Marcian, *oikonomos* of the Great Church' under the Patriarch Gennadius (458-71), and where, from the 10th cent., the relics of Gregory Nazianzen were located, *Chron.* 5. 13 (PG 110. 1193B). But he also says that this Marcian was a convert from Novatianism, and identifies this church with the Novatian church of the same name mentioned in Soc., *HE* 2. 38. 16-24, cf. 7. 39. 3 (GCS 165. 22-166. 20, cf. 388. 27-8). Since we are also told that the two groups did worship together, and that at this time the Catholics lacked a church (Soz., *HE* 4. 20. 7 (GCS 170. 28-171. 7)), the idea is a tantalizing one. Unfortunately, it is also clearly mistaken. The Novatian Church in question was in the Pelargus district of Constantinople, Soc., *HE* 2. 38. 14 (GCS 165. 19-20), and that puts it north-west of the Hippodrome in the vicinity of the Strategion, R. Janin, *Constantinople Byzantine* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1964), 405. The church George describes was located toward the church of St Thomas, which was south-west of the Hippodrome. It seems, then, that George has made a faulty inference from the historians and combined it with other information, perhaps from an inscription on the church itself. To smooth over the discrepancies, he has assumed that the *oikonomos* Marcian had originally been a Novatian. By George's time, presumably, the actual Novatian church had long since disappeared.

⁵⁴ Grg. Naz., *Ep.* 77. 1-3, 78. 1-4 (Gallay i. 95, 98-9).

⁵⁵ Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1327-35 (PG 37. 1120-1).

bishop Eudoxius had tried to draw interested parties together and was thus moved to reconcile with Aetius.⁵⁶ Demophilus' relations with Eunomius were only slightly less strained than those of Eudoxius with Aetius, but necessity drove him to a similar expedient.⁵⁷ At the very least, we can discern a remarkable change in Eunomius' own behaviour. When he first arrived back from exile he was very cautious indeed; but by the time Theodosius arrived he had become the darling of the 'Arian' party, and was reading his works to enthusiastic crowds at his estate in Chalcedon.⁵⁸ And, more to the point, his theology was popular—according to his opponents it had become the common chatter of the 'cocktail-party circuit'.⁵⁹ We may well ask, however, who these chatterers were. For while they certainly included the fashionable world of the day (those who could be found at races, concerts, or dinners), they also included the eunuchs who were now (at least to unfriendly eyes) once again prominent at court.⁶⁰ It was presumably as a result of their efforts that Theodosius, like Valens before him, expressed a wish to meet Eunomius; the Empress Flacilla is said to have prevented this from happening.⁶¹ Eunomius' tactics, then, appear to have remained just what they always were—an attempt to foment revolution 'from above' by concentrating on court and palace.

Nevertheless, there was not a great deal of time within which to achieve this. Theodosius' ecclesiastical settlement was very

⁵⁶ See above Ch. 7, pp. 282–4.

⁵⁷ The repeal of the edict of toleration in Aug. may have been the catalyst, *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 5 (Mommsen i. 2. 856).

⁵⁸ Soz., *HE* 7. 6. 2 (*GCS* 307. 17–19), cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 20. 4 (*GCS* 294. 18–20), Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 1 (*GCS* 324. 17–20).

⁵⁹ Grg. Naz., *Or.* 27. 3. 15–19, 6. 3–12 (*SC* 250. 76, 84), cf. also *Or.* 21. 5 (*PG* 35. 1088A), 42. 22 (*PG* 36. 484B).

⁶⁰ Zosimus 4. 28 (*CShB* 47. 205. 19–206. 3). It may be we should not take this too seriously. The same author claims that the pretender Maximus (one of whose great virtues was that he was *not* Theodosius) detested eunuchs, *ibid.* 4. 37 (*CShB* 47. 217. 14–15); Ambrose, on the other hand, says when he visited the court of Maximus that he was received by a 'eunuchus regius', *Ep.* 30. 2. 15–16 (*CSEL* 82/i. 208).

⁶¹ Soz., *HE* 7. 6. 3 (*GCS* 307. 19–23), cf. Philost., *HE* 9. 8 (*GCS* 119. 8–14), Grg. Nyss., *Flacill.* (J ix. 480. 21). The fear that an orator would sway the emperor was a common one; the same fear was expressed of Aetius, Soz. *HE* 4. 23. 4 (*GCS* 177. 12–14), and later of Anastasius, see below n. 307.

fragile, and Gregory's appointment was not by any means a marriage made in heaven, so the window of opportunity was narrow. Quite apart from the fact that Gregory's own support of the emperor was none too visible (damned with faint praise⁶²), he was by no means an obvious choice for a major see. Being enthroned at sword's point would have raised canonical questions even if there had been no political ones and, as soon became obvious, Gregory was no administrator—definitely a problem in so wealthy a see.⁶³ Theodosius' solution to this and other problems was to summon a council, which began meeting in May, not six months after his arrival.

For a synod perceived in retrospect as the Second Ecumenical Council, we know surprisingly little about it. Its *Acta* and *Synodical Tome* have both disappeared, and a great deal of what does survive seems to come from a second session which met the following year. Still, the little we do know tells us a good deal, especially about the so-called 'Theodosian settlement'. For while Theodosius made a point of inviting primarily 'those of his own faith', we are also told that he deliberately included the leaders of the Macedonians. It is not known how many actually turned up, especially at the opening session, but by the time it issued its decrees the council consisted of just under 150 'Nicenes'. To begin with there were also at least thirty-six Macedonians,⁶⁴ but the latter—led by Eleusius of Cyzicus and Marcian of Lampsacus—unfortunately did not stay, and so, with the exception of a single Spaniard (perhaps an imperial chaplain), almost all the rest were from Syria-Palestine or Asia Minor.⁶⁵ Notably absent to begin with were

⁶² Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1282-92 (*PG* 37. 1117-18). Earlier Gregory had been prepared to speak of the emperor as a veritable Josiah compared to Ahab, Grg. Naz., *Or.* 33. 2 (*PG* 36. 215C); the reality had taught him caution.

⁶³ Cf. Grg. Naz., *Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1475-84 (*PG* 37. 1131-2), *Or.* 42. 1 (*PG* 36. 457AB).

⁶⁴ Soc., *HE* 5. 8. 2-5 (*GCS* 279. 16-25), Soz., *HE* 7. 7. 1-3 (*GCS* 308. 14-22).

⁶⁵ The list in Mansi, however, gives only 148 names (iii. 568A-572B), including four presbyters, and six bishops represented by lesser clergy. Since Gregory Nazianzen is listed under Cappadocia with Nectarius as archbishop of Constantinople, while Meletius is still listed for Antioch and Flavian (his successor) only as a presbyter, it must be presumed that this list represents the council as it was in middle or late June 381 (after the election of Nectarius and the arrival of the Egyptians, but before the election of Flavian; Meletius is

the bishops of Egypt. It is not clear whether this was because initially they were not invited or because they were merely reluctant to come.⁶⁶ Their earlier attempts to replace Gregory of Nazianzus with a candidate of their own had proved futile, but they were not for all that likely to admit defeat and give their support to him.⁶⁷ In any event, for whatever reason they did not arrive until after a compromise engineered by Meletius took effect in June.

Since our own interest in this council lies in its effect on those who did *not* accept it, we can concentrate on that, and pass over the details of some of its other accomplishments. Both politically and doctrinally, then, the bishops knew that they had to achieve some kind of common mind (*homonoia*).⁶⁸ Indeed they did! But before they could broach the doctrinal issue they needed to address the political one. Politically the most contentious issue was: who was bishop of Constantinople? Demophilus was perhaps *hors de combat*, but though the Egyptians might be willing to abandon their own candidate (Maximus), they were unlikely to accept Gregory. Apart from his enforced enthronement and personal inadequacies, there were claims that he was just an opportunistic 'hick' looking for better things in the big city.⁶⁹ The result was conciliar deadlock, with Gregory's supporters choosing to worship separately.⁷⁰ The solution was a deft compromise engineered by Meletius and grudgingly accepted by Gregory.⁷¹ Gregory was recognized

listed as having been present even though by this time he was dead). Pēter of Sebaste, Gregory of Nyssa's brother, who is said to have been present by Theodoret, *HE* 5. 8. 4 (*GCS* 287. 22–3), is omitted. This may be a slip, or he may have gone home early.

⁶⁶ *Grg. Naz., Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1797–1802, cf. 1509–13 (*PG* 37. 1155A, cf. 1134A).

⁶⁷ They tried to use sailors from the grain fleet to install an Alexandrian philosopher, Maximus the Cynic. His philosophical orientation gave Gregory an opening for some of his choicest invective, *Grg. Naz., Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 750–1239 (*PG* 37. 1081–1114). It appears Maximus tried to further his cause (later? or at the same time?) by appealing to the Emperor Gratian, Hieron., *Vir. Inlus.* 227 (*TU* 14. 1. 54. 6–9).

⁶⁸ Mansi iii. 557B/C.

⁶⁹ *Grg. Naz., Or.* 33. 8 (*PG* 36. 224C–225A).

⁷⁰ *Thdt., HE* 5. 8. 4–6 (*GCS* 287. 19–288. 5).

⁷¹ Gregory, amid many laments and much criticism of other bishops, describes Meletius as ἀρεχρος, *Grg. Naz., Carm.* 2. 1. 11. 1515 (*PG* 37. 1134); in fact, his solution suggests a very deft hand indeed.

as archbishop of Constantinople, but resigned (by prearrangement?) not long after, citing a desire to be relieved of so unwelcome a burden.⁷² This allowed the council to affirm his claim to be the legitimate bishop, while at the same time requiring no one to live with the consequences of that admission—in the list of signatories he is called, neutrally, 'Nazianzenus'.⁷³ His replacement was an effective if startling choice—a noble who, so far from possessing a previous track record, was not even baptized! This was Nectarius, recommended by Diodore and Meletius, accepted by the emperor, and then (still in his baptismal robes) proclaimed bishop of Constantinople. If his subsequent reputation failed to match that of another neophyte, Ambrose, he managed none the less to move the council through the far thornier pastures of discipline and doctrine.

We are poorly informed about the latter, since most of the council's dogmatic pronouncements have been lost. Still, it is difficult not to be tantalized by the little that remains. Theodosius had made a point of inviting the Macedonians, but unfortunately to no avail. Guided by Eleusius, these bishops firmly rejected the efforts of Ascholius and others to induce them to accept the new formula and withdrew, claiming they would never accept it.⁷⁴ This makes the pronouncements of the remaining bishops all the more interesting, for almost everything they published is at least aware of Macedonian sensibilities. 'Semi-Arians' and 'Pneumatomachians' are condemned by name, and the primacy of the Nicene faith is affirmed, but this pre-eminence is expressed only in negative terms: no one is actually to deny it (*μὴ ἀθετεῖσθαι*).⁷⁵ Assuming that the synodical letter and canons issued in the following year reflect the council's original intent, the bishops delicately affirm the need to speak of a single divinity, power, and essence of Father, Son, and Spirit (*θεότητος καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ οὐσίας*), and the need to describe them as 'subsistences' or 'persons' (*ὑποστάσεων, ἥγουν . . . προσώπων*), but they avoid the flat statement that the Spirit is 'God'.⁷⁶ A similar reticence can be

⁷² Grg. Naz., *Or.* 42. 20 (PG 36. 481AB).

⁷³ Mansi iii. 569D, i.e. neither 'Constantinopolitanus' nor 'Sasimensis'.

⁷⁴ Soc., *HE* 5. 8. 7–10 (GCS 279. 26–280. 11), Soz., *HE* 7. 4 (GCS 309. 1–6).

⁷⁵ CCP (381), *Can.* 1 (Mansi iii. 557E).

⁷⁶ CCP (381), *Ep.* apud Thdt., *HE* 5. 9. 11 (GCS 292. 13–16), *Can.* 5

observed in the so-called 'Nicene Creed' which is linked somewhat mysteriously to this council by the bishops at Chalcedon.⁷⁷ For while, on the one hand, a committed Macedonian could not have said that the Spirit was 'worshipped and glorified' along with the Father and Son,⁷⁸ on the other, someone who was less 'precise' might still be able to worship in a Nicene church if they were not actually driven out.⁷⁹

The tolerance accorded the followers of Eleusius was, however, denied those of Eunomius. Even before the council actually met, the government issued a pointed reminder that the Eunomians, like their opposite number the Photinians, were specifically excluded from the churches.⁸⁰ The heresiological range implied by this is not unlike that in the council's

(Mansi iii. 560E). Content apart, the absence of canons 5-7 from the medieval Latin translations (Mansi iii. 566D-567C, 572B-574A) shows that they must have been added later, in the case of 5 certainly and 6 probably, at this later meeting. Note the government's cautious language before the council met in *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 6 (Mommmsen i. 2. 857): Catholics are those who 'spiritum sanctum, quem ex summo rerum parente speramus et accipimus, negando non violat'.

⁷⁷ *ACO* II. i. 2. 80. 17-18.

⁷⁸ Cf. Ar. Ign., *Fid.* fr. 21, A 32. 4-5, 21-48, cf. fr. 23, 5. 208. 26-30 (*CCL* 87/i. 262, cf. 265).

⁷⁹ The modern reader, accustomed for centuries to hear of 'God the Holy Spirit', may find this caution puzzling. Yet even Basil the Great was reluctant to speak of Spirit simply as 'God', e.g. *Ep.* 251. 4. 7-14 (Courtonne iii. 92; *Ep.* 8. 2. 16-17, 11. 25-6, etc. (i. 24, 35) is not usually considered to be Basil's). Part of the reason for this is that, for us, the word 'God' very often functions as a proper name, or at least a proper noun, so that in many cases we are more aware of it as designating a particular Entity rather than as delineating what that Entity might be. Yet the ancients were much more conscious than ourselves of the connection between Deity and the power to create, and thus found it difficult to describe the Spirit as 'God' on any other basis, e.g. Aug., *Trin.* 15. 1. 10-11 (*CCL* 50A. 460). That is why so much Nicene language is negative, asserting that the Spirit is *not* a creature. The non-Nicenes, for their part, insisted very strongly that the Spirit did not 'create' in the proper sense, that its role was restricted to sanctification: e.g. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 205. 15-206. 3), Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 51. 306^r. 2-10, 63. 308^r. 3-28 (*SC* 267. 242, 250), Ar. Ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 5, 5. 286. 37-50 (*CCL* 87/i. 237). When Nicenes did start to speak of the Spirit in this way, they were aware they were making an innovation, Grg. Naz., *Or.* 31. 27. 6-19 (*SC* 250. 328-30); one part of their solution was to extend the meaning of 'create', e.g. Basil, *Eun.* 3. 4. 7-10 (*SC* 305. 158).

⁸⁰ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 6 (Mommmsen i. 2. 856-7), 10 Jan. 381.

first canon, which is a picture in miniature of the 'opposition' as it appeared to the participants. The Eunomians are distinguished from the Arians, who are said to be followers of Eudoxius (*not* Demophilus), while the Macedonians are identified more ambiguously as 'Semi-Arians' and 'Spirit-fighters'.⁸¹ In opposition to them all are those at the opposite extreme: modalists, who are categorized as Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians, and Apollinarians.⁸² If we compare this with the boundaries set earlier by Constantius and Valens, we find that the extremes are what remain constant; the centre is what needed adjusting. The delegates presented their formal conclusions to the emperor on 9 July 381.⁸³ Ten days after that, a surviving piece of the enabling legislation decrees that no Eunomian or Arian, or anyone 'ex dogmate Aeti' is to construct a house of worship, even in the country.⁸⁴ The government clearly continued to find Eunomius and his 'precisianists' useful symbols of an excluded extreme.

It is, however, a good deal easier to make a law than enforce it, and so radical a change was certainly not met without resistance—there were serious disturbances when the authorities tried to hand the churches over to their new owners.⁸⁵ One part of the emperor's solution was a 'Council of Heresies' summoned with an eye to some kind of reconciliation. This body met in the month of June 383,⁸⁶ but we know very little about it. For one thing, it would be extremely interesting to know just which groups were invited as opposed to those who eventually came, but we have detailed information about only one, the Novatians.⁸⁷ Of the others, we are told that Demophilus represented the 'Arians', Eunomius the 'Eunomians', and Eleusius the 'Macedonians'.⁸⁸ Presumably the latter were

⁸¹ Identification on the basis of theological orientation rather than episcopal loyalty is probably deliberate; it allowed anyone who could say that *they* did not fight the Spirit to conform without necessarily condemning Macedonius as an individual.

⁸² CCP (381), *Can.* 1 (Mansi iii. 557E–560A).

⁸³ *Ibid.*, *Can.*, prologue (Mansi iii. 557A).

⁸⁴ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 8 (Mommsen i. 2. 858).

⁸⁵ Soc., *HE* 5. 10. 1–2 (*GCS* 282. 8–14), Soz., *HE* 7. 12. 1 (*GCS* 314. 17–19).

⁸⁶ Soc., *HE* 5. 10. 6 (*GCS* 282. 22–3), cf. Soz., *HE* 7. 12. 2 (*GCS* 314. 23–6).

⁸⁷ Soc., *HE* 5. 10. 8–13 (*GCS* 283. 2–24), Soz., *HE* 7. 12. 3–6 (*GCS* 315. 3–19). Socrates' source may have been a life of Sisinius.

⁸⁸ Soc., *HE* 5. 10. 24 (*GCS* 284. 18–20), Soz., *HE* 7. 12. 9 (*GCS* 315. 29–316. 3).

once again the primary positive focus, as being locally more numerous, theologically less alien, and perfectly prepared to riot, but the emperor may also have entertained some hopes of the none too 'precise' Demophilus. Eunomius could probably ascribe his presence to Theodosius' need for a foil, and to the work of his sympathizers at court, for like Aetius he remained influential in some circles there for many years.

The primary temporal issue was presumably the possession of church property, since that is what occasioned the need for a council in the first place. That meant, then, that even groups with no hope of any more comprehensive reconciliation might still hope for legal or physical breathing space. In the event this proved a forlorn hope, since only the Novatians did in fact retain their churches,⁸⁹ but the possibility must have been strong enough in the beginning to give Nectarius pause. Indeed, to begin with, the emperor seems to have intended some kind of general discussion of the issues; this was rejected, but the alternative proposed by Nectarius is almost as interesting.⁹⁰ Urged on by the Novatians, Nectarius suggested that the council reject dialectic, and concentrate instead on the witness of Christian antiquity. Since all the groups claimed to recognize *quod semper, quod ubique*, if not necessarily, perhaps, *quod ab omnibus*, it was a clever move, and one itself likely to produce a good deal of dissension. It was ultimately rejected, but it is of interest none the less because it may provide the *Sitz-im-Leben* for the theological 'improvement' of so many early Christian works at this period. Among the latter we may include the Pseudo-Ignatian *Epistles* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, as well as a lengthy 'anomoean' interpolation in the *Clementine Recognitions*.⁹¹ The battle over the immediate past so characteristic of the controversy's early stages was thus now matched by another equally fierce one over the more remote past of the apostles and their successors. In the context of the council,

⁸⁹ That of the Macedonians was made the shrine of their founder's chief rival, Paul, Soc., *HE* 5. 9. 2 (*GCS* 281. 18-21), Soz., *HE* 7. 10. 4 (*GCS* 313. 19-24).

⁹⁰ For this and the following, see Soc., *HE* 5. 10. 8-21 (*GCS* 283. 2-284. 13), Soz., *HE* 7. 12. 5-8 (*GCS* 315. 11-29).

⁹¹ *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 2. 1-11. 12 (*GCS* ii. 96. 5-107. 13). At least part of it was already present in both the recensions known to Rufinus, *ibid.*, prologue 7-11 (*GCS* ii. 4. 8-23).

however, since none of the parties was willing to accept Nectarius' suggestion either, the emperor abandoned it in turn. Instead, he asked each group to submit its 'faith' in written form, promising to make a decision on that basis. The groups did as asked, but all their contributions have perished with one fortunate exception—that of Eunomius himself.

Ironically we owe its preservation primarily to Gregory of Nyssa. Eunomius' so-called *Expositio Fidei* was early attached to manuscripts of its refutation by Gregory, and as a result has come down to us entire.⁹² It is evident from its forthright tone that Eunomius did not really expect to sway the emperor, since he rather pugnaciously insists that he has 'passed over' nothing 'out of shame or fear' and added nothing out of love of rivalry.⁹³ Still, though he is not deliberately provocative, he does make a point of saying that what he intends to present is a 'reason of the hope' that is in him, and identifies this with the formal acknowledgement of the Saviour which is the beginning of salvation.⁹⁴ On this we need to take him seriously. If the symbolic node that separated the two sides was the analogy of generation, in both its technical and its narrative dimensions,⁹⁵ this can be seen in the *Expositio* by the sheer amount of space devoted to it.⁹⁶ In general keeping with the non-Nicene schema as a whole, the Son begins his saving journey from the Father's throne, moves through the mighty acts of Israel's history⁹⁷ to achieve a genuine incarnation (unhindered by a soul),⁹⁸ and then, risen and ascended, returns to the originating Source. Within this narrative framework we are told in the more dogmatic sections that ontological posteriority is a necessary feature of 'Sonship',⁹⁹ and that the Son's mediatorial role must be guaranteed by his distinction in action and essence.¹⁰⁰ *Agennetos* is nowhere mentioned, but Eunomius insists that the divine essence is

⁹² On this, see Vaggione 134-45.

⁹³ Eun., *EF* 6. 2-3 (Vaggione 158).

⁹⁴ Ibid. 1. 1-5 (Vaggione 150).

⁹⁵ Cf. the remarks of Sisinius in Soc., *HE* 5. 10. 12-13 (GCS 283. 18-24), Soz., *HE* 7. 12. 6 (GCS 315. 17-19).

⁹⁶ Forty-six out of 113 lines (40%).

⁹⁷ Eun., *EF* 3. 33-6 (Vaggione 154).

⁹⁸ Ibid. 3. 40-2 (Vaggione 154-6).

⁹⁹ Ibid. 3. 2-4 (Vaggione 152).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. 3. 9-17 (Vaggione 152).

absolutely incomparable,¹⁰¹ and that it is the Son, and not the Spirit who is the 'Lord and Giver of Life'.¹⁰² Eunomius concludes with a wishful desire for the condemnation of his detractors, but to no avail. The emperor accepted only one of the documents offered him, that of the Novatians, and condemned all the rest to various degrees of exclusion. It should come as no surprise that Eunomius' was among the more severe.

Theodosius' religious policy was to 'speak loudly and carry a big stick', while trying to avoid having to use it.¹⁰³ This was consistent with his policy goals in general. Having made ecclesiastical allegiance a qualifying mark for civil participation, he also had to provide a safety-valve for the more highly pressured society that was the result. Here, it was the pagans who were the real losers—dissident Christians would have to be left some (qualified and graded) breathing space. Indeed, one of the more remarkable if less acknowledged features of the Theodosian settlement was the expansion of a practice begun under Valens: the toleration of an opposition *extra muros*.¹⁰⁴ True, only the Novatians retained their buildings within the walls, but the others could meet (noisily and publicly) outside. Of course, there was no way that Eunomius—already a forbidden extreme—could be officially included, but where he could not hope for toleration, he might easily look for neglect. The 'wild card' in any imperial programme, after all, was always selective prosecution.

To begin with, however, it did not look as though there was even going to be hope of that. Theodosius was preparing his 'big stick'. On 25 July Eunomius was named first in a decree against dissidents of every kind. They were all forbidden to assemble or build places of worship.¹⁰⁵ Six months later the decree was given teeth by a threat to confiscate all property so used, whether within or without the walls.¹⁰⁶ A month after that

¹⁰¹ Eun., *EF* 2. 4-10 (Vaggione 150).

¹⁰² Ibid. 3. 6-7, 16-17 (Vaggione 152).

¹⁰³ Soz., *HE* 7. 12. 11-12 (*GCS* 316. 9-15).

¹⁰⁴ Soc., *HE* 5. 20. 5-6 (*GCS* 294. 21-7), cf. CCP (381), *Ep.* apud Thdt., *HE* 5. 9. 7 (*GCS* 290. 17): ἀντισυνάξεις τοῦ μόνωντες.

¹⁰⁵ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 11 (Mommsen i. 2. 859).

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. 16. 5. 12 (Mommsen i. 2. 859-60).

dissident clergy were ordered to be expelled and it was decreed that none of them should henceforth function as a minister of religion.¹⁰⁷ As in the conciliar decrees of two years before, Eunomius is named first. There is no doubt that he was being singled out, but nevertheless, where so much depended on the government's will to enforce, he could still hope to meet (cautiously) with his followers in private.¹⁰⁸

This gives us a context within which to understand the ecclesiastical landscape as it now appeared to Eunomius. The Nicene triumph had left the diocesan bishops almost entirely *ultra vires*.¹⁰⁹ In other words, in the eyes of continuing 'Christians' the only congregations with a prima-facie claim to be considered 'churches' were those of the dissident minority. The problem, however, was that not all of these were ἀκριβής. This was particularly true *vis-à-vis* the crucial issue of Christ's separate identity and likeness to the Father. With the departure of the unifying hand of the state, the non-Nicene jurisdictions found it increasingly difficult to articulate the *positive* sense in which they believed the Son to be like the Father—some said it was in the will, others in the nature, still others in a shared capacity to create. For Eunomius these positions shared only one thing in common: they all led sooner or later to *homo-ousios*.¹¹⁰ The practical result for Eunomius and his followers was that they were forced to become more explicitly sectarian: they refused to accept either the baptism or the ordination of most other non-Nicene churches.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 13 (Mommson i. 2. 860).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 20. 4 (*GCS* 294. 17–20).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Maximinus, *Comment.* 76. 310^o. 23–38 (*SC* 267. 260): 'Ergo iuste meritoque nunc per omnia exteri cristianis iudicauuntur, qui basilicas cristianis uiolenter deripuerunt et eis denegauerunt. Audient utique secundum magisterium Cristi ab ipsis: *Ecce relinquetur uobis domus uestra deserta*, in qua nec baptismum uerum celebratur nec mysteria sancta conficiuntur nec sacerdotium stare potest, pulsus sacerdotibus ueris.'

¹¹⁰ Eun., *Apol.* 11. 4–9, 21. 1–4, 22. 1–4, 24. 26–8, 26. 3–4 (*Vaggione* 46, 60, 62, 66, 70), etc.

¹¹¹ Philost., *HE* 10. 3–4 (*GCS* 127. 3–13). In effect non-Nicene churches were to be treated as though they were Nicene, whether they were conscious of the implications of their theology or not. Since Philostorgius continued to regard western non-Nicenes as colleagues, cf. 2. 5 (*GCS* 18. 12–14), presumably the chief worry was about those in the vicinity of Constantinople. Like the Nicenes, Philostorgius was probably prepared to assume that the

Twenty years earlier a similar tactic had not precluded the possibility of reconciliation,¹¹² and the same was presumably true now. Eunomius did not intend to declare that the sacraments of the offenders 'invalid' in the abstract, in the later western sense;¹¹³ rather, he was trying to respond to a specific situation. Given the close connection between faith and sacramental activity in general, and the numerous reported irregularities,¹¹⁴ he insisted as a matter of practice on withholding recognition. This was not an attempt to initiate a new schism, but to deal with the consequences of an old one. The new variable factor was the growing 'imprecision' of the non-Nicene churches. It was therefore decided that when individuals from those churches desired to join the continuing church, their sacraments would be treated as 'non-events'. In an age without the concept of 'conditional rebaptism' that was the only available option.¹¹⁵ Eunomius' solution, therefore, was specific rather than general. This involved no change at all with regard to the Nicenes—they were always beyond the pale. What changed was the situation of the non-Nicenes: so many of them had become 'imprecise' that they had to be treated as though they understood the consequences of their position—that is, as though they were Nicene.¹¹⁶ Catholic baptism *per se* never entered into the picture at all.¹¹⁷ As for the others, if *per* Barbarians were protected by their own simplicity. Nearer home, the real focus remained the adherents of Demophilus and the still large continuing non-Nicene churches.

¹¹² See above, Ch. 7, pp. 278–80.

¹¹³ As e.g. in the problematic raised by St Thomas in *Summa Theologica*, pars II, ii, quaest. 19, art. 3.

¹¹⁴ Philost., *HE* 10. 3 (*GCS* 127. 8–11).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Hieron., *Lucif.* 23 (*PL* 23. 177B–178A). Note Athanasius' concern in *Apol. Sec.* 30. 1 (Opitz ii. 109. 11–12) that the intruder Gregory was a stranger to Alexandria, 'not having been baptized there', his faith as well as his person presumably unknown. The Paulinians of Antioch would not accept baptisms or ordinations performed by Meletius because of a defect of faith in his consecrators, Soc., *HE* 2. 44. 10 (*GCS* 182. 15–18), Soz., *HE* 4. 28. 10 (*GCS* 186. 11–14). The same reasoning presumably underlies Auxentius' rebaptism of Catholics at Milan, Ambrose, *Auxent.* 37 (*PL* 16. 1018C), cf. *Const. App.* 6. 15. 1–11, 8. 47. 184–95 (*SC* 329. 342, 336. 290).

¹¹⁶ Cf. Maximinus, *Comment.* 77. 310^v. 38–43 (*SC* 267. 260).

¹¹⁷ It could be assumed to be invalid. It is noteworthy that Eunomian rebaptism of Catholics did not require a response from the government until a full generation later, in 415 (*Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 58 (Mommmsen i. 2. 875–6)). By

impossible they ever did receive the truth, it might then perhaps become possible to recognize their sacraments. In the mean time these would have to be repeated in order to be sure that all 'right-thinking' Christians remained fully 'precise'.¹¹⁸

This raises the question of the practical extent of the prophylaxis, for it is said to have extended to matters of liturgical detail, particularly as regards baptism. The Nicenes of later decades were prepared to believe almost anything of Eunomian liturgy,¹¹⁹ but their accounts are often associated with claims of a verbal change in the baptismal formula which are almost certainly mistaken.¹²⁰ There is one liturgical change, however, that does have some plausibility. This is the claim that Eunomians baptized 'into the death of Christ' rather than into the Trinity, and that some of them substituted a single for a triple immersion.¹²¹ We can be reasonably certain that the latter was actually done, at least at Constantinople, because Philostorgius tells us that this was the practice of his own church.¹²² What we still need to try to determine is when this was done, and why.

We will put changes in the baptismal formula to one side for the moment, since even those making the allegation do not associate it with Eunomius.¹²³ Indeed, the text (if not the mean-

that time Catholics were in the majority at Constantinople; thirty years earlier, however, the non-Nicene community was still very large, if not the largest in the city. Inevitably, therefore, for Eunomius it remained the focus.

¹¹⁸ This, of course, was merely the conclusion of a process begun long before; Aetius' emphasis on 'precision' had caused a breach already in the 340s, Philost., *HE* 3. 19 (*GCS* 48. 15-18).

¹¹⁹ Thdt., *Haer.* 4. 3 (*PG* 83. 420B-421A), Thdr. Mops., *Eun.*, fr. 6 (Vaggione, *Fragments*, 427-8), cf. Epiph., *Haer.* 76. 54. 32-5 (*GCS* iii. 413. 31-414. 11). A propos the possibility that candidates were turned entirely upside down, cf. the comment of Rowan Williams in 'Baptism and the Arian Controversy', Barnes and Williams, 172-3, that the 'lover of the pleasingly exotic in liturgical history must hope it is true'. Others claimed that only the upper portions of the body were baptized, the genitals being covered or excluded, Tim. CP, *Haer.* (*PG* 86. 24B-C), Damasc., *Haer.* 76 (*PG* 94. 725B), *Histoire Nestorienne* i. 52 (PO 5. 284. 2-5), Agapius (Mahboub de Menbidj), *Histoire Universelle* ii (PO 7. 574. 7-11).

¹²⁰ See above, Ch. 6, pp. 258-60.

¹²¹ Soc., *HE* 5. 24. 6 (*GCS* 307. 8-10), Soz., *HE* 6. 26. 4 (*GCS* 273. 6-7), Thdt., *Haer.* 4. 3 (*PG* 83. 420B), cf. Basil, *Spir.* 12. 28. 1-7 (*SC* 17bis. 344).

¹²² Philost., *HE* 10. 4 (*GCS* 127. 13-16).

¹²³ Sozomen, *HE* 6. 26. 2, 4 (*GCS* 272. 21-5, 273. 2-7), cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 24. 6

ing) of Matthew 28: 19 was one of the few things on which most of the participants did agree! Vigilius of Thapsus goes so far as to make his fictional Arius and Athanasius start a debate by reciting it together!¹²⁴ If even for Eunomius these words could be described as summing up 'the mystery',¹²⁵ then presumably to misunderstand them is to risk invalidating the sacrament.¹²⁶ But if so, in what sense? And who exactly were the intended targets? Because it was the Nicenes who won in fact and because almost all later accounts were written by them, it is easy to assume that the charge in question was aimed at them. In point of fact, however, a little thought shows that this is unlikely to be the case. As with reordination or rebaptism which we just looked at, the main targets were closer to home. This was not an attempt to change doctrine so much as an attempt to avoid error in it. We can see why once we consider the context of the accounts. Our one piece of direct evidence on this subject is preserved by Photius in his epitome of Philostorgius. But what he tells us is that both single immersion and rebaptism were a response to heterodoxy—not the heterodoxy of the Nicene churches, but of the non-Nicene!¹²⁷ Eunomius would not have

(*GCS* 307. 6–10), where this change is associated with Eunomius' disciple, Theophronius.

¹²⁴ Vigilius, *Ar. Dial.* 5 (*PL* 62. 158C). In *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 3 (*PL* 62. 181D–182A) he even includes Sabellius! For instances of non-Nicene usage see Appendix ad loc.

¹²⁵ Eun., *EF* 3. 44–5 (Vaggione 156), cf. Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 16. (*PL* 42. 733–4). For M. van Parys, the mystery in question is that summed up in John 20: 17, ('Exégèse et théologie dans les livres contra Eunome de Grégoire de Nysse: Textes scripturaux controversés et élaboration théologique', in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), 173, found earlier in his 'Grégoire de Nysse: Réfutation de la profession de foi d'Eunome' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Université de Paris, 1968), 125. On the surface this is not unreasonable because Eunomius does in fact use the passage on at least two occasions, *Apol.* 21. 9–11 (Vaggione 60) and *AA* 3 (J ii. 291. 26–292. 7, cf. 289. 3–13. The real question, however, is whether he would have thought of Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene, and not Matt. 28: 19, when he was preparing a list of the most significant final events of Jesus' stay on earth? Especially when the list includes the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension and Matt. 28: 19 would fit chronologically? I think we must conclude that here, at any rate, the reference is to the latter.

¹²⁶ As in *Recogn. Clem.* 4. 36. 2 (*GCS* ii. 164. 23–5).

¹²⁷ Cf. Philost., *HE* 10. 4 (*GCS* 127. 12–13): οἱ περὶ Εὐνόμιον τοσούτων τῶν εἰρημένων αἵρέσεων ἀπεκρίθησαν.

been able to take the Nicene position seriously enough to regard it as anything but a political danger. Doctrinal danger could only come from some source which had a *prima-facie* claim to righteousness—in other words, other non-Nicenes. Thus, what Philostorgius is telling us is that single immersion, like rebaptism or reordination, was a response to the chaos of the newly independent non-Nicene churches, absent the controlling hand of the state.¹²⁸ The same context is also visible in Socrates.¹²⁹ Single immersion, then, was introduced to counter heterodoxy, not in the Nicene community (already beyond salvation), but in the non-Nicene. But if so, heterodoxy of what kind?

We have already seen that the baptismal formula itself remained unchanged (at least to begin with), but verbal identity by no means guaranteed identity of meaning. *Vis-à-vis* Nicene and non-Nicene the same words were in effect images in little of their controlling frameworks.¹³⁰ This made the situation as seen by Eunomius all the more serious. For in his eyes the newly independent continuing churches were united in only one thing: their inability to see that their positions were in effect equivalent to *homoeousios*!¹³¹ That meant that there was a real chance the fundamental meaning of the Gospel would be undermined. We can see why if we go back to the non-Nicene framework in general. In an earlier chapter, we saw that a different understanding of essence and activity led the two sides to construct superficially similar but structurally different understandings of the Christian story as a whole.¹³² Baptism is the same story applied to the life of the individual, and the names of its actors are considered to be real and operative powers.¹³³ Thus the Triune activity believed by Nicenes to be operative in human

¹²⁸ Philost., *HE* 10. 3 (GCS 127. 3–11).

¹²⁹ Soc., *HE* 5. 20. 1–6, 23. 1–13 (GCS 294. 10–27, 305. 14–306. 20), interrupted by a lengthy excursus on the Novatians; Soz., *HE* 6. 26. 2, 4, 7. 17. 2–14 (GCS 272. 21–5, 273. 2–7, 325. 1–327. 7), has included most of this material in a more general discussion.

¹³⁰ Cf. e.g. the exchange between Germinius of Sirmium and his baptizand Heraclianus in *Heracl.* (PLS 1. 345D): 'Germ[inius] d[ixit]: Dic, Heracliane! Ego te baptizaui; quomodo a me recepisti? Her[ac]lianus] d[ixit]: Accepi a te: In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Non enim accepi: in deo maiore et in deo minore, et hoc creato. Sic et in spiritu sancto dicis.'

¹³¹ Philost., *HE* 10. 3 (GCS 127. 6–8).

¹³² See Ch. 4, pp. 130–5 above.

¹³³ Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 1. 17. 37–8 (CSEL 78. 10): 'operatricis virtutis indicia'.

history as a whole could in their eyes be seen in the sacrament,¹³⁴ while the contrasting position of the non-Nicenes *vis-à-vis* the same events was visible in their understanding of it as well. Two different pictures of God's activity in general thus provided a paradigm for two different understandings of the sacrament of baptism.

Our own focus will naturally enough be on that of the non-Nicenes. A good place to begin (regardless of its actual provenance) is with the *Apostolic Constitutions*. There we find that the fourth-century editor has extensively glossed the traditional liturgical directions that underlie his work:

'So then, Bishop,' he says, 'you are to anoint after the same pattern the heads of those who come to you for baptism—male as well as female—using holy oil in token of spiritual baptism.¹³⁵ Then, Bishop, you or a priest appointed by you are to pronounce and recite over them the holy invocation (ἐπίκλησιν) of "Father and Son and Holy Spirit", immersing them in the water (βαπτίσεις). The men, [as they come out,] are to be received by a male deacon, the women by a female deacon. That way, the unbreakable seal will be conferred in a fitting and decent manner. After that, the Bishop anoints those who have been baptized with chrism.

Baptism, after all, is administered into the Son's death;¹³⁶ the water is instead of burial; the oil is instead of the Holy Spirit, the seal instead of the cross; the chrism is the confirmation of the confession. The Father is mentioned because he is the Source and Sender, the Spirit is included because it is Witness. The immersion¹³⁷ is the dying with Christ, the ascent is the rising with him. The Father is God over all; Christ is the Only-begotten God, the "beloved Son", "Lord of glory"; the Holy Spirit is "the Counsellor" sent by Christ, instructed by him and proclaiming him."¹³⁸

This gives us a fairly good visual picture of the rite, as well as of its theological interpretation. There is an initial pre-

¹³⁴ e.g. Ath., *Ar.* 2. 41 (PG 26. 176A–177A), (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (PG 29. 729C–732A).

¹³⁵ Cf. Ath., *Jud.* 8. 1. 88'. 5–15 (CCL 87/i. 105).

¹³⁶ Cf. (Ps.-)Ignat., *Phil.* 1 (Lightfoot II. iii. 189. 22–3).

¹³⁷ κατὰδύοις, singular.

¹³⁸ *Const. App.* 3. 16. 20–17. 10, cf. 7. 22. 1–12, 22–30, 25. 18–22, 40. 11–15, 44. 1–2 (SC 329. 156–88, cf. 336. 46–8, 48, 54, 96, 104). Ibid. 3. 16. 20–8 generally corresponds with *Didascalia* 3. 12. 3 (Funk i. 210), while the rest is from the 4th-cent. editor, On 3. 17. 9–10, cf. *Eun.*, *EF* 4. 12–13 (Vaggione 156).

baptismal anointing, after which the candidates go down into the water. The bishop or one of the assisting clergy recites the *epiclesis* of Matthew 28: 19 (over the whole group?) while they are immersed in the water. The newly baptized are then raised up by their respective deacons and brought before the bishop to be anointed by him in turn. There is no particular emphasis on the number of immersions, but we are told that their purpose in general is to represent our death with Christ.

If we then reread the passage and compare it with what we know of non-Nicene baptism from other sources, we find that the general picture is quite consistent. Baptism is as Christocentric as the rest of non-Nicene theology,¹³⁹ and here as elsewhere we find that no mere human can save us.¹⁴⁰ It is the new Adam, the Only-begotten God in the flesh, bearing no sin of his own, who enters the waters bearing ours;¹⁴¹ his own baptism is thus a kind of passion by prolepsis. When we ourselves enter the same waters, we die in them to rise as adopted sons and daughters of God.¹⁴² The rite's detailed choreography carries the same message; for this is a rite, after all, which may *not* be performed by a lay person.¹⁴³ When we take that seriously, we find that the parallels become even more exact. For in this context the lawful celebrants, bishop or priest and deacon,¹⁴⁴ have important symbolic functions: the bishop, who stands outside the font, acts in the place of God; the deacons

¹³⁹ Ar. Ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.* fr. 2, 5. 195. 29-45 (CCL 87/i. 232); cf., *par contre*, (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 5 (PG 29. 745B).

¹⁴⁰ Ar. Ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.* fr. 5. 5. 286. 23-49 (CCL 87/i. 237). In (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 364-5 (SC 146. 90) it is because he is not a mere *ἄνθρωπος ψιλός* that Christ rises from the dead. and in *Const. App.* 7. 43. 7-10, cf. 8. 2. 227-31, 41. 15-18 (SC 336. 102, cf. 196, 256), it is precisely the death of the Only-begotten God that is the type of baptism.

¹⁴¹ Ar. Ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 2. 3. 42^v. 10-14, cf. 2. 42^v. 9-12 (CCL 87/i. 53, cf. 52).

¹⁴² *Const. App.* 7. 39. 34-8 (SC 336. 94). The meaning of 'adoption' is what lies behind the rather pointed query of the 'Orthodox' in (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 14 (PG 28. 1180B/C); he wants to know why in baptism the 'Anomoean' bothers to mention the Father at all, since on his view he isn't really a 'father' (i.e. *κατ' οὐσίαν*). From an 'Orthodox' perspective the 'Anomoean' baptizes into a *ψιλή προσηγορία*, *ibid.* 2. 15 (PG 28. 1181B).

¹⁴³ *Const. App.* 3. 9. 1-4, 10. 1-3 (SC 329. 142, 146), cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 26. 9 (GCS 273. 25-8).

¹⁴⁴ *Const. App.* 3. 11. 1-4 (SC 329. 146).

within or beside it are the representatives of the obedient Christ.¹⁴⁵ Thus from the candidates' perspective this rite corresponds closely to the non-Nicene picture of salvation history as a whole:¹⁴⁶ like Christ before his journey, the candidates stand before the 'hierophant of the mysteries'¹⁴⁷ and are anointed for their descent;¹⁴⁸ then, when they have entered the water and are 'buried' in its depths, the bishop recites over them the solemn *epiclesis* of the three Names; finally, the deacon draws them out and brings them each before the bishop to be anointed and to confirm their confession. Thus, like the martyr (Christ's 'brother' in blood),¹⁴⁹ and like the Saviour himself, the candidates stand before their Source and Sender;¹⁵⁰ as they 'approach the Mystery' they are initiated by the Spirit;¹⁵¹ they then 'die' with Christ in the waters¹⁵² and are raised up by him to be brought before his Father's throne.¹⁵³ While the symbolic details probably varied from place to place, the correspondences in the overall pattern are striking. This, surely, is the inherited *visual* context within which any attempt to alter practice must be understood. Eunomius' primary difficulty, after

¹⁴⁵ *Const. App.* 2. 30. 1-10, cf. 32. 4-11, 44. 15-19 (*SC* 320. 248-50, cf. 250-2, 282-4), (Ps.-)Ignat., *Smyrn.* 8, 9 (Lightfoot III. ii. 223. 35-6, 225. 32-3).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Williams, 'Baptism', 168: in the *Constitutions* the 'threefold formula' is not a pointer to inseparable unity, but functions almost as a code for the stages of salvation history.'

¹⁴⁷ Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 40. 19-20).

¹⁴⁸ Note the same general sequence is also found in another work used by this community, *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 67. 3-4, cf. 4. 32. 2, 7. 29. 2 (*GCS* ii. 141. 12-17, 162. 15-17, 211. 17-18).

¹⁴⁹ *Const. App.* 5. 1. 7-14, cf. 7. 178-82, 16. 30-4, 8. 8. 3-8 (*SC* 329. 202-4, cf. 238, 264, 336. 160).

¹⁵⁰ Cf. the implied contrast in (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 28 (*PG* 28. 1201B), where it is not the one who says 'begotten' and 'Unbegotten' who can stand with the Son of God, but the one who confesses 'Father, Son, and Holy Spirit'.

¹⁵¹ Eun., *EF* 4. 14-15 (Vaggione 156).

¹⁵² *Const. App.* 5. 6. 38-43 (*SC* 329. 218).

¹⁵³ One way our baptism differs from Christ's own, is in the identity of the Witness; in Jordan it was the Father who bore witness to his 'beloved Son', while the Spirit 'in bodily form like a dove' proclaimed him, (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 335-7 (*SC* 146. 86), (Ps.-)Ignat., *Phil.* 8 (Lightfoot II. iii. 196. 4-6), Ar. Ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 2. 7. 45^r. 2-4 (*CCL* 87/i. 55), *Sermo* 6 (*PL* 42. 679). Since one of the Spirit's primary works is to announce Christ, presumably its role in baptism is to bear witness to God's adoptive sons and daughters as well, cf. *Sermo.* 11 (*PL* 42. 680).

all, was not with those who did not share his framework, but with those who did. If he or one of his disciples felt the need to make a change in liturgical practice, it can only be because they intended to strengthen a framework otherwise held in common.

This is consistent with what we know from the writings of Eunomius himself. In a work written just about this time, Eunomius tells us that no appeal to ecclesiastical usage, however venerable, can take precedence over the *akribeia* received from the saints: 'We ourselves, however, obey saints and holy men, in that we do not claim "the mystery of godliness" is subordinate to the dignity of the Names, the details of custom or of mystic symbols (οὔτε τῇ σεμνότητι τῶν ὀνομάτων οὔτε ἐθῶν καὶ μυστικῶν συμβόλων ἰδιότητι), but rather to accuracy of teaching'.¹⁵⁴ In other words this passage is Eunomius' attempt to apply in a more specific way the general principle that names derive their meaning from the things to which they refer, not the other way around.¹⁵⁵ That it was intended to apply to baptism is shown by the passage of Basil it refutes,¹⁵⁶ but as Philostorgius makes clear,¹⁵⁷ Eunomius' main concern at this time was not with Nicene but with non-Nicene infidelity. The severing of communion and the single immersion were both intended to respond to this; since the specific complaint was confusion of the divine Persons, presumably the purpose of changing the 'details of custom' was to render this impossible.¹⁵⁸ Candidates might thus indeed be baptized in the name of the 'threefold blessedness', but they were not to think that there were 'two unbegotten Gods', or that 'one [God was] divided into two'.¹⁵⁹ Rather, they were to recognize that they were baptized 'into the death of Christ', a 'death' which restored the divine image they could now share with the Son

¹⁵⁴ Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii: 284. 20-5). On the date of book 3, see Vaggione 82-9.

¹⁵⁵ As in Eun., *Apol.* 18. 7-8 (Vaggione 54-6), *AA* 2, 3 (J i. 398. 7-11, ii. 299. 21-3).

¹⁵⁶ Basil, *Eun.* 2. 22. 27-32 (*SC* 305. 90).

¹⁵⁷ Philost., *HE* 10. 3-4 (*GCS* 127. 3-16).

¹⁵⁸ For what it is worth, and to the extent that Gregory of Nyssa preserves the actual language, it appears that a few years earlier Eunomius himself was prepared to speak of βαπτισμῶν τε τρόπον in the plural, perhaps in describing his own baptism, Eun., *AA* 1 (J i. 40. 20), cf. Soz., *HE* 6. 26. 7-9 (*GCS* 273. 17-274. 2).

¹⁵⁹ *Recogn. Clem.* 1. 69. 5-7 (*GCS* ii. 47. 11-18).

and the all-ruling God;¹⁶⁰ and to this the Spirit bears witness. Rowan Williams is doubtless right to see the introduction of a single immersion not directly linked to the threefold invocation as an attempt 'to avoid the dangerous implication of equality and indistinguishability among the persons of the Trinity'.¹⁶¹ Those who were chiefly imperilled, however, were not the followers of Basil and Athanasius (already hopelessly lost), but those much nearer home, with a more plausible claim to be called 'Christian'. It is they who stand most in need of 'precision'.

Before we leave this issue, however, we need to ask to what extent the practice was received, even within the Eunomian church itself. For there is at least some evidence to show that acceptance was neither automatic nor universal. For one thing, it is worth noticing that almost all our actual information about such a change comes from Constantinople or its environs. This is certainly true of Philostorgius, and even (at this stage) of Eunomius himself, but more to the point, it is the explicit claim of most of the historians who give us our information.¹⁶² That makes it all the more interesting to find that there is a work often associated with Eunomius which rejects single immersion but is connected with Antioch. The work in question is the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*. We will make no attempt to resolve the very complicated issue of its specific provenance here;¹⁶³ we will merely note that its general non-Nicene focus is difficult to escape. It is interesting, therefore, that in the main body of the work the number of immersions is nowhere mentioned;¹⁶⁴ it is only when we come to the final book that we

¹⁶⁰ (Ps.-)Ignat., *Magn.* 5 (Lightfoot II. iii. 169. 25-9). Note that in *Const. App.* 7. 34. 31-8, 8. 12. 97-102, cf. 5. 7. 114-28 (*SC* 336. 72, 184-6, cf. 329. 232), it is the pre-incarnate Divine Wisdom who received the command to create humanity 'in our image'. It is the same Wisdom, therefore, incarnate who restores it.

¹⁶¹ Williams, 'Baptism', 175, cf. 173-6).

¹⁶² Soc., *HE* 5. 24. 8-9 (*GCS* 307. 13-17), cf. Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 1, 4, 5, 7, 9 (*GCS* 324. 2-3, 325. 13, 20-1, 27, 326. 8-9), etc.

¹⁶³ I hope to address this directly at a later time.

¹⁶⁴ T. A. Kopecek, 'Neo-Arian Religion: The Evidence of the Apostolic Constitutions', in Gregg, *Arianism*, 166, slightly overstates the case when he says that 'it is everywhere assumed that there is only one immersion'. It would be truer to say that while a single meaning is everywhere assumed ('burial'), and *κατάδυσις* is used in the singular, the number of immersions is a non-issue before the final book.

find a reference to the single immersion, and that in the negative. The fiftieth of the eighty-five so-called 'Apostolic Canons' that conclude the work condemns baptism by single immersion 'into the death of Christ'. The real meaning of the rite is then explained in an accompanying gloss.¹⁶⁵ Since the theology of the latter is identical with that found in the rest of the work, it has rightly been observed that this is 'no Nicene interpolation'.¹⁶⁶ What is equally difficult to deny, however, is that the issue raised there is found nowhere else in the work.

One reason for this is suggested by the canons themselves. They are not in any easily discernible order; in fact, it looks very much as though they were added to over a period of time as circumstances called them forth.¹⁶⁷ That said, however, the gloss itself is still an obvious break in the flow—it is the only theological statement in what is otherwise a uniform collection of law. That is something requiring explanation. For if the author indeed added paragraphs to these canons as situations required, we need to ask what circumstance could have called for this? We can only be sure of one thing: that it occurred some time between the 370s, when Christmas began to be celebrated in the East,¹⁶⁸ and 394, when the canons are first quoted by an outside source.¹⁶⁹ If we first allow, say, ten years for diffusion, that means the crisis we are looking for occurred around 383 or 384;¹⁷⁰ or in other words, just about the time the Eunomian

¹⁶⁵ The gloss in what is generally conceded to be its original form exists only in Syriac. The surviving Greek is a 'sanitized' version which forms the basis of several (slightly different) retro-versions, see C. H. Turner, 'Notes on the Apostolic Constitutions', *JTS* 16 (1914/15), 523–38.

¹⁶⁶ Williams, 'Baptism', 164.

¹⁶⁷ As suggested by Turner, 'Notes on Apostolic Constitutions', 532–3. For the possibility that canon 50 and its gloss were the original ending of the work, see *ibid.* 537–8.

¹⁶⁸ *Const. App.* 5. 13. 1–3, 8. 33. 12–15 (*SC* 329. 246, 336. 242).

¹⁶⁹ Council of Constantinople, Oct. 394 (*Mansi* iii. 853C).

¹⁷⁰ Marcel Metzger, the most recent editor of the Constitutions, assigns their completion to 380 itself, though he allows the possibility that they may have appeared later than 381 (*SC* 320. 58–60). His reasons for this precision, however, are largely dependent on the absence of a direct reference to the recent 'ecumenical' council at Constantinople, and allusions to continuing pagan worship. At Antioch, however, the council was at this point only 'distant thunder' and by no means universally accepted at that. As for the pagans, the emperor indeed issued decrees, but enforcement was haphazard at best, since we find Antioch's pagan 'Olympic Games' still being celebrated in the 6th

community at Constantinople was being forced to consider a change in its baptismal rite. This does a good deal to strengthen the suggestion made by Professor Maurice Wiles that the canon and its gloss are signs of a conflict within the Eunomian community, not an attack from without.¹⁷¹ Wiles calls attention to the perennial human tendency to use the same data to achieve opposite ends,¹⁷² but here we seem to have a case of identical ends creating opposite data.

This becomes apparent when we look at the gloss's content in detail. The canon decrees that a bishop or priest who substitutes 'one immersion into the Lord's death' for 'three immersions with one initiation' is to be deposed. This is justified on the basis of Matthew 28: 19, the traditional baptismal formula.¹⁷³ It is clear, however, when we look a little further afield, that the author's objection cannot be to baptism 'into the Lord's death' as such, since he frequently speaks this way himself.¹⁷⁴ Rather, his objection is to a change in its ritual expression. This is confirmed when we note that the emphasis is on Matthew 28: 19 as something the Lord *said*, that is, as a command. In the context that only makes sense if the author understood 'baptize' there in its literal sense of 'dip' or 'immerse'. His argument, then, is that triple immersion is an implied part of the dominical command. Thus he bases his negative argument ('why we should not baptize with one immersion') on authority—we do not dip once 'into the Lord's death' because that is merely Paul's explanation of its meaning; the Lord himself is the only one who can tell us what we should *do*. But if that is the case, why was a gloss thought necessary at all, and to whom is it addressed? That question is a significant one because oddly enough, though the gloss is grammatically addressed to the bishop (*Διδασκέσθω*),¹⁷⁵ the focus of its content is on the candidate. That makes it all the more interesting to

cent., G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 168, 197, 440, etc.

¹⁷¹ M. Wiles, 'Triple and Single Immersion: Baptism in the Arian Controversy', *SP* 30 (1997), 337–49.

¹⁷² *Ibid.* 337–8, cf. 348–9.

¹⁷³ *Const. App.* 8. 47. 202–8 (*SC* 336. 290–2).

¹⁷⁴ e.g. *Const. App.* 2. 7. 1–9, cf. 6. 15. 1–11, 7. 43. 24–8, 44. 9–10, 45. 4–5 (*SC* 320. 160, cf. 329. 342, 336. 104, 106).

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 8. 47. 209 (*SC* 335. 2912).

discover that, while the bishop's ostensible purpose is to prevent the rite from being misunderstood, single immersion is not mentioned at all. On the contrary, all the emphasis is on rightly understanding why there are three. That is, there may be three 'dippings' (βαπτίσματα), but it is to be made clear that there is only one initiation (μυήσεως). Appearances to the contrary, the divine Entities do not all act identically in the sacrament: the Father did *not* become a human being to suffer for us; the Son is *not* the Sender but the Sent; the Spirit is *not* the Father or the Son, but the obedient witness.¹⁷⁶

But Eunomius could not have agreed more—indeed, he was preaching that very thing at the same moment in Constantinople. Why then did the same message require a different expression in different contexts? That, after all, is where the answer must lie, since it clearly does not lie in a different problematic. In point of fact, the misunderstandings so vehemently condemned at Antioch were almost identical to those which stricter non-Nicenes ascribed to the 'Demophilists' and Macedonians of Constantinople.¹⁷⁷ What needs to be explained, then, is not why people in two cities were concerned about keeping the divine Entities distinct, but rather why in the one case the solution was more explicit catechesis, while in the other it was a drastic liturgical change. At least part of the reason must lie in the different situations of the two communities. Eunomians at Constantinople were influential at court, and continued to gain converts,¹⁷⁸ but they were also a minority even among their own, and comparatively isolated. Their problem was to preserve their own identity while attracting new converts. Since the supporters of Demophilus and Dorotheus were by far the largest source of the latter, it was important that boundaries be clear. The danger there, after all, was 'creeping Nicenism'; a change in the ritual would make 'precision' unavoidable. Significantly, however, there is nothing to show that even so anyone thought baptism with three immersions invalid in itself; only that, under the circum-

¹⁷⁶ *Const. App.* 8. 47. 221–31 (SC 336. 292).

¹⁷⁷ Note that in the 'confession of Wulfila', allegedly delivered in Constantinople not long before, they march in a modalist parade accompanied by the Photinians, Patripassians, and Homoousians, among others, Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep. apud Maximinus, Comment.* 49. 305^v. 4–8 (SC 267. 240).

¹⁷⁸ Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 1 (GCS 324. 19–20).

stances, it was expedient to do something else.¹⁷⁹ On the other hand, the situation at Antioch was quite different. Dorotheus, the former diocesan, was at Constantinople, so there was no rival bishop 'in the suburbs' to divide loyalties.¹⁸⁰ True, an attempt at reconciliation after Dorotheus left failed,¹⁸¹ but the really significant thing is that someone tried to do it. It may even be that the Anomoean bishop (Julian?) was now the only non-Nicene prelate in the city.¹⁸² Whether that is the case or not, there seems little reason to doubt that at Antioch the Anomoeans were not as isolated as their confrères in Constantinople. A few years later John Chrysostom could expect to find a significant Anomoean presence in his own congregation,¹⁸³ and twenty years after that they were still numerous enough to warrant attack by Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹⁸⁴ But that too had consequences. If these Anomoeans were comparatively 'mainstream',¹⁸⁵ then radical liturgical change was risky—it could only increase their isolation. Thus, attempting to clarify the catechesis was one thing; ignoring a dominical command something entirely different. We may assume, then, on the basis of the canon that they were out of communion with the Eunomian *προεστώς* at Constantinople, but possibly not with the Eunomian community there. It is interesting to note that, while the canon orders the deposition of the celebrant, there is nothing whatever about rebaptizing the candidate.

We can conclude, then, that some members of the Anomoean community at Constantinople did indeed introduce a single

¹⁷⁹ Sozomen, *HE* 6. 26. 7–9 (*GCS* 273. 17–274. 2), of course, introduces a lengthy *reductio ad absurdum* based on just this premiss (the Eunomians say it is necessary to be baptized with one immersion, and that no unbaptized person may baptize; they themselves were not so baptized, so they are unbaptized). What he actually shows is that they did not hold the first premiss: single immersion was necessary under the circumstances, but very far from necessary in itself.

¹⁸⁰ Note the similar situation of the Macedonians at Constantinople, Soz., *HE* 8. 1. 7 (*GCS* 348. 5–9). At Antioch the remaining non-Nicenes were forced to meet in the suburbs, Soc., *HE* 5. 15. 8 (*GCS* 289. 17–19).

¹⁸¹ Philost., *HE* 10. 1 (*GCS* 1226. 2–13).

¹⁸² See above, pp. 318–19.

¹⁸³ Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 1. 336–40 (*SC* 28bis. 130).

¹⁸⁴ Thdr. Mops., *Jo.*, praef. (*CSCO* 115. 3. 7–13; 116. 1).

¹⁸⁵ Note Chrysostom's counsel of forbearance in *Incomprehens.* 1. 351–428, 2. 490–508, 3. 333–52, 5. 421–8 (*SC* 28bis. 132–8, 182, 214–16, 306–8).

immersion in the early 380s, and that this innovation was not accepted everywhere. But who made the change? This is of interest because, while most of our accounts simply describe 'Eunomian' practice in general, Socrates and Sozomen are more specific. Both authors appear to be working on the basis of the same source, though Sozomen gives it in fuller form.¹⁸⁶ In this version, though some people ascribed the change in baptism to Eunomius himself, others ascribed it to two disciples who formed their own sects some time during the reign of Theodosius.¹⁸⁷ We will return to the teaching of these disciples (Theophronius and Eutychius) in a few moments, but just how are they said to have changed baptism? Eunomius alone is mentioned in connection with single immersion. Eutychius and Theophronius are cited in connection with the *substitution* of baptism 'into the death' for baptism in the name of the Trinity, a change which Sozomen specifically denies was made by Eunomius himself.¹⁸⁸ It seems clear, then, that this latter charge involved some sort of change in the baptismal formula, and that the source used by Socrates and Sozomen did not claim that Eunomius had changed that. What it does seem to have claimed is that Eunomius changed the number of immersions associated with the invocation. Since a generation later Philostorgius understood this to signify baptism 'into the Lord's death', Eutychius and Theophronius may have taken the final step and actually changed the formula. There is no reason to think Eunomius himself ever did so.

Earlier I noted that *akribeia* did not provide a very firm basis

¹⁸⁶ It is possible, of course, that Sozomen had only Socrates before him and added additional information from another source, but most of the new information is about doctrinal divisions, which Socrates knows about but does not choose to give, Soc., *HE* 5. 24. 6 (*GCS* 307. 6-8). Although there is matter which goes slightly beyond what can be inferred from Socrates, almost everything new is about doctrine, Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 3-5 (*GCS* 325. 5-22). This seems to indicate that Socrates and Sozomen both had the same source, but Sozomen has chosen to give it more fully.

¹⁸⁷ Soz., *HE* 6. 26. 4-5, 7. 17. 8 (*GCS* 273. 2-6, 326. 2-4), cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 24. 6 (*GCS* 307. 8-10). Both authors say 'they', so the practice, if not the innovation is ascribed to both. Soz., *HE* 6. 26. 4 (*GCS* 273. 4-5) ascribes this to the 'next reign' (that of Theodosius), and places Eutychius' schism after Eunomius' exile in 389, *HE* 7. 17. 5-6 (*GCS* 325. 18-25).

¹⁸⁸ Soz., *HE* 7. 26. 2, cf. 4-5 (*GCS* 272. 21-5, cf. 273. 5-8).

on which to build a church.¹⁸⁹ The schisms of Eutychius and Theophronius are a case in point. Though they occurred somewhat later in time, they show that the Eunomians were not immune to the 'confusions' plaguing the non-Nicene churches in general. Eunomius' own concern, of course, was about confounding the Persons, but many of the newly freed churches were arguing internally about the divine foreknowledge. Inevitably this was an important issue because it involved the problem of the permanence or otherwise of some of God's attributes. Chief among these was the title 'Father'. Some claimed that the very idea of fatherhood implied a beginning of status, others that this was a characteristic that God possessed in foreknowledge even before he possessed it in fact.¹⁹⁰ Theophronius and Eutychius tried to address a related issue, but in a different way. Theophronius, one of Eunomius' disciples and, like himself, a Cappadocian, had composed a work entitled *Περὶ Γυννασίας Νοῦ*, 'On the Functioning of Mind', which discussed, at least in part, the functioning of the divine Mind. It is said to have shown the influence of Aristotle's *Categories* and of his *De Interpretatione*.¹⁹¹ Theophronius' subject, so far as we can still discern what it was, was the sense in which the divine Mind might be said to possess discursive knowledge. Using the same combination of biblical and speculative elements so characteristic of Eunomius himself, he appears to have argued that to the extent the divine Mind knows anything at all *in time*, it must know it in differing senses.¹⁹² We do not know exactly what he meant, but the response of the wider Eunomian community was to excommunicate him, presumably on the grounds that 'contentual logic' would force him to introduce multiplicity into God. At any rate, he and his followers began to meet separately. A like fate awaited another dissident named Eutychius, who also raised an issue about the divine knowledge, in this case the knowledge possessed by Christ. The Son's professed ignorance of 'the day or the hour' (Matt. 24: 36, cf. Mark 13: 32) had long been

¹⁸⁹ See above, Ch. 7, pp. 286-8. On some of the disruptive consequences, see Lim, pp. 137-8.

¹⁹⁰ Soc., *HE* 5. 23. 7 (*GCS* 305. 17-306. 4), Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 9-10 (*GCS* 326. 8-16).

¹⁹¹ Soc., *HE* 5. 24. 2 (*GCS* 306. 26-307. 1), Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 2 (*GCS* 325.

1-5). ¹⁹² Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 3-4 (*GCS* 325. 5-12).

important to non-Nicene theologians.¹⁹³ Eutychius apparently contended that though the Son did not possess this knowledge by nature, he did possess it in so far as he received 'all things' from his Father (cf. Matt. 11: 27; Luke 10: 22; John 5: 20, 16: 15). Eunomius himself agreed that this was the case, but since the leaders of the Anomoean community at Constantinople did not, Eutychius and his followers were expelled. Philostorgius mentions neither group, but they were apparently still in existence fifty years later to be seen by Socrates and Sozomen.

An insistence on *akribeia* did indeed leave Eunomius and his partisans isolated and fissiparous, but as in earlier reigns their fortunes were strongly connected with the fortunes of the imperial house. The new world created by Theodosius' restrictions indeed looked to be a bleak one, but within a month of the 'Council of Heresies' something happened which seriously affected the government's ability to enforce them. This was the murder of Gratian, the senior Augustus. Though this son of Valentinian I was only 24 years old, he had been emperor for fifteen years.¹⁹⁴ While attempting to engage a usurper, Maximus, in Gaul, a mutiny among his own soldiers forced him to flee. On 25 August 383 he was captured at Lyons and killed.¹⁹⁵ That left the West divided between Maximus and the emperor's much weaker¹⁹⁶ younger brother, Valentinian II. The East remained firmly in the hands of Theodosius, but even if he wanted to, he was in no position to make a response—the Balkans were once again in turmoil.¹⁹⁷ Fortunately Bauto, one of Valentinian's generals, managed to keep Maximus out of Italy, with the help of barbarian auxiliaries.¹⁹⁸ This allowed everyone a certain amount of breathing space. Maximus was forced to initiate negotiations with Valentinian and later that winter St Ambrose was sent to Trier to work out a truce.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹³ See Ch. 4 n. 182 above.

¹⁹⁴ Soc., *HE* 5. 11. 9 (*GCS* 286. 6–7).

¹⁹⁵ *Fasti Vindebonenses Priores* 502 apud Mommsen, *Chronica* i. 297, cf. Zosimus 4. 35 (*CSHB* 47. 214. 10–215. 22).

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Ambrose, *Ep.* 30. 3. 35–6 (*CSEL* 82/i. 209).

¹⁹⁷ Zosimus 4. 35, 38 (*CSHB* 47. 214. 3–10, 218. 13–219. 22), cf. Ambrose, *Ep.* 30. 8. 94–101 (*CSEL* 82/i. 212).

¹⁹⁸ Ambrose, *Ep.* 30. 4. 39–43 (*CSEL* 82/i. 209).

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 30. 1. 8–9, 5. 48–50, cf. 63–4 (*CSEL* 82/i. 208, 210, cf. 210–11), cf. Ruf., *HE* 11. 15 (*GCS* 11. ii. 1020. 18–20).

Summer, however, found the two sides in stasis, staring at one another from heavily fortified positions in the Alps.²⁰⁰ Though Maximus was a Spaniard who had served with Theodosius in the past,²⁰¹ for the moment the eastern emperor managed to stay above the fray. He was, however, necessarily distracted. Pending religious legislation was completed, but until the final crisis there was little that was new.²⁰² Theodosius spent the summer of 384 fighting the barbarians in Thrace,²⁰³ and in August appears to have gone on to Italy,²⁰⁴ like Valentinian himself,²⁰⁵ however, he found it politic to accept the situation.²⁰⁶ Still, he seems to have accorded formal recognition only a year later, in 385. That left Maximus free to consolidate his power beyond the Alps, and he therefore remained in more or less peaceful possession of Gratian's realm for the next two years.

²⁰⁰ Ambrose, *Ep.* 30. 7. 82-3 (CSEL 82/i. 211).

²⁰¹ Cf. Zosimus 4. 36 (CSHB 47. 214. 21-215. 3).

²⁰² After *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 13 (Mommson i. 2. 860) at the beginning of 384, there is no further religious legislation (which survives) from either court until 25 May 385 when Theodosius placed new restrictions on pagans, *Cod. Theod.* 16. 10. 9 (Mommson i. 2. 899).

²⁰³ Zosimus 4. 39 (CSHB 47. 219. 22-221. 12). Since this took place on the Danube when the emperor is said to have been nearby, it must have been during the latter's residence in Heraclea in June and July of 384, *Cod. Theod.* 6. 30. 7. 12. 1. 106, 10. 20. 11, 15. 9. 1 (Mommson i. 2. 296, 688, 563, 825).

²⁰⁴ Or so we may deduce from *Cod. Theod.* 12. 1. 107 (Mommson i. 2. 688-9), issued on 31 Aug. 384 from Verona, and addressed to the eastern praetorian prefect and thus presumably from the emperor of the East. We should note, however, that on 22 Sept. a decree similarly addressed is listed from nearby Regium, but only as 'accepta', *Cod. Theod.* 3. 1. 5 (Mommson i. 2. 128).

²⁰⁵ Soc., *HE* 5. 11. 10 (GCS 286. 9-10).

²⁰⁶ Zosimus 4. 37 (CSHB 47. 217. 9-218. 10). Zosimus seems to imply that one of the results of this embassy was increased pressure on pagans. At any rate he claims that among its results was the erection of Maximus' statues at Alexandria in connection with a mission by Cynegius to close the Egyptian temples (implying that Maximus was in some way to blame?). Since he also claims that Cynegius died on his way back from this mission, 4. 45 (CSHB 47. 228. 19-229. 5), and there are laws addressed to his successor beginning in the summer of 388, the mission to Egypt must have been during the summer and early winter of 387-8, cf. *Cod. Theod.* 10. 10. 19 (Mommson i. 2. 545), dated 2 Mar. 387, and the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* ad annum 388 apud Mommson, *Chronica* 244. Still, the only anti-pagan legislation specifically associated with Cynegius is from the summer of 385 (indeed, it is the only religious legislation that year at all), *Cod. Theod.* 16. 10. 9 (Mommson i. 2. 899). It may reflect part of the settlement.

This was not a stable situation politically, but the religious situation was almost equally complex. In the West, Maximus was undoubtedly a committed Nicene, even a rigid one,²⁰⁷ while Valentinian's mother was a strong supporter of the Council of Ariminum and a doughty opponent of St Ambrose. Yet that did not necessarily mean that Theodosius would support the former. Theodosius himself was undoubtedly committed to 'Nicaea', but he had shown himself remarkably deft and flexible in dealing with the various parties in his divided realm.²⁰⁸ There was thus no need to suppose that there would be an automatic 'Nicene' alliance linking the Alps to the Bosphorus.²⁰⁹ On the other hand, Theodosius would want to keep his options open. By 385, indeed, Maximus was sufficiently 'integrated' into the imperial system that his praetorian prefect was named *Consul Ordinarius* for 386 along with Theodosius' infant son, the *nobilissimus puer* Honorius. Not long after, Maximus' statues were erected in the East, at least in some places. But Theodosius was also prepared to look in other directions. As we have seen, his religious policy *vis-à-vis* Christians in his own realm was to establish a rather broadly defined Nicene supremacy, exclude the extremes, and allow a graded amount of breathing space within the tolerated middle. What this meant in actual practice was that the price paid by the official establishment for dominance within the walls was the toleration of dissidence outside them. In two remarkable laws from the beginning of 386 we can see that the same policy could be applied on an international basis.

Part of this puzzle is fairly straightforward. In January of 386 a law was issued by Valentinian II which guaranteed freedom of assembly to those who supported the Council of Ariminum, as confirmed by another council which met at Constantinople.²¹⁰ There is not much doubt that the latter was the council of 360 at

²⁰⁷ He is chiefly remembered today for his execution of the heretic Priscillian (over the protests of St Martin) in 386, Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 49. 6-51. 4, cf. *Dial.* 2. 12. 1-4 (*CSEL* 1. 102. 17-104. 16, cf. 210. 4-26), Hieron., *Vir. Inlus.* 121 (*TU* 14. 1. 53. 2-4).

²⁰⁸ Cf. Ruf., *HE* 11. 9 (*GCS* II. ii. 1023. 12-17).

²⁰⁹ Despite Maximus' earnest efforts, see n. 233 below.

²¹⁰ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 1. 4 (Mommmsen i, 2. 834), cf. Ambrose, *Ep.* 75. 13. 93-14. 101, 75a. 25. 295-302 (*CSEL* 82/iii. 79, 98-9), Soz., *HE* 7. 13. 7 (*GCS* 317. 13-16).

which Eunomius presented the *Apology*.²¹¹ The law concludes with a warning against violence, and threats of capital punishment in the event of its breach.²¹² Since it is dated 23 January 386 from Milan and is addressed to Valentinian's praetorian prefect, it is pretty clearly associated with a struggle in the western capital over allocation of a church to the non-Nicene Dowager Empress Justina and her followers. This canny lady²¹³ and her son provoked a confrontation with St Ambrose at Easter which allowed that prelate to display a fine command of the eastern tactic of 'antiphonal psalmody'.²¹⁴ Such a law in a western context is therefore not surprising.

What is surprising is that a portion of the same law was issued on the same day, to the same praetorian prefect from Constantinople,²¹⁵ and thus presumably from Theodosius.²¹⁶ Laws promulgated by one court were routinely issued in the name of all three, but here it is the prohibition of violence in the exercise of the right of assembly that is reiterated. Theodosius' own policy helps us understand why. The emperor used the pre-existing practice of allowing dissidents to worship outside the walls to relieve the strain of official Orthodoxy. The law in the form he issued it (minus the mention of Ariminum) was all that was needed under the circumstances because the supporters of that council had possessed a *de facto* right of *colligendi copiam* for the previous six years. What was being asked at Milan (presumably with Theodosius' support) was that a similar latitude be afforded 'Ariminians' there. For the

²¹¹ In the decree, the faith of Ariminum is described as that which was proclaimed 'temporibus divae memoriae Constanti sacerdotibus convocatis ex omni orbe Romano'. It is difficult to believe the council in which this faith was 'confirmata' can be any other than that of 360, since it was sometimes itself described as the faith 'of Ariminum' (see above, Ch. 6 n. 157, cf. n. 108).

²¹² Cf. Ambrose, *Epp.* 75. 11. 76-9, 75a. 16. 180-9 (*CSEL* 82/iii. 78, 91-2).

²¹³ Cf. Zosimus 4. 44 (*CSHB* 47. 227. 20-1).

²¹⁴ Ambrose, *Epp.* 75a. 34. 422-7, 76. 24. 235-9, cf. 74. 16. 183-9 (*CSEL* 82/iii. 105, 123, cf. 64).

²¹⁵ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 4. 1 (Mommsen i. 2. 853).

²¹⁶ There is a slight verbal discrepancy in the address ('Eusignio P(raefecto) P(raetori)o' as opposed to 'ad Eusignium P(raefectum) P(raetori)o') and a couple of others in the text that make it unlikely that either one was copied from the other within the Code. *Cod. Theod.* 16. 4. 1 is quoted, perhaps independently, by Maximinus, *Comment.* 143. 349^r. 39-43 (*SC* 267. 326).

disputed edifice (probably the still impressive San Lorenzo²¹⁷) was, like its counterparts at Constantinople, *extra muros*. The very different outcome where so many of the components were the same is an illustration of one of the abiding differences between East and West.

But what of Eunomius during this time of imperial distraction? We are fortunate that one of our last portraits of him comes from about this time. For though unwelcome even in suburban churches, Eunomius continued to meet with his followers in private houses.²¹⁸ It was at this point that the 20-year-old Philostorgius first saw his hero:

[Philostorgius], says Photius, 'praises Eunomius extravagantly, and describes his understanding and character as "incomparable". He also speaks flatteringly of the great distinction of his facial appearance and of his limbs. He even likens the words of his mouth to pearls—though a little further on he admits (if unwillingly) that his voice had a lisp. Nor was he ashamed of the lisp; he extols it as extremely elegant. Likewise, the white blemishes which disfigured and spotted his face he strives to turn into a bodily ornament. He praises all his works extravagantly . . .'²¹⁹

Even in the hostile summary of the Patriarch Photius it is possible to see that Eunomius had at last reached his goal: he was visibly a 'gentleman'. Now his was the 'winged eye' and 'lofty brow' that attracted the gaze of the admirer from the provinces. Like Lucian and Aetius before him, Eunomius in his sixties was a *peritus*, the focus of a circle of admiring disciples, and the guardian of a 'precise' apostolic wisdom. Yet this was not the reign of Valens, nor even that of Diocletian. To have reached this goal in the reign of Theodosius meant that Eunomius was neither to die a martyr like Lucian, nor receive

²¹⁷ See Richard Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals, Topography and Politics* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1983), 89–90.

²¹⁸ Soc., *HE* 5. 20. 4 (*GCS* 294. 18–21).

²¹⁹ Philost., *HE* 10. 6 (*GCS* 128. 10–20). In Photius' epitome this description comes as a 'flashback' following an account of Eunomius' final exile, Philost., *HE* 10. 6 (*GCS* 127. 12–128. 10), and therefore toward the end of his time at Constantinople, about 387 or 388. This fits with what we learn elsewhere, since Philostorgius describes his parents and family in the general context of the reign of Valens and the accession of Demophilus, see above, Ch.

honourable burial like Aetius. The delicate political equilibrium that had permitted so much earlier latitude was beginning to break up.

Maximus is said to have been an excellent man except that he became emperor.²²⁰ Even then, as long as he was content with what he had already achieved, he was relatively safe behind the Alps. By 386, however, he had begun to think of breaching the passes, and against the advice of St Martin invaded Italy.²²¹ That winter²²² he managed to convince one of Valentinian's ambassadors that he truly desired peace, and then sent an army to follow that over-trusting diplomat and enter Italy by stealth. He thus managed to capture the stronghold of Aquileia.²²³ Since Valentinian was still conducting the ordinary business of government as late as May 387,²²⁴ defeat was not thought inevitable. By summer's end,²²⁵ however, with at least one battle lost²²⁶ and his staff afraid of his capture,²²⁷ Valentinian fled to Thessalonica, the easternmost of his dominions,²²⁸ with his mother and sister. There they were followed by an embassy from Maximus²²⁹ and, at the year's end,²³⁰ by Theodosius. The latter, with customary caution,

²²⁰ Sulp. Sev., *Dial.* 1. 6. 2 (*CSEL* 1. 187. 17-21), though in *Mart.* 20. 1 (*CSEL* 1. 129. 2-3) he is said to have been 'ferocis ingenii uirum'.

²²¹ Sulp. Sev., *Mart.* 20. 8 (*CSEL* 1. 130. 4-7). Apparently, the matter had already been under discussion, but Martin is said to have confronted Maximus at a dinner attended by Evodius as both prefect and consul, and therefore in 386, *Mart.* 20. 4 (*CSEL* 1. 129. 18-19).

²²² According to Zosimus 4. 42 (*CSHB* 47. 225. 4-7) negotiations for the embassy began at Aquileia, therefore presumably during Valentinian's residence there in Nov. 386, *Cod. Theod.* 8. 8. 3, cf. 2. 8. 18, 11. 7. 13 (Mommson i. 2. 401-2, cf. 87, 588). The ambassador, Domninus, must have been completing his embassy in the spring of 387 when Maximus followed him into Italy.

²²³ Zosimus 4. 42 (*CSHB* 47. 224. 17-226. 13).

²²⁴ *Cod. Theod.* 11. 30. 48 (Mommson i. 2. 636).

²²⁵ Valentinian was apparently still at Milan in early Sept., *Cod. Theod.* 6. 28. 4 (Mommson i. 2. 289).

²²⁶ Sulp. Sev., *Mart.* 20. 8 (*CSEL* 1. 130. 5-6).

²²⁷ Zosimus 4. 43 (*CSHB* 47. 226. 14-227. 1).

²²⁸ The dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia had been transferred to their control a few years earlier, see Jones, *LRE* i. 159, ii. 1099, n. 44.

²²⁹ Soc., *HE* 5. 12. 10 (*GCS* 287. 7-8).

²³⁰ *Cod. Theod.* 1. 32. 6 (Mommson i. 2. 68), from Thessalonica but addressed to the eastern praetorian prefect.

began with a studied neutrality,²³¹ but by March²³² had achieved a settlement embarrassing enough to posterity to require several versions.

Maximus had tried to justify his invasion on the grounds that he wished to prevent religious innovation, specifically in the inherited (Nicene) faith.²³³ Though undoubtedly a Nicene, Theodosius did not elect to align himself with the Nicene invader, but with Gratian's dispossessed 'Arianizing' brother.²³⁴ More to the point, he agreed to seal the arrangement by marrying Valentinian's sister Galla, the daughter of St Ambrose's persecutor, Justina. True, the Empress Flacilla was dead, but this move seems to have surprised almost everyone. The ever-unsympathetic Zosimus puts it down to lust,²³⁵ while some Christian authors assure us that the lady and her brother were both converted by Theodosius, and that the mother died providentially soon thereafter.²³⁶ Still others assume that the 'Arian' wife must have come *first*, since the mature Theodosius could never have been so deceived.²³⁷ In fact he was showing his usual deft political hand. He and Maximus were so evenly matched that Theophilus of Alexandria is said to have sent a messenger with *two* versions of a letter, one to Theodosius, the other to Maximus, the recipient to be determined by the out-

²³¹ Soc., *HE* 5. 12. 10 (*GCS* 287. 6-7), cf. Zosimus 4. 43-4 (*CShB* 47. 227. 4-18).

²³² His last law from Thessalonica is dated 10 Mar. 388, *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 14 (Mommsen i. 2. 860).

²³³ Ruf., *HE* 11. 16 (*GCS* II. ii. 1022. 4-8), Thdt., *HE* 5. 14 (*GCS* 304. 9-14), Soz., *HE* 7. 13. 10 (*GCS* 318. 1-6), cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 11. 10 (*GCS* 286. 8-9). It may be that Maximus made a mistake about the same time in presenting himself to the Romans as a 'rex Christianissimus': he chastised them for burning a synagogue. They therefore concluded that he was really a 'rex . . . Iudaeus', Ambrose, *Ep.* 74. 23. 261-7 (*CSEL* 82/iii. 68-9). Theodosius was sure enough of them not long after to send them Justina and Galla to rally support, Zosimus 4. 45-6 (*CShB* 47. 229. 18-230. 8).

²³⁴ Part of the attraction may have been that, as Augustine put it, Valentinian was 'destitutum omnibus opibus' and unlikely to offer any serious competition, Aug., *Civ.* 5. 26. 1-9 (*CCL* 47. 161).

²³⁵ Zosimus 4. 43, 44 (*CShB* 47. 226. 17-227. 4, 227. 20-228. 13).

²³⁶ Thdt., *HE* 5. 15. 3 (*GCS* 305. 3-9), cf. Ruf., *HE* 11. 17 (*GCS* II. ii. 1022. 15-16), Geo. Mon., *Chron.* 4. 197. 7-9 (*PG* 110. 693D-696D).

²³⁷ Assisted by such easily confused names as 'Flacilla, Placilla, Placidia', etc. *Chron. Pasch.* ad annum 385 (*CShB* 22. 563. 13-564. 2), Jo. Mal., *Chron.* 13 (*CShB* 38. 344. 11-19).

come!²³⁸ Thus if Theodosius were to undertake so risky a manœuvre²³⁹ he would have to have some assurance of dynastic advantage. And then again, whatever his own religious scruples,²⁴⁰ those of the ladies had to be addressed as well. It is thus probably significant that a decree was issued from Thessalonica in March rejecting modalism.²⁴¹ There is very little in it that is new, but it does make clear (in case anyone doubted it) that support for the *homoousion* did not mean accepting Apollinarianism. Theodosius was thus able to reassure his in-laws and at the same time reiterate a forbidden extreme. By mid-June he was on his way,²⁴² and by late August had captured and executed the usurper at Aquileia.²⁴³

This happy outcome, however, was not matched by an equal tranquillity at home. Even as Theodosius began his move to the West, disturbances began at Constantinople—rumour had it that he had been defeated. The news was taken up gladly by the dispossessed 'Arians' and in one of the ensuing riots the house of the Orthodox bishop Nectarius was burnt.²⁴⁴ It is possible that among the events that precipitated this was the death or approaching death of the non-Nicene bishop Demophilus, which occurred about this time.²⁴⁵ Whatever the truth of that,

²³⁸ Soc., *HE* 6. 2. 6–8 (*GCS* 312. 19–313. 4), Soz., *HE* 8. 2. 17–18 (*GCS* 352. 13–22).

²³⁹ For his very elaborate military and diplomatic preparations, see Pacatus 32. 1 (Bachrens 116. 21–6).

²⁴⁰ According Pall., *H. Laus.* 35. 2 (Bartelink 168. 12–26), Aug., *Civ.* 5. 26. 9–14 (*CCL* 47. 161), cf. Ruf., *HE* 11. 19 (*GCS* II. ii. 1024. 1–3), Soz., *HE* 7. 22. 7–8 (*GCS* 336. 1–10), he was assured by John of Lycopolis, an Egyptian hermit, that he would be successful. But it is worth noting that in Palladius (seconded more or less ambiguously by Rufinus and Sozomen) the initiative comes from the hermit; only Augustine claims the emperor consulted him himself.

²⁴¹ Cited above, n. 232.
²⁴² *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 15 (Mommsen i. 2. 860–1), issued from the central Balkans on 14 June.

²⁴³ 28 Aug. 388 in the *Fasti Vindebonenses Priores* ad annum 388, Mommsen, *Chronica* 298, a month earlier according to the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, *ibid.* 245, but cf. Soc., *HE* 5. 13. 7–14. 1 (*GCS* 288. 1–6).

²⁴⁴ Soc., *HE* 5. 13. 1–6 (*GCS* 287. 12–31), Soz., *HE* 7. 14. 5 (*GCS* 319. 4–9).

²⁴⁵ Soc., *HE* 5. 12. 6–8 (*GCS* 286. 24–287. 2), Soz., *HE* 7. 14. 4 (*GCS* 318. 27–319. 3). This would make sense because it would explain the burning of Nectarius' house in particular: in the course of a disputed election between the Marinus and Dorotheus, the 'Arian' candidates, the house of the Orthodox bishop was burnt. The rumour of Theodosius' defeat merely provided the occasion.

the emperor's response was prompt but not violent.²⁴⁶ He issued two decrees, not quite consecutive, which placed limits on religious debate, and withdrew the right of assembly from those breaking the peace.²⁴⁷ Another law which was issued just over a month later from Constantinople (presumably therefore by Arcadius acting for his father) rebukes 'nonnullos Arrianorum' for using an imperial decree to seize property which did not belong to them—a reference to Theodosius' concessions of a few years before.²⁴⁸

As this was enough to secure temporary tranquillity, the emperor could get on with his campaign. It was more or less inevitable, however, that the return of peace would require a more systematic solution, and it was not long before something happened that triggered it. We do not know exactly what it was, but it was connected in some way with those who supported Eunomius at court. As we have repeatedly seen, one of the leit-motifs of Eunomius' life was the attempt to gain influence in imperial circles—from Gallus to Julian, to Procopius, and beyond. The result was an entrenched circle of admirers cultivated over many years. At least one of the elements that so attracted the gaze of the young Philostorgius was their reflected glory. Moreover, many of these admirers were eunuchs, with their entrenched control of the levers of access. It would seem, then, that during that winter of 388–9 something happened which drew the emperor's attention to the fact that many of his own *cubicularii* were Eunomian.²⁴⁹ The emperor was then resident at Milan, and as a result that May he issued a particularly harsh decree against those described crudely as 'Eunomiani spadones'.²⁵⁰ We do not know just what caused the emperor's

²⁴⁶ According to Ambrose, *Ep.* 74. 13. 147–56 (*CSEL* 82/iii. 62), his son Arcadius dissuaded him from taking vengeance, but he would also have been reluctant to spare the necessary troops, given the difficulty of the approaching campaign.

²⁴⁷ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 15, 4. 2 (Mommсен i. 2. 860–1, 853–4), cf. Maximinus, *Comment.* 141. 34'. 13–21 (*SC* 267. 324), dated 14 and 16 June respectively. Note that in the former, there is no prohibition of assembly in general, but only as applied to groups 'quos in deum miserae vesania conspirationis exercet'.

²⁴⁸ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 16 (Mommсен i. 2. 861), dated 9 Aug. 388.

²⁴⁹ Philost., *HE* 10. 6 (*GCS* 127. 23–128. 1).

²⁵⁰ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 17 (Mommсен i. 2. 861). King, *Emperor Theodosius*,

alarm, but his response is clear enough: any eunuch who supported Eunomius was to be classified with the apostates²⁵¹ and Manichaeans²⁵² as incapable of receiving anything by inheritance or of making a will. Offenders were to be segregated from all others, and considered outside the scope of Roman law.²⁵³ Even what had been willed to them previously was to be confiscated. Thus, like Manichaeans, Priscillianists, and Montanists, Eunomius' followers were treated as in effect guilty of *maiestas*, treason.²⁵⁴ This approach tells us a good deal about the Eunomian community as perceived by the government. For the next twenty-five years and throughout the reigns of two emperors, this prohibition would be a bone of contention between rival factions at court. This can be seen in the legislation. Under Theodosius, this law was repealed in 394,²⁵⁵ then under Arcadius restored in 395, then rescinded again three months later.²⁵⁶ In 399 this concession was repeated (though without a reference to 'spadones'), while the penalties for illicit religious activity were made harsher.²⁵⁷ Under Theodosius II the original prohibitions were again applied and even extended, but then in 415 slightly relaxed: Eunomians could again make wills, but they could only do so in favour of non-Eunomians. Thus Eunomian individuals regained some control of their property, while the government was assured that sooner or later their wealth would leave the Eunomian community.²⁵⁸ Though this tells us a good deal about the tenacity of the movement,²⁵⁹ it also tells us the government's main purpose: to destroy their

58 takes this to be 'coarse vituperation' for Eunomians in general; but 'spadones' is to be taken literally—it refers to the court eunuchs.

²⁵¹ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 7. 1, 2, 7 (Mommsen i. 2. 884, 886).

²⁵² *Ibid.* 16. 5. 7, 18, cf. 65 (Mommsen i. 2. 857, 861–2, cf. 878–9).

²⁵³ *Ibid.* 16. 5. 40, 7. 2, 4, cf. 16. 5. 17 (Mommsen i. 2. 868, 884, 885, cf. 861): 'nihil ex moribus, nihil ex legibus sit commune cum ceteris', 'absque iure Romano', 'a consortio omnium segregati'.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 16. 5. 40 (Mommsen i. 2. 868).

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 16. 5. 23 (Mommsen i. 2. 863), dated 21 May 394.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 16. 5. 25, 27 (Mommsen i. 2. 863–4), dated 13 Mar. and 24 June respectively.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 16. 5. 36 (Mommsen i. 2. 866–7), dated 6 July 399.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 16. 5. 49, 58 (Mommsen i. 2. 871, 875–6), dated 1 Mar. 410 and 6 Nov. 415 respectively.

²⁵⁹ According to Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 1 (*GCS* 324. 19–22) at Constantinople his community was *πολύάνθρωπον*.

power-base. There were doubtless many poor Eunomians in both city and country, but those who were the focus of the government's efforts were those with something to lose, the propertied classes, especially those connected with the court.²⁶⁰ Eunomius may not have succeeded in fulfilling any youthful ambition to become 'Governor of a Province or a District',²⁶¹ but he clearly had acquired plenty of influence with those who had.

Theodosius' officials were naturally aware of this, and eager to change the situation by removing the source of the infection. At some point, then, during the summer of 389 Eunomius was arrested at Chalcedon and exiled to Halmyris, an appropriately named fortress on the salt-flats of the Danube delta.²⁶² Unfortunately (or perhaps fortunately), before Eunomius could actually arrive the river froze and the barbarians crossed over and captured the fort. Since a new location then obviously had to be chosen, Eunomius was sent to Caesarea in Cappadocia (probably in the spring of 390). Given the nature of his relations with the sainted Basil, one of that city's most popular previous bishops, he was thought to be in sufficient danger within the walls to be allowed to live outside them.²⁶³ For the next several years, therefore, he resided at an estate known as Dacora on the slopes of Mt. Argaeus.²⁶⁴ His confinement cannot have been particularly rigorous, for he was still able to receive visitors and to maintain oversight of his community,²⁶⁵ but it was a pre-

²⁶⁰ Cf. Synesius, *Ep.* 4 [5] (Garzya 8. 5-9. 7), where Eunomian missionaries are said to be received in the houses and on the estates of the wealthy.

²⁶¹ See the passage quoted above, Ch. 1, p. 8.

²⁶² Philost., *HE* 10. 6 (GCS 128. 2-4). Procopius, *De Aedificiis* 4. 7 (CSHB 21. 293. 23-6) refers to it as a *φρούριον* on the borders of Scythia; its location in a salt marsh is shown by its name. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Thematicis* 2 (CSHB 5. 47. 13-16) describes it as a *πόλις* in the eparchy of Moesia, but governed from Scythia.

²⁶³ Like Eleusius at Cyzicus (see Ch. 6 n. 202 above), Basil had guaranteed his local popularity by building numerous charitable institutions, known collectively even in his own day as *τὴν καινὴν πόλιν*, Grg. Naz., *Or.* 43. 63 (PG 36. 577C).

²⁶⁴ Philost., *HE* 10. 6 (GCS 128. 6-10), Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 1 (GCS 324. 21-325. 1). Sozomen wrongly calls this his *πατρίς*, but Philostorgius agrees that it was his own property. We are not told it was the gift of any emperor, so it was presumably inherited or purchased out of Eunomius' private means.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 4-6 (GCS 325. 12-25).

carious situation, and one not likely to survive another change in the imperial house.

That change occurred in the mid-390s. The last two decades of the fourth century were a time of generational change in both Church and State. Those who had been dominant factors in Eunomius' youth were by now long dead, while those who had influenced his maturity were starting to go. Thus Demophilus died in 386, to be preceded by Timothy at Alexandria, and followed a decade later by Nectarius at Constantinople.²⁶⁶ The latter was still alive toward the end of 395, however, to receive the remains of his imperial master, for in January of that year Theodosius died.²⁶⁷ The repercussions of that event were naturally significant, but they were not felt by Eunomius until almost a year later. Rufinus, the young Emperor Arcadius' praetorian prefect, renewed existing penal legislation in March,²⁶⁸ including that aimed at Eunomians, but without adding anything new. All this began to change in November, when troops arriving from Milan slaughtered Rufinus at the emperor's feet.²⁶⁹ That young man was still only 17 years old, and fell under the influence of a court faction headed by the sinister eunuch Eutropius.²⁷⁰ Among the things that changed was religious policy.

Rufinus had already renewed the penal legislation of Theodosius (including testamentary prohibitions), and had begun to rein in religiously oriented court factions,²⁷¹ but the tolerance of earlier years had been motivated in part by the presence of large dissident numbers at Constantinople. With generational change in these communities they were becoming increasingly divided and started to decline in numbers.²⁷² Yet they could still mount an impressive public display, and that spring the government decided to try to crack down on 'anti-

²⁶⁶ 27 Sept. 397, Soc., *HE* 6. 2. 1 (*GCS* 312. 4-6).

²⁶⁷ On 17 Jan. 395; the body entered Constantinople on 8 Nov., Soc., *HE* 6. 1. 3 (*GCS* 311. 19-20).

²⁶⁸ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 25 (Mommsen i. 2. 863-4), dated 13 Mar. from Constantinople.

²⁶⁹ Rufinus was killed on 28 Nov. 395, Soc., *HE* 6. 1. 4-7 (*GCS* 311. 20-8), Philost., *HE* 11. 3 (*GCS* 134. 9-135. 11), Zosimus 5. 7 (*CSHB* 47. 255. 13-256. 2).

²⁷⁰ Philost., *HE* 11. 4 (*GCS* 135. 18-21).

²⁷¹ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 29 (Mommsen i. 2. 864-5), dated 24 Nov. 395, four days before Rufinus' assassination.

²⁷² Soz., *HE* 8. 1. 6 (*GCS* 348. 1-5).

phonal psalmody.²⁷³ It was becoming increasingly obvious, however, that the Nicene revolution was—at least in the short term—a fact. Contemporaries may have been spared our knowledge of that revolution's finality, but as a new generation succeeded the old it was becoming clearer that the balance which had allowed so many dissidents to remain within the imperial penumbra was beginning to change. The Macedonians who had originally been the most assiduously wooed were among the first to note the difference. Ever since the departure of Macedonius, they had managed to get along without a resident bishop, at least in the capital. Now with the abandonment of all hope of official comprehension, they at last ordained their own.²⁷⁴ It was a recognition that a situation which once seemed temporary was now permanent. Loyal or not, the opposition was here to stay.

The Eunomians, to begin with at least, had little cause for concern—they had been singled out for years. What one minister did another might easily undo, and where so much depended on the will of the sovereign, the accession of a 17 year old could only be regarded as promising. They were still, moreover, a potent if covert presence at court, and at the time could even arrange to send out missionaries in the entourage of a provincial governor.²⁷⁵ The fact that the destination in this instance was Libya tells us that as late as the 390s Eunomians were still trying to strengthen or restore the 'shadow episcopate' of the reign of Julian.²⁷⁶ Where a change of ministers might so easily mean a change in religion they could therefore rest in hope for, as another non-Nicene was to put it, a church

²⁷³ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 30 (Mommson i. 2. 865), dated 3 Mar. 396, forbidding dissident worship within the walls and especially forbidding 'litaniam faciendam intra civitatem noctu', cf. Soc., *HE* 6. 8. 1-3 (*GCS* 325. 1-8), Soz., *HE* 8. 8. 1-5 (*GCS* 360. 18-361. 13).

²⁷⁴ Soz., *HE* 8. 1. 7, cf. 4. 27. 6 (*GCS* 348. 5-9, cf. 184. 17-19). Since they had long since done this in other areas, Grig. Naz., *Ep.* 202 (*PG* 37. 332A), it may be that their reason for doing the same in the capital was a schism which occurred about this time, Soc., *HE* 5. 24. 7 (*GCS* 307. 11-12).

²⁷⁵ Synesius, *Ep.* 4 [5] (Garzya 8. 5-7) portrays them as boasting of their influence at court.

²⁷⁶ See above, Ch. 7, pp. 276-80. A possible allusion to 'anomoeans' in Nag Hammadi Codex VI. 4. 40. 7 which might reflect this effort appears to be a mistake; see P. Cherix, ed. *Le Concept de notre grande puissance* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 14-15, 27 n. 56.

which waned might very well—like the moon—soon begin to grow again.²⁷⁷

Events, however, soon overtook this hopeful beginning—the emperor's new minister was not prepared to tolerate any rival faction. In April of 396 he ordered Caesarius, the new praetorian prefect, to seek out members of the Eunomian church, in particular its founders and teachers ('auctores doctoresque'), and to expel them from the cities.²⁷⁸ Among the victims was Eunomius himself. The heresiarch was removed from his relatively comfortable place of exile at Caesarea and committed to the rather dubious care of a monastic community at Tyana. A century later the laws separating his followers from all human converse ('humanis coetibus segregentur') caused them to be nicknamed 'troglodytes'.²⁷⁹ At Tyana their founder anticipated the reality—he was in effect already a 'cave dweller' hidden from human eyes. Not surprisingly for someone in his seventies, he died soon after.²⁸⁰ Thirty years earlier Aetius had had the good fortune to die at a moment when full honours might be paid him; Rome's new rulers went to considerable lengths to see to it that Eunomius enjoyed no such thing. In spite of repeated requests, he was denied burial with his master.²⁸¹

The fate of his body raises a further issue. About a decade later the ever irascible Jerome accused Vigilantius of keeping company with Eunomians because like them he deprecated the veneration of relics.²⁸² Since one of Eunomius' followers,

²⁷⁷ Ar. Ign., *Jud.* 9. 3. 90^r. 1–13 (CCL 86/i. 107).

²⁷⁸ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 31–2 (Mommmsen ii. 2. 865), dated 21 and 22 Apr. respectively.

²⁷⁹ Tim. CP, *Haer.* (PG 86. 24B–C).

²⁸⁰ Philost., *HE* 11. 5 (GCS 135. 22–4), probably in the winter of 396–7, assuming he was removed to Tyana in the spring or summer of 396. Soz., *HE* 7. 17. 7 (GCS 325. 25–6) seems to imply that he died at Dacora, since he does not mention a transfer, but he seems to have had only general, not specific knowledge.

²⁸¹ Philost., *HE* 11. 5 (GCS 135. 24–6).

²⁸² Hieron., *Vig.* 8 (PL 23. 347A), cf. Gennadius, *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus* 73 (PL 58. 997B). Vigilantius, of course, was a westerner, and Jerome's vituperative pamphlet very hastily composed. It may be that his comparison comes not from any contemporary practice, but from the behaviour of 'Arians' (including Eunomians) during the controversy over relics in the basilicas of Milan in the 380s, cf. Ambrose, *Ep.* 77. 16. 157–22. 236 (CSEL 82/iii. 136–9).

Philostorgius, was disturbed by the prayers, incense, and apotropaic salutations offered to an image of Constantine,²⁸³ it is easy to wonder whether there might be something to the accusation. But the government's concern suggests otherwise, and in fact there is plenty to show that, whatever qualms they might have felt about some features of the martyr cult, they were as willing as their Nicene counterparts to venerate their *λείψανα*.²⁸⁴ We may note their veneration of the hero-martyr Artemius, so closely associated with the transfer of relics to churches at Constantinople and Antioch,²⁸⁵ but more to the point Philostorgius is careful to note the divine intervention which preserved the relics of Lucian at Helenopolis.²⁸⁶ Hilary once complained that Constantius was cruel in exiling him instead of sending him to the block, since it gave him the pains of martyrdom without their glory.²⁸⁷ In a similar vein the parallels between the popular martyred exegete and the all-but-martyred Eunomius were sufficiently clear (even if Philostorgius had not taken pains to draw attention to them) to make the government unwilling to provide his followers with a focus for veneration.²⁸⁸

Aetius' tomb was still accessible,²⁸⁹ while that of Eunomius was out of reach. Yet the organization they left behind them still mirrored the fertile crescent and stretched around the shores of

²⁸³ Philost., *HE* 2. 17 (*GCS* 28. 4-8).

²⁸⁴ 'remains'. At *HE* 7. 3 (*GCS* 78. 15-20), Philostorgius distinguishes between worship and veneration with respect to a statue.

²⁸⁵ Damasc., *Artem.* 9. 6-11, 17. 1-3, 55. 13-60. 7 (*PTS* 29. 206, 211, 233-6), cf., Philost., *HE* 3. 2, 7. 8 (*GCS* 31. 2-32. 4, 86. 18-91. 2).

²⁸⁶ Philost., *HE* 2. 12 (*GCS* 24. 23-4).

²⁸⁷ Hilary, *Const.* 4. 1-22 (*SC* 334. 174). Referring to his own exile, Hilary comments that earlier martyrs fought against 'absolutos . . . hostes' and thus were not troubled by the ambiguity of Constantius' half measures.

²⁸⁸ In fact this is confirmed by a careful reading of Jerome's complaint about Vigilantius, loc. cit. He never says that Eunomians objected to the cult of the martyrs as such, but only that 'Basilicas apostolorum et martyrum non ingrediuntur'. He then clarifies what he means: like the Montanists and Manichaeans (and presumably Vigilantius) they think 'the dead Eunomius' is a 'culmen veritatis' more important than the Gospels. This seems to imply that they abstain from entering the basilicas not because they object to the presence of relics but because their keepers are not 'precise'.

²⁸⁹ At least, so we may deduce from the fact some wished to bury Eunomius near him.

the eastern Mediterranean from Constantinople to Cyrene. As before, then, their disciples presumably considered themselves as leaven in the loaf and were prepared to wait for better days. At any rate they had no premonition of disaster. For Philostorgius the empire is still 'us',²⁹⁰ and despite strenuous efforts to link imperial success or failure to true religion—Gratian is his Nero,²⁹¹ not Constantius—the Roman order is assumed throughout.²⁹² And yet the reign of Arcadius was not that of Constantius; and in spite of ambiguities, the Nicene revolution was clearly becoming permanent.

This became unmistakable as more serious persecutions began to follow the first. The prolonged struggle over inheritance marks the fortunes of the various court factions,²⁹³ but John Chrysostom's arrival in 398 at least signalled the government's increased unwillingness to tolerate dissent.²⁹⁴ In March of that same year, at any rate, the expulsion orders of earlier reigns were reiterated, and it was announced that henceforth Eunomian documents were to be searched for, not merely burnt when found.²⁹⁵ Even the revocation of testamentary penalties the following year was accompanied by more stringent penalties for religious deviance.²⁹⁶ And yet there is no sign that the situation had really changed materially; indeed, the following decades appear to have been times of relative Eunomian prosperity. The mere fact that the government had to prohibit rebaptism in 413 and again in 415 points to this,²⁹⁷ even if

²⁹⁰ Philost., *HE* 3. 11 (*GCS* 41. 5).

²⁹¹ Philost., *HE* 10. 5 (*GCS* 127. 20–2). Note the contrast with his estimate of Theodosius, whose happy end is ascribed to his anti-pagan zeal, *HE* 11. 2 (*GCS* 133. 24–134. 5).

²⁹² God does not tolerate usurpers, Philost., *HE* 12. 6 (*GCS* 145. 1–6).

²⁹³ For a similar, if differently oriented struggle at the western court, cf. *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 42 (Mommmsen i. 2. 869), 27 Nov. 408.

²⁹⁴ This may be merely an example of the fallacy 'post quod, propter quod', but the law cited in the next note is dated 4 Mar. 398; John Chrysostom was consecrated the previous week on 26 Feb. As first suggested by C. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Lucae: Typis Leonardi Venturini, 1740), vi. 281, anno 398, section LXXVIII, this may well reflect the new Archbishop's hard-line approach, cf. Chrys., *Hom.* 46 in *Mt.* 1, 2 (*PG* 58. 477B).

²⁹⁵ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 34 (Mommmsen i. 2. 866), cf. Philost., *HE* 11. 5 (*GCS* 135. 26–7), Nicéphorus Callistus, *HE* 13, 1 (*PG* 146. 925C).

²⁹⁶ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 6. 36 (Mommmsen i. 2. 866–7).

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 16. 6. 7, 5. 58 (Mommmsen i. 2. 883–4, 875–6). Note that the former

numerous Nicene complaints from North Africa did not hint at the same.²⁹⁸ Indeed, Theodore of Mopsuestia was forced to complain of the 'many' reading Eunomian books about the same time at Antioch,²⁹⁹ and Cyril of Alexandria's interest in them cannot have been exclusively archaeological. For one thing, while Eunomians were mentioned by name in a number of omnibus edicts,³⁰⁰ it was still felt prudent to specify as late as 423 that the general prohibition against Eunomians in government service (aimed primarily at the eunuchs) did not apply to members of the imperial guard!³⁰¹

The Eunomians themselves, of course, recognized that they were a minority, but like the Maccabees they believed they were a minority chosen by God.³⁰² Thus, as seen by Philostorgius, for instance, the political calamities that mingled barbarian and Roman marked the arrival of Daniel's kingdom of iron and clay, one which, though 'partly strong and partly broken', would presumably be replaced by one that 'shall never be destroyed'.³⁰³ And yet, divine intervention apart, even from a contemporary perspective Philostorgius' optimism might be questioned. The existing community did indeed seem to be holding its own—perhaps was even expanding—but it was also very much what it had always been: a group of clerical 'experts', and well-educated amateurs at court, with a limited representation in other areas of society.³⁰⁴ There is nothing to indicate that *akribeia* ever reached *directly* outside camp or palace. And that is what makes the mention of the Maccabees so telling, for it is the description of a saving remnant in the midst of an otherwise apostate people. That is a recipe for continuity, not growth. When we couple this with what appears to be a continuing

appears to be part of a general crack-down, also directed at another rigorist sect, the Novatians, *ibid.* 16. 6. 6 (Mommmsen i. 2. 883).

²⁹⁸ Isidore, *Epp.* 1. 242, 246, 922, 3. 63, 342, 355, 386, cf. 2. 93, 3. 334 (*PG* 78. 329C, 332C, 417A–B, 772D, 1001B, 1012C–D, 1028C–D, cf. 589A, 989D–992D).

²⁹⁹ Thdr. Mops., *Źo.*, praefatio (*CSCO* 115. 3. 7–13; trans. *CSCO* 116. 1).

³⁰⁰ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 59, 60 (Mommmsen i. 2. 876).

³⁰¹ i.e. 'cohortalini', *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 61 (Mommmsen i. 2. 877).

³⁰² Philost., *HE* 1. 1 (*GCS* 5. 1–16).

³⁰³ *Ibid.* 12. 4 (*GCS* 143. 1–144. 6), cf. Sulp. Sev., *Chron.* 2. 2. 4–3. 7 (*CSEL* 1. 58. 3–59. 10); Dan. 2: 31–45.

³⁰⁴ See above, Ch. 7, pp. 286–7.

inability to engage the theology of the majority, we are left with a community in stasis. A movement already strained by the requirements of 'precision' was now in danger of becoming almost entirely a *mos maiorum*:³⁰⁵ a theology which was indeed faithfully transmitted, but one incapable of encompassing the new insights that would enable it to grow.

Whatever the truth of that, it is clear that as the century wore on the penal legislation was beginning to have its effect. Eunomians appear legislatively for the last time in 428, along with many others,³⁰⁶ but their legislative absence is no sign of extinction. Indeed, it was still possible as much as a century later to accuse a Roman emperor of 'Eunomianism'.³⁰⁷ But if by that time such an accusation was more likely to be political code than religious reality, there were still Eunomians around to give it substance. By that time, however, they had become, at least in the capital, what their founder had already been in exile: 'troglodytes'—without church, without sanctuary, without buildings to call their own, meeting in the hidden places of the earth. Their nickname³⁰⁸ is a sign that the end was already visible; for fittingly enough the last living Eunomian we encounter appears not long after as a convert—a now Orthodox young Thracian in the retinue of Belisarius.³⁰⁹ We are not told what became of his family or friends, but if they survived at all, they were doubtless swept away in the massive population shifts and dislocations of the following century. And with that, there were no Maccabees left.

³⁰⁵ As certainly did happen in other non-Nicene circles, cf. Vigilius, *Felic.* 3, 7, cf. 4, 6 (*PL* 42. 1158, 1162, cf. 1159, 1161).

³⁰⁶ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 5. 65 (Mommsen i. 2. 878–9).

³⁰⁷ *Anonyma Valesiana*, pars posterior 13. 78.

³⁰⁸ Tim. CP, *Haer.* (PG 86. 24B–C).

³⁰⁹ Procopius, *Historia Arcana* 1 (*CSHB* 21. 14. 1–3).

Conclusion

Heretic

Language is often enough, it seems, destiny. At least, by the time Eunomius came to die Nicene language, and to some extent the Nicene framework, was dominant throughout the region he had hoped to make his own—and that not merely on an official level. The spirited exchange between nave and pulpit that by that time had been going on for a half-century had led to at least one clearly discernible result: the narrowing of the gap between ‘ordinary’ and ‘expert’ language. ‘Ordinary’ language, however, had not become more expert; ‘expert’ language had become more ordinary. The learned bakers and captious bath attendants lampooned by Gregory of Nyssa¹ were the exponents of a ‘technical’ language that had, in effect, burst the bonds of *τέχνη*. This was not accidental. Eunomius could take some of the credit (at least negatively), but it was the deliberate relaxation of *akribeia* by St Athanasius and others,² as well as Basil’s positive estimate of ordinary language, that really made popular Nicenism possible.³ *Akribeia* might defend the faith,

¹ Grg. Nyss., *Deit.* (J X. ii. 120. 14–121. 14).

² See above, Ch. 7, p. 273–5.

³ See above, Ch. 6, pp. 264–5. For a slightly different ‘take’ on all this, see Lim, pp. 177–81, esp.: ‘By emphasizing the vertical gulf between man and his creator, human weakness could be turned into the social glue of earthly communities’ (p. 179). It is worth noting, however, that even if not *ἀκατάληπτος* or *ἄγνωστος*, Eunomius’ deity was discursively as ‘mystified’ as those of Gregory or Chrysostom. It is perhaps better, therefore, not to contrast ‘day-to-day solidarity’ on the one hand with a ‘two-tiered system of elites and masses’ on the other, but rather to note that although both communities had ‘tiers’, they were of somewhat different kinds. The *θεὸς ἄνθρωπος* envisaged by Eunomius was almost always also a *peritus*; the corresponding figure among Nicenes was more likely to think closeness with God was independent of intellectual expertise, and thus potentially more accessible to the masses (see Vaggione, *Monks*, 209–14).

but it could not by itself 'inflamm[e] the imagination' or 'pierce the heart'.

One of the effects of this transformation can be seen most clearly in the way theology was discussed in the following century. For while almost all the participants were Nicene, they were by no means all equally *ἀκριβής*. Since by this time both the Nicene framework and its language could be taken for granted, there was less need to be 'precise'.⁴ The years following the 'Council of Heresies' thus saw one of history's more dramatic transitions: the widespread acceptance of a new way of thinking about God and human history across a broad geographical range. For more than fifty years Constantinople, Antioch, and the cities of the Aegean littoral had been centres of controversy. Now, suddenly, within a relatively short period of time, formularies that had been resisted throughout the region for more than a generation were identified as ancestral faith: it turned out that they had 'always' been Nicene. The bishop who baptized Theodosius is a case in point. This close friend of Meletius was able to tell the emperor in all sincerity that neither he nor his church had ever accepted a *καίνοτομία*, or been other than 'Nicene'.⁵ And that, truly, is the Nicene victory—the capacity to see an inherited faith in formularies that had previously been thought to exclude it. The terminological changes of the 370s and 380s thus had given enough breadth to the Nicene formula to allow a later generation to apprehend it as 'real'.

But what about the other side? The non-Nicenes too, after all, had a framework, and they too had formulae that were apprehended as 'real'. How was it, then, that during this same period their framework all but disappeared from the popular consciousness? The answer cannot lie solely in the presence or absence of imperial patronage, for the same kinds of pressure that undid the 'Arians' had allowed the Nicenes to flourish. The means, after all, used by Valens and Theodosius were the same, it was only their objects that were different. And yet when

⁴ At least as regards the Nicene framework as such; see S.-P. Bergjan, *Theodoret von Cyrus und der Neunizänismus* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 102–

4.

⁵ Soc., *HE* 5. 6. 5 (*GCS* 278. 2–8), cf. Soz., *HE* 7. 4. 3 (*GCS* 305. 7–8). See above, Ch. 8, pp. 314–5.

Valens came to the throne in 364 he inherited from Constantius the legacy of the 350s: significant numbers of people who thought the non-Nicene framework to be the everlasting Gospel, and who were prepared to suffer on its behalf. Fifteen years later Theodosius inherited many of the same people, and yet within a generation almost all of them came to tolerate and finally accept what earlier they resisted mightily. Somehow, the initiative seized under Constantius was lost under Valens.⁶ We lack the data to account for this fully, but one thing at least remains obvious—that in the reigns of Valens and Theodosius something happened to tip the balance. Gradually over that same period, large numbers of people seem to have come to the conclusion that to be ‘omousianus’ did not necessarily mean to be ‘haereticus’,⁷ and that they could acquiesce in the use of the word even if they were somewhat hesitant as to its meaning. That took a good deal of the cachet out of martyrdom, or as Gregory of Nazianzus put it in another context, hesitation blunted the edge of courage.⁸ Second thoughts and hesitation, indeed, were what enabled the government’s policy to work—they created ‘a reasonable doubt’. Nicene popular success was thus based as much on what brought the two sides together as what divided them. They had long been bedevilled by the amount they held in common. Under Constantius that had worked against the Nicenes, because it deprived even a stalwart like Hosius of a clear choice; now, under Theodosius, the same circumstance worked in reverse. Both sides were convinced that their tradition was ‘apostolic’, but the claims of the Nicenes were starting to become plausible outside their own circle. Indeed, like the Nicenes before them, non-Nicenes were starting to find they could not always tell when they were in a ‘heretical’ church.⁹ That was an environment in which even a small change could prove decisive, and the distinction between *hypostasis* and *ousia* was subtle rather than small. It allowed the

⁶ It is interesting to wonder what might have happened if Constantius had lived. Certainly there is no reason to think the situation would have remained static. The solutions forced on a living Constantius in the 370s might well have been different from those adopted in the 350s. It is possible the final result would not have been all that different in any case.

⁷ Cf. *Heracl.* (PLS 1. 350B).

⁸ *Grg. Naz., Or.* 21. 32 (PG 35. 1120C); courage was now ἀμφιβολον.

⁹ See Ch. 4 n. 142 above.

Nicenes to co-opt one of their opponents' most powerful narrative themes, the plurality of actors prior to the incarnation.

Both sides could agree, after all, that it was 'God' who came 'in the flesh' (if anything, it was the non-Nicenes who were the more vehement); they could also agree that it was this same 'God' who, in a pre-incarnate state, had been the primary actor in Israel's history. Yet in the 330s and 340s ambiguity made Nicene speech seem potentially modalist, and made the charge of Sabellianism plausible. Two decades later, the advent of a more flexible vocabulary allowed the same people to articulate the Christian story in a way that was subtly rather than strikingly different from that of their adversaries, and which was also popularly accessible. More to the point, when coupled with a deliberate relaxation of *akribeia*, it made *homoousios* palatable to those who might otherwise have felt obliged 'to preserve the faith unshaken for the one who gave it to them', and wait patiently for 'the judgement seat of Christ'.¹⁰ One of those who felt that they *did* have to do so was Eunomius.

And not just because of *akribeia*. He had, after all, encountered seductive ambiguity before—his mentor Leontius had worked very much in that vein. But *akribeia* forced both him and his followers to remain faithful to the hierarchical doxologies of an earlier age,¹¹ even while all around them those of the official churches were becoming more and more Nicene.¹² For

¹⁰ Eun., *Apol.* 27. 29–31 (Vaggione 72).

¹¹ e.g. *Const. App.* 7. 25. 12–17, 27. 2–5, 38. 32–4, 47. 9–11, 49. 4–6 (*SC* 336. 54, 58, 90, 112, 114).

¹² The beginnings of this process can be seen in the roughly contemporary *Anaphora of St Basil*, see D. R. Stuckwisch, 'The Basilian Anaphoras', in Paul F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 126–8. The process as a whole, however, was a complex one, not easily traced, in part because the stages of transition are difficult to date. It is worth noting, for instance, that in the next century Cyril of Alexandria was often staunchly hierarchical and traditional, e.g. *Dial. Trin.* 4. 544. 7–9, 5. 586. 12, 28–30, 6. 596. 36, 618. 44–619. 3, etc. (*SC* 237. 260., 384; 246. 38, 104). One sign of the continuing difference between East and West was the fact that in the West the doxologies did *not* change. In the *Gloria Patri* 'and' became standard; but in prayer, very few of the concluding doxologies have been altered. Almost all western prayers end with some version of the traditional 'per Jesum Christum Filium tuum, Dominum nostrum', etc. This makes one wonder exactly when the Nicene picture (as opposed to Nicene language) came to be accepted in the West.

just as fifty years earlier such changes had been the harbingers of an impending revolution, so too now they helped to gauge the encroaching Nicene framework, for the latter was becoming nearly as pervasive as its language. In that respect, then, liturgical conservatism was as characteristic of the Eunomian churches as liturgical innovation, for it was a reflection of Eunomius' own background. Eunomius had, after all, come to maturity during the reign of Constantius, and to the end of his days remained a man of that reign. In his eyes Nicaea was simply beyond repair—no terminological change could ever set it right. Constantius' final programme was thus the only one which had any hope of success: Nicaea had to be jettisoned and a new beginning made. The new vertical and horizontal vision of the Godhead then sweeping the world was for Eunomius just another Sabellian attempt to undermine the Gospel by turning the Unbegotten God into some kind of 'threefold substance'.¹³ *Akribeia's* intolerance of ambiguity made it impossible for Eunomius or his community to take any part in the controversies of the rising generation: he was now definitively a 'heretic'. He and his followers were obliged to observe the theological world of the next century from the sidelines, their proper voice audible only in (heavily doctored) Nicene *florilegia*.¹⁴

Yet in many ways theological marginalization was only the mirror of political marginalization. For like Eunomian theology, Eunomian politics was the image of an earlier time. True to his training under Constantine and Constantius, Eunomius remained committed to the idea of revolution 'from above', and to the court as the primary instigator of religious change. And yet so narrow an imperial focus was bound to be as constricted as it was powerful, for as Eunomius and his followers soon discovered, having once appealed to Caesar, with Caesar they were obliged to remain. Their power-base was too narrow to allow growth. That left them with only two options, and both spelt the end of the living community: conversion or extinction. That, however, is what makes the actual outcome so ironic—for in some ways extinction increased rather than decreased Eunomius' own influence.

¹³ See Ch. 3 n. 163 above.

¹⁴ e.g. Anast. S., *Monoph.* 4. 1. 24-43 (CCG 12. 88).

This paradoxical result was an indirect consequence of Nicene victory—its very totality permitted its supporters to reconsider defeated alternatives.¹⁵ True, they were considered within a different framework, but once Eunomius was unquestionably a 'heretic', it was much easier to address his arguments on their merits. It thus became possible to marshal both the persons and the arguments of the vanquished in the service of Nicaea. In Eunomius' case what makes that particularly interesting is the fact that, despite a very close remembered association with Arius,¹⁶ he was never allowed to disappear in his own right. To the end of the Byzantine Middle Ages, he remained a posthumous participant in many of its most vexing controversies.

One of the earliest of these, interestingly enough, had political overtones, or at least was discussed in a political context. Eunomius in a work of logic is perhaps not surprising;¹⁷ Eunomius in the life of a saint, even if only as a foil, is more remarkable. That is especially true when, as here, the context is imperial rather than specifically ecclesiastical. The saint in question is Amphilochius of Iconium, and Eunomius appears in his presence as the worldly 'expert' overcome by the simplicity of a holy man. Such a scene is not improbable in itself, for the encounter takes place in the presence of Theodosius the Great, and the historical Theodosius considered Amphilochius a pillar of Orthodoxy.¹⁸ But there is more, for it is fairly clear that this is an expansion of an already existing legend. Amphilochius had earlier been portrayed as a kind of *alter Ambrosius*, perfectly prepared to withstand an emperor to his face,¹⁹ and that is his role here. His imperial *παρηγορία* (forth-

¹⁵ See Ch. 4 nn. 35–6 above. Parts of this process have been very interestingly explored in Elena Cavalcanti's *Studi Eunomiani* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 202; Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1976).

¹⁶ See above, Ch. 3 nn. 33–6.

¹⁷ *Anonymus in Sophisticos Elenchos* (CAG XXIII. iv. 12. 24–32).

¹⁸ *Cod. Theod.* 16. 1. 3 (Mommson i. 2. 834).

¹⁹ The story of Amphilochius' encounter with the emperor recounted in Thdt., *HE* 5. 16. 1–5 (GCS 305. 12–306. 6), cf. Soz., *HE* 7. 6. 4–7 (GCS 307. 23–308. 13) is almost certainly the kernel around which a later writer developed the encounter with Eunomius, cf. *V. Ant. Amph.* 5 (PG 39. 25A–B), Symeon M., *V. Amph.* 7 (PG 116. 965C–968A). It is worth noting that in the latter, the fictional Amphilochius is a good deal less confrontational than the historical Ambrose.

rightness) is what gives him the credibility to withstand Eunomius.

The narrative framework of this encounter is the same in all the surviving versions, but the exchange with Eunomius is not. According to the former, Amphilochius is summoned to the Council of Constantinople in 381, and there encounters three improbable 'Arabian wolves': 'Eunomius, "Arian", and Macedonius'. The latter two remain in the background while Eunomius boldly challenges Amphilochius to a debate. It is the debate that tends to change. In its oldest form it consists of little more than a number of opposing texts of scripture offered with little exposition. By the time it reached Symeon Metaphrastes, however, it had become almost a mini-treatise, in which Eunomius' role is reduced to that of interlocutor; it is Amphilochius who gives the speech.²⁰ It is this second form that circulates independently,²¹ showing that it had a continuing relevance. The narrative outcome is naturally everywhere the same: Eunomius is defeated. The narrative does, however, differ in one respect—in the earlier version Amphilochius saves his opponents from lynching.²²

Eunomius the heretic, then, survived as a symbolic adversary, even though there was little detailed recollection of his theology.²³ This can be seen in another, less sophisticated encounter, this time with Basil the Great. In this case there is no narrative framework at all; the dialogue (*ἐρωταποκρίσις*) is everything. Eunomius' function, however, remains the same: he is the 'straight man' who asks the questions that allow the saint to give his easily memorized replies. Since the dialogue occurs in several different forms, all based on a common source,

²⁰ Symeon M., *V. Amph.* 5–6 (PG 116. 960C–965B).

²¹ *Codex Oxon. Bodleianus Canon 41*, fos. 83^r–84^r, discussed Vaggione 187. Since that work was published another copy has come to my attention: *Codex Parisinus gr.* 1195, fos. 440^r–442^v. Though entitled *τοῦ μακαρίου ἀμφιλοχίου διήγησις κατὰ ἀρριανοῦ καὶ εὐνομίου καὶ μακεδωνίου* . . . the Paris MS is not identical with that in the Bodleian, and contains more of the narrative context.

²² *V. Ant. Amph.* 3–5 (PG 39. 17B–25C).

²³ In this guise he was thought still worth condemning as late as the mid-19th cent., when he was anathematized anew (along with Nestorius, Arius, and Leo of Rome) by a synod of the Syrian Malabar Church, *Ms. Bodl. Or.* 667, fo. 41 (my thanks to Mr Richard Judd of the Bodleian Library for confirming this reference).

it was obviously considered pedagogically useful.²⁴ Still, in both these works Eunomius functions more as a symbol than a person. Apart from some more specific motivation, it seems, he was doomed to remain in a kind of literary limbo—not altogether forgotten, but also, not altogether remembered. Obviously it was going to take something much more relevant and contemporary to make people wonder what he really taught.

In the East the stage was set for this by news from the West. In the eighth and ninth centuries eastern Christians were becoming more and more aware that people in the West taught the doctrine of the *Filioque*—that the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son. Most eastern Christians rejected this, and since there is a passage in some copies of Basil's *Adversus Eunomium* that seems to support this doctrine,²⁵ there was a revival of interest in that work. Naturally, this also called attention to Basil's opponent, Eunomius. To begin with, of course, the latter's teaching was too far removed from the main points at issue to be of much interest. It was only with the advent of a new and more tightly focused controversy that attention began to shift to Eunomius in his own right. This controversy was over the relationship of the divine energies to the divine essence and is associated with the name of St Gregory Palamas (1296–1359). Eunomius, of course, had discussed all this himself, and as a result, 'Eunomian' was an epithet that could be used by either side.²⁶ It is difficult to use an epithet effectively, however, without knowing something about those to whom it refers, and this sparked an interest in the now shadowy figure of the bishop of Cyzicus. As a result, Eunomius' works began to be copied and read²⁷ once more. Indeed, two of the surviving

²⁴ For the MSS and their locations see Vaggione, appendix II, no. 2, 186–7.

²⁵ The so-called 'Latinophrone' reading at Basil, *Eun.* 3. 1. 27 apparatus (SC 305. 146, cf. 146–7 n. 1).

²⁶ For Palamas, see the list of his works printed in PG 150. Codex 98 (olim 212): 2, 17 (812), 2, 19 (812–13), 3, 10 (814); Codex W (olim 215): 3 (829), and his remarks in the *Capita physica* 83 (PG 150. 1180D), 124 (1208C), 125–6 (1208C–1209C), 150 (1225B). Palamas' opponents were also eager to use the accusation of Eunomianism, though from a somewhat different perspective. In their eyes Palamas himself was: τοῦ νέου τούτου ὁυσοεβοῦς Εὐνομίου, as in Nicephorus Gregoras, *Byzant. Hist.* 23. 2. 11 (PG 148. 1396B), cf. 19. 4. 5–6 (PG 148. 1220B–C), etc.

²⁷ At C. *Gregoram* 8 (PG 151. 966B) the violently pro-Palamite Patriarch

manuscripts of the *Liber Apologeticus* can be connected with this controversy.²⁸

The manuscripts in question (along with one other) appear to have entered Italy in 1438 in the luggage of the Greek delegation to the Council of Florence. Since the *Filioque* was naturally enough one of the principal points at issue, manuscripts of Basil were at a premium. The West had already condemned the teaching of Palamas, so the teaching of his alleged avatar, Eunomius, was also under discussion.²⁹ This was facilitated by the fact that several of the copies of the *Adversus Eunomium* actually present at the Council contained copies of the *Liber Apologeticus*. As a result, one of Eunomius' own works thus became available in the West for the first time. Very shortly thereafter a copy was made, possibly at the instigation of Pico della Mirandola, that found its way into the collection of Domenico, Cardinal Grimani, at Venice. The latter willed it in turn to the Augustinians of San Antonio di Castello in the same city. The nearly contemporary outbreak of religious revolt in northern Europe led to a renewed interest in Church history, and a few years later, when delegates to the Council of Trent were scouring local libraries for information on the subject, one of the ones they visited was that of San Antonio. There they found the *Liber Apologeticus* of Eunomius. Due to the efforts of the Spanish and French ambassadors, a member of the Fuggers banking house, and a number of private individuals, six new copies began to circulate in Western Europe.³⁰

Philotheus quotes Eun., *Apol.* 15. 7, 9-11 (Vaggione 52). Philotheus (or his source) must actually have read the *Apology* because Basil nowhere quotes this section entire but gives it (with lacunae) in two separate sections, *Eun.* 2. 18. 3-7, 19. 38-41 (*SC* 305. 70, 78). Philotheus' version also has a lacuna, but not the same one.

²⁸ MSS G and I, described Vaggione 18-22. For this and what follows, see R. P. Vaggione, OHC, 'The Other Half of a Controversy: The Rediscovery of One of Basil's Opponents in Renaissance Italy', *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Patristic, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies* (Villanova, Pa.), 6 (1981), 101-16.

²⁹ Eunomius himself figures prominently in their debate: J. Gill, SJ (ed.), *Quae Supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini* (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1913), 210-387, summarized in Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 194-226.

³⁰ Codices VMOSAF, see Vaggione 23-4.

These copies reflect the beginnings of a paradigm shift in the way early dissident authors were being read. Naturally, they were still considered heretics, but the fact that they were being read at all shows that people were becoming aware that theology *had* a history, that it was something more than just transmission. Some of the fruits of that realization can be seen in the copies made in the following century. There are eleven seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century manuscripts of Eunomius,³¹ almost all of them copies of those made at Trent. They can almost all be associated with one or another of the learned circles of the day, and among their owners can count Queen Christina of Sweden, her librarian Isaac Vossius, two archbishops of Canterbury, and many of the participants in the Socinian controversy. It was one of the latter, William Whiston, who translated the *Liber Apologeticus* into English and published it in 1711. The loveable and eccentric Whiston, who was Newton's successor at Cambridge, was defrocked for what can only be described as an excess of candour and enthusiasm. He responded by endeavouring 'to let all the Church see how grossly they [had] been impos'd upon, by putting . . . the Testimonies into English'.³² Since his aim was to lay the foundations of a 'Primitive Christianity Reviv'd', he thought that in the non-Nicene framework visible in the works of Eunomius he had found it.³³ Few of his contemporaries were convinced, but it was not long before they had an opportunity to judge for themselves. The *editio princeps* of the Greek original appeared only a few years later, and the age of manuscripts was over.³⁴

With that, the study of 'Arianism' moved into a new, and more self-consciously scientific era. Yet partly because of that, and partly because of the outcome of earlier research, it also

³¹ Codices PWLHNTEYQRJ, see Vaggione 24–5, and for their provenance and history see Vaggione, 'An Appeal to Antiquity: The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Manuscripts of the Heretic Eunomius', in Gregg, *Arianism*, 335–60.

³² W. Whiston, *An Historical Preface to Primitive Christianity Reviv'd* (London, 1711), 27.

³³ For a general discussion of Whiston and his contemporaries, see M. Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism through the Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 62–164.

³⁴ By J. A. Fabricius in 1717, see Vaggione 27.

spelt the end of a presupposition shared by many of those who had earlier read Eunomius: that 'the Ancient Fathers . . . before Constantine the Great . . . had extraordinary Revelations of God's Will vouchsafed to them which after ceased'.³⁵ Even those who rejected this assumption in its religious form accepted something like it in a more secular guise: they assumed that Christian thought developed from some unitary deposit that a judicious historian might discover.³⁶ The actual diversity of Christian thought made that assumption first perilous and then untenable, and required a shift in the parameters of the debate. For while it could not be denied that doctrine was propositional in form, propositional manipulation did not seem to account for the changes observed; they did not progress in a linear fashion, as inferences, say, proceed from premisses.³⁷ That left scholars working within the Christian tradition in a quandary. For if they could not well deny that doctrine changed in substance as well as in form, they had not only to describe the changes, but to determine which ones were 'true' and which 'false'. Even those whose purview did not include the latter problem experienced difficulties—their categories did not seem to fit the subject. Given that the latter was propositional in form, why was it so difficult to explain solely in propositional terms? What seemed to be needed was a new set of categories that could encompass the historical and the propositional without minimizing either.

Similar difficulties, of course, have been experienced by historians of science, and in this book I have used one of their solutions:³⁸ I have assumed that the arguments of the propositional debate are the reflections of more comprehensive but less fully articulated hermeneutical frameworks used to select and

³⁵ P. Brokesby, *The Life of Mr. Henry Dodwell* (London: Printed by Geo. James, for Richard Smith, 1715), i. 60.

³⁶ Even Gibbon could look back to a period before Trajan or Hadrian when 'the disciples of the Messiah were indulged in a freer latitude both of faith and practice than has ever been allowed in succeeding ages', *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (New York: Random House, n. d.); i, ch. 15, 393.

³⁷ In other words, it could not be shown that later doctrines are deduced from earlier ones the way logical conclusions are deduced from premisses; this implied some more personal or 'historical' element. See Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 44–8.

³⁸ See above, Ch. 4 n. 157.

define them. That assumption seems to allow us to take the propositions at full seriousness while at the same time recognizing that there are factors that transcend them. In effect, it gives us a 'two-track' view of doctrinal history: we use the propositions and the frameworks to account for one another. By expanding the 'matter' of doctrinal history, we seem to have accounted for most of the phenomena of doctrinal history, but that also requires a change in the way we perceive the 'rhythm' of the story.

To some extent, of course, we do that already. Since at least the time of Harnack we have generally conceded that *homoousios* meant more in 381 than it did in 325.³⁹ We have been less quick, however, to recognize that this implies an interpretative principle not contained within the word itself. And yet if we acknowledge that the meaning changed while the word did not, we have already acknowledged that there is another factor at work. In this book I have tried to take account of that factor. I have assumed that doctrinal history requires a model which includes not only propositions, but the frameworks governing their choice. The resulting model may be more complex than those to which we have become accustomed, but it also seems to explain more.

At the beginning of this work I said that among the reasons for studying Eunomius as an individual was a desire to use him as a *pou sto*, a fixed point from which to observe the larger changes around him. Now, as we near the end of our study, we need to ask whether such an approach has shed any light on the meaning of the controversy as a whole. For the mere fact that so many people adopted the Nicene framework as well as Nicene language was indeed the sign of a revolution—it marked a change in the way large numbers of people envisioned their place in the universe, and the means used by God to redeem them. Within that larger transition Eunomius indeed played only a minor part, and yet viewed from his vantage-point it is possible to see that the surrounding landscape and mountain were larger than we imagined. We can get a sense of this by looking briefly at the entire process in outline.

³⁹ Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma* (New York: Dover Publications, 1961), iv. 81–9.

We usually think of the 'Arian' controversy as beginning with its first public appearance in the years preceding 318 and ending with the triumph of '(neo-)Nicene' Orthodoxy in 381. This is certainly not untrue as regards the propositional debate, but if we start to look beyond it and ask what criteria were used to chose the propositions, then we find we must expand our definition of the controversy as well: its beginnings lie well before 318, and its final resolution after 381. At each stage we must allow time for the growth and acceptance of the frameworks used to choose the propositions. That gives us the following (very rough) sequence:

254-318 (from the death of Origen to the excommunication of Arius)

318-325 (from the excommunication of Arius to Nicaea)

325-350 (from Nicaea to the death of Constans)

350-361 (From the revolt of Magnentius to the death of Constantius)

Development of the main structures of the non-Nicene (Lucianist?) framework.

The non-Nicene framework enters public consciousness and is identified by many with their 'ancestral' faith.

Homoousios is adopted, but without a clear hermeneutical context. Some non-Nicene propositions are explicitly rejected; Arius' opponents begin to articulate an alternate framework.

Increasing emphasis on formulae as guaranteeing one position or the other. The Nicenes begin to lay greater emphasis on *homoousios* while others look for an equivalent; the non-Nicene framework comes under pressure over the issue of 'similarity' and the metaphor of birth; the government attempts to achieve a new propositional beginning.

361-378 (from the accession of Julian to Adrianople)	Nicaenes seize the initiative by distinguishing between <i>ousia</i> and <i>hypostasis</i> , and by relaxing <i>akribeia</i> ; <i>homoousios</i> becomes more widely accepted; a government attempt to reimpose Constantius' propositional solution leave the non-Nicene framework in stasis.
378-383 (from the death of Valens to the Council of Heresies)	The government imposes the (neo-)Nicene propositional solution, with some tolerated non-Nicene dissidence in the suburbs.
383-431 (from the Council of Heresies to the Council of Ephesus)	Increasingly fragmented non-Nicene community. Widespread popular identification of <i>homoousios</i> and the Nicene framework with 'ancestral' faith. More explicit references to the Nicene formula and framework in the liturgy and ordinary Church life.

As we can see, choosing to take into account the development of the frameworks as well as their propositional expression has definitely forced us to extend the story. For while the non-Nicene framework came as a surprise to many of Arius' hearers, its main structures must have been in place long before he brought them to the attention of the public. And that helps us account for some of the movement's more puzzling features: for instance, the curious ambivalence felt by almost all 'Arians' about Arius. The latter, after all, enjoyed a good deal of general support, but there is little to show that anyone considered him authoritative in his own right or thought he was a 'doctor'. Then too, there is the speed with which the propositional controversy spread, both geographically and socially. It moved outside Egypt virtually on the morrow of its inception, and very nearly as quickly outside the charmed circle of 'experts'. If

Arius were indeed only one element in a wider dialogue that is perfectly understandable—his teaching already resonated in other pulpits. Finally, there is the stability of the non-Nicene framework itself. As this book bears abundant witness, the propositional history was one of endless, confusing adjustment, and yet so far as we can see over the same period the hermeneutical structure scarcely changed at all. That too is understandable if Arius was working within a framework he shared with other 'Arians', but one whose formative period was in the past. Thus for him, as for Eunomius, the theologian's task was to explain and defend an existing framework, not create a new one. This latter task was in any case unnecessary, for the apostles had left us one already.

But if Arius' role *vis-à-vis* the framework was that of disseminator rather than creator, what happened when he confronted his bishop was that a particular way of thinking of and imagining the Christian story entered the public domain. Presumably he expressed this in his own terms, but as he tells us himself,⁴⁰ his goal was to interpret not create. Like Aetius and Eunomius after him, his aim was to expound a 'pious and governing tradition' that had come down to him 'from the fathers'.⁴¹ That being said, the collective perception that they were defending an inherited and not a freshly invented vision permits us to understand the rancour of the 'Arian' internal debate. Aetius and Eunomius were perfectly willing to challenge Arius on the grounds of *akribeia*, but the reason they did so with such vigour was that he was thought to be betraying a common vision. That also allows us to understand why their attention remained so fixed on those in or near their own camp: they were unable to take the Nicene theology seriously until almost the end because prior to 360 they took it to be more or less equivalent to Sabellianism. Thus Eustathius and Basil of Ancyra were their primary theological opponents, not Marcellus and Athanasius. It was only in the very different world of the 370s that this began to change, and that helps us understand why, when Eunomius did begin to take the Nicenes

⁴⁰ In the *Thalia*, as quoted in Ath., *Ar.* 1. 5 (PG 26. 20C–21A). This ignores his actual speculative contributions, but *vis-à-vis* the framework itself is accurate enough.

⁴¹ Eun., *Apol.* 4. 6–7 (Vaggione 36–8).

seriously, his focus remained on an ex-disciple of Eustathius, Basil the Great. By that time, of course, it was much too late. The rising neo-Nicene tide overwhelmed both the fractious 'old' Nicenes at Constantinople and Antioch, and their 'semi-Arian' opponents. Within a generation both had been absorbed, and only the rival extremes remained, excluded by their own *akribeia*. We have long recognized the role played in this by Eustathius and Basil of Ancyra; it is the contribution of those whose 'precision' left them definitively on the outside that we now need to remember as well.

One way to do this is by reflecting on the nature of the controlling frameworks. For as I have noted in the body of this work, while these frameworks were articulated in intellectual terms, they contained a substantial imaginative element. Moreover, their adherents considered them 'inherited' and 'apostolic', even though a modern critic usually does not require much time to discover that they contain both traditional and newly minted elements. Still, this helps us understand why Arius could, on the one hand, claim to have learnt his theology at Alexander's knee,⁴² while on the other the latter was denouncing him for innovation contrary to scripture.⁴³ They were neither of them altogether wrong. If we are looking for a word that characterizes this curious amalgam of new and old, intellectual and imaginative, one possibility is 'conglomerate'.⁴⁴ This word designates a single entity which, though one, is none the less composed of distinct parts. Entities of this kind are notoriously unstable, but they are also, for that very reason, dynamic. When a group receives a conglomerate of this kind as inherited rather than invented, it becomes a significant part of its group-identity, something to be interpreted and defended, but not (without great provocation) to be changed.

The non-Nicenes arrived on the scene already possessed of just such an 'inherited conglomerate', one they considered 'apostolic', while their opponents had the ingredients of a conglomerate, but one they still had to give coherent shape.

⁴² Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 1 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 1-2).

⁴³ Alex. Al., *Ep. Encycl.* 7 (Urkunde 4b, Opitz iii. 7. 17-18).

⁴⁴ The terminology is that of E. R. Dodds in his classic study, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1973), 179-81, 243-4.

That is why the Council of Nicaea found it so difficult to give Constantine the unity he sought. Among its members were those who could condemn the offending propositions, and just as many, perhaps, who could acquiesce in its formula, but very few who had a framework within which to understand it. For those who continued to regard the council as authoritative, the construction of such a framework was to occupy the next twenty-five years. It was not the work of any one individual, though the contribution of Athanasius was crucial, but by the date of the latter's triumphal return in 346 it was coherent enough to make *homoousios* the vehicle of a total vision. A decade later the deliberate relaxation of *akribeia* and a new terminology laid a foundation for popular victory.

What is striking about all this is that, when we compare the developmental paths of the two frameworks, we find that their respective 'rhythms' were markedly different. The non-Nicenes developed their framework in comparative independence, and did not therefore have to confront a genuine alternative until much later.⁴⁵ Not so their opponents. The Nicenes *started* with an alternative already in place. What that meant for the 'rhythm' of the two movements was that the impact of each framework on the other was quite different. We have already noted that the non-Nicene framework was little affected by that of the Nicenes until almost the end. The Nicenes, on the other hand, were obliged to take account of their opponents' framework right from the beginning. They could not afford, in other words, the luxury of separating apologetics from systematics. As a result, the non-Nicene theologians tended to have a much greater impact on their opponents than the other way around. Both frameworks resulted from a dialectic, but that of the non-Nicenes was primarily from one within their own school; that of the Nicenes was perforce broader—it had to be constructed with one eye cocked toward an existing alternative. The Nicene framework, then, was shaped in part by that of its opponents. Each was a

⁴⁵ There were, of course, just as many alternate systems of theology in the late 3rd and early 4th cents. as there were after Arius had his historic confrontation, but none of these was close enough to the non-Nicene to tempt its supporters seriously. As we have repeatedly seen, much of the quarrel can be explained by proximity, not separation.

conglomerate, and each contained both traditional and newly minted elements, but for the Nicenes the selection and the relative importance accorded those elements was partly determined by the enemy they had to face. Within the total process the non-Nicenes served a vital function. They helped to determine which issues would be considered, and thus contributed to a developing Christian consensus that was forming not just in spite of them, but because of them.

The council of 381 and the imperial legislation that followed brought with it (neo-)Nicene propositional victory. Acceptance of the Nicene framework, however, took much longer. What the council achieved in effect was a propositional *modus vivendi* that allowed time for this to happen. In the fifty years that followed Constantinople I, the Nicene framework, like Nicene language, became part of the mental furniture of most Christians. Eunomius and his *periti* became a minority within a minority, but for all that their contribution did not die when they did. That was not because they invented a framework—far from it—but because they defended the one they received with such vigour and ‘precision’. Theirs indeed was not the road taken, but simply by being who they were and saying what they said they helped to determine the course taken by others. They contributed to that validation of ordinary language that moved theology beyond the study. In the continuing dialectic of theological change, they helped to lay the foundation of the new ‘conglomerate’ that was even then starting to take shape.

To one degree or another, of course, we ourselves are the inheritors of that conglomerate. The religious elements, indeed, that we have been studying were only one part of it, and it came ultimately to include history, geography,⁴⁶ and almost all the other elements that define a world (*κόσμος*). And yet it is clear that for some centuries now this ‘world’ has been under strain and is perhaps breaking down, and that, just possibly, a new one is in the process of formation. At any rate, we ourselves are clearly in mid-stream, and it is that which makes the study of the conglomerate we have so essential. The work contained

⁴⁶ This was a process in which Eunomius’ followers too played a part. Among those concerned with the detailed shape of the physical world and its relation to the imagined historical and theological world of scripture was Philostorgius, e.g. *HE* 3. 6–11 (*GCS* 35. 12–42. 35).

in this volume is intended to be a contribution to that effort. Yet we may still ask whether there is anything to be learnt from this stormy passage in the creation of a world most of us have called 'home' for a millennium and a half. Doubtless there is, but the simplest lesson is perhaps only this: that as a process it looked vastly different from within and from without. To those in mid-stream (including Eunomius) it must have looked like a battle 'waged at night' often enough, a struggle without form or logic. And yet to us who have been gifted with hindsight, it is clear that the battle was indeed dialectical, and that even chaos had a 'rhythm'. It is Euripides, then, who perhaps put it best:

... τὰ δοκηθέντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθη,
τῶν δ' ἀδοκῆτων πόρον ἡδρε θεός.
τοιόνδ' ἀπέβη τόδε πρᾶγμα.

... the things we looked for never came,
God brought the unforeseen to be,
and that is what has happened here.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ *Bacchae* 1390-92.

APPENDIX

Theologically Significant Passages of Scripture Used by Non-Nicenes

The list which follows includes only passages mentioned in the notes. The entries are not necessarily exhaustive, but they do contain every instance of non-Nicene usage the author has been able to find, arranged in very rough chronological order. They are either from works by non-Nicenes, or from those of other schools which specifically ascribe such usage to them. 'Cf.' before an entry means that the item in question is an allusion rather than a direct quotation. No attempt is made to distinguish shorter citations within a longer passage. The numbers in parentheses at the end of each heading indicate the chapter and note number in the main text.

Genesis 1: 26

(4/349)

Cf. Germinius, *Ep. Ruf.* 1. 4 (CSEL 65. 161. 26-162. 1); Cyril, *Thes.* 19 (PG 75. 317B); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 26 (PL 42. 739); Vigilius, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 1. 8 (PL 62. 185C, D); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 4. 80^r. 17-19 (CCL 87/i. 96), *Job* 1 (PG 17. 374A).

Genesis 18: 1-33

(4/302)

Cf. (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 204-5 (SC 146. 74); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 134. 346^v. 37 (SC 267. 316); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 26 (PL 42. 739); Aug., *Trin.* 2. 11. 21-3, 12. 3-4 (CCL 50. 107, 108); Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 1. 2. 7^v. 24-8^v. 5 (CCL 87/i. 47), *Jud.* 14. 2. 97^v. 7-9 (CCL 87/i. 115), *Anmunt.* 3. 15 (Leroy, *Epektasis*, 350).

Genesis 19: 24**(4/301)**

(Ps.-?)Ath., *Trin. et Spir.* 3 (PG 26. 1193B); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 705B); cf. Eun., *EF* 3. 34-5 (Vaggione 154); cf. Julian, *Job* (Hagedorn 221. 7-8); Vigilius, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 1. 8 (PL 62. 185D); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 2. 97°. 10-11, cf. 2. 5. 80°. 3-7 (CCL 87/i. 115, cf. 96), *Job* 1 (PG 17. 423A).

Genesis 32: 23-31**(4/303)**

Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 134. 346°. 38 (SC 267. 316); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 3. 97°. 17-18 (CCL 87/i. 116), cf. *Job* 1 (PG 17. 390A).

Exodus 3: 1-15**(4/304)**

Asterius Sophista apud Marcellus, *Fr.* 63 (GCS iv. 196. 28); cf. Eusebius, *Ep. Alex.* 4 (Urkunde 7, Opitz iii. 15. 3, 4, 5); Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 8. 56-7 (CCL 62. 109); Eun., *Apol.* 8. 3, 17. 2, 28. 4 (Vaggione 42, 54, 74), *AA* 3 (J ii. 273. 24, 26, cf. 251. 19-20, 22, 255. 3, 277. 27), *EF* 2. 6, 13 (Vaggione 150); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 71. 3 (GCS iii. 219. 1-3); cf. Aug., *Trin.* 3. 10. 53-8, cf. 44-5 (CCL 50. 152); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 26 (PL 42. 740); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 14. 4. 98°. 2-3, 6-7, cf. 97°. 26-98°. 2 (CCL 87/i. 116).

Psalms 44 (45): 7-8**(4/410)**

Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 14 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 22. 1-3); Eus. Nic. et Arius apud Ath., *Ar.* 1. 37 (PG 26. 88C); Hilary, *Trin.* 11. 10. 11, cf. 4. 34. 4ff. (CCL 62A. 539, cf. 62. 138); cf. (Ps.-) Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 705B); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 13 (PG 39. 860D); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 16 (PL 42. 734); Vigilius, *Ar. Dial.* 2. 9, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 1. 9, 2. 29 (PL 62. 174A, 186A, 216B); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 3. 3. 81°. 17-21, 22 (CCL 87/i. 97), *Comm. in Lc.* 1: 32. 29°. 6-7, 4: 18. 143°. 7-8 (CCL 87/i. 205, 212), *Fid.*, fr. 19, 5. 66. 47-50 (CCL 87/i. 260).

Psalm 109 (110): 1**(4/337)**

Germinius Sirmiensis apud *Heracl.* (PLS i. 349 ad initium); cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 4. 3-4 (SC 250. 230); cf. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 705B); *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 10. 6, 9 (GCS ii. 105. 4-5, 11); cf. Ambrose, *Fid.* 2. 12. 24-5, 39-40 [103, 104] (CSEL 78. 95); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 135. 347'. 16-19 (SC 267. 316); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 4 (PL 42. 725); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 3. 4. 81'. 2-3, 5 (CCL 87/i. 97), *Haer.* 4. 134'. 19-20, 135'. 6-9, 20 (CCL 87/i. 144), *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 2, 5. 196. 20-2 (CCL 87/i. 233), cf. *Fid.*, fr. 17, 5. 71. 50-5. 72. 2, fr. 19, 5. 66. 41-5 (CCL 87/i. 255, 260), *Sermo* 9 (PL 42. 680).

Psalm 109 (110): 3**(4/337)**

Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 5 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 13. 17) [= Hahn, § 186, p. 256], Asterius Sophista apud Marcellus, *Fr.* 28, cf. 29 (GCS iv. 189. 18-19, cf. 23-4); cf. Anomoei apud (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 6 (PG 28. 1125C); cf. Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 444. 11-15 (SC 231. 302); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 101. 339'. 46 (SC 267. 288); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 18 (PL 42. 734); Vigilius, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 1. 13, 2. 11 (PL 62. 189B, 205A); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 13. 2. 96'. 1-3, 5. 96'. 14-17, 22-3, 97'. 2-3 (CCL 87/i. 114, 115), *Comm. in Lc.* 1: 33. 29'. 1-2 (CCL 87/i. 206).

Psalm 109 (110): 4**(4/337)**

Ar. ign., *Jud.* 9. 6. 91'. 6-9 (CCL 87/i. 108).

Proverbs 8: 22-5**(4/28)**

Arius, *Ep. Eus.* 5 (Urkunde 1, Opitz iii. 3. 3); Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 4 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 16. 11-12); Eusebiani apud Ath., *Decr.* 13. 1 (Opitz ii. 11. 17); *Symb. Ant.* (345) 8. 2 apud Ath., *Syn.* 26 (Opitz ii. 253. 28-9) [= Hahn, § 159, p. 195]; Ath., *Ar.* 1. 53 (PG 26. 121B), 2. 1, 18, 72 (PG 26. 148A, 184C, 301A), 3. 1 (PG 26. 321B), *Dion.* 10. 1, 11. 1 (Opitz ii. 53. 4, 54. 7), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 17 (PG 25. 576C), *Ep. Serap.* 2. 7, 9 (PG 26.

620A, 624A); cf. Ath., *Inc. et c. Ar.* 6 (PG 26. 992C); (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 14, 21, 39 (PG 26. 1269C, 1273C, 1289D), *Disp.* 14, 15, 16, 18 (PG 28. 453A, 453C/D, 456A, C, 457B); Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 35. 4-5, 4. 11. 15-16 (CCL 62. 34, 112), 12. 1. 16-17, 35. 7-8 (CCL 62A. 579, 606); Acac. Caes. apud *Cat. Gen.* 2. 10. 8-10 (CCG 15. 9); Eun., *Apol.* 26. 15-16, 28. 23-4, cf. 12. 2-3, 17. 13-14 (Vaggione 70, 74, cf. 46-8, 54), *AA* 3 (J ii. 10. 25-11. 8), *EF* 3. 4-5 (Vaggione 152); Anomoei apud (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 9 (PG 28. 1129D, 1132B); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 12. 1, 14. 1 (GCS iii. 162. 6-11, 163. 23-5); (Ps.-?) Basil, *Ep.* 8. 8. 2 (Courtonne i. 32); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 704A); Grg. Naz., cf. *Or.* 29. 18. 3, 30. 2. 2 (SC 250. 214, 226); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 3 (PG 39. 805C); Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 15. 8 [96] (CSEL 78. 42); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 533. 33 (SC 237. 226); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 110. 341^v. 1-3, 37. 42-3, 134. 346^v. 35-7 (SC 267. 294, 296, 316); Vigilius, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 1. 13 (PL 62. 189B); Ar. ign., *Jud.* 2. 3. 79^v. 25-80^f. 2, 12. 3. 95^f. 10-13 (CCL 87/i. 95, 113), *Comm. in Lc.* 1: 33. 29^v. 4 (CCL 87/i. 206).

Job 38: 17**(4/386)**

Symb. Sirm. 3 (Hahn, § 163, p. 204); *Symb. CP* (360) (Hahn, § 167, p. 209); cf. (Ps.-)Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 380-1 (SC 146. 92); Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 3. 4. 48^f. 15-18 (CCL 87/i. 58-9).

Joel 2: 25**(6/246)**

Ath., *Decr.* 20. 2 (Opitz ii. 16. 38-17. 1), *Ar.* 1. 5, 2. 37 (PG 26. 21B/C, 227A), *Syn.* 18. 7, 39. 4 (Opitz ii. 246. 16, 265. 22-3), *Ep. Afr.* 5 (PG 26. 1040A), *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 12, 16 (PG 25. 565B, 576A); Soc., *HE* 1. 36. 2 (GCS 86. 7-8); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 3 (PG 39. 476B).

Isaiah 1: 2**(6/245)**

Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 7 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 17. 1-2); Alex. Al., *Ep. Alex.* 11 (Urkunde 14, Opitz iii. 21. 16); Acac. Caes., *Fr. Marcell.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 72. 9. 5 (GCS iii. 263. 24-5); Hilary, *Trin.* 6. 23. 16-17, cf. 12. 13. 10-11 (CCL 62. 222, cf.

62A. 588); cf. Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 1. 414. 8-9, 4. 514. 39 (SC 231. 212, 237. 170); Vigilius, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 2. 11 (PL 62. 205B).

Matthew 4: 2, cf. Luke 4: 2

(4/183)

Cf. Hilary, *Trin.* X. 24. 1 (CCL 62A. 478); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 10 (SC 250. 214); Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 5. 1.50^v. 23 (CCL 87/i. 62).

Matthew 20: [20-]23, cf. Mark 10: 40

(4/187)

Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 19. 3, 58. 1 (GCS iii. 168. 18-23; 205. 28-206. 5); cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 7 (SC 250. 214); Eunomiani apud Cyril, *Thes.* 26 (PG 75. 413C); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 708C); Ambrose, *Fid.* V. 5. 6-10 (CSEL 78. 238); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 29 (PG 39. 945D-948A).

Matthew 22: 43-5, Mark 12: 35-7, Luke 20: 41-4

(4/355)

(Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 33 (PG 39. 957C-960A); cf. Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 4 (PL 42. 725).

Matthew 24: 36, cf. Mark 13: 32

(4/182)

Ath., *Ar.* 3. 26, 42 (PG 26. 380B, 412A), *Ep. Serap.* 2. 9 (PG 26. 621C, 624B), *Inc. et c. Ar.* 1, 7 (PG 26. 985C, 993C); Hilary, *Syn.* 85 (PL 10. 537 A-B), *Trin.* 1. 29. 37-8, 30. 10-12 (CCL 62. 28, 28-9), 9. 2. 21-2, 58. 2-4 (CCL 62A. 372, 436-7); cf. Germinius Sirmiensis apud Heracl. (PLS i. 347 post medium); cf. (Ps.-?)Basil, *Ep.* 8. 6. 1-2, 12-13 (Courtonne i. 29); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 696B); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 15. 1-3, cf. 29. 18. 8 (SC 250. 256, cf. 214); Ambrose, *Fid.* 5. 16. 34-5 (CSEL 78. 289); cf. (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 22 (PG 39. 917A); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 15. 5, 43. 1 (GCS iii. 165. 1-4; 191. 4-7); cf. Ar. ign., *Fid.*, fr. 17, 5. 72. 2-4 (CCL 87/i. 255).

Matthew 26: 37, cf. Mark 14: 33

(4/180)

Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 11 (SC 250. 214); cf. Ar. ign., *Job* 3 (PG 17. 515C).

Matthew 26: 38, cf. Mark 14: 34**(4/180)**

Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 31. 8 (CCL 62. 29), 10. 9. 8-9, 29. 2-3, 36. 2-3, cf. 22. 12 (CCL 62A. 466, 484, 489, cf. 475); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 21 (PG 39. 900B).

Matthew 26: 39**(4/179)**

Ath., *Ar.* 3. 26, 54 (PG 26. 377C, 436B); Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 31. 12 (CCL 62. 29), 10. 9. 10-11 (CCL 62A. 466); cf. (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 697A); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 12. 10-11 (SC 250. 250); Amphilochius Iconiensis apud Thdt., *Eran.* 3. 1. 304 (Ettlinger 243. 1-2); Ambrose, *Fid.* 2. 5. 12-14, 44-5 (CSEL 78. 70, 72); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 21 (PG 39. 900B); Ar. ign., *Job* 3 (PG 17. 515C); Ar. ign., *Sermo* 6 (PL 42. 679).

Matthew 27: 46, cf. Mark 15: 34**(4/181)**

Ath., *Ar.* 3. 26, 54 (PG 26. 380A, 436B), *Inc. et c. Ar.* 1 (PG 26. 985C), (Ps.-)Ath., *Ar.* 4. 6 (PG 26. 476B); Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 31. 16-17, 6. 25. 6-7 (CCL 62. 29-30, 225), 10. 31. 2-3, 49. 3-4, cf. 51. 15-16 (CCL 62A. 485, 503, cf. 505); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 19. 5, 63. 2 (GCS iii. 168. 28-169. 1; 212. 3-4); Eunomiani apud Cyril, *Thes.* 10 (PG 75. 124D); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 21 (PG 39. 900B, cf. 901A).

Matthew 28: 19**(8/128).**

Arius et Euzoius, *Ep. Const.* 4 (Urkunde 30, Opitz iii. 64. 13-14) [= Hahn, § 187, p. 257], *Symb. Ant.* (341) 2 apud Ath., *Syn.* 23. 5 (Opitz ii. 249. 28-9) [= Hahn, § 154, p. 185]; *Symb. Sirm.* 2 apud Hilary, *Syn.* 11 (PL 10. 489B); Ath., *Syn.* 28. 11 (Opitz ii. 257. 24-5) [= Hahn, § 161, p. 201]; Auxentius Mediolanensis, *Ep.* apud Hilary, *Auxent.* 14 (PL 10. 618A/B); cf. Germinius Sirmiensis apud Heracl. (PLS i. 345 ad pedem); (Ps.-)Ath., *Ar.* 4. 6 (PG 26. 476A, B); Ambrose, *Fid.* 5. 9. 1-6 [116] (CSEL 78. 259-60); cf. Eun., *Apol.* 25. 3-4 (Vaggione 66), *AA* 3 (J ii. 284. 22); Vigilus, *Ar. Dial.* 1. 5 (PL 62. 158C), cf. *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 1. 3 (PL 62. 181D-182A); cf. Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 2. 7. 45^r. 9-10 (CCL 87/i. 55).

Mark 10: 18, cf. Luke 18: 19**(4/186, 372)**

Ath., *Inc. et c. Ar.* 1, 7 (PG 26. 985C, 993A); Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 29. 15–16, 4. 8. 22 (CCL 62. 27, 107), 9. 2. 9–10, 15. 12 (CCL 62A. 372, 386); cf. (Ps.-?) Aetius, *Fr.* apud Anast. S., *Monoph.* 4. 1. 33 (CCG 12. 88); Eun., *Apol.* 21. 12 (Vaggione 60), *AA* 3 (J ii. 264. 6–7); Anomoei apud (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 1. 11 (PG 28. 1133B); Eunomiani apud Cyril, *Thes.* 9 (PG 75. 113D); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 700C); Macedoniani et Anomoei apud (Ps.-?) Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 3 (PG 39. 476A); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 13. 3 (SC 250. 252); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 19. 1, 57. 1 (GCS 3. 168. 11–12; 204. 18–20); Ambrose, *Fid.* 2. 1. 7–8 (CSEL 78. 63); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 103. 340^r. 7–10 (SC 267. 288); Maximinus, *Comment.* 39. 304^r. 35–6 (SC 267. 234); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 23 (PL 42. 738); Ar. ign., *Fid.*, fr. 17, 5. 197. 18 (CCL 87/i. 256).

Luke 6: 12**(4/180)**

Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 8 (SC 250. 214).

Luke 22: 44**(4/181)**

Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 11, 30. 16. 16–17 (SC 250. 214, 260).

Luke 23: 46**(4/186)**

Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 31. 19–20 (CCL 62. 30), 10. 9. 11–12, 34. 3–4 (CCL 62A. 466, 487); (Ps.-?) Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 30 (PG 39. 949A/B); cf. Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 3. 4. 48^r. 6 (CCL 87/i. 58), *Sermo* 7 (PL 42. 679).

John 4: 6**(4/184)**

Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 10 (SC 250. 214); (Ps.-?) Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 21 (PG 39. 900B); cf. (Ps.-) Chrys., *Hom. Anom.* 1. 37 (SC 146. 58).

John 4: 22-24

(6/292)

Hilary, *Trin.* 4. 8. 49-51 (CCL 62. 109); cf. Eun., *Apol.* 17. 6, 25. 13-16 (Vaggione 54, 66-8); Ambrose, *Fid.* 5. 4. 4-7 (CSEL 78. 236); Chrys., *Incomprehens.* 5. 395-6 (SC 28bis. 304); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 623. 3-5, cf. 5. 546. 17 (SC 246. 116, cf. 237. 264); Eunomiani apud Isidore, *Ep.* 3. 334 (PG 78. 989D-992A); Macedoniani apud (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 2. 10 (PG 39. 641B-644A); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 15 (PL 42. 733); cf. Auxentius Dorostorensis, *Ep.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 52. 306'. 21-2 (SC 267. 242); Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 11. 6. 67'. 3-4, 13. 5. 71'. 14-15 (CCL 87/i. 80, 85), *Fid.*, fr. 17, 5. 198. 10-13 (CCL 87/i. 256), *Sermo* 28 (PL 42. 681).

John 5: 19

(4/187)

(Ps.-)Ath., *Disp.* 7, cf. 8 (PG 28. 444C, cf. 445A); Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 29. 26-7 (CCL 62. 27), 9. 2. 17-18, 43. 3-5 (CCL 62A. 372, 419), *Const.* 17. 10-12 (SC 334. 202); Germinius, *Ep. Ruf.* 1. 3 (CSEL 65. 161. 15-17); cf. Aetius, *Ep. Mazona* apud *Doct. Patr.* 41. 30 (Diekamp 311. 23-4); Eun., *Apol.* 20. 21, 26. 22-3 (Vaggione 60, 70), *EF* 3. 6-7 (Vaggione 152); Anomoei apud (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 9 (PG 28. 1172C); (Ps.-?)Basil, *Ep.* 8. 9. 1-3 (Courtonne i. 33); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 697C); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 5-6, 30. 10. 1-2 (SC 250. 214, 242); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 78. 1 (GCS iii. 226. 14-15); Ambrose, *Fid.* 4. 4. 4-7, 54-9 (CSEL 78. 170, 172-3); Amphilochius Iconiensis apud Thdt., *Eran.* 1. 100, 2. 196, 3. 304 (Ettlinger 107. 21-2, 170. 21-2, 243. 25-6); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 6. 615. 26-9, 620. 33-6 (SC 246. 94, 110); Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.* fr. 7, 5. 204. 4-12 (CCL 87/i. 240), *Fid.*, fr. 21, A 32. 49-50 (CCL 87/i. 262), *Sermo* 20 (PL 42. 681).

John 14: 14-17

(4/180)

Symb. Ant. (341) 3 apud Ath., *Syn.* 24. 4 (Opitz ii. 250. 17) [= Hahn, § 155, p. 187]; *Symb. Sirm.* 3 apud Ath., *Syn.* 8. 6 (Opitz ii. 236. 7-10) [= Hahn, § 163, p. 205]; *Symb. CP* (360) apud Ath., *Syn.* 30. 7 (Opitz ii. 259. 12) [= Hahn, § 167, p. 209]; cf. Eun., *Apol.* 25. 17-18 (Vaggione 68), *EF* 4. 1-2 (Vaggione 156);

Auxentius Mediolanensis, *Ep.* apud Hilary, *Auxent.* 14 (PL 10. 618A); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 12 (PL 42. 716); Arianus ignotus, *Hom. Sollemn.* 5. 2. 51^r. 23-4 (CCL 87/i. 62), *Fid.*, fr. 23, 5. 207. 35-47 (CCL 87. 264-5), *Sermo* 34 (PL 42. 683).

John 14: 28

(4/186)

Cf. Ath. Anazarbenus, *Fr.*, apud Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 4, 5. 275. 30-2 (CCL 87/i. 235); Theognius Nicaenus, *Fr.*, apud Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 4, 5. 276. 9-11 (CCL 87/i. 235); Asterius Sophista apud Ath., *Ar.* 3. 2, cf. 1 (PG 26. 325A); Ath., *Inc. et c. Ar.* 4 (PG 26. 989B); (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 14, 39 (PG 26. 1269C, 1289D), *Disp.* 9, 10 (PG 28. 448A, C, 448D-449A); Anomoei apud (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 2. 7 (PG 28. 1168A); *Symb. Sirm.* 2 apud Hilary, *Syn.* 11 (PL 10. 489A) and Ath., *Syn.* 28. 7 (Opitz ii. 257. 13); Hilary, *Syn.* 85 (PL 10. 537A), *Trin.* 1. 29. 33, 4. 11. 24, 5. 6. 3-4, 7. 6. 3, cf. 6. 25. 2 (CCL 62. 28, 112, 156, 265, cf. 225), 9. 2. 18-19, 51. 8, 14, 58. 2 (CCL 62A. 372, 429, 436); Germinius Sirmiensiensis apud *Heracl.* (PLS i. 346 ad pedem, 347 ad initium); Eun., *Apol.* 11. 11-12 (Vaggione 46); Eunomiani apud Cyril, *Thes.* 11 (PG 75. 144D, cf. 140C) et apud Isid. Pel., *Ep.* 3. 334 (PG 78. 992B); (Ps.-?)Basil, *Ep.* 8. 5. 1 (Courtonne i. 28); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 693C); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 17. 4, 53. 1 (GCS iii. 166. 212; 199. 31); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 2, 30. 7. 1 (SC 250. 214, 240); Ambrose, *Fid.* 2. 8. 3-4, 5. 18. 53-4 (CSEL 78. 77, 302); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 18 (PG 39. 880A/B), cf. 1. 16 (PG 39. 340A); Amphilocheus Iconiensiensis apud Thdt., *Eran.* 1. 100, 2. 196, 3. 301 (Ettlinger 107. 6, 18-20, 170. 17, 242. 17-18); Wulfila apud Palladius, *Ep.* in Maximinus, *Comment.* 45. 305'. 2-3 (SC 267. 238); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 108. 341^r. 4 (SC 267. 292) et apud C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 36 (SC 267. 356); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13 (PL 42. 719); Aug., *Trin.* 1. 7. 13-15 (CCL 50. 45), cf. 2. 5. 2-3 (CCL 50. 87); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 566. 1, 573. 25-6, 574. 8-9 (SC 237. 324, 346, 348); Ar. ign., *Fid.*, fr. 16, 5. 199. 6-11 (CCL 87/i. 252).

John 20: 17**(4/210)**

Cf. Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 5 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 13. 16); *Symb. Sirm.* 2 (Hahn, §, 161, p. 200); Hilary, *Trin.* 1. 33. 6-7 (CCL 62. 31), 11. 8. 2-3, 11. 10. 2-3 (CCL 62A. 535, 539); Eun., *Apol.* 21. 10-11 (Vaggione 60), cf. *AA* 3 (J ii. 287. 17); Eunomiani apud Cyril, *Thes.* 10 (PG 75. 124D); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 2, 30. 7. 2 (SC 250. 214, 240); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 17. 5, 53. 1 (GCS iii. 166. 25-6; 201. 32-202. 1); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 9 (PG 39. 852B); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 566. 1-3, cf. 570. 37-42 (SC 237. 324, cf. 338); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13, 14. 16 (PL 42. 718, 733); cf. Vigilius, *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 2. 47 (PL 62. 228C).

Acts 2: 36**(4/192)**

Cf. Eustathius of Antioch, *Fr. in Pr.* 8: 22 apud Thdt., *Eran.* 3. 288 (Ettlinger 232. 15-17); Ath., *Ar.* 1. 53. 2. 11 (PG 26. 121C, 169B); (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 22 (PG 26. 1273D), *Disp.* 18 (PG 28. 460A); Eun., *Apol.* 26. 14-15 (Vaggione 70), cf. *AA* 3 (J ii. 112. 15, 17-18, 115. 21-2); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 704D); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 14. 2, 42. 1 (GCS iii. 164. 3-5; 189. 23-6); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 6 (PG 39. 841B); Ambrose, *Fid.* 1. 15. 2 (CSEL 78. 41); Amphilocheus Iconiensis apud Thdt., *Eran.* 3. 304 (Ettlinger 243. 17-19, 22-3); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 533. 34-6 (SC 237. 226), 6. 599. 24-7, cf. 605. 8-9 (SC 246. 48, cf. 64); cf. Ar. ign., *Haer.* 4. 135^v. 1-12 (CCL 87/i. 144).

Romans 8: 29**(4/297)**

Acac. Caes., *Fr. Rom.* (Staab 54. 29-30); cf. Eustathius, *Hom. in Pr.* 8: 22 apud Thdt., *Eran.* 2. 176 (Ettlinger 158. 2) Ath., *Ep. Afr.* 5 (PG 26. 1040A); Maximinus, *Comment.* 39. 304^f. 18-19 (SC 267. 234); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 2. 437. 2 (SC 231. 282); Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 8. 5. 59^v. 20-2 (CCL 87/i. 71-2).

Romans 16: 27**(6/241)**

Cf. Arius, *Ep. Alex.* 2 (Urkunde 6, Opitz iii. 12. 5), Eun., *Apol.* 21. 11 (Vaggione 60); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 13. 6 (SC 250. 252);

(Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 31 (PG 39. 949C); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 104. 340^f. 24-8 (SC 267. 288); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13, cf. 14, 14. 13 (PL 42. 719, cf. 723, 730); cf. Ar. ign., *Fid.*, fr. 22, 5. 210. 22-3 (CCL 87/i. 263).

1 Corinthians 1: 24

(4/29)

Asterius Sophista apud Ath., *Ar.* 1. 32, 2. 37 (PG 26. 77A-B, 225B), *Syn.* 18. 4 (Opitz ii. 246. 2-3); cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Disp.* 8, 11 (PG 28. 445B, 449A/B); Germinius, *Ep. Ruf.* 2. 1 (CSEL 65. 163. 3); Eun., *Apol.* 12. 2-3, 19. 3-4 (Vaggione 46-8, 56), *AA* 3 (J ii. 10. 25-11. 8), *F.* 4. 3 (Vaggione 178); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 7 (PG 39. 849A); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 104. 340^f. 28-30, cf. C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 21 (SC 267. 288, cf. 344); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 13 (PL 42. 730); cf. Ar. ign., *Jud.* 13. 4. 96^f. 21 (CCL 87/i. 114), *Fid.*, fr. 22, 5. 209. 35-7 (CCL 87/i. 263).

1 Corinthians 11: 12

(6/247)

Cf. Eus. Nic., *Ep. Paulin.* 8 (Urkunde 8, Opitz iii. 17. 7); Geo. Laod., *Ep. Alex.* (Urkunde 13. 3-4, Opitz iii. 19); cf. Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 3. 463. 8-9 (SC 237. 14).

1 Corinthians 15: 24-8

(4/31)

Cf. Agrippinus (presbyter?) Sirmiensis apud *Heracl.* (PLS i. 347-8); cf. (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 32 (PG 26. 1285C/D, 1288A); cf. Hilary, *Syn.* 79 (PL 10. 532B), *Trin.* 1. 33. 12-15, 11. 8. 8-11, 21. 1-6 (CCL 62. 31-2, 62A. 536, 551); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 693B); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 8, 30. 4. 2 (SC 250. 214, 230); Eun., *Apol.* 27. 14-15 (Vaggione 72); Anomoei apud Severianus Gabalensis, *Abr.* 5 (PG 56. 559C); Epiph., *Haer.* 69. 74. 2-3 (GCS iii. 221. 28-34); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 20, cf. 1. 31 (PG 39. 893A-B, 421A, 424B/C); Ambrose, *Fid.* 5. 12. 21-4, 28-30 [148, 149] (CSEL 78. 269-70); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 5. 546. 17-18, 582. 1-5, 583. 13-19 (SC 237. 264, 372, 376); cf. Palladius apud C. Aquileia, *Gesta* 39 (SC 267. 358); cf. Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 13, 14. 18 (PL 42. 719, 735);

Aug., *Trin.* 1. 8. 19-20, 22-3 (CCL 50. 47); Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 2, 5. 196. 25-8, 37-8 (CCL 87/i. 233), *Sermo* 34 (PL 42. 683, 684).

Philippians 2: 6-11

(4/189)

Eus. Nic. et Arius apud Ath., *Ar.* 1. 37 (PG 26. 88B-C); cf. Ath. Anazarbenus, Fr. apud Ar. ign., *C. Orth. et Maced.*, fr. 4, 5. 275. 28-9 (CCL 87/i. 235, = De Bruyne, ZNTW 27 (1928), 107); Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 112. 18-20, 114. 22-5, cf. 116. 15-18), *EF* 3. 42-3 (Vaggione 156); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 693B); cf. Grg. Naz., *Or.* 29. 18. 4, 30. 16. 13 (SC 250. 214, 260); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 10 (PG 39. 856B); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 3. 484. 35-7, cf. 5. 566. 33-4 (SC 237. 78, cf. 326); cf. Chrys., *Anom.* 10. 6 (PG 48. 792A); Ambrose, *Fid.* 2. 10. 1-3 [87] (CSEL 78. 87); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 10, 14. 2, 14, 15, cf. 25 (PL 42. 714, 724, 732, 733, cf. 738-9); Anomoei apud Sev. Gab., *Abr.* 2 (PG 56. 555B-C); Vigilius, *Ar. Dial.* 2. 9 (PL 62. 174A), *Ar. Sabel. Dial.* 2. 29 (PL 62. 216B); Macedoniani apud (Ps.-)Ath., *Dial. Trin.* 3. 6 (PG 28. 1212B); cf. Ar. ign., *Hom. Sollemn.* 1. 6. 40^v. 7-8, 9. 4. 61^v. 10-12, 14. 2. 71^r. 25-71^v. 8 (CCL 87/i. 49, 73-4, 85), *Pag.* 7. 4. 112^r. 5-7 (CCL 87/i. 133), *Comm. in Lc.* 1: 17. 16^r. 22, 1: 31. 28^r. 6-7 (CCL 87/i. 202, 204), *Fid.*, fr. 17, 5. 197. 6-8 (CCL 87/i. 256), *Sermo* 6, 34 (PL 42. 679, 682, 684).

Colossians 1: 15

(4/296)

Asterius Sophista apud Marcellus, *Fr.* 3, 90 (GCS iv. 186. 6, 204. 28-9); Ath., *Ar.* 2. 63, 64, 3. 1 (PG 26. 280C, 281C, 321B); (Ps.-)Ath., *Serm. Fid.* 14 (PG 26. 1269D); C. Serd., *Ep. Syn. Orient.* 2. 2 (CSEL 65. 50. 2); cf. Hilary, *Fr. Hist. B.* II. 11. 3. 1 (CSEL 65. 152. 3-7); *Symb. Sel.* (Hahn, § 165, p. 207); cf. Acac. Caes., *Fr. Marcell.* apud Epiph., *Haer.* 72. 8. 1, 10. 2 (GCS iii. 262. 28, 264. 28); Eunomiani apud Cyril *Thes.* 25 (PG 75. 412C); cf. Eun., *AA* 3 (J ii. 66. 20), *EF* 3. 1-2, 31-2 (Vaggione 152, 154); (Ps.-)Basil, *Eun.* 4 (PG 29. 701B); (Ps.-?)Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 4 (PG 39. 828C); *Recogn. Clem.* 3. 8. 1, 9. 5, cf. 11. 6 (GCS ii. 102. 1, 103. 18-104. 1, cf. 106. 12-13); Cyril, *Dial. Trin.* 4. 514. 30-1, 517. 36-7 (SC 237. 168, 178);

Palladius (?), *Apol.*, apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 102. 340^v. 4 (SC 267. 288); Maximinus apud Aug., *Coll. Max.* 14. 14, 17 (PL 42. 730, 734); cf. Ar. ign., *Fid.*, fr. 22, 5. 209. 25-6 (CCL 87/i. 263), *Sermo* 1 (PL 42. 677).

1 Timothy 1: 17

(6/241)

Cf. Eun., *Apol.* 21. 11, *EF* 4. 2 (Vaggione 60, 156); Grg. Naz., *Or.* 30. 13. 8-9 (SC 250. 252); (Ps.-?) Didymus, *Trin.* 3. 16, 31 (PG 39. 865A, 949C); Palladius (?), *Apol.* apud Maximinus, *Comment.* 106. 340^v. 3, 107. 340^v. 19-23 (SC 267. 290); Aug., *Trin.* 2. 8. 19-20, 9. 42-3, 11. 5-6, cf. 17. 136 (CCL 50. 99, 101, 107, cf. 107).

INDEX

- ἀβασίλευτος* 259
 Abraham 134, 140, 141, 156,
 275
 Acacians 220 n. 124, 281
 Acacius of Caesarea 62 n. 162,
 99 n. 132, 210, 224 n. 142,
 225 n. 159, 230 n. 206, 231,
 281 n. 127
 collection of *Acta* 222 n. 136,
 224 n. 146
 at Seleucia 219–23, 229 n. 192
 academic theology, *see* theology,
 expert
 access (political) 67 n. 195, 75,
 196, 199, 200, 210–11
 Achillius of Cyzicus 293 n. 197
 Adam 118, 248, 263, 282 n. 136,
 336
ἀδέσποτος 259
 Adrianople 217, 291 n. 188, 308,
 312, 313 n. 6, 377
 Adrianus, *see* Annianus
 Aetians 99 n. 132, 282 n. 133,
 326
 Aetius 60, 140, 153, 291, 321,
 332 n. 118, 350
 birth and origins 14–15, *cf.*
 20, 198
 at Constantinople (360) 224–5
 as deacon 26–7, 210 n. 49,
 218, 221, 275
 death and burial 296, 350–1,
 359
 divine call 23–4, 192
 education 14–26, 158
 and ‘exactly similar’ (*ἀπαρλ-*
 λάκτως ὅμοιον) 225, 283, 286
 exiles 211, 225–6, 232 n. 216,
 266
 and Gallus 160–1, 198, 206,
 211, 268–9
 imitator of Lucian 25, 35, 193
 Lesbos estate 272, 296
 male and female disciples 76,
 185
 medical training 25, 193
 miracle worker 193 n. 271,
 226
 ordained bishop 277–8, *cf.* 27
 pagan background? 16–17
 and Procopius 296
 public disputations 20, 23, 24,
 159, 161 n. 52, 209, 222
 n. 136
 rejection of
 ‘incomprehensible’ (*q.v.*)
 167, 173
 relationship to Arius 43, 47–8,
 169, 378
 at Seleucia (359) 220–3
 symbol of an extreme 203,
 215
 theological method 178,
 285–6
 works:
 Epistola ad Mazona 243
 n. 281, 250 n. 313
 Expositio Patricii et Aetii
 276 n. 91, 283–4
 Syntagmation 142 n. 396,
 223 n. 140, 253
 Africa 298, 362
 Agapetus of Apamea 193 n. 271
 Agapetus of Synada 193 n. 271

- Agapetus of Synaus 193 n. 271,
293 n. 197
confessor 194 n. 271
miracle worker 194 n. 271
- agenetos*, see *agennetos*
- agennetos* (unbegotten) 112, 174,
186, 328
and *agenetos* 248-9
and baptismal formula 259,
337 n. 150
and the Christian hope 254-5
devotional use 259-60
and God's essence 228, 246-9,
252-3, 262-3
- ἄγνωστος*, see incomprehensible
- aeon (αἰών)
boundaried but unmeasured
time 142, 264
concomitant creation 141,
143, 145, 264
- age, see aeon
- Ahab 322 n. 62
- ἀκατάληπτος*, see
incomprehensible
- ἀκεραιότεροι*, see non-experts
- akribeia* (ἀκρίβεια, ἀκριβής),
precision 46-7, 114, 147,
157, 178, 203, 211, 231, 233,
254, 265, 282, 285-6, 300,
325, 330-1, 332 n. 118, 338,
342, 344, 346, 362-3, 364-5,
367-8, 378, 380
and divine favour 180 n. 163
criticism of 91-2, 186, 275
and knowledge of God 257-8
- Alexander of Alexandria 47
n. 90, 48-9, 52, 55 n. 126, 83
n. 26, 85 n. 35, 122, 144-5,
238, 315, 379
- Alexander of Aphrodisias 16
n. 26
- Alexander of Thessalonica
(Constantinople) 10, 143
- Alexandria 159 n. 45, 195, 269
n. 24, 280 n. 120, 292 n. 193,
307, 317, 331 n. 115, 357
- Aetius and Eunomius in 24-
35, 70, 77, 199
- 'Arian' community 36 n. 30
- bishop 32-3, 199
- Jews and pagans 31-2, 199
n. 301
- medical schools 25 n. 75
- size and population 30, 181
- allegory 106 n. 168, 240
- ἁλλότριος 177
- Amblada 226
- Ambrose of Milan 42, 51 nn.
107-8, 55 n. 128, 80 nn. 5-6,
81 n. 13, 84 n. 32, 86 n. 43,
91, 107 n. 177, 109-10 nn.
195-7, 141, 284 n. 145, 321
n. 60, 324, 346, 349, 369
n. 19
- Ammianus Marcellinus 200, 231
n. 214, 271 n. 49
- Amphilochius of Iconium
369-70
- ἀναλογία*, see similarity
- analogy of being, see chain of
being
- Anastasia (church) 320
- Anastasius 321 n. 61, 363
- Anazarbus 20
- Ancyra 210, 213 n. 71, 289
- ἀνεννόητος*, see incomprehensible
- angels 109 n. 194, 122, 135
n. 345, 136, 137-8, 145
n. 407, 168 n. 91, 169 n. 99,
170, 284
- Anianus (Adrianus) of Antioch
223
- anomoeans 155 n. 31, 176-7,
215, 216 n. 92, 218-19
- anomoios*, *anomoion* (ἀνόμοιος,
ἀνόμοιον) 202, 221, 223

- n. 140, 224, 225, 228
 Aetius and Eunomius and
 invention of 174-5
 apologetic function 174, 176,
 177 n. 149
 Arius and 166, 175 n. 140,
 177
 Athanasius and 166, 175
 Athenagoras and 175
heteroousios and 177
 property of essence as such
 172, 175, 176, 230
 qualities and 173
 Antichrist 68, 181
 Antioch 309 n. 287
 Antioch 12-14, 36, 69, 75, 78,
 148, 153, 158, 161, 199, 221
 n. 133, 226 n. 167, 231, 276
 n. 92, 292, 293, 306, 307,
 316, 317, 318, 331 n. 115,
 340 n. 170, 365
 Eunomian Church in 339,
 342-4, 362
 Nicenes in 273-4
 antiphonal psalmody 309, 349
 lay leadership 154, 156, 181
 political function 153, 155,
 209, 329, 358
 Antony of Egypt 4 n. 22, 40 n.
 47, 95 n. 119, 183 n. 184
 Antony of Tarsus 21, 44 n. 72,
 45, 64, 167
ἀπαράλλακτος, *see* Christ, image
ἀπαράλλάκτως ὅμοιον, *see*
 similarity
ἀπαράτρεπτον, *see* immutability
ἀπασχουισμένος 177
 Aphthonius the Manichaean 24,
 159 n. 45
 Apollinarius, Apollinarianism
 118, 183, 277 n. 99, 317,
 326, 353
 Apollo 268 n. 12
 Apollonius of Oxyrynchus 219
 n. 114
 apostles:
 Bartholomew 43 n. 66
 John 43 n. 66, 195
 Paul 43 n. 66, 80 n. 5, 161,
 187, 195, 341
 Peter 41 n. 50, 43, 109 n. 196,
 187, 195, 262, 316
 Philip 136 n. 348
see also, tradition, apostolic
 Apostolic Canons 339-43
 Apostolic Constitutions 88 n.
 58, 188, 189, 190, 259-60,
 319 n. 44, 327, 335, 339
ἀπρόσσιτον, *see* unapproachable
 Aquae Saravenae (Therma) 2
 Aquileia 351, 353
 Aquinas 172, 331 n. 113
 Arabia 69 n. 213, 273
 Arcadius 354, 355, 357, 361
 'Arian' controversy:
 dialectical structure of 150-2,
 376-81
 immediate spread 74, 81, 375,
 377
 propositions and 99-102, 374
 'realized' doctrine and 102-
 12, 124, 127, 147, 155, 286
 'Arian' (individual) 370
 'Arianism':
 as characterised by Nicenes
 52, 166, 206
 classification of:
 modern 98-9, 204-5, 373-4
 partisan 10, 76 n. 254
 propositional 99, 155-6,
 204
 school 98
 relationship to Arius 37-9, 50,
 95, 98
 'Arians', *see* non-Nicenes
 Ariminum 213, 217

- Arintheus 304, 308
 Aristophanes 273 n. 63
 Aristotle 15, 25, 92, 95-6, 119,
 130 n. 316, 164, 169 n. 101,
 263, 345
 Arius 39, 63 n. 170, 70 n. 218,
 79 n. 5, 83, 85 n. 35, 122,
 126 n. 288, 142, 144-5, 166,
 206, 216 n. 92, 333, 369, 370
 n. 23, 379
 acceptance of
 'incomprehensible' (*q.v.*)
 64, 167-8, 173
 ascetic 191
 authority (*magisterium*) of 42-
 3
 condemnation and deposition
 48-9, 58 n. 146, 376
 death 36, 180
 doctrine of the incarnation
 113-14
 exegete 80
 'fellow Lucianist' 44
 female supporters 77 n. 255,
 181
 innovation and 40, 377
 non-Nicene criticism of 42
 n. 58, 47 n. 92, 178
 relationship to 'Arianism'
 41-3, 50, 377-8
 syllogisms and 92 n. 89, 95-6
Thalia 47 n. 93, 63 n. 171,
 144, 185 n. 204, 243 n. 278,
 378 n. 40
 Armenia, Armenians 26 n. 79,
 179, 211, 219 n. 118
 Armenius 25 n. 74
 Arrianus (bishop of Lydia and
 Ionia) 193 n. 271, 278, 280
 n. 117, 281-2, 318
 arrogance, *see* presumption
 Artemas 38 n. 39
 Artemius 194-5, 360
 ascetic women:
 active participants 77 n. 255,
 154 n. 29, 181
 consecrated virgins 22, 76,
 154 n. 29, 188, 191, 230
 Nicene and non-Nicene 191
 widows 76, 188, 230
 asceticism:
 and non-Nicenes 190-2
 false asceticism 187-9
 opposition to 181-4, 192
 ascetics, monks:
 and antiphonal psalmody 153
 nn. 23-4, 181
 dialecticians, rhetors and 95
 n. 119, 192, 369
 efforts to co-opt 183, 191-2
 pagan ascetics 181-2, 267 n. 6
 Ascholiis of Cyzicus 293 n. 197
 Ascholiis of Thessalonica
 314-15, 317, 319, 324, 365
 Asia Minor 69, 219, 281, 322
 Asterius (Antiochene presbyter)
 318
 Asterius (imperial notary) 7 n. 48
 Asterius the Sophist:
 and Dianius of Caesarea
 10-11, 67 n. 190
 disciple of Lucian 61, 46 n. 80
 and Paulinus of Tyre 18
 homoios kat' ousian and 66-7,
 211, 283
 Syntagmation of 144 n. 403
ἀσύγκριτος, *see* incomparable
 Athanasius of Alexandria 50
 n. 106, 51 n. 111, 55 n. 126,
 57 n. 140, 60, 70 n. 218, 79
 n. 5, 83 n. 27, 85 n. 35, 95
 n. 113, 96 n. 128, 107, 115,
 122, 151, 152, 156 n. 33,
 166, 181, 185 n. 204, 206 n.
 19, 207, 214, 218 n. 110, 221
 n. 133, 238 n. 257, 266, 274

- n. 70, 290 n. 179, 292 n. 191,
299 nn. 232, 234, 312, 315
n. 25, 331 n. 115, 333, 339,
378
accusations of magic 93 n. 102
accusations of malfeasance
34-5 n. 25, 68 n. 202, 72
n. 229
and Basil of Ancyra 163
champion of *homoousios* 72
n. 229, 153, 158, 208 n. 36,
209, 380
collusion with pagans 32 n. 11
doctrine of the incarnation
113-14, 117 n. 244
exiles 24, 34, 195, 198, 201,
208, 273
and Jovian 280-1
symbol of an extreme 203,
215
terminological flexibility 275,
285, 364, 380
use of violence 212 n. 66
Athanasius of Anazarbus 20-1,
61, 144, cf. 17 n. 31, 44
nn. 70, 73
Athanasius of Ancyra 14 n. 17
Athenagoras 175
Atticus of Constantinople 193
n. 271
attributes, see *ousia*
audience (theological) 74, 76,
100, 131, 146, 156 n. 32, 179,
180-1, 195-6, 202-3, 286
see also experts, non-experts
Augustine 16, 80 n. 6, 82, 91,
107, 110 n. 199, 116 n. 235,
128, 216 n. 94, 246 n. 293,
255 n. 336, 264 n. 404, 352
n. 234, 353 n. 240
Ausonius 313 n. 7
autogenes (αὐτογενής) 255
αὐτογέννητον 255 n. 336
autopator (αὐτοπάτωρ) 255
Auxanon (ascetic) 212 n. 66
Auxentius of Milan 42 n. 58,
129, 331 n. 115
Auxentius of Mopsuestia 226,
231 n. 215
Auxidianus 282
Auxonius (Praetorian Prefect)
298
Babylas 154
Balkans 346, 353 n. 242
baptism 53, 79 n. 3, 151
baptismal anointings 145,
335-6
compulsory 212 n. 66
coverings and position 332
n. 119
divine and human actors in
336-7, 342
function of liturgical symbols
338-9
'into the death of Christ' 332,
336-8, 340-1, 344
number of immersions 332-
44
rebaptism 331-2, 333, 361
see also liturgical formulae
Barses (*episcopus vagans*) 277
n. 99
Barses of Edessa 307, 309
Bartholomew the apostle, see
apostles
Basil of Ancyra 50 n. 106, 210,
225, 229, 252, 303
at the council of Ancyra (358)
210-12
at the council of Seleucia (359)
218, 221-3
and Eustathius of Sebaste 29
n. 79, 158-64, 166, 176, 206,
207, 224, 228, 250, 378-9
medical training 159

- Basil of Ancyra (*cont.*)
 mission to Antioch 158–60,
 206
 public disputations 159, 206,
 209, 227
- Basil of Caesarea 10, 84 n. 34, 89
 n. 72, 108–9, 138, 140, 147,
 166 n. 82, 189 n. 239, 226–7,
 228, 229 n. 196, 232, 260,
 262 n. 392, 272, 300 n. 238,
 314, 325 n. 79, 338–9, 356,
 370, 372
Adversus Eunomium 232–3,
 302, 371, 372
 anaphora of 367 n. 12
 and Basil of Ancyra 163
 death 302 n. 245, 304–11
 and *epinoiai* 263–4
 and Eustathius of Sebaste 26,
 158, 163, 233, 303, 379
 and *homoousios* 233
 and non-Nicene accusations
 81 n. 13, 86, 92, 169 n. 102,
 263
 theory of language 235, 264–
 5, 303
- Basilides 38 n. 39, 169
- Baucalis 48 n. 97
- Bauto 346
- begetting (divine):
 analogy with creation 72,
 83–5, 124–6
 analogy with human (animal)
 begetting 117–18 142, 161–
 4, 212, 250, 376
 and *energeia* (action) 250
 from the essence 54, 57
 n. 140, 212, 238, 249
homoiousios and 162
homoousios and (critique)
 57–8, 62
 implication of priority 238,
 328
 as inherently finite 62, 145
 and linguistic 'oddness' 233–
 4, 237–8
 as locus of mediation 123, 328
 from nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων)
 52, 72 n. 230
 premundane (before all ages)
 71, 143
 psychological analogy (will)
 63, 72–3
 time and (ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν)
 52, 72, 141–2, 145
 unknowable 96 n. 127, 215
- Beirut 13
- Belisarius 363
- Bematus of Malle 309
- Bethlehem 141
- biblical imagery:
 body and soul and 115–6
 Christ's anointing and 145–6
- biblical interpretation:
 and creation narratives 119,
 134 n. 338, 136, 263–4
 and divine dispensations (Old
 and New Testament) 134–
 5, 137, 140, 215
 as focus of controversy 235,
 236
epinoia and 242–3
 non-Nicenes and 80 n. 10,
 107–8, 114 n. 222, 136–7,
 139–40, 237
 Old Testament theophanies
 127–8, 134–5, 137–9, 207,
 282 n. 136
 parable of the lost sheep 21,
 144
 parable of the prodigal son
 274 n. 71
 parallel interpretations 83
 n. 28
 plurality of divine actors and
 127, 134, 215, 240, 367

- sayings of Christ and 109-11
see also scripture
 bishops (*episcopi vagantes*) 277
 Bithynia 213, 225, 288
 Blemmyes 160 n. 51
 Borborians 23
boulesia, *see* will, divine

 Caesarea-Maritima (Palestine)
 53 n. 116
 Caesarea-Mazaca 1, 8, 232
 n. 216, 294, 295 n. 205, 302,
 317, 359
 Caesareum (Alexandria) 31 n. 9,
 199 n. 301
 Caesarius (brother of Gregory
 Nazianzen) 25, 272 n. 59
 Caesarius (Praetorian Prefect)
 359
 Candidus (bishop of Lydia and
 Ionia) 278, 280 n. 117, 281-2
 Cannae 305
 Cappadocia 1, 3 nn. 20-1, 5-6,
 10, 198, 231, 232 n. 216,
 278, 287, 288 n. 166, 292,
 322 n. 65, 356
 Carpocrates 38 n. 39
 Carterius (Philostorgius' father)
 286, 318
 catechesis 121, 342-3
 catholic(s) 40 nn. 47, 49, 71-2,
 121-2, 214, 244 n. 285, 316,
 320 n. 53, 325 n. 76, 331
 Cecropius of Nicomedia 213
 n. 76
 Celsus 75, 131 n. 317, 136 n. 354
 Cerinthus 169
 chain of being 63, 123, 144-5
 n. 407, 167, 169, 171-4, 256
 Chalcedon 294-5, 297 n. 224,
 298, 311, 321, 356
 chastity, celibacy 187, 190
 n. 247, 193

 Christ:
 and angel-language 122, 126,
 137-8
 and *anomoios* 175
 as contingent 126
 baptism 141, 146, 336
 'creature' 52, 72 n. 231, 108,
 124, 125-6, 169, 258
 apologetic function 126-7,
 259
 scriptural basis 125 n. 285
 death 116-7
 descent into hell (*descensus*)
 141-2, 215, 217
 divinity 108, 111, 125-6, 144,
 367
 election (anointing) 145
 firstborn of all creation 110
 n. 196, 118 n. 251, 126, 129
 ignorance 109-10, 284, 345-6
 image of God 71, 122 n. 265,
 176, 229
 Aetius and Eunomius and
 66 n. 186, 249
 Asterius and 66-7
 'exact' (*ἀπαράλλακτος*) 46
 n. 80, 53, 54 n. 124, 65-7,
 166 n. 84, 283
 Macedonians and 66 n. 186
 in prayer 110 n. 199
 incarnation:
 analogous to human
 begetting 117-18:
 faculties (*dunameis*) and 120
 locus of mediation 123,
 328
 Logos literally present 134,
 367
 Nicenes deny 113, 207
 not mere man 111, 336
 n. 140
 instrumental Creator 112,
 121, 125-6, 215, 329

- Christ, instrumental Creator
 (cont.)
 knowledge of Father:
 according to Arius 63-4,
 167, 249
 discursive knowledge of
 284
 simple 110 n. 200
 Logos 64 n. 174, 135, 136
 motivating force of the
 cosmos 115
 not inherently God's 85
 n. 35
 subject of Christ's earthly
 experience 114-15, 120, 195
 mutability 52, 116 n. 238,
 143, 144 n. 404, 282-3
 Nicene and non-Nicene
 portraits 107-10, 121, 195
 offspring (γέννημα) 124
 Only-begotten God 109
 n. 195, 110 n. 200, 111, 120,
 129, 135, 174, 176, 326
 power (*dunamis*) of God 83-
 4, 173, 236, 237, 251
 pre-existence 83-5, 117
 n. 246, 134, 136, 143, 207
 not in existence before
 coming to be 118 n. 251,
 142, 238
 potential 60, 143
 priest 126, 260
 progress in virtue 142 n. 396,
 143-4, 282
 prophet, revealer, teacher
 106-7, 126, 134 n. 338
 scriptural attributes 73, 110
 n. 200, 139, 173, 234
 Son 54, 161, 163, 234, 238,
 243, 249, 275
 soul and 114-15, 274, 328
 subordination 83, 335
 suffering and 113 n. 219, 116
 n. 238, 117 n. 242, 163
 univocal (one subject) 109-11,
 113-14, 123, 127, 134, 144,
 163, 195
 Wisdom 83-5, 173, 236, 243,
 339 n. 160
 Christina of Sweden 373
 Christmas 304 n. 255, 340
Χρόντος, see temporists
χρόνος, see time
 Chrysippus 96
 Chrysostom 96, 190 n. 247, 262,
 284 n. 144, 343, 361
 church buildings 13, 69, 154,
 218, 275, 285, 316
 conflict over 199, 326-7
 house churches 36 n. 30, 320,
 350
 outside the walls (suburbs)
 292-3, 310, 317, 319, 326,
 329, 343 n. 180, 348-50, 358
 n. 273
 Cicero 13, 184
 Cilicia 14 n. 14, 20, 69 n. 213,
 198, 214 n. 80, 278 n. 106
 Clement of Alexandria 262
Clementina 80 n. 5, 262, 327
 Coele-Syria, see Syria
 comparison (qualities and
 essences) 163-5, 172-4,
 249, 252, 262
 concepts, conceptions, see shared
 conceptions
Confessio Eunomiana 101 n. 148
 confessors, see martyrs
 conglomerates, see frameworks
 Constans 67, 70, 82 n. 18, 148,
 152, 376
 Constantia 67 n. 195
 Constantina (wife of Gallus)
 149, 197
 Constantine I 34 nn. 21-2, 50
 n. 107, 55 n. 128, 61-3, 67,

- 70 n. 218, 95, 100 n. 139,
149 n. 8, 150-1, 193 n. 271,
194, 205, 273, 313, 317, 360,
368, 380
- Constantine II 67
- Constantinople 8-9, 76 n. 254,
185, 193 n. 271, 219, 223,
224, 269-70, 272, 276 n. 92,
278, 279, 286, 289, 295, 297
n. 224, 306, 307, 311, 312,
319, 330 n. 111, 332, 343,
349, 350, 353-4, 557-8, 361,
365
- church in 9-10, 36, 230, 316-
18
- Eunomian community in 339,
341, 342-4, 346
- 'old' Nicenes in 299 n. 235,
379
- Constantius II 67, 76 n. 254,
159 n. 47, 179 n. 159, 194-5,
197, 201-2, 210, 224-5, 226
n. 167, 232, 287, 290 n. 182,
292, 295, 301, 315, 326, 361,
366, 368
- and Athanasius 34-5, 95
n. 113, 195, 198, 201
- and Magnentius 148-9, 158
- death 221 n. 133, 231, 265-6,
267, 269, 272 n. 55, 279,
376
- public reputation 68, 201-2
- religious policy 203-4, 205-6,
207 n. 28, 208-9, 215-17,
227, 270, 273, 283, 317
- savage leniency 82 n. 20, 360
- Corniaspa 2
- contingent, *see* ontology
- contrast, *see* comparison
- 'Council of Heresies' 326-8,
346, 365, 377
- councils:
Alexandria (362) 273-5
- Ancyra (358) 161-2, 210-12
- Antioch (258) 57 n. 142
- Antioch (325) 52, 53 nn. 117-
18, 54
- Antioch (341) 67 n. 190, 69,
158 n. 39, 189
- Antioch (344) 26 n. 81
- Antioch (358) 210
- Antioch (361) 231 n. 215
- Antioch (364) 281
- Antioch (378) 304, 308-10
- Ariminum (359) 51 n. 107, 56
n. 134, 213, 215-18, 222
n. 136, 227, 301, 348, 349
- Constantinople (360) 188, 210
n. 49, 225-6, 227, 234, 291,
348-9
- Constantinople (362) 276-9
- Constantinople (381, 382) 216
n. 96, 309, 315 n. 18, 322-5,
340 n. 170, 370, 381
- Constantinople (394) 340
- Ephesus (431) 377
- Florence (1438) 51 n. 108, 372
- Gangra 188-90
- Jerusalem (335) 69 n. 207
- Lampsacus (364) 291, 292,
294
- Milan (355) 216 n. 94^c
- Nicaea (325) 50 n. 107, 52-3,
62 n. 162, 150, 376
- anathemas 52-3, 274
- and *homoeousios* 53-5
- Arius' supporters at 49
n. 101, 58 n. 146, 61 n. 159
- as beginning of separate
histories 49, 93-4
- authority 50-1, 151, 209
- reception 59-60, 153, 202,
205, 221-2, 274, 365, 380
- Puza 282 n. 133
- Seleucia (359) 213-14, 218-
23, 277, 284, 301

- councils, Seleucia, (*cont.*)
 Aetius and Eunomius at
 177 n. 150, 218
 and substance-language
 221, 244
 Serdica (343) 70, 71, 152
 n. 17, 209
 Sirmium 1 (351) 159 n. 44,
 206, 234
 Sirmium 2 (357) 208-9, 234
 Sirmium 3 (359) 214-15, 234
 Trent (1545-63) 372-3
 Ustodizo/Nicaea (359) 217,
 222 n. 136, 234
 councils (subject) 202-3
 court, imperial 160, 194 n. 271,
 196, 208, 210, 272, 286, 321,
 342, 354-6, 358, 361, 362,
 368
 creeds (subject) 121
 and biblical words 54
 n. 124
 and philosophical language
 53-5, 92, 155
 baptismal 53, 79 n. 3
 political function 51, 58-60,
 74, 150, 155-6
 creeds:
 Antioch (341) 1 70 n. 218, 71
 n. 224, 72 n. 228
 Antioch (341) 2 71 n. 224, 70,
 72 nn. 228 and 230, 73
 ascribed to Lucian 66 n. 190,
 70, 220
 at Seleucia (359) 220-3
 Antioch (341) 3 70 n. 218, 71
 n. 224
 Antioch (341) 4 70, 71 n. 224,
 73, 206, 214
 Antioch (345) ('Macrostich')
 71 n. 224, 206, 255 n. 336
 Ariminum (359) 217-18, 225,
 227, 290
 Constantinople (360) 225
 Constantinople (381, 382)
 324-5
 Nicaea (325) 42 n. 57, 51, 53,
 153, 202, 221-2, 365
 Philippopolis 71 n. 224, 72
 n. 228, 206
 Seleucia (359) 219 nn. 114,
 117, 277, 282
 Serdica (343) 71
 Sirmium 1 (351) 215
 Sirmium 2 (357) (the
 'Blasphemy') 208-9, 210,
 212, 214, 228
 Sirmium 3 (359) (the 'Dated
 Creed') 214-5, 220
 Ustodizo/Nicaea (359) 217,
 227
see also councils
 Crispinus (Antiochene
 presbyter) 318
 cross 5 n. 36, 65, 108-9, 117
 curiosity, *see* presumption
 Cynegius (Praetorian Prefect)
 347 n. 206
 Cynics 33 n. 20, 182, 237, 267
 n. 6
 Cyprian of Carthage 41, 42, 50,
 128, 179 n. 158
 Cyrene 361
 Cyril of Alexandria 31 n. 10, 34
 n. 21, 84 n. 30, 362
 Cyril of Jerusalem 98 n. 132,
 131, 219, 222, 225
 Cyzicus 226 n. 167, 229, 230
 n. 207, 232, 275, 292-4, 295,
 299, 315, 317
 Dacia 351 n. 228
 Dacora 2 n. 10, 356, 359 n. 280
 Dagalaifus 288
 Damasus of Rome 297 n. 221,
 305 n. 263, 315, 316

- Daniel 106, 187, 362
 Danube 347 n. 203, 356
 Daphne 154
 Decius 68, 79 n. 1, 201
 decurions 182
 deduction 262
 Demophilus of Constantinople
 293 n. 197, 303, 315, 316,
 321, 326–7, 331 n. 111, 342
 accession 286 n. 151, 299, 302
 n. 245, 350 n. 219
 called 'sanctus' 42, 300
 death 353, 357
 doctrine of the incarnation
 115 n. 233
 expulsion 319, 323
 Demosthenes 13, 184
descensus, *see* Christ, descent into
 hell
 Devil 38, 41, 56 n. 139, 87, 109
 n. 195, 117 n. 243, 135
 n. 345
δαίσεις, *see* deduction
 dialectic 50, 55 n. 126, 60, 62,
 75, 77, 81, 95, 121, 157, 380
 dialogue, *see* inter-party dialogue
 Dianius of Caesarea 10–11, 62
 n. 162, 232 n. 220
διάστημα, *see* ontology, 'break'
διαφορά 252 n. 326
Didascalia Apostolorum 335
 n. 138
 Didymus Julianus 295 n. 207
 Dio Chrysostom 184
 Diocletian 15, 148, 350
 Diodore of Tarsus 154, 309–10,
 324
 Diogenes 237
 Dionysius of Alexandria 57
 n. 140, 124 n. 279
 Dionysius of Rome 57 n. 140
διορισμός, *see* deduction
 disputation 23, 24, 206
 divination, *see* theurgy
 'divine man' 193, 364 n. 3
 Docetists, Docetism 114 n. 223,
 187
 doctrinal formulae (subject):
 and flexibility in terminology
 275, 285
 and interpretative frameworks
 203, 365
 political function 58–9, 155–6,
 273
 Dominica (empress) 290, 311,
 312
 Domninus (imperial
 ambassador) 351 n. 222
 Domninus of Marcianopolis 298
 Dorotheus of Antioch 187
 n. 214, 300, 318, 342, 343,
 353 n. 245
 Dracontius of Pergamum 225
 dreams, *see* visions, dreams
dunamis, *dunameis* (δύναμις,
 δυνάμεις) 66, 130, 324
 see also Christ, power of God
 Ebion 38
 Edessa 149 n. 7, 280, 307
 effects (ἔργον, ἔργα) 130, 132
 Egypt 31 n. 8, 32–3, 34 n. 23, 59
 n. 147, 181, 183, 199, 273,
 323, 347 n. 206, 377
 Eleusinian mysteries 269 n. 20
 Eleusius of Cyzicus 229–30, 293
 n. 197, 299–300, 322, 324,
 325, 326, 356 n. 263
 deposed 225, 230, 292
 homoiousian 229–30
 restored 275
 at Seleucia 219 n. 118, 224
 use of violence 212, 230
 Elisha of Diocletianopolis 219
 n. 114
 Elizabeth 190

- energeia, energeiai* (ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργειαι) 130
 in baptism 334-5
 and *ousia* 162, 238 n. 257, 250, 371
 and scripture 132-4
ἐπαγωγή, see induction
 Epicurus 92, 263
epinoia (ἐπίνοια) 110 n. 200, 242-3, 247
epiousios 54
 Epiphanius 48 n. 97, 159 n. 44, 173 n. 125, 186, 219 n. 117
 Epiphany 226 n. 167, 230 n. 207, 231, 304 n. 255
 eschaton 119-20
 essence, see *ousia*
 eternity, see *aeon*
ἐτεροούσιος, ἑτεροούσιον, see *heteroousios*
 Ethiopian eunuch 136 n. 348
 eucharist 79 n. 3
 Eudoxians 38 n. 40, 83 n. 27
 Eudoxius (Eunomian presbyter) 187 n. 214
 Eudoxius of Germanicia (Constantinople) 62 n. 162, 186, 200, 209-12, 224, 232 n. 216, 266, 275, 277, 278 n. 104, 287, 292, 298, 299 n. 232, 326
 Aetius and Eunomius and 210-11, 229-31, 276, 279, 281-2, 285, 290-1, 297-8, 312 n. 3, 321
 and *homoios kat' ousian* 211, 283
 Lucianist 209
 at Seleucia 177 n. 150, 213 nn. 71-2, 220-3, 284
 Eugenius of Nicaea 299 n. 232
 Eulalius of Antioch 18 n. 32, 19
- Eulampia (Philostorgius' mother) 286
 Eulogius (*episcopus vagans*) 277 n. 99
 Eulogius of Edessa 309
 Eunapius 182
eunoia (εὐνοια, right-mindedness) 87
 see also *kakonoia*
 Eunomians 38 n. 40, 80 n. 5, 83 n. 27, 258, 305, 312 n. 3, 325, 326
 and other non-Nicene churches 330-2, 333-4
 clerical and familial orientation 286-7, 362
 missionary efforts 101 n. 148, 356 n. 60, 358
 parallel hierarchy 278-9, 281-2, 318, 358
 suppression 329-30, 361-3
 Eunomius 60, 77, 102, 157, 192, 294-6, 317, 318, 370
 and Aetius 27-9, 200, 272, 275, 296
 baptism 5, 28, 338 n. 158
 birth and origins 2-5, 7, 286
 as bishop of Cyzicus 226-7, 230-1, 275, 277 n. 100, 278, 292-4, 295
 death 359
 education 6-7, 12, 35, 185
 estate at Chalcedon 294, 297 n. 224, 298, 311, 321, 356
 and Eudoxius 210-11, 231, 296, 298, 312 n. 3
 exiles 212, 231, 297-8, 300, 302, 344 n. 187, 356-7, 359
 miracle worker 193 n. 271
 ordination as deacon 210-11
 posthumous influence 369-73
 relationship to Arius 43, 47-8, 98 n. 132, 169, 185, 378

- and rhetoric 8, 184, 192, 350
 and syllogistic reasoning 92-4
 symbol of an extreme 203,
 215, 315, 329
 theological method 90, 178,
 233, 235, 285-6, 378
 theory of language 252-8,
 263-5, 303
 works:
 Apologia Apologiae 222
 n. 136, 302-5, 311
 Apology 101 n. 148, 138,
 226-9, 232-3, 302, 349,
 372-3
 Commentary on Romans 253
 Confessio Eunomiana 251
 n. 315
 Expositio Fidei 101 n. 148,
 328-9
 eunuchs 75, 196, 210 n. 47, 213
 n. 72, 271, 272, 279, 321,
 354-7
 Euphronius of Antioch 19 n. 43,
 20
 Euphronius of Pontus 278
 Eusebia (empress) 198
 Eusebians (*οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον*) 71,
 74, 79 n. 5, 83 n. 27
 called 'Arians' 38 n. 40
 membership 44 n. 70, 61-2
 Eusebius (imperial eunuch) 213
 n. 72
 Eusebius of Caesarea 20, 50 n.
 107, 52, 55 n. 128, 57 n. 140,
 74, 98 n. 132
 accepted
 'comprehensible' (*q.v.*) 64
 commemorated as a saint 43
 n. 61
 criticized by Philostorgius 46
 friend of Paulinus of Tyre 18
 non-Nicene appeal to 42
 response to Nicaea 59-60
 Eusebius of Emesa 98 n. 132
 Eusebius of Nicomedia
 (Constantinople) 10, 18, 34
 n. 22, 39, 55 n. 128, 58
 n. 146, 61, 62, 63 n. 169, 67,
 69, 73 n. 235, 76 n. 254, 83,
 91 n. 89, 151, 299 n. 234
 called 'the great' 44
 criticized by Philostorgius 46
 'eyewitness' of Lucian 44, 189
 rejected incompressible'
 (*q.v.*) 64, cf. 167
 relationship to Arius 39 n. 41,
 45 n. 75
 Eusebius of Samosata (*episcopus*
vagans) 277 n. 99, 309
 Eustathius of Antioch 18 n. 32,
 19, 50 n. 107, 55 n. 128, 63
 n. 170, 72 n. 229, 73 n. 235,
 114 n. 223, 154 n. 25, 299
 n. 235, 315
 Eustathius of Sebaste 188
 n. 233, 189, 219-20, 225,
 315
 and Basil of Ancyra 29 n. 79,
 158-64, 166, 176, 206, 207,
 224, 228, 250, 378-9
 connection with Aetius 25-6,
 158
 disciple of Arius 26, 158
 mission to Antioch 158-60,
 206
 teacher of Basil the Great 26,
 158, 233, 303
 Eustolium (consecrated virgin)
 22
 Eutropius (imperial eunuch) 357
 Eutychius (Eunomian dissident)
 344-6
 Euzoius of Antioch 98 n. 132,
 221 n. 133, 274, 276, 278-9,
 283, 285, 291, 293, 307
 n. 276

- Evagrius (miracle worker) 193
n. 271
- Eve 248 n. 300, 263
- Evodius (consul) 351 n. 221
- exoukontians 155 n. 31
- ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *see* begetting
(divine)
- exegesis, *see* biblical
interpretation
- experience 89 n. 67, 130-2, 258
n. 349, 262, 265 n. 408
- experts (*periti*), 45-6, 54-5, 74,
76, 77, 92, 94, 101, 103, 157,
192-3, 279, 364 n. 3, 377
see also non-experts
- faith (*fides qua creditur*) 83, 94,
95 n. 119, 328
- faith (*fides quae creditur*) 10
n. 70, 11, 31, 40 n. 47, 41,
43, 51, 53, 58, 60, 91, 92, 95,
100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 128,
129, 150, 151, 157, 186, 193,
218, 274, 324, 328, 349
n. 211
- fasting 185-187, 189, 191, 192
- Father (as applied to God) 54,
73, 109 n. 195, 134, 176,
234, 247, 336 n. 142
- Faustina (empress) 295
- Filioque* 371
- Flacilla (empress) 321, 352
- Flacillus of Antioch 22, 62
n. 162
- Flavian of Antioch 154, 309, 322
n. 65
- Florentius of Constantinople
193 n. 271, 278, 279, 296
- frameworks, interpretative
49-50, 62, 71-3, 90, 95, 163,
334, 364-5, 373, 376-81
and Aetius and Eunomius
174, 211, 288
- no agreed framework at
Antioch (341) 71
- no agreed framework at Nicaea
59-60, 286, 376
- basis of selection and
interpretation 99, 102, 103,
134, 156, 204, 235-6, 374-5
as conglomerates (composite)
379-82
- and creeds 205-6, 215
- and propositions 96-7, 105,
112, 147, 178, 203-4, 215,
369, 374-5
- religious appeal 99, 101, 102
- and scripture 104-5, 129, 137,
138, 140, 238
- tacit (gradually articulated)
97-8, 121, 156-7, 378-80
- and worship 335-8, 367-8
- Fritigern 287
- Galatia 2, 3, 278, 295 n. 205
- Galla (empress) 351-2
- Gallus, Flavius Constantius
149-50, 159, 354
and Aetius 160-1, 198, 206
death 197, 208
- Garnier, Julien 304-5, 311
- Gaul 148, 208, 276 n. 92, 295
- Genadius of Constantinople 320
n. 53
- generation, *see* begetting
(divine)
- genetos* 248-9, 254
- see also* agenetos
- γέννημα, *see* Christ, offspring
- George Hamartolus 320 n. 53
- George of Cappadocia
(Alexandria) 2 n. 12, 27 n.
83, 32 n. 11, 218-19, 307
- Aetius and 198-9, 210 n. 49
- death 31 n. 9, 200
- imperial access 199

- industrial monopolies 33
 n. 18, 199
 lower-class origin 4 n. 25,
 cf. 198
 use of violence 199, 212 n. 66
 George of Laodicaea 14 n. 17,
 210, 219 n. 118, 299 n. 234
 Germinius of Sirmium 82, 122
 n. 270, 206 n. 17, 208, 218
 n. 108, 334 n. 130
 Gethsemane 109
 Gibbon, Edward 99, 374 n. 36
 Gideon 137
Gloria in Excelsis, see liturgical
 formulae
Gloria Patri, see liturgical
 formulae
 glory 66, 107, 167 n. 90, 172 n.
 118, 174 n. 128
 gnosis, gnostics 187, 190 n. 247,
 255 n. 336
 God:
 and attributes 172-4
 as boundaried 169, 252
 as Creator 325 n. 79
 as Necessary Being 169
 God's knowledge:
 immediate and exact 46
 n. 86, 254 n. 332, 258 n. 349,
 284
 foreknowledge 143, 255,
 345
 not discursive 255, 257, 345
 not *kat' epinoian* 242
 n. 275, 255
 self-knowledge 253, 284
 God of Jesus Christ 112
 Name:
 'Almighty' 134, 236
 'I AM' 133-4, 137-9, 247,
 253
 not *kat' epinoian* 244-7, 253
 'Unbegotten', see *agennetos*
 others' knowledge of:
 according to capacity 63-4,
 167, 171, 284
 agennetos and 252-3
 as God knows himself
 253-4
 not discursive (*kat' epinoian*)
 256-7, 262, 284
 unity 71 n. 224, 73
 wholly uncaused 173, 249,
 255-6
 'God-language' 233, 235, 237
 Goths 287-8, 291 n. 185, 294
 n. 200, 297, 301, 306, 309,
 311, 314 n. 16
 grace 56, 123 n. 276
 Gratian 290 n. 182, 304-7, 310,
 312-13, 323 n. 67, 346-7,
 352, 361
 Greece 269 n. 20
 Gregory of Cappadocia
 (Alexandria) 24, 26, 32
 n. 11, 33 n. 20, 62 n. 162,
 331 n. 115
 Gregory of Nazianzus 3 n. 20,
 5 n. 33, 6 n. 38, 91 n. 89, 96,
 101 n. 147, 134, 171, 184,
 198 n. 296, 309 n. 283, 314,
 317, 319-20, 320 n. 53,
 322-4, 366
 Gregory of Nyssa 3 n. 20, 159
 nn. 44-5, 47, 171, 198 n. 296,
 232 n. 220, 255 n. 335, 302,
 304, 308-11, 328, 364
 Gregory Palamas 371, 372
 Grimani, Domenico 372
 group identity:
 akribeia and 285-7
 creation of 39-40, 151
 defined by inter-personal links
 44, 152-3, 156-7, 317
 defined by doctrine 10, 28,
 152-3, 156-7, 282, 301

- Halmyris 356
 Harnack, Adolf 375
 heaven 168 n. 94
 Hebrew language 264 n. 403
 Hebrews (Epistle to) *see*
 scripture, canon
 Helenopolis 360
 Heliodorus of Sozusa 226
 n. 163, 277, 278 n. 105
 hell 141, 142, 215
 Hellespont 291, 315–6
 Heraclea 347 n. 203
 Heracleon 56 n. 139
 Heraclianus 82, 156 n. 32, 334 n.
 130
 Heremius of Thessalonica 315
 nn. 20, 25
 heresy 90, 97, 100, 228 n. 183
 hermeneutical frameworks, *see*
 frameworks, interpretative
 Hesychius (presbyter of
 Constantinople) 230
 heteroousians 279
heteroousios (ἐτεροούσιος) 49
 n. 103
 opposite of homoousios 55
 as shorthand for the Gospel 177,
 211, 221 n. 133
 Hieracas 38 n. 39
 Hierapolis 280
 hierarchy (celestial), *see* *taxis*
 Hilary of Poitiers 42 n. 57, 51,
 53 n. 119, 69–70, 80 n. 6, 83
 n. 26, 84 n. 30, 99 n. 136,
 104, 107, 116 n. 238, 118
 n. 250, 200, 201, 209, 218,
 221, 244, 269, 360
Historia Acephala 283
 Holy Spirit 56, 73, 248
 angel-language and 122
 as co-equal (*homoousios*) 234
 n. 233, 274
 as Creator 325 n. 79, 329
 ‘creature’ 174 n. 134, 274, 325
 n. 79
 as ‘God’ 274, 324–5
 discursive knowledge and 284
 role in baptism 337 n. 153
 role in incarnation 117–18
 scriptural attributes 234 n. 233
 homoceans (homoians) 98 n. 132,
 204–5, 301 n. 243
homoios 204
homoios kat’ousian, *see*
 homoiousios
homoiousios (ὁμοιούσιος) 49
 n. 101, 58 n. 146, 162, 174,
 176, 202, 208–9, 217, 221,
 230
 homoiousian(s) 162 n. 61, 215,
 218, 229
 homoousians 27, 40 n. 46, 155
 n. 31, 342 n. 177, 366
homoousios (ὁμοούσιος, ὁμοούσιον)
 48, 54, 56, 60, 62, 66, 69,
 123 n. 274, 127, 156, 157,
 177, 205, 208–9, 217, 219,
 221, 233 n. 222, 281, 285,
 330, 334, 353, 367, 375, 376,
 377
 as characteristic of the plants
 and animals 162
 as implying paganism of 174,
 176
 as requiring a material matrix
 172
 as Sabellian or Montanist 60,
 71, 176, 367–8, 378
 how proposed 55 n. 128,
 cf. 57 n. 140
 not found in scripture 54
 official definition 58
 opposite of *heteroousios* 55
 pre-Nicene usage 57 n. 140
 Honoratus (prefect of
 Constantinople) 224

- Honorius 348
 Hosius of Cordoba 48, 55
 n. 128, 189 n. 235, 204–5,
 206 n. 17, 208, 366
 hymns 112, 141
 Hypatian of Heraclea 283
hypostasis (ὑπόστασις) 65, 217,
 228
 as distinguished from *ousia*
 274, 324–5, 366
 and *epinoia* 242, 245
 as equivalent to *ousia* 71, 162,
 164–5
 as equivalent to *prosopon* 73,
 324
 and *pragma* 73
 and *ὑπαρξίς* 245, 250 n. 311
 Hypsistarians 6 n. 38
- Iamblichus 55, 56, 164 n. 76,
 255 n. 336
 Ignatius of Antioch (pseudo-)
 187, 189, 319 n. 44, 327
 Illyria, Illyricum 290 n. 179, 291
 n. 185, 295, 298
- Image:
 of attribute or essence? 65, 66,
 229
 positive or negative? 65 n. 180
 see also Christ, image of God
 imagination 56, 103, 105, 111,
 117, 121, 127, 143, 146–7,
 155, 157, 166, 168–70, 173,
 262, 286, 334–5, 337, 379
 imperial guard 362
 immutability of saints 87, 282
 incomparable (ἀσύγκριτος) 166
 n. 82, 167 n. 90, 172, 175,
 329
 incomprehensible (ἀκατάληπτος)
 63, 167–8, 364 n. 3
 inconceivable (ἀνενόητος), *see*
 incomprehensible
- Indians 43 n. 66
 induction 262
 infinite, *see* unboundaried
 ingenerate, *see* *agennetos*
 innovation (καινοτομία) 38, 365
 intelligible entities 116, 119,
 122, 163, 169 n. 99, 284
 individuation and 144–5, 162
 n. 61, 164 n. 78, 172, 245–6
 inherently *anomoios* 172, 174
 inter-party dialogue 62, 97,
 103–4, 147, 150–1, 301, 378
 interpolation of texts, *see* textual
 changes, alleged
 interpretative frameworks, *see*
 frameworks, interpretative
 invisible 168 n. 94, 261
 Ionia 278
 Isauria 69 n. 213, 214
 Israel 134, 328, 367
 Italy 207 n. 29, 273, 347, 351,
 372
- Jacob 127, 135 n. 340, 137, 140
 James of Nisibis:
 claimed by non-Nicenes 180,
 194 n. 271, 287 n. 159
 present at Nicaea 179–80, 192
 present at Antioch (341) 180
 saviour of Nisibis 179, 193,
 280
 Jerome 46 n. 83, 182 n. 173,
 192, 203 n. 8, 204, 205, 281
 n. 127, 305–6, 359, 360
 n. 288
 Jesus, *see* Christ
 Jews, Judaism 31, 131, 140
 n. 383, 249, 352 n. 233
 Job 46–7 n. 86, 87–8, 106, 135
 n. 340, 137, 140, 190–1
 John Chrysostom, *see*
 Chrysostom
 John of Lycopolis 353 n. 240

- John of Palestine 318
 John the apostle, *see* apostles
 Jonah 140 n. 383
 Jordan 142, 337 n. 153
 Josiah 322 n. 62
 Jovian 225 n. 159, 229 n. 194,
 270 n. 40, 271, 278 n. 104,
 283 n. 138, 305, 308 n. 280,
 312, 320
 anomoean relatives 280, 282
 claimed as Nicene 280-1
 death 284-5, 288
 Judas 106
 Julian ('the Apostate'), emperor
 131, 179 n. 159, 184, 208,
 268, 272, 290 n. 181, 292,
 301, 354, 358, 377
 and Aetius 161, 269, 272
 at Antioch 154-5, 276, 278 n.
 104
 and Artemius 194
 and Basil of Caesarea 272
 at Constantinople 269-70
 death 270, 280, 288
 religious policy 270-3, 285
 religious upbringing 267-8
 savage leniency 270 n. 36
 Julian of Cilicia 264 n. 400, 278
 bishop in Antioch (?) 318-9,
 343
 commentary on Job 46 n. 86,
 87, 188, 190, 278 n. 106, 319
 n. 44
 Julius of Rome 62 n. 162
 Justin Martyr 107, 127, 131
 n. 322, 145
 Justina (empress) 218 n. 108,
 290, 348-9, 352
 Justinian 33 n. 17, 104 n. 162,
 287
 καινοτομία, *see* innovation
 kakonoia (κακόνοια,
 wrong-mindedness) 87-8,
 93, 97, 147, 303
 see also eunoia
 knowledge
 and ἀναλογία 252 n. 323
 and *energeia* 251-2
 and essence (*ousia*) 239-40,
 245, 251-2
 innate (φυσικὴν ἔννοιαν) 46
 n. 79, 87-8, 246, 252 n. 323,
 262 n. 392
 natural 89-91, 94, 256-7,
 261-2
 and seeing 63-4, 261
 τί ἐστι vs. ὅτι ἐστι 261-2
 κοινῶν λογισμῶν, *see* shared
 conceptions
 Kuhn, Thomas 104 n. 157
 Lampsacus 291
 language (ordinary) 54-5, 74,
 364, 381
 and biblical imagery 161,
 233-4, 236, 264-5
 and *epinoia* 242
 polyvalent 59, 77, 233, 240
 language (philosophical,
 technical) 74, 364
 and apologetics 126-7
 and scripture 130-3, 140
 function in creeds 53-5, 92
 univocal 59, 233
 language (scriptural):
 and material or sexual
 resonances 233-4, 237
 and reference of words 84
 n. 34, 133, 136-7, 139, 170,
 241
 confirmation of 92-3
 incarnate vs. non-incarnate 84
 object and meaning 86, 236,
 253, 264 n. 404, 338
 'oddness' 234-5, 237-8, 240

- pre- or extra-mundane 84,
264, 282
- Lauricius (*dux*) 219, 224 n. 147
- Lazarus 275
- Lazarus (*episcopus vagans*) 277
n. 99
- leadership ideal 179, 180-1,
191-2, 194, 195-6, 279-80
- learned theology, *see* expert
theology
- Leo of Rome 370 n. 23
- Leonas (*comes*) 219-20, 222,
224 n. 147
- Leontius of Antioch 22, 26-7,
45, 367
- death 200, 209
- disciple of Lucian 22
- and Gallus 159 n. 44, 160, 198
- miracle worker 193 n. 271
- rejected 'incomprehensible'
(q.v.) 64, cf. 167
- sotto voce* participation 14,
147, 154, 156
- Leontius of Tripolis 277, 278
n. 105
- Lesbos 272, 278
- Libanius 75, 182, 184
- Liberius of Rome 201, 208, 216
n. 92, 218 n. 107
- Libya 219, 273, 279, 358
- Licinius 194 n. 271
- light 172-3, 174, 237, 241,
260-1
- liturgical formulae:
- baptismal formula: (Matt.
28:19) 332-3, 336, 341-2
- changes in 258-9, 332
- hierarchal interpretation of
60, 137
- Gloria in Excelsis* 259-60
- Gloria Patri* 14, 147, 154, 367
- liturgy 79 n. 3, 100, 126, 199,
258, 367-8, 377
- logic 16, 25 n. 75, 94, 100, 164-5,
247 n. 294, 369, 374 n. 37
- contentual logic 245-6, 345
- as source of error 91-3
- Logos, *see* Christ, Logos
- lord (as applied to the divine)
54, 109, 133, 134 n. 337,
136, 138-9, 329
- Lucian (Eunomius' nephew) 4,
286
- Lucian of Antioch 45, 50, 74,
114, 128, 194 n. 271
- disciples 21, 22, 44, 46, 61, 209
- doctrine of innate knowledge
46 n. 79
- 'Lucianic' recension 46 n. 83
- martyrdom 44 n. 71, 350
- medical training 25, 193
- relics 45 n. 78, 360
- theologian and exegete
(*peritus*) 45-6, 192-3, 350
- venerated by Macedonians 45
n. 78, 220
- venerated by non-Nicenes 45
n. 78, 179 n. 158
- Lucian of Samosata 184
- Lucianic school 21-2, 114-5
- Lucifer of Caligari 275 n. 83,
281, 314
- Lucius of Alexandria 307, 318
n. 38
- Lydia 278, 281
- Lyon 346
- Maccabees 44 n. 69, 362, 363
- Macedonia 351 n. 228
- Macedonians 45 n. 78, 66
n. 186, 80 n. 6, 118 n. 249,
281, 324-6, 327 n. 89, 342,
343 n. 180, 358
- Macedonian religious 212 n. 66
- relations with Nicenes 216
n. 92, 316, 322

- Macedonius of Constantinople
 229, 299 nn. 232, 234-5,
 315, 326 n. 81, 358, 370
 deposition 225, 283
 election as bishop 10, 76
 n. 254
 lower-class origins 4 n. 25
 at Seleucia 218, 219 n. 118,
 221-3
 use of violence 212
- Macedonius of Mopsuestia 62
 n. 162
- 'Macrostich', *see* Creeds,
 Antioch (345)
- Magi 112
- magic 34 n. 24, 93 n. 102
- Magnentius 148-9, 152, 290
 n. 182, 376
- Magnus of Nisibis 25 n. 76
- Magusacans 6 n. 38
- Mamas 267 n. 7
- Mamre 127
- Mani 38, 24 n. 67
- Manichaeans 24, 188, 216 n. 92,
 305, 312, 355, 360 n. 288
- Marathonius of Nicomedia 212
 n. 66
- Marcellians 326
- Marcellus of Ancyra 41 n. 54, 71,
 72 n. 229, 151, 203, 206, 207
 n. 25, 228 n. 183, 243, 378
- Marcian (*oikonomos*) 320 n. 53
- Marcian of Lampsacus 322
- Marcianopolis 297
- Marcion 38 n. 39
- Marina (empress) 290 n. 182
- Marinus 318 n. 42, 353 n. 245
- Maris of Chalcedon 44 n. 70, 58
 n. 146, 61, 271, 282
- Mark of Arethusa 214
- marriage 187-8, 190 n. 247
- Martin of Tours 268, 348
 n. 207, 351
- martyrs, confessors 62 n. 164,
 82, 128-9, 152, 360
- Mary, *see* Virgin Mary
- Mary Magdalene 333 n. 125
- matter 144, 161, 162, 165, 170,
 172, 241, 242, 245-6
- Mauritania 298
- Mavia (Queen) 311, 312
- Maximian 204
- Maximinus 41 n. 50, 80 n. 5, 82,
 109 n. 194, 117 n. 247, 128,
 216 n. 94, 217 n. 105, 218
 n. 108
- Maximus (imperial pretender)
 321 n. 60, 346-53
- Maximus of Ephesus 268, 269
 n. 21, 272, 290 n. 181
- Maximus the Cynic 33 n. 20,
 319 n. 52, 323
- mediation 121
- medicine, medical language 25,
 120, 163 n. 66, 164-5
- Meletius of Antioch 154 n. 25,
 222 n. 133, 274, 281, 283,
 293, 309-10, 314, 315, 317-
 18, 319, 322 n. 65, 323-4,
 331 n. 115, 365
- Melitians 59 n. 147, 183 n. 185
- Melitius of Lycopolis 59 n. 147
- Mesopotamia 69 n. 213, 148,
 288 n. 165
- metaphysics 132
- Milan 331 n. 115, 349, 351
 n. 225, 354, 359 n. 282
- miracles, miracle-workers 107
 n. 177, 131 n. 322, 160, 165
 n. 78, 193, 196, cf. 279
- Mirandola, Pico della 372
- modalism 60, 69, 70 n. 218,
 71, 72 n. 229, 206, 207
 n. 28, 216 n. 92, 217, 243,
 274, 326, 342 n. 177, 353,
 367

- Modestus (Praetorian Prefect)
299–300
- Moesia 356 n. 262
- monks, *see* ascetics
- Montanists 355, 360 n. 288
- Montanus 41 n. 54, 57 n. 139,
169
- Mopsuestia 226
- Moses 58 n. 69, 106, 127, 137–40
- Muhammad 183 n. 185
- Mursa 159 n. 44, 298
- Mysia 277
- Mytilene 272
- Nag Hammadi 358 n. 276
- names, *see* words
- Narcissus of Neronias 44 n. 70,
61
- nature (*φύσις*)
and *energeia* 251–2
in Christ 109–10
and grace 56
and person 73
and words 240
- Naxos 300, 307, 311
- Nectarius of Constantinople 322
n. 65, 324, 327–8, 353, 357
- Nemesius of Emessa 118–19
- Neo-Arianism 98 n. 132
- Neo-Nicene ('New' Nicene) 82
n. 18, 303, 315, 320, 376,
377, 379, 381
- Nepotianus (imperial pretender)
149 n. 8
- Nero 68, 79 n. 1, 201, 361
- Nestorius 370 n. 23
- New Testament, *see* biblical
interpretation, dispensations
- Newman, John Henry 102–4,
178
- Nicaea 213, 288, 289
- Nicene creed, *see* creeds
- Nicenes 26, 28, 62, 68, 69, 91,
93, 99, 100, 107, 109, 111,
113, 116, 123–5, 133, 135,
137, 140, 141, 156, 158, 172,
178, 183, 191, 197, 206–7,
228, 237 n. 249, 248, 249
'creature' as understood by
108, 124–5, 145
and Holy Spirit 274–5
innovation and 129–30, 365,
377
internal divisions 156, 274 n.
71, 281, 315, 379
and non-Nicene framework
379–81
- Nicobulus (Gregory Nazianzen's
nephew) 7
- Nicomedia 213, 267
- Nineveh 140 n. 383
- Nisibis 148, 179, 280
- non-experts ('simple',
ἀκεραιότῆροι) 77, 79 n. 3, 94,
100–2, 111, 265
see also audience, experts
- non-Nicenes:
continuity with past 39–41,
377–9
'creature' as understood by
124–7
geographical focus 61, 68,
158, 365
morality and 186–8
relationship to Arius 40–3, 50,
95, 98 n. 132
use of Nicene writers 45 n. 77
veneration of Lucian 45 n. 78
western non-Nicenes 39, 43,
45, 91–2 n. 89, 195, 218,
330–1 n. 111
- notaries, *see* shorthand writers
- nouns, *see* words
- Novatians 188 n. 232, 273, 320
n. 53, 326–7, 329, 334
n. 129, 362 n. 297

- Numa Pompilius 271
- Old Testament, *see* biblical interpretation, dispensations
- Oltiseris 2, 232
- Olybrius 313 n. 7
- ὁμοειδές 56
- ὅμοιον κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, *see* similarity
- ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα, *see* similarity
- ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν, *see* *homoiousios*, similarity
- ὁμοιούσιος, *see* *homoiousios*
- ὁμοούσιος, ὁμοούσιον *see* *homoousios*
- ὁμοφύες 56
- Only-begotten, *see* Christ, Only-begotten God
- ontology 121, 173, 176
- as basis of individuation 73, 144, 162, 164 n. 78, 245-6, 328, 338-9
- 'break' between contingent and non-contingent 123-4, 129-30, 140, 143, 166, 167-8, 169, 172-3, 236, 237, 249
- Origen 19, 35, 57 n. 140, 101, 127 n. 299, 144-5, 168 n. 94, 169, 242, 243 n. 277, 376
- Origenism 183 n. 185
- ὅτι ἔστι, *see* knowledge
- ousia (οὐσία) 228, 328
- and *anomoios* 172
- and attributes (qualities) 65, 66, 164, 165-6, 172-3
- and *dunamis* 66, 250-1, 324
- and *energeia(i)* 137, 162, 238 n. 257, 250-1, 371
- and *hypostasis* 134, 162, 164-5, 274, 324, 366
- material resonance 56
- and scripture 132-3
- see also* substance-language
- pagans 123, 131, 174, 199 n. 301, 248, 250, 263, 340 n. 170
- Christian appeal to 92 n. 89, 273
- restoration of temple subsidies 271
- persecution of 290, 347 nn. 202, 206
- source of 'Arianism' 95-6
- Pachomius 183 n. 183
- Palestine 69 n. 213, 219, 278, 318, 322
- Palladius (ascetic) 353 n. 240
- Palladius of Ratiaria 41 n. 50, 42
- palliatum* (student cloak) 272
- Pamphylus of Caesarea 57 n. 140
- Pancratius of Pelusium 219 n. 114
- Pannonia 288, 289
- Paphlagonia 188
- Paris 295 n. 205
- παρησία* 180 n. 163, 224, 369
- Patricius of Nicaea 283
- Patricians 342 n. 177
- Patrophilus of Scythopolis 44 n. 70, 61, 218
- Paul of Constantinople 10, 76 n. 254, 315, 319 n. 50, 327 n. 89
- Paul of Samosata 38 n. 39, 41 n. 54, 57 n. 142, 60, cf. 69, 207 n. 25
- Paul the apostle, *see* apostles
- Paulinians 331 n. 115
- Paulinus of Antioch 154 n. 25, 274 n. 71, 281, 293, 315, 379
- Paulinus of Tyre (Antioch) 16-19, 44 n. 70, 61
- Pelagius of Laodicea 309
- Pelargus district 320 n. 53
- periousios* 54

- peritus, periti, see experts,*
akribeia
- Persia, Persians 148–9, 232
n. 216, 280, 292, 295 n. 205,
306, 308
- person, *see hypostasis, ousia*
- Peter of Alexandria 316, 317,
319 n. 52
- Peter of Sebaste 322–3 n. 65
- Peter the apostle, *see apostles*
- Phaedra 131 n. 320
- Philagrius (Prefect of Egypt) 34
n. 23
- Philip, *see apostles*
- Philo Judaeus 35
- Philogonius of Antioch 18 n. 3
- philosophers 95 n. 119, 183,
239, 241–2, 280, 319 n. 52
- philosophy 93, 184, 191, 271
n. 49
- Philostorgius 154 n. 25, 159
nn. 44, 47, 177 n. 152, 180
n. 163, 186, 187 n. 214, 193
n. 271, 197, 198 n. 296, 213
n. 77, 222 n. 136, 224 n. 146,
231 n. 214, 276 n. 92, 278
n. 104, 282, 290, 293 n. 197,
300, 304 n. 253, 330 n. 111,
332, 333, 338, 346, 360, 361,
362, 381 n. 46
- encounter with Eunomius 286
n. 151, 350, 354
- family 286–7, 318, 350 n. 219
- Philostratus 184
- Philotheus of Constantinople
371–2 n. 27
- Phoebus of Polychalandus 282
- Phoenicia 69 n. 213, 219 n. 117
- Photinians 216 n. 92, 305, 312,
325, 326, 342 n. 177
- Photinus of Sirmium 71, 156
n. 32, 159, 206–7, 215, 227,
228 n. 183, 243, 315
- Photius 154 n. 25, 177 n. 152,
333, 350
- Phrygia, Phrygians 226, 277,
282 n. 133
- physicians 183 n. 198
- φυσικὴν ἔννοιαν, see knowledge,*
innate
- φύσις, see nature*
- Placillus, *see Flacillus*
- Placitus (Flacitus), *see Flacillus*
- Plato 119, 239, 246
- Platonism, Platonists 89, 174,
262
- Plotinus 55, 56
- Plutarch 75, 184
- 'Pneumatomachians' 324, 326
- Poemenius of Constantinople
278, 279
- Polanyi, Michael 103 n. 157
- polemical themes (Nicene):
- 'Arian' innovation 38
 - 'Arians' not Christians 39,
81–2
 - 'Arians' deny Christ's divinity
108, 111
 - 'Arians' make Christ a mere
creature 124, 169
 - 'cloud gatherers' 257
 - heretical antecedents 38 n. 39
 - lower-class origins 4, 14, 93
n. 101
 - pagans 60, 95–6
 - wine-bibbers and gluttons
185–6
- polemical themes (non-Nicene):
- false ascetics 189
 - heretical antecedents 41 n. 54
 - 'homoousians' not Christians
40 n. 46, 81 n. 13, 86, 93
 - homoousios* like misshapen
growth 48 n. 99, cf. 283
 - 'incomprehensible' not
Christian 167, 250

- Nicenes are arrogant 170
 n. 107
 Nicenes rely on syllogisms
 91-2 n. 89, 96
 Nicenes deny incarnation 113
 Nicenes preach two Christs
 109, 111, 123
 Nicenes preach two
 Unbegottens 207 n. 23, 338
πολυπραγμοσύνη, *see* presumption
 Pontifex Maximus 270
 Pontus 1, 278
 Porphyry 16, 55, 175 n. 140, 255
 n. 336
 Potamius of Lisbon 208
 power, *see* *dunamis*
pragma (πράγμα) 73, 123 n. 275,
 131 n. 322, 239
 precision, *see* *akribeia*
 presumption (τόλμα,
 πολυπραγμοσύνη) 94, 96, 170
 n. 107, 228, 257
 Priscillian, Priscillianists 348 n.
 207, 355
 Priscus (Eunomius' grandfather)
 4
 privation 245-7
 Procopius (imperial pretender)
 288, 292, 294-7, 307 n. 275,
 354
 professionals 74, 155-6, 179,
 212, 286
 propositions 97, 99, 102-3, 157,
 178, 215, 374
prosopon (πρόσωπον) 73, 136-8
 providence 92, 169 n. 102, 263-
 4
 Ptolemaeus of Thmuis 219
 n. 114
 Ptolemy (heretic) 38 n. 39
 Puza 282 n. 133
 qualities, *see* *ousia*
 Ravenna 213
 reason, *see* logic, revelation
 Regium 347 n. 204
 relics of the Saints 45 n. 78,
 154-5, 179 n. 159, 194-5,
 280, 314 n. 16, 320 n. 53,
 359-60
 responsorial psalmody, *see*
 antiphonal psalmody
 revelation and reason 161
 rhetoric 8, 13, 25, 93, 184, 192-
 4, 350
 right mindedness, *see* *eunoia*
 Rome 148, 149 n. 8, 208, 213
 n. 73, 212, 315 n. 18, 317,
 352 n. 233
 Rufinus 57 n. 140, 191 n. 257,
 305-6, 307 n. 276, 327 n. 91,
 353 n. 240
 Rufinus (praetorian prefect)
 357
 Sabellianism, *see* modalism
 Sabellians 326
 Sabellius 38, 41 n. 54, 207 n. 25,
 228 n. 183, 243
 Sabinus of Heraclea 55 n. 126,
 218 n. 110, 220 n. 127
 safe havens 150, 152
 sailors 33 n. 20, 319 n. 52, 323
 n. 67
 St Thecla (basilica of) 218
 St Thomas (church of) 320 n. 53
 saints claimed by both sides 43
 n. 66, 44, 50, 179-80, 194
 n. 271, 287-8
 Sallustius (Praetorian Prefect)
 288, 298
 San Antonio di Castello (library)
 372
 San Lorenzo (church of) 350
 Satan, *see* Devil
 Saul 131 n. 322

scripture:

appeal to 40 n. 49, 41 n. 50,

79, 85, 100, 102

canon of 79-80 n. 5, 235

confirmation of 90-3

and 'creation-Language' 83-

6, 124-7

innerrant 46 n. 84

and innate knowledge 88-9

mind of (*σκοπός*) 85-6, 90

n. 77, 132

perversion of:

by Nicenes 86, 90, 264-5

by non-Nicenes 90-1, 95

n. 114, 237 n. 249

reference of words in 73,

132-3, 139, 170, 236, 239

sufficiency of 79, 85-6

see also biblical interpretation

Sebastianus 288 n. 165

sectarianism 36, 152, 178, 285-

6, 330

Secundianus 41 n. 52, 42

Secundus of Ptolemais 27, 45,

58 n. 146, 64, 167

seeing, *see* knowledge

'Semi-Arians' 324, 326

Septuagint 84

Serapion of Thmuis 183 n. 183

Serras of Paraetionium 27, 226

n. 163, 276-7, 278 n. 105

Seth 248 n. 300

Severa (empress) 290 n. 182

Severian of Gabala 81 n. 11

sexual intercourse 187-8

shared conceptions (*κοινών*

λογισμῶν) 88-9

'Shepherd' of Hermas 79 n. 5

shorthand writers 233

career possibilities 7

considered a craft (*τέχνη*) 7

semi-official status 6 n. 43

training and costs 6 n. 40

Silvanus of Tarsus 219 n. 118,

224, 225

Scythia 356 n. 262

similarity 376

ἀναλογία and 172 n. 116

and essence 164-5, 176

formulae expressing:

exactly similar

(*ἀπαρἀλλάκτως ὁμοιον*) 225,

283, 286

similar in accordance with

the scriptures (*ὁμοιον κατὰ*

τὰς γραφάς) 215, 217, 221

n. 133, 228 n. 181, 230

similar in all respects (*ὅμοιος*

κατὰ πάντα) 212, 215, 217,

222

similar in essence (*ὅμοιος*

κατ' οὐσίαν) 211, 233 n. 222

in imitation of God or Christ

109 n. 194

similarity of essence 162,

176

see also Christ, image

Simon Magus 167 n. 88

'simple', *see* non-experts

Sirmium 149, 208, 289, 305

n. 264

Sisinius 326 n. 87, 328 n. 95

σκοπός, *see* scripture, mind of

slogans 154-5, 178

Slusser, Michael 98

Socinian Controversy 373

Socrates (philosopher) 271

Socrates Scholasticus 104, 159

n. 44, 188, 198 n. 296, 206

n. 17, 215 n. 90, 220 n. 127,

222 n. 133, 226 n. 167, 231

nn. 214-15, 271 n. 49, 290

n. 182, 291 n. 189, 292

nn. 194-5, 293 n. 197, 294,

307, 310, 326 n. 87, 334,

344, 346

- Sodom 127
 Sophronius of Pompeiopolis 219
 n. 118
 soul(s) 55, 89, 114–16, 118–20,
 248, 256 n. 339, 264, 328
 Sozomen 159 n. 44, 188, 192,
 198 n. 296, 206 n. 17, 224
 n. 142, 226 n. 167, 287
 n. 159, 292 n. 194, 293
 nn. 195, 197, 294, 310, 344,
 346, 353 n. 240
 spirit(s), *see* Holy Spirit,
 intelligible entities
 stenographers, *see* shorthand
 writers
 Stephanus of Antioch 14
 Stephen (protomartyr) 187
 Stephen of Ptolemais 226
 n. 163, 278 n. 105
steresis (στέρεσις), *see* privation
 Stoics 89, 96, 241, 262
 Strategion 320 n. 53
 Strategius 294
 stylites 188 n. 232
 subordination, *see* Christ,
 subordination
 suburbs, *see* church buildings
 substance, *see* *hypostasis*, *ousia*
 substance-language 221, 274
 Eunomius and 228–9
 Eusebius of Nicomedia and
 55 n. 128
 physical analogies and 65
 popular impact of 209, 212
 rejection of 208–9, 214
συγγενής 56
 Susanna 106
 syllogistic reasoning, *see* logic
 Symeon Metaphrastes 370
 Syria 69, 87 n. 56, 182–3, 219,
 295, 299 n. 232, 322
 Syriac culture, speakers 22–3,
 153, 173, 181
 Syrian Malabar Church 370
 n. 23
 Synesius of Cyrene 7 n. 48, 255
 n. 336
 synonyms (συνώνυμα), *see* words
 systematic context, *see*
 frameworks, interpretative
 Tacitus 312
 Tarsus 21, 213 n. 71, 288 n. 166,
 310
 Tauric Chersonnese 294
 Taurus (*comes*) 219 n. 119
 Tavium 3, 6
 taxis (τάξις) 121
 Christocentrism and 128, 336
 ‘frozen’ by non-Nicenes 128–
 9
 order of 123 n. 273
 and scripture 237, 243
techne (τέχνη) 7, 99, 100, 127,
 140, 178, 242 n. 276, 257,
 364
 aimed at persuasion not truth
 93
 defined by attitude,
 orientation 97, 105
 serving not creating
 framework 147
 source of Eunomius’ error
 93–4
 temples 269–70, 275, 276 n. 92
 ‘temporists’ (Χρονίτας) 142
 n. 396, 282 n. 135
 terminology, *see* doctrinal
 formulae
 textual changes, alleged:
 Aetius 142 n. 396, 243 n. 281
 Arius 47 n. 93
 early Christian writings 327–8 *
 Lucian of Antioch 46
 Thalassius 159 n. 44
Thalia, *see* Arius

- Thallus of Lesbos 278
- Thebaid 273 n. 69, 309 n. 287
- Theoctistus of Ostracina 219
n. 114
- Theodore of Heraclea 62 n. 162,
299, 300 n. 237
- Theodore of Mopsuestia 2 n. 9,
200, 343
- Theodoret of Cyrus 186, 192,
213 n. 77, 253, 281 n. 128,
304, 308
- Theodosius (père) 313
- Theodosius I ('the Great') 270
n. 29, 313, 319-22, 344, 347,
349, 350, 351, 354, 355,
365-6, 369
baptism 314-16
death 357, 361 n. 291
religious policy 317-18 321-3,
329, 348-50, 352-3
- Theodosius II 267 n. 2, 355
- Theodosius of Philadelphia 142
n. 396, 144 n. 404, 281-2,
283
- Theodotus of Laodicaea 44
n. 70, 61
- Theodulus of Chaeretapa 277,
278, 318
- Theognius of Nicaea 42, 58
n. 146, 61
- Theognostus 35, 57 n. 140
- Theology:
expert 74, 91-2, 94-6, 99, 126
n. 290, 127, 146, 155, 265,
285, 328
narrative 105-7, 124, 127-8,
129-30, 132-3, 136, 143-4,
156, 174, 285, 328, 337, 367
popular 74, 100-2, 133 n. 326,
367
topics of 101 n. 147, 235
- Theonas of Marmarica 45, 58
n. 146, 64, 167
- theophanies, *see* biblical
interpretation, Old
Testament theophanies
- Theophilus of Alexandria 352
- Theophilus the Indian 24 n. 69,
159 n. 47, 226 n. 163, 277,
279, 291
exile 197, 211
and Gallus 159 n. 44, 160,
197
miracle worker 193, 197
mission to Antioch 278-9,
318
- Theophronius (Eunomian
dissident) 344-6
- Theophronius of Tyana 70
n. 218
- Thessalonica 313, 315, 316, 317,
351, 353
- theurgy, divination 268, 290
n. 181, 313 n. 6
- Thrace, Thracians 291, 295, 300
n. 237, 306, 312, 318 n. 42,
347, 363
- τί ἐστι*, *see* knowledge
- time (*χρόνος*) 142
- Timothy of Alexandria 357
- τόλμα*, *see* presumption
- tradition:
apostolic 50, 74, 90, 91, 102,
121, 128, 129, 180, 200, 279,
288, 378-9
as understood by non-Nicenes
40 n. 49, 41 n. 50, 122, 127
n. 300, 327-8
continuity in faith vs.
canonical practice 72 n. 228
'expert' tradition (*periti*) 45-
7, 192-3
episcopal tradition 42-3
written and unwritten 265
n. 407
- Trajan (general) 308

- Trier 346
 Trinity 71, 206, 233 n. 222, 243,
 248 n. 300, 274, 344
 Tyana 1, 359
 typology 106 n. 168

 Ulfilas, *see* Wulfila
 unapproachable (*ἀπρόσβουτον*)
 260-1
 unbegotten, *see* *agennetos*
 unboundaried (*ἄπειρος*) 119,
 168-71, 265
 ungraspable (*ἀκατάληπτος*), *see*
 incomprehensible
 unknown, unknowable
 (*ἄγνωστος*), *see*
 incomprehensible
 unlikeness, *see* *anomoios*
ὑπόστασις, *see* *hypostasis*
 Ursacius of Singidunum 61, 206
 n. 17, 208, 214, 216-17, 223
 n. 141
 Ustodizo 217

 Valens (heresiarch) 38 n. 39
 Valens (emperor) 226 n. 167,
 286, 287, 289-93, 295-7,
 300 n. 238, 312, 313 n. 7,
 321, 326, 350, 365-6
 death 304-5, 377
 recall of exiles 305-7, 309-10
 religious policy 291-3, 301,
 306, 307, 317, 329
 Valens of Mursa 42 n. 58, 61,
 206 n. 17, 208, 214, 216-17,
 223 n. 141, 298
 Valentinian I 276 n. 92, 288-90,
 295-6, 346
 Valentinian II 305 n. 262, 307
 n. 276, 313, 346-7, 349,
 351-2
 Valentinus (heresiarch) 38, 169
 Venice 372

 Verona 347 n. 204
 Vetrano (imperial pretender)
 149
 Victor (general) 308
 Vigilantius 359, 360 n. 288
 Vigilius of Thapsus 287, 333
 violence (ecclesiastical) 76-7,
 199, 212, 299 n. 236, 320,
 349
 Virgin Mary 110, 112, 117, 207,
 320 n. 53
 anointed by the Spirit 146
 not ever-virgin 118 n. 251,
 231
 virginity, *see* chastity
 virgins, *see* ascetic women
 visions, dreams 5 n. 30, 23-4
 n. 66, 268 n. 12, 318
 Vossius, Isaac 373

 Whiston, William 373
 Wiles, Maurice 341
 will, divine (*boulesis*) 63, 66, 73,
 87
 Williams, Rowan 40 n. 47, 339
 Wisdom, divine:
 creating and created 85 n. 36
 feminine imagery 85
 image of God's goodness 64-5
 in Proverbs 83-5, 124-6, 136,
 145-6
 witch of Endor 131 n. 322
 women:
 and access 67 n. 195, 75, 196,
 211, 272
 focus of missionaries 75-6,
 196
 in violent situations 77, 212
 n. 66
 as theological students 22
 n. 61, 76, 190
 Word (divine), *see* Christ,
 Logos

- words, names:
 and objects:
 linked by convention (*θέσει*) 240, 243
 linked by nature (*φύσει*) 240
 mathematical 241–2
 as applied to God or Christ 233–4, 236, 243, 244, 246
 as human inventions (*kat' epinoian*) 110 n. 200, 244, 246, 263–4
 as sounds 239, 240 n. 264, 244, 246
 as vehicles of meaning 239
 essence (*ousia*) and 239–40, 244, 254–5
 reference of 132, 139, 239
 synonyms (*συνώνυμα*) 96–7, 172 n. 121, 236
 wrong-mindedness, see *kakonoia*
 Wulfila 39, 41 n. 50, 129, 193, 196, 342 n. 177
 and non-Nicene framework 288
 conversion of the Goths 287–8, 301
 ξένος 177
 Yemen 160
 Zacharias 190
 Zeno of Tyre (1) 17 n. 31
 Zeno of Tyre (2) 17 n. 31, 309
 Zcus 268 n. 12
 Zosimus 182, 288 n. 168, 290 n. 182, 347 n. 206, 352