The Meletian schism at antioch

Barker, Celia B.

THE MELETIAN SCHISM AT ANTIOCH

THE MELETIAN SCHISM AT ANTIOCH

THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

BY

CELIA B. BARKER, B.A. (Dunelm)

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Theology,
University of Durham.

Date: April,1974.

The object of this thesis is to examine the schism in the Church of Antioch during the Arian Controversy of the Fourth century, with a view to establishing what coherent order, if any, can be found in the course of events, and to show how the interaction of theological emphases and personal prejudices exacerbated and prolonged the Antiochene divisions.

Proceeding from this investigation an attempt will be made to relate the events at Antioch to the theological controversies of the Fourth century as a whole and their legacy in determining the character of subsequent Christological debates in the East in the Fifth century. It is hoped to demonstrate both the complexity of ecclesiastical politics in the patristic period and to indicate the unreliability of any facile distinction between 'Eastern' and 'Western' theological tendencies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express my grateful thanks to my Supervisor, Mr. G. Bonner, for his many helpful suggestions and for his guidance and encouragement during the course of my work. I am also deeply indebted to the Staff of the Sheffield City Library for so speedily and efficiently supplying me with many of the necessary books.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

325 - 360

The city of Antioch on the Orontes, situated some twenty miles from the sea in a river valley famous for its beauty, was long ago described by the historian Ammianus Marcellinus as the "fair crown of the Orient". Even before its foundation, Greek legend told how the Argives, then Kassos, and later the children of Hercules, had settled at Mount Silpius, thus favouring the site of the future city.

It was actually founded about 300 BC by Seleucus Nicator, a general of Alexander the Great, who had observed the site during the battle of Issus in 333 BC and had vowed to build a city there after his campaigns. It was named after his father, the Macedonian general Antiochus, and was intended as one of the centres of Hellenic civilisation which were to dominate the Oriental lands conquered by Alexander.

When Rome occupied Antioch in 64 BC, a new and vigorous development of the city's history began, so that Libanius, who was by no means friendly to Rome, could write that the city flourished under its new rulers. Antioch was now the capital of the Roman province of Syria, and formed the military base for operations against the Persians in Mesopotamia. Its strategic position on the important trade routes between the East and the Graeco-Roman world meant that Antioch soon became one of the leading cities of the East, and a sophisticated culture evolved in its cosmopolitan society.

In the Apostolic Age Antioch provided an ideal base for the Christian mission to the Gentiles, although the Christianity of its own citizens seems to have been of a very worldly character as reflected in Julian's treatise Misopogon (1) which

was written after his visit to Antioch in July 362 and expresses his increasing vexations caused by the frivolities of the Antiochenes (2). Although his visit took place many years after Christianity had been emancipated by Constantine, and pagans and temples were steadily diminishing, pagan influences were still to be seen in music, dancing and merrymaking, in the wearing of pagan magical objects, and in the dramatisation of the private lives of the gods and goddesses. At a later date, John Chrysostom was to be worried by the levity of his flock while he was a priest at Antioch. Moreover, the tendency of the citizens to turbulence, strikingly revealed in the affair of the tomb of St Babylas and the notorious affair of the imperial statues in the episcopate of Flavian may cast light on various episodes in the history of the Church of Antioch.

Nevertheless, as the capital of the Diocese of the East, Antioch became with Rome and Alexandria one of the three main centres of the ecclesiastical world, and remained so until its sack by the Persian Khosrau in AD 540.

Antioch was rebuilt by Justinian, only to be captured in 638 by the Arabs who preferred, however, to establish their capital at Damascus. With the advancement of Damascus the position of Antioch began to decline. Captured and re-captured by Byzantine and Latin crusading Christians and Moslems during the middle ages, it finally passed into the hands of the Turks in 1517. Today, with its predominantly Turkish - speaking inhabitants, Antioch is still one of the four senior patriarchates of the Eastern Orthodox Church, but remarkably little can be seen of the former glories of the ancient metropolis. A few bastions and wall — walks on the slopes of

Mount Silpius, and the superstructure of the famous Iron Gate may be appreciated, but most of the ancient city lies buried beneath a thick deposit of alluvium.

It was in the third and fourth centuries AD, the period which concerns us here, and a period of the city's greatest prosperity under the Romans, that a vigorous intellectual atmosphere was inspired in the Antiochene Church by the famous school of Antioch. The pagan orator Libanius, who in his day was recognised as the leading citizen of Antioch, regarded the 'eloquence of Antioch' as one of its chief virtues: 'The power of the city drew to it strangers who wished to partake of its surpassing education. Those who came to Antioch as rulers became lovers of the city because of its wisdom and its literary distinction, and the people of Antioch itself enjoyed a social life and a kind of intellectual association such as other cities did not.' (3) Much of the intellectual excitement was a result of the interaction of Christianity with paganism. Libanius himself, who had been highly educated at Athens in philosophy and literature, and during the years 336 - 340 was friendly with Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus, was unable to understand the Christian doctrine or appreciate the Christian way of life. In fact, his history and encomium of Antioch, the Antiochikos, reveals his belief that Christianity was threatening the basis of pagan education, and his determination to keep alive the classical tradition. His hostile attitude was, at one time, reciprocated by Christians and had at the end of the Second century prompted Tertullian to pose his famous question: 'What has Athens to do with Rome?' but gradually

theologians like Clement of Alexandria and Origen began to see that some of the best elements of pagan Greek thought and literature could be useful in the ethical and intellectual training of Christians. It is significant that the great Antiochene preacher, John Chrysostom, 'John of the Golden Mouth', had been taught rhetoric by Libanius himself.

Among Antioch's greatest theologians and leading Christians was the saintly and gifted presbyter Lucian. Born in Samosata in 240 and educated under Macarius, he eventually came to Antioch where he was probably instructed by Malchion the sophist who seems to have been the true founder of the Antiochene theological school. Lucian himself became principal, and died a martyr's death in AD 311 in the reign of Maximinus. His body was buried at Drepana in Bithynia.

His later disciples, in following and developing his doctrines, were to initiate a lamentable schism which was to divide the church at Antioch for over seventy years (4). Lucian's teaching, which gave the school the tone of literal, as opposed to allegorical, interpretation of Scripture, was representative of the current Logos theology of the Greek world and followed Origen's doctrine (5) that on the one hand God is eternal, and that creation is an eternal action. The Son, possessing his own eternal being or <u>hypostasis</u>, is always being begotten by the Father, there never was when he was not. On the other hand, God is altogether one, incomprehensible, and unbegotten. He is the founder and originator of everything. From this point of view, the Son is inferior to the Father; He is certainly God, but not the God. Origen had particularly emphasised this aspect of his

teaching to safeguard against tendency to Sabellianism, the type of theology later taught by Paul of Samosata who became bishop of Antioch in 260. Paul's Adoptionist theology may have been derived from Jewish Christianity, having a different orientatition from that founded upon the Hellenic basis, and it was thought approximating to his own which formed the second element in the great conflict at Antioch in the Fourth century (6). Stressing the unity of God and the complete manhood of Christ, Paul maintained that the Logos is an attribute of the Personality of God, as reason is in the heart of man. Taking ousia in the sense of personality, he would have agreed that the Logos was homoousios with God. The bishop understood the Scripture's affirmation that the Logos is begotten by the Father to mean that the Logos existed only in activity. Jesus Christ was a man like us, but better in every way. Paul's conflict with the tradition of Alexandria is important, for Eustathius of Antioch was condemned as Paul was when he carried forward the same Syrian - based theology in his attach on the Origenists of his own day.

The trouble began because not all the Lucianic followers of Origen were competent to hold together their pioneer's system and, over-eager to avoid thought which might obliterate all distinction between Father and Son, they seized upon his Subordinationist teaching. As a result, the problem exploded in the hands of Arius, an Egyptian priest taught by Lucian (7), when he overstressed the inferiority of the Son and denied a common generic nature of the Son with his Father. Nothing, he argued, is eternal or truly unborn except God the Father; all other beings are creatures, of whom the Logos is the first, and

placed immeasurably above the other creatures, but nevertheless, like the others, is a creature made from nothing, before time certainly, but indisputably made. Thus, 'there was when the Son was not.' (8) The Son is God, though by adoption and not by nature, and is the creator of all beings, including the Holy Spirit. Arius' system was the logical outcome of Lucianist doctrinal principles, and in loyalty to their school, the 'Collucianists' were prepared to support the Egyptian priest when he was attacked, even though he went much further than they were willing to go at this stage of the controversy, so that it was left for the next generation of Lucianists to revive Arius' teachings to their fullest extent.

In the view of Alexander, the contemporary bishop of Alexandria, and of his deacon Athanasius, destined to become the most famous opponent which Arianism encountered, Arius' theology sacrificed the essential divinity of Jesus Christ, who thus became only a secondary God, thereby destroying the essence of Christianity by imperilling the doctrine of man's redemption, since only a divine Saviour could redeem fallen man. In 319 Alexander tried to check Arius' heresy by remonstrance at an interview. When this failed, the bishop summoned his clergy to a conference where he asserted in strong terms the co-equality of the Son, whereupon Arius criticised his language as savouring of the Sabellian error of 'confounding the Persons'. Alexander next tried by letter to exhort Arius and his followers to renounce their impiety, and when this also failed, Arius was summoned to a synod of Egyptian and Libyan suffragan bishops to whom he stated his opinions. Reconciliation proved impossible and Alexander deposed the heretic in 320.

Unable to remain in Egypt, Arius fled to Syria, where he found much sympathy with his cause among those who held views akin to Lucianist doctrines. Alexander had not succeeded in arresting this great movement of rationalistic thought which had so determinedly set in, and Arianism proved to be the most important of the heresies which troubled the Church in the first five centuries. It is to this heresy that we may ultimately trace the origins of the great schism which divided Antioch in the Fourth Century, and which provides one of the most complex and intricate questions of ecclesiastical history.

Among those who welcomed Arius' representations sympathetically was Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was to become the real genius of the Arianising party. Our knowledge of him is derived solely from the bitter language of theological antagonists who portray him as an astute politician endowed with a mental capacity and a diplomatic skill worthy of a better cause (9). His doctrine was representative of the Lucianist school, and may be illustrated by the letter he wrote to Paulinus of Tyre requesting some support for Arius (10). He begins with the view that God, as the Absolute, is incapable of division or change. Following the teaching of Proverbs 8,22 Eusebius deduces that Christ exists after the perfect likeness both of character and power to the Creator, and is entirely distinct in nature and power. The mode of His beginning is incomprehensible both to man and to superior beings, but He was created, established, and begotten in the substance and in the immutable and inexpressible nature, and in the likeness which belongs to the Creator. However, Eusebius would not allow that Christ has come into being of the Father's substance, or that he possesses the sameness of nature. He argued that there is

nothing which is of the Father's substance, but everything which exists has been called into being at his will.

Believing 'church government to be his affair'(11), and seeing in Arius' deposition an attack on the Lucianists' position (12), Eusebius wrote letters to the Eastern bishops explaining the views of the Lucianists. The Eastern bishops were asked to inform the Lucianists wherein true doctrine lay if they did not agree with these views. As most of the bishops were Origenists they had certain sympathies with Arius and the Lucianists, and they consequently believed Alexander was acting over-zealously in the direction of Sabellianism. Eusebius also succeeded in winning over to his side several influential bishops (including Eusebius of Caesarea, an Origenist who was sympathetic towards the Lucianists), who gathered at a synod in Bithynia and decreed that Arius should be reinstated at Alexandria by Alexander. The latter adamantly refused this suggestion, and wrote some seventy letters to various bishops of the East urging them to have no dealings with Arius (13).

Alexander's horror of Arianism sprang from his own tendency, along with other theologians in Alexandria at that time, to emphasise the Son's eternity with the Father rather than His subordination to God, and consequently the unity between the Father and Son. Any idea of separation could not 'even be conceived by his mind.' (14). It is not Sonship by adoption, but one which, 'naturally partaking of the paternal Divinity', is 'true, peculiar, natural and special'. Sellers sums up the deadlock produced by these differing doctrinal standpoints as follows: 'We can understand, therefore, why on the one hand

Alexander firmly opposed the teaching of Arius, and why on the other Arius felt constrained to question the orthodoxy of his Bishop when in his sermon on the Trinity Alexander had so far insisted on the divine unity that he seemed to obliterate all distinction between the Father and the Son in the intricacies of philosophical thought.'

The Churches of the East became divided over this issue and when letters from the Emperor Constantine himself failed to produce a reconciliation between Alexander and Arius, the Emperor decided in 325 to call the Council of Nicaea. Hitherto the church had been accustomed to determine matters of faith and practice in local assemblies, and anything like a council of delegates summoned from all parts of the Empire was unknown.

According to the account of Athanasius (15), written a generation after the events described, the original intention of the Council had been primarily to pronounce not what the Church ought to believe, but rather what had been taught from the beginning, in language borrowed from Scripture (16). This aim was abandoned only when it was seen that the Arians were able to distort all texts in support of their speculations, and it was only then that the members of the Council were induced under the influence of a small group of theologians including Ossius of Cordova (17) and Eustathius of Antioch, supported by imperial pressure, to employ the crucial formula 'of the same substance' (homoousios) to safeguard the divinity of Christ. 'The Son of God, engendered and not made, consubstantial (homoousios) with the Father.'

In pre-Nicene times, according to Eusebius (18), some eminent bishops and learned writers among the ancients used

homoousios in their theological discourses concerning the nature of the Father and the Son. Athanasius also testifies that the bishops of Nicaea did not invent this word for themselves, but used the testimony of the Fathers (19). Apparently, Theognostus used ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς (20), and the affair of the two Dionysii shows that already in the mid-third century an orthodox group in Egypt considered the rejection of the homoousios as a deviation from the correct doctrine (21). The term was apparently used by Pamphilus who studied at Alexandria at the beginning of the Fourth Century (22), and also by the author of the Dialogus Adamantii, a disciple of Origen. This latter work contains the only known instance of the presence of homoousios in a pre-Nicene creed - although it may possibly be a private composition of the author, or else an early interpolation.

Similarly, the Latin consubstantivus and consubstantialis were used by Christian writers of the West when discussing Gnostic theories (23), and Tertullian uses expressions like unius substantiae, ex unitate substantiae in his exposition of Trinitarian doctrine (24).

Thus it seems that the term had been used in both East and West before Nicaea, although it received no official sanction and was not a central issue until the Council itself. It is not clear whether Ossius took his key word from the terminology of the Roman Church or from the theological language of Alexandrian circles; but since Alexander does not use it before Nicaea in his dispute against Arius, and Athanasius used it only sparingly after Nicaea (it occurs only once in his first three Orationes Contra Arianos (25)),

many historians conclude that the homoousios was suspect in the East, and it must therefore be a Western importation.

Ousia was from the Latin point of view a convenient Greek translation of the Latin substantia (substance) which the Western Trinitarian theologians, with their emphasis on the divine monarchy had inherited from Tertullian. Unfortunately, although una substantia was firmly secured in the West, a difficulty immediately became apparent when it was translated into Greek. Not only was ousia a possible rendering of substantia, but also etymologically the Greek hypostasis was an exact translation. The different shades of meaning attached to the words ousia and hypostasis are crucial for any understanding of the developing theology of the Arian controversy, and supply the key to what theologians of the Fourth and Fifth centuries meant by their doctrine of the Trinity.

Whatever later interpretations might be made, the creed of Nicaea equated ousia and hypostasis, with portentous consequences in the subsequent Arian controversy. Thus an anathema was pronounced against those 'who assert that the Son of God is of a different hypostasis or ousia (from the Father)'. At the subsequent Council of Sardica of 343 this equation was underlined by the Western bishops: 'Ursacius and Valens... pertinaciously maintain, like the heretics, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are of diverse and distinct hypostases. We have received and been taught, and we hold the catholic and apostolic tradition and faith and confession which teach, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost have one hypostasis, which is termed ousia by the heretics. If it be asked: "What

is the hypostasis of the Son?" we confess that it is the same as the sole hypostasis of the Father.' (26)

Although hypostasis ultimately became accepted as the technical description in Greek Trinitarian theology of what the Latins called the personae of God (27), it was the generic connotation of hypostasis which was more readily accepted, both in the Third century and at Nicaea. In this sense hypostasis or ousia, signified the kind of substance or 'stuff' common to several individuals of a class. In other words, 'substance' is an inward reference to the nature of the thing itself - what Aristotle had called 'secondary substance' (deutera ousia). Hypostasis, used in a philosophical sense, is a later and rarer word than ousia - although unlike ousia it could be found in Scripture.

Although he was not a leading figure in early Christian thought, an observation made by Macarius Magnes is appropriate here. He remarks (28) that when counterfeit coins are dipped in gold they present a bright surface, but their hypostasis is base metal. The Epistle to Diognetus (29) asks the reader to consider of what hypostases they are whom the heathen regard as gods; one is made of stone like the roads underfoot, another is made of bronze like the cooking-pots in the kitchen.

It was precisely in this sense that Origen used the idea of the homoousios (even if he did not employ the actual term) in his anologies of 'water and the steam which rises from it,' and 'light and its brightness.' (30) Thus the legacy of Origen had an important part to play in the determining of the Nicene symbol, and J. N. D. Kelly observes it is paradoxical to suppose that the Nicene Fathers employed the word in any entirely novel or

unexpected sense (31). For the theologians of the Fourth Century, if not for Constantine, the main doctrinal issue turned upon the status of the Word and His relation to the Godhead. Was He divine, and therefore akin to the Father, or was He merely a superior creature separate from the Godhead? Thus, the intention at the Council was to underline the conviction that the Son was fully God, in the sense of sharing the same divine nature as the Father, as against Arius' repudiation of the Son's alleged divinity. Furthermore, the issue at the Council was the Son's co-eternity with the Father, His full divinity in contrast with the creaturely status the Arians had ascribed to him. There was no problem about the unity of the Godhead as such, although the discussion of this problem was inevitably brought nearer.

According to St. Ambrose (32) the homoousios appeared particularly apt when a letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia was quoted at the Council: 'If we call him the Son of the Father and uncreate, then we are granting that he is one in essence.' The term homoousios had been disavowed in Alexandria by Arius as being Manichaean, and Ambrose tells us that when it was mentioned at Nicaea, 'it struck terror into the adversaries' hearts', and so the Fathers decided to use it to 'sever the head of the foul heresy with the very sword which they themselves unsheathed.'

N. H. Baynes suggests a further reason why homoousios particularly had been chosen by the Council (33). Not only would it satisfy the orthodox vanguard, but it could also be accepted by subordinationists of the school of Origen. The orthodox, prompted by Constantine, 'refrained from setting

forth their case so that the Origenists could give their assent to the Creed of the Council, trusting the Emperor that he would allow them a liberal interpretation of the crucial word.'

Be this as it may, the inclusion of the word homoousios was the victory of a mere handful of bishops, and constituted an embarrassment to many members of the Council of Nicaea. The Arians were quick to understand the term in a material sense: it seemed to them to imply a division of substance. Eusebius of Nicomedia envisaged precisely the same idea when he angrily exclaimed (34) that they had never heard of two ingenerate beings nor of one divided into two or subjected to any bodily experience. Eusebius apparently had no suspicion that numerical identity of substance was being imposed upon the Council in the homoousios, or else he would have objected to it as Sabellian. According to Eusebius' letter, Constantine felt it necessary to explain that the word carried no quasi-physical implications, and must not be taken as suggesting any division or severance from the Father's substance. Kelly believes this implies that many more than the out-and-out Arians took this view of the homoousios (35).

Eusebius of Caesarea (36) was not happy about the term, but was assured by the Council that this did not mean that the Son was 'part of' the Father. 'One in substance with the Father' really meant only that the Son was from the Father, and Eusebius could accept this on the authority of Dionysius of Alexandria (37) whose memory he revered. He was also assured that Origen had used it, and that the Emperor supported its use (38). Eusebius had been compromised by

sheltering Arius when he fled to Palestine, and had been temporarily excommunicated by the Council of Antioch in 324. He may, therefore, have felt that he had to clear himself of suspicion at Nicaea.

Further objections to the homoousios included the complaint that it was not found in the Bible, and that it had some nuances of pagan philosophy (39). Furthermore, it was felt, it could not strictly apply to God, seeing he was not a material being. Yet the important fact remained that the homoousios was a safeguard against Arianism, a safeguard which attempted to emphasise that redemption is a divine act only God Himself can perform. The Logos took flesh, and the Logos was divine, and since a unitary object cannot be consubstantial with itself, the term homoousios inevitably implies a plurality of hypostases (that is, in the later technical sense). But this opens the door to a polytheistic interpretation of the Godhead, and it was for this reason that the Fathers at Nicaea denounced anyone who should say there was more than one ousia or hypostasis in the Godhead(40).

Thus the bishops at the Council were suspicious of what appeared to them a new direction in theological interpretation. Arius and two of his friends, the Libyan bishops Theonas and Secundus, preferred to go into exile rather than sign the creed. But most of the other bishops agreed to sign, reflecting that homoousios had been employed by certain ancient 'learned and distinguished bishops and writers' - presumably Origen and Dionysius bishop of Alexandria. Even Eusebius of Nicomedia limited his opposition to a refusal to endorse the official condemnation of Arius himself, maintaining that the

teaching of Arius had been grossly misrepresented in the formal accusations.

The esteem accorded to this controversial formula can be explained by Constantine's earnest desire, once he had united the Roman world, to cement it together in tranquil subservience to his own will. 'My own desire,' he declared in a letter which was circulated throughout the empire to announce the universal enforcements of his pro-Christian enactments,'is for the welfare of the whole world and the advantage of all humanity, that God's people should enjoy a life of peace and untroubled concord.' (41). In his opening speech at the Council of Nicaea, he remarked,'I hold any sedition within the Church of God as equally formidable as any war or battle, and much more difficult to bring to an end, and am more opposed to it than anything else'. (42). Constantine was the first Roman ruler to see in Christianity the basis for a new social order, and considered it to be his divine mission to restore peace where Diocletian had caused division. It seems probable that Constantine never really understood the details of the quarrel over Arius' teaching: 'I find their cause to be of a truly insignificant nature, one quite unworthy of such bitter contention... You, Alexander, asked your priests what they thought about a certain passage in the Law (Proverbs 8,22) or, rather, about one insignificant detail of it, and you, Arius, impudently voiced an opinion which ought never to have been conceived or, once it was conceived, ought to have been silently buried... So now let each of you, displaying equal forbearance, accept the equitable advice of your fellow-servant. What is that advice? Primarily, not to pose such questions, or to reply to them if they are posed.' (43)

Constantine provides the prototype of the lately-Christianised emperor with an outlook formed by the assumptions of the old state religion, and its stress on the due performance of rites without any concern for agreement on doctrinal truth - orthopraxis rather than orthodoxy. He had not yet adjusted himself to the idea that a theological cult involved a prior agreement on belief as a prelude to worship(44). Thus at Nicaea, the formula provided by the creed - so far as Constantine was concerned - was the result of religio-political expediency rather than an attempt to elucidate the Christian faith. He did not want to impose a new and difficult theology, but wanted a terminology wide enough in connotation to accomodate all groups. Thus, when the Emperor was assured that homoousios in its Latin form would be acceptable in his own Catholic church in the West and that it would satisfy Alexander and the fiery Eustathius of Antioch, he put himself enthusiastically to the task of 'making it the key to lock the whole church together into one universal department of state.' (45).

However, the term chosen left the problem of divine multiplicity in unity unresolved, and the controversy recommenced as soon as the decrees of Nicaea were promulgated. Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea resolved on a united effort to remove the great supporters of the Catholic faith in the East (46), and in particular they focussed their attention on one of the earliest and most vigorous of their opponents, the venerated Eustathius of Antioch, who had been a confessor under Diocletian and Licinius, and had just ascended the throne of Antioch when the Council of Nicaea commenced (47).

According to Jerome (48), Eustathius was a native of Side in Pamphilia and had originally been bishop of Beroea (Aleppo) in Syria where he heard of the activities of Arius through letters from the bishop of Alexandria (49). In 324 he was translated (50)
to Antioch where he became popular. The new bishop was indefatigable in his vigilance against Arianism, warning the faithful against 'the Plague arising from Egypt', (51), and pursuing the new heresy wherever he found it. It was one of his maxims that he was not only in charge of the souls of his diocese, but he was interested in the whole Church of God. He was a militant enemy of Origen, which was no recommendation to him at Caesarea, and he is coupled by Socrates and Sozomen with Methodius, Apollinarius and Theophilus in his attacks on Origen. A brilliant writer and an eloquent speaker, he wrote and pronounced multiple letters, sermons, refutations and exegetical commentaries - all with great spirit and vigour (52), and all declaring the Nicene faith in the strongest terms (53). In fact, when Eusebius began to pay particular attention to the teaching of Eustathius, he found there an insistence on the unity of God which in his mind imperilled the Son's personal existence. Eusebius accused Eustathius of Sabellianism, that is of reducing the divine Persons to simple temporary manifestations, and in reply Eustathius wrote a trenchant homily (54) denouncing his opponents as Ariomaniacs, atheists and sycophants.

In this attach against Eustathius, a personal element was deeply involved. At Nicaea, Antioch had been given ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Caesarea, and this was

probably regarded as an indignity by Eusebius. At the same Council, Eustathius was probably one of those who opposed the creed Eusebius had produced in an attempt to clear himself of suspicion, for it opened the way to the blasphemies of Arius, and Eusebius could give only evasive answers when asked to explain (55). A further grievance was added when Eustathius refused to ordain young men who had been educated at the Lucianist school, including George of Laodicea and Eustathius of Sebaste. He also discriminated against Stephen, Leontius and Eudoxius, all of whom successively occupied his episcopal seat. From the Eusebian point of view, these men were some of the best products of their school (and as such were later established as bishops of important sees). The Eusebians were prepared to resist this high-handed action as strongly as when Alexander had expelled Arius.

Bitter letters were exchanged and the quarrel grew fiercer until a savage conflict developed. Eusebius was determined to have Eustathius deposed. On his way to Jerusalem ostensibly to visit the great basilica sponsored by Constantine, Eusebius, accompanied by Theognis of Nicaea, passed through Antioch where he was conducted by Eustathius on a tour of the city and shown the places worthy of note. He also received details of the numbers, resources and influence of the Arians in Antioch, and obtained an introduction to the principal leaders of the sect, finally leaving Antioch with every appearance of goodwill towards Eustathius. On his arrival in Palestine, Eusebius rallied Aetius of Lydda, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theodorus of Laodicea - all Arians of the deepest dye - and his namesake the bishop of Caesarea,

and secured their co-operation in a 'plot' against Eustathius.

They all entered Antioch about 330, where they assembled a synod to settle the quarrel between Eusebius and Eustathius (57). Of the other bishops who appeared, most were firmly attached to the Nicene faith. From the confused accounts we have at our disposal it appears that during the investigation some unedifying information came to light apparently impugning the character of the bishop of Antioch.

According to George of Laodicea (one of the young men Eustathius had refused to ordain), it was Eustathius' teaching which condemned him because he was over-zealous for the homoousios (58). By carefully isolating from his polemics phrases which savoured of Sabellianism, Eusebius' friends were able to supply enough 'evidence' against Eustathius. From the writings which are left to us it is difficult to see how this was done, as Eustathius always affirms the full deity of the Word, yet also stresses His distinction from the Father. However, it seems that the doctrinal issue was of minor importance here.

By Theodoret's account (59), which is supported by that of Philostorgius and Jerome(to whom Paulinus may subsequently have recounted the whole affair), Eustathius was guilty of episcopal tyranny, and the bishop was further discredited when a woman appeared in the assembly holding a baby in her arms and accused him of seducing her. This was obviously a trumped-up charge as the woman later admitted she had been bribed: a Eustathius was the father of her child, but he was a copper-smith (60).

Furthermore, Athanasius reported (61) that Eustathius was guilty of insulting Helena, the Emperor's mother, who had

been the first wife of his father Flavius Constantius and a woman of very humble origins. St. Ambrose tells us that Helena had been a servant girl at an inn which, considering the customs of that age in matters of hospitality, could have implied a great many things. Helena's own specially-favoured martyr was Lucian, sometime head of the school at Antioch and an object of great veneration by the Arians, whose body had been thrown into the sea off Nicomedia and had been carried by currents (or by a dolphin in the best classical tradition, according to the legend) to the exact spot on the shore at Drepanum where the Empress herself had been born. The language of the charge was vague and could be interpreted to mean insult either by actions or by words, and it is possible Eustathius let fall some indiscreet words about Lucian and his votary the Emperor's mother. This charge of high-treason was a clever move, and in keeping with the subtle dealings of the Eusebian party.

Finally, according to Sozomen (62), the bishop was deprived of his see because 'it was most generally believed' that he had accused Eusebius of Caesarea, Paulinus and Patrophilus (members of the Eusebian party and the Lucianist school) of favouring the heresy of Arius.

If there was an official record of the Council it must have been lost at an early date, and the story of Eustathius' deposition seems to have been kept alive through popular tradition. Sellers believes something graver than the Eusebian charges of Sabellianism and immorality must have effected Eustathius' banishment. Using a passage from the Life of Constantine written by Eusebius of Caesarea, he attempts to show (63) that before the Council was convoked, an uproar

was caused by Eustathius' attacks on the Eusebian party when supporters of the Lucianist school arose in revolt against Eustathius' provocative rule. Party-feeling arose to such a pitch that a bloody riot seemed imminent, and a report was sent to Nicomedia where the Emperor was possibly influenced by Eusebius to regard Eustathius as a disruptive influence and wholly to blame for the disturbance of the peace which meant so much to Constantine. Count Strategius Musonianus was despatched with letters to quell the sedition and it is possible that the Council of 330 (or 331) was summoned so that an enquiry might be made into the affair.

Eustathius' attack on Eusebius of Nicomedia (who had now secured the Emperor's favour), his autocratic rule, his involvement in the uproar, plus any of the other charges of immorality, high-treason and heresy made against him, doomed the bishop of Antioch from the start, and he was banished by the Emperor to exile in Thrace (64). The bishop submitted, and accompanied by many of his clergy, left Antioch without resistance (65), but with a calm and firm exhortation to his people to continue patiently in the interests of unity and peace, and to remain faithful, even under heretical bishops if necessary.

In exile Eustathius wrote a good deal, including the De Anima et contra Arianos and his Contra Arianos in which he attacks Arian Christology, but although many of his letters were extant during Jerome's period, there is no reference among the ancient historians of any correspondence between Eustathius and the Church at Antioch. He soon fell into complete obscurity, and died probably before 337 or at any

rate before 343 (66). John Chrysostom says he was 'entombed in the hearts of the people of Antioch.' (67). His cause was eventually vindicated at the Council of Sardica in 343, when the assembled bishops, examining the charges brought by the Eusebians against Athanasius, Asclepas and Marcellus, acquitted them and insisted upon the divine unity in a statement which was so entirely consistent with the views of Eustathius that Sellers suggests it may have proceeded from one of the Eustathian party (68). Furthermore, the members of the Council deposed most of Eustathius' opponents who were still alive, including George of Laodicea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and thus Eustathius' downfall was virtually avenged.

Eustathius' last wish was obeyed, except by a minority who refused to submit as expected to the Arian leadership which was now imposed upon the people of Antioch, and this small party of the ultra-orthodox, fervently united by the warmth of their religious convictions, held services apart (69) under Paulinus, a priest of Antioch and an uncompromising man as his later history will verify. These were sometimes called the 'Eustathians', although they had disregarded that bishop's command.

Thus it was that, only a short time after the Council of Nicaea, one of the most vehement adversaries of Arius became the victim of the anti-Nicene reaction. The adherents of the minority at Antioch were strictly correct in their belief that because Eustathius was still alive and improperly deposed, any successor was a usurper. However, the deposition of Eustathius was a disciplinary measure, not technically including matters

of faith, and should not in itself have provided a motive for separation. Insofar as the deposition was a condemnation of dogma, it should not have been taken as a rejection of the Nicene faith, for Eustathius was deposed for being a Sabellian. It is probable that everyone was aware that the real reason for his deposition was the bishop's wish to defend the Nicene faith and his consequent attack upon the Arians. As for the majority who succumbed to the Arians, they could claim to be following the advice of their deposed bishop in accepting his supplanters, and it is a matter of fact that all of these were elected according to canonical requirements, and not one of them until Eudoxius was technically convicted of heresy or lost his communion with the bulk of the Eastern Church. Another point is valid here: by the Fourth century the mass of the faithful was content to accept bishops without quarrelling, leaving the 'doctors' to wrangle over doctrinal points and hurl texts at each other. When the time came for electing bishops, they were told which name they ought to acclaim, and they did so on trust. Unhappily, the Arians held great power in this matter; outwardly professing the Nicene faith, they formed a compact minority of certain views acting with insight upon a vacillating and vague power - the Emperor was no theologian; and after the deposition of Eustathius the see of Antioch was to be secured for a long time to the secret enemies of the Council of Nicaea (70).

It was not easy to find a successor for Eustathius, but eventually Paulinus, the unattached bishop of Tyre, was claimed by the Church of the Antiochenes as 'their own property' (71) and chosen as their bishop. Like his friend

Eusebius of Caesarea he was an Arianiser and was claimed by Arius in a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia as one of his sympathisers (72). Paulinus had filled the office as bishop of Tyre with great splendour and after the persecution had rebuilt the cathedral there with great magnificence (73). We do not know why he had been replaced by another bishop at Tyre, but it was Zeno who signed in that capacity at Nicaea. Eusebius of Caesarea lavished praise on his fellow-partisan and dedicated to him his Ecclesiastical History and spoke with great indignation of the unfounded charges which the 'Sabellian' Marcellus of Ancyra had brought against him with the view of fixing on him the impious tenet that our blessed Lord is no more than a created being (74).

According to Philostorgius, Paulinus held his new dignity for only half a year before his death in 330 (75). Not much is known about his successor Eulalius, except that he was an Arian and had likewise only a short reign (76), after which the vacancy was offered to Eusebius of Caesarea himself, who would have been a popular choice. But Eusebius was not anxious to leave his own see which was well-suited to a man of his scholarly habits, especially when he would have to face the supporters of the man he had helped to depose. So he protested that the canons of Nicaea forbade the translation of bishops and requested the Emperor to advise the bishops to choose someone else. Cavallera believes this excuse was merely a pretext, as he allowed the translation of Eusebius of Nicomedia (77), but Wallace-Hadrill comments, 'We need not regard his appeal to the canons of Nicaea as being merely a

convenient means of escape from his dilemma. He really did have a high regard for the authority of the church, and it is entirely in accord with his temper that he should refuse translation on such grounds'. (78)

The Emperor commended his modesty and his respect for rules, and wrote to the Antiochenes exhorting them not to rob another church in order to advantage their own (79). He recommended Euphronius, a Cappadocian priest of the same theological views as Eusebius and Eulalius, who had been indicated by the bishop of Caesarea. The Emperor also mentioned a priest of Arethusa named George, who had been ordained, and subsequently deposed, by Alexander of Alexandria, and later became bishop of Laodicea.

It was Euphronius who was chosen, but a year after his election he died, and the see passed to Flacillus (332-342), another friend of Eusebius of Caesarea, whose name appears on all the manifestoes of the Eusebian party. The bishop of Caesarea dedicated to him his Refutation of Marcellus of Ancyra, and it was thanks to the new bishop that Aetius, the founder of the Anomoean sect, was able to return to Antioch and follow the lectures of Leontius (who was to become bishop of Antioch in 344). Flacillus took part in the Council of Tyre against Athanasius in 335, and presided over the 'Dedication' Council of Antioch in 341 (80). After his death, the see was offered to Stephen (342-344), a more decided Arian who had once been banished from Antioch by Eustathius. Despite Flacillus and Stephen's Arianising tendencies, their flock again remained faithful to Eustathius' parting request.

Thus, less than six years after Nicaea, we can already distinguish three groups among the Christians of Antioch. First, the official party, which included those who could not attack the Council of Nicaea openly since the Emperor would not have tolerated this, but who were nevertheless trying to undermine its doctrine. Secondly, there were those who were faithful to the person of Eustathius, but not to his command, and who held resolutely to the homoousios. In the opinion of some, their teaching, and especially their horror of the three hypostases, closely approached Marcellus of Ancyra's Sabellian doctrine of a single hypostasis and temporary manifestations in the Trinity. The 'Eustathians' were led by Paulinus, and they did not return to the main body even after the death of Eustathius. The third party was made up of those who communicated with the bishop in charge whoever he might be. This included those for whom schism was a horror, as well as Homoousians and churchmen of a more conservative temperament who were prepared to accept the Nicene formula, provided that it was not pressed too far.

About this time Constantius, the ruler of the East, who had succeeded his father Constantine in 337, was urged by his brother Constans, the Western emperor, to check the spread of Arianism and to uphold the cause of Athanasius. Part of this policy included arrangements for the deposition of Stephen. The bishop of Antioch was excommunicated at the Council of Sardica in 343, where a document was drawn up requesting Constantius to depose him. This address, backed by a recommendation from Constans was sent to Antioch, where Constantius was temporarily residing, with Vincent of Capua,

who had been a legate at Nicaea, and Euphrates of Cologne. With them was Salianus, a general of tried virtue. According to Athanasius (81) Stephen, realising his danger, became involved in a scandalous plot to ruin the character of Constans' envoys. Stephen's house was in a lonely spot, and the bishop's servants engaged the services of a common prostitute and introduced her into the room where Euphrates was sleeping. Both began to call out in alarm when they discovered each other, and those hiding in readiness burst into the house. Salianus, who had different lodgings, demanded a full enquiry. The bishops would have been satisfied with an ecclesiastical judgment, but Salianus demanded a civil tribunal. The clerks of Stephen who were implicated in the affair were put to torture and confessed at once; Stephen's complicity was established and he was deposed.

One should not reject the account of the plot of Stephen out of hand, but it is worth remembering that the account ultimately goes back to Athanasius who is hardly an unprejudiced witness. One may assume that something fairly scandalous took place, or Constantius would scarcely have consented to the deposition of Stephen, but abuses of the morals of one's opponents was standard procedure in the altercations of the ancient world, and allowances should be made for this fact.

In Stephen's place Constantius effected the appointment of Leontius (344 - 357), a native of Phrygia (82) and a disciple of Lucian (83) and of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was alleged to have been deposed from the presbyterate of Antioch by Eustathius for having seduced a subintroducta named Eustolium - although he asserted her purity - and subsequently mutilated

himself in order to live with her in apparent innocence (84). If there had been any truth in this, Leontius would have been deposed, not for mutilation, but for corrupting a church virgin, and it is doubtful if even the courtier bishops of Constantius could have forced him on Antioch if the whole business had been really so disgraceful. If it had been believed at Antioch, the respect paid him by the orthodox would be inconceivable. It is worth remembering that Leontius accused Athanasius, who records this tale, of cowardice when he fled from Alexandria in 356, an unfair charge which stung Athanasius deeply, prompting him to write his Apologia de Fuga in reply; thus he always spoke bitterly of Leontius, never ommitting to call him ὁ ἀπόκοπος. The censure of Athanasius - who had been elected bishop of Alexandria on the death of Alexander in 327 - irretrievably damaged Leontius in the estimation of succeeding ages, but it was not only his anti-Athanasian views which marked out the bishop of Antioch. Professing to be a man of moderate views, the bishop kept his real opinions to himself, and while Flavian of Antioch, a much respected layman, and the congregation as a whole clearly enunciated the words of the Catholic version of the doxology: 'Glory be to the Father in company with (meta) the Son and at the same time as (sun) the Holy Ghost,' Leontius always dropped his voice (85) and no one ever heard whether he spoke the Catholic version or the version favoured by the Arians which ran: 'Glory be to the Father through (dia) the Son, in (en) the Holy Ghost.' Although the Arian doxology may simply have been old-fashioned (that is, representing the theology of pre-Nicene times), it was tantamount to putting the Son in a secondary place and was accepted as a key Arian phrase, and many believed

Leontius was a crypto - Arian, all the more dangerous for his moderation.

In fact, the orthodox found more substantial cause for complaint when Leontius promoted to the diaconate a certain unprincipled and self-taught sophist named Aetius - called 'the ungodly' by Sozomen (86) - who shocked even the Arians by the extremes to which he pressed the principles of Arius, and who became the founder and head of the sect which came to be known as the Anomoeans because its members insisted the Son was completely unlike the Father. An immediate outcry by the orthodox led by Flavian and Diodore who were both much-respected laymen (87), convinced Leontius that he had gone too far, and he hastily removed Aetius to Alexandria where he became one of George's most energetic advisers (88).

According to a well-known tale, Leontius was once heard to say, running his hand through his white hair: 'When this snow has melted, there will be mud in Antioch.' (89). Who could be better informed than he on the divisions in his church, or more competent to hold them together? For, true to his policy of moderation, he occasionally communicated with the partisans of Flavian and Diodore, being aware that courtesy to them was perhaps the best safeguard of his own flock.

When he died in 357 Eudoxius, a most influential Arian, was appointed bishop of Antioch by order of the Emperor and without due election; an opportunity to end the schism now presented itself. Eudoxius had once been refused ordination on the grounds of unsound doctrine by Eustathius, but on the latter's deposition, had been admitted to orders by the Arians and made bishop of Germanica, a position he held from 341 to

358. After the Dedication Council of Antioch in 341, Eudoxius had been bearer of the Macrostichus (the Long-lined Creed) to Constans in the West, and had also subscribed to the so-called Blasphemy of Sirmium of 357 (90). This formula had been produced mainly by Ursacius and Valens, and it had an unmistakable Arian bias. While it avoided criticising any Arian tenet, it prohibited 'of the same substance' and 'of like substance'.

> The Catholic doctrine is that there are two Persons of the Father and the Son, the Father is the greater and the Son is subordinate to the Father... the Father having no beginning... but the Son having been begotten...He is essentially unlike Him.

This was pure Anomoeism because it specified 'the Son is unlike (ἀνόμοιος) the Father in all things'. (91).

It was towards the end of 347 when Eudoxius had been in attendance on the Emperor in the West that news came of the death of Leontius of Antioch. Pleading that affairs in Germanica required his presence, Eudoxius excused himself, and, arriving in Antioch just before George of Laodicea who was also eager to take over the see, represented himself as nominated by the Emperor (92). He managed things so well that, despite protests raised by bishops of neighbouring sees, he was acclaimed bishop of Antioch and immediately sent Asphalius, an Antiochene presbyter, to make the best of the case at court. Constantius had gone so far as to write and despatch letters approving Eudoxius' installation before he discovered the truth but he immediately commanded the letters to be returned, and

sent others instead expressing his disapprobation of bishops who changed their sees. 'Eudoxius went to seek you without my sending him...To what restraint will men be amenable, who impudently pass from city to city, seeking with a most unlawful appetite every occasion to enrich themselves?' (93).

Meanwhile, the new bishop of Antioch openly preached Arianism in terms so blasphemous that Hilary of Poitiers, who was then in the East and heard his sermons, wished his ears had been deaf (94). Theodoret and Epiphanius report him as boasting that he had the same knowledge about God as God had about himself (95).

In the last year of his episcopate at Antioch Eudoxius held a council which revived the Blasphemy of Sirmium. At this point, Eustathius of Sebaste produced an heretical exposition of faith which he attributed to Eudoxius, and this, together with complaints by George of Laodicea about his cruelty and bad adminstration, aroused Constantius. Eudoxius, however, disowned the exposition and attributed it to Aetius who confessed to it and was duly exiled. Eustathius persisted in asserting that Eudoxius and Aetius were practically at one, and to escape exile Eudoxius repudiated Anomoeanism. In revenge he demanded that the Homoeousians should give up the homoeousios as unscriptural (96). They defended their catch-word, but Constantius drove them into exile.

In September 359 Eudoxius appeared at a Council in Seleucia, the Eastern counterpart of the Council of Ariminum (97), where the orthodox formed a minority, and the majority signed 'the Creed of the Dedication'. Statements made by the bishop of Antioch were taken down in shorthand - 'God...was

not a Father, for he had not a Son. To have a Son he must have had a wife....' (98) - and he was forthwith deposed by the less heretical party as being an unconcealed Arian of the Anomoean type. It appears that he sought shelter at court in Constantinople where, by the aid of the Acacians (99), he secured his appointment as patriarch on the deposition of Macedonius, and on 27 January 360 took possession of the throne in the presence of seventy-two bishops (100).

Ignoring the fact that Paulinus had kept the Nicene faith since 331, Constantius summoned a Council in 360 to make an official appointment to the see of Antioch. According to Epiphanius, Jerome and Philostorgius, Acacius nominated and George of Laodicea assisted at the election of Meletius, who had been bishop of Sebaste in Armenia (101).

Both orthodox and Arians seemed to have reasons to claim Meletius as their own, but it is difficult to assess his doctrines before his election because contemporary sources are so unsatisfactory. Several facts seem to justify Greenslade's view (102) that Meletius had 'a bad past doctrinally'. In the first place, in 358 when the new bishop was one of the clergy at Melitene and was held in high repute for his piety and uprightness of mind, he had agreed to replace Eustathius of Sebaste when he was deposed by a little-known council in Melitene because he professed doctrines closely approximating to Nicene orthodoxy (103). Meletius had also been a friend of Acacius at one time, but not a very close friend and he never took part in any of his intrigues.

Furthermore, either at the Council of Seleucia or afterwards (104) Meletius had signed the Homoean Acacian formula, and he also subscribed in 360 to the Semi-Arian creed presented at the Council of Constantinople over which Acacius had presided. This Council approved as the official formulary of Arianism the Formula of Ariminum, repudiating all former creeds and condemning beforehand all those which might be suggested subsequently. The formula was not an explicit profession of Arianism since it employed no technical terms of the primitive heresy, but it declared the Son is like the Father, and forbade the terms ousia and hypostasis. Its very vagueness allowed itself to be understood in the most different and even most opposite senses - Duchesne (105) comments that, with a little complaisance, 'Athanasius and Aetius might both have repeated it together' - and thus, no Christian worthy of the name could hesitate to condemn it.

Despite these aberrations, Meletius had many good qualities and was universally praised as a brilliant orator evincing simple but affable manners, and esteemed for his piety and the dignity of his life. He was praised by John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nyssa (whose panegyrics are admittedly rather exaggerated), and Basil of Caesarea made a veritable cult of the bishop of Antioch, defending him with great vigour on many occasions. The bishop of Caesarea would hardly have kept up a friendship with him if he thought Meletius held any depraved doctrines, andif there had been a bad blot on his past, surely he would have tried to excuse Meletius, but would not have passed over it in silence? Gregory of Nazianzus, writing after the Council of Constantinople in 381, was to say this of the bishop of Antioch: 'Their president was a most

pious man, simple and unpretentious. His face shines with peace, and he inspires both confidence and respect in those who see him.' (106). Even Epiphanius, a determined partisan of the Eustathians, and therefore an 'enemy' of Meletius, praised his good qualities: 'He still lives (377) in his own country, a man well-esteemed and much regretted, above all for his great actions. His life was recommendable and his morals most excellent. He was well-loved by the people because of his way of life.' (107).

Sozomen and Theodoret (108) tell us that when Meletius arrived in Antioch, a general movement of sympathetic curiosity emptied the whole town to see him and cheer him. Behind the bishops and clergy, Jews and pagans massed to catch a glimpse of the man who was so well spoken about. Arians, Eustathians and orthodox all wondered which side he would support - already a rumour circulated that he was a Nicene.

Immediately the new bishop set to work as a peace-loving, moderate, but firm pastor. He attacked abuses and removed those among the clergy whom he thought to be unworthy. In his sermons, which he expressed in popular and non-technical terms, he tried to recall his flock to their duties, and touched upon controversial issues with the greater discretion (109).

It was Constantius, decidedly in favour of anti-Nicene theological disputes, who took the initiative and finally forced Meletius to give voice to his deepest thought. The Emperor requested that at the consecration of the new bishop the most eloquent preachers of Antioch should preach publicly on Proverbs 8,22: The Lord created me the beginning of his works - a key Arian text - and Meletius took his position among the other speakers

before Acacius of Caesarea and George, the usurping bishop of Alexandria.

George of Laodicea began by preaching an openly Arian sermon, and he was followed by Acacius, who was more reserved, but in no way satisfied the orthodox. Finally Meletius appeared. His sermon is alleged to be extant (110), and it seems that he began by mentioning the presence of the Emperor - though this is denied by Sozomen and Socrates (111) - and commending those who preceded him. The new bishop then made a warm exhortation to peace, running through a number of scriptural texts in a very traditional way, but it served to lead the way to the critical topic of his sermon:

> Since certain people distort the meaning of the words found in the Scriptures and give them another sense which they will not bear, without reflecting on the value of the words or the nature of the subject, and dare to deny the divinity of the Son because they cause difficulties over the word 'creature' in Proverbs 8,22: 'The Lord created me at the beginning of his ways for his works' for all those who ought to follow the inspiration of the living spirit instead of the letter which kills, for 'the Spirit giveth life' (2 Cor.,3,6), let us also, then, take courage and touch upon this subject for a while, not that previous speakers have neglected all this by any means - to emulate them would be folly - nor that you need a teacher, for you are instructed by God

Himself, but to prove to you that you are numbered among those who wish to partake of spiritual benefits with you.

In the first place...it is impossible to find in this world a single example which is sufficient on its own to express adequately the nature of the only Son. That is why the Scriptures use many...expressions about this subject so that, aiding us by what is within our comprehension, they enable us to understand to a limited extent those things which we cannot grasp and, helping us by things which we do understand, they reveal those things which we do not, leading us gently and gradually from the evident to the obscure. Thus, because we must believe in Christ, let us also believe that the Son is like (ὅμοιός) the Father, being the image of the One who is above all, who is everything, by whom everything was made in the heavens and on the earth; an image, not like a representation of an animate being, nor like an artistic creation, nor like the result of that creative act, but actually born of what gave him birth; and in order that it should be understood that it is not permissible to imagine the beginning of the physical human generation of the only Son - a generation before all ages - in terms of a human corporeal generation, and that contrary to the wisdom which contains human thoughts, that of the Father is neither insub-

> stantial nor unstable, the Scriptures employ the two words κτίσις and γέννησις, ἔκτισεν and ἐγέννησεν, not that they should appear to contradict the same aspect of the same objects, but so that they might establish by the word ἔκτισεν the possession of subsistence and stability, and by the word ἐγέννησεν that which is special and exclusive to the only Son. 'I came forth from the Father,' He said 'and am come into the world'. (John 16,28). The name of wisdom suffices to dispel any idea of suffering (112).

The orator then hastened to leave this dangerous ground, and the remaining two-fifths of his discourse is concerned with recalling his hearers to the humility of our human condition.

It is difficult to determine the actual position of Meletius with regard to the Trinity. His statement that the Son is another order than creatures and is the living offspring of the Father, of whom He was the perfect image, is balanced by the view that the Son is distinct from the Father and is not one of his attributes, and thus the bishop appears to avoid not only the Arian error, but also the Sabellianism of Marcellus of Ancyra.

However, the chief characteristic of the Sermon as it appears in the writings of Epiphanius is its vagueness - there is no complete or definable system as such, and scholars have been unable to see in it that strongly-implied Nicene teaching which apparently so angered the Arians. It simply appears

that Meletius wished to avoid controversy and the metaphysics of dogma; the scriptural faith of the ancient fathers sufficed him without his having to resort to technical words like ousia and hypostasis.

Nevertheless, the populace seemed to accept his sermon as substantially Nicene. Theodoret (113) remarks that the orthodox members of Paulinus' party and those of Meletius' party trembled with joy, applauded him warmly, and when the bishop was finished, demanded an encore. A deacon rushed forward and clapped a hand over the bishop's mouth, but using three fingers and then one, Meletius repeated his discourse in dumb show: 'We think of three, but it is as if we speak of one.' Basil of Caesarea also gives evidence of the reverberations caused in the East by Meletius' public sermon, and appeals frequently to the fact that the bishop had discussed the orthodox faith quite openly. 'Since Meletius was the first to have spoken freely in favour of the truth and fought the famous combat during the age of Constantius, since my church has kept his communion and loves him because of his bravery and his firm resolution, I have communicated with him until now, and by divine grace, I shall continue if God wishes it.' (114).

The Arians were apparently horrified by his orthodoxy, and were determined to remove him at once (115). They accused him before the Emperor of impiety and tyrannous actions against his clergy. Taking advantage of disciplinary measures, they accused him of violating the canons of Nicaea by his translation from one see to another. He was reproached for duplicity and treated as a hypocrite for having pretended to share their opinions - now he had become an intrepid defender

of the homoousios (116). Others accused him of favouring the Sabellian heresy.

Constantius vacillated about taking action, until finally the Arians influenced him to expel Meletius from the city (117). Sozomen (118) adds that they gave him time to repent, but having found him inflexible, they exiled him in 361 to Armenia, his country of origin. John Chrysostom subsequently declared in a sermon:

> 'The administrator of the town came forward escorting around the market place the carriage in which the saint was already seated near him; stones fell from all sides on the head of the administrator, for the town was not able to support the separation but preferred even the loss of life to be deprived of this saintly man. But what did our blessed man do? He held his mantle over the head of the official, showing up the hatred of his enemies by the excess of his kindness and showing his own disciples what patience one should show towards those who are unjust.... Who was not thrilled to see the intense love felt by the city for its bishop and did not admire his sublime philosophy, his gentleness and mildness?' Even more idealistically he continues: 'They have expelled him in order to alienate his supporters - the opposite has been achieved. His body may be in Armenia, but his mind and soul live continually with you.' (119).

Up until now, the members of the orthodox party at Antioch

had, down to the time of Leontius inclusively, accepted bishops pleasing to the court and to the Arianising courtier-bishops but, rallied by Flavian and Diodore, they accepted the election of Meletius and thenceforth remained faithful to him even during his exile. Thus there was now a definitive break between Catholics and Arians in the Church of Antioch, and the two parties no longer worshipped together in the same communion. The supporters of Meletius (now led by Flavian and Diodore) met apart in the Apostolica, the ancient church in the Old Town of Antioch which used to be the cathedral.

But despite the fact that Meletius had proved with his profession of orthodoxy that he was doctrinally in agreement with the Paulinian party, so that, with a little tact and consideration they might have become united (especially in view of the fact that only one of the parties was led by a bishop), the Paulinians refused to be reconciled, and continued to meet in their own little church in the New Town on an island in the river. Their main objection against uniting with Meletius was that he had been ordained by Arians; but their obstinacy was unreasonable in that the Arians had subsequently rejected their own choice! Furthermore they demanded, not only the fundamentals of orthodoxy but the confession of the test-word homoousios, which had been officially proscribed at Rimini and which Meletius had carefully omitted from his sermon. 'Thus was the Antiochene Church divided, even in regard to those whose views on matters of faith exactly corresponded.' (120).

Immediately following Meletius' exile, the Emperor sent from Alexandria Euzoïus, one of the most determined of Arians, and one of the few survivors of the original supporters of Arius (121) to be the new leader of the official party.

CHAPTER TWO

360 - 370

In 359 General Sapor menaced Syria. Short of troops, Constantius ordered Julian, who had just been successful in his German campaigns, to send reinforcements from Gaul to meet the Persians; but Julian's troops, having no desire to go to the East to fight under the command of the not - very - successful Constantius, rose in revolt, giving Julian the choice of being killed or of being made emperor. Understandably, he chose the latter, and tried to persuade Constantius to accept him as co-emperor. Constantius refused, and it was while he was on his way to the West to fight with Julian that he fell ill in Cilicia, and after being baptised by Euzoius of Antioch, died on 3 November 361. Athanasius was very near the truth when he said that, with the death of Constantius, the arm of flesh supporting Arianism fell into the dust (1).

Julian, left sole ruler of the Roman Empire, promptly reversed his uncle's religious policy (2) and with a move which must have seemed to every Christian sect to be the frankest liberalism, he permitted the return to their sees of all exiled bishops (regardless of their religious beliefs), including Meletius of Antioch and Athanasius. Ostensibly an act of toleration, this procedure was really part of Julian's vigorous anti-Christian policy. In order to understand his motives, the moral and intellectual position of Julian requires some explanation. He was born in Constantinople in 331, the son of Julius Constantius (Constantine's brother) and Basilina, a Roman lady of high social status who died shortly after his birth. Julian was baptised a Christian and was always surrounded by ecclesiastics, but throughout his early life he had known scarcely anything but constraint, resentment

and suspicion. At six years of age he was orphaned when his father and one of his brothers were killed by the army in the great massacre which followed the death of Constantine, without any protest from his cousin Constantius, who did, however, make provision for the young boy and his half-brother Gallus. Julian remained for a time with Eusebius of Nicomedia, a distant relative, at Nicomedia and then lived at Constantinople for five years. He seems to have been influenced by his tutor, the eunuch Mardonius, who had taught his mother Basilina before him, and who was, as it happened, a Christian. Julian was to refer to him later with respect in his Misopogon. The two brothers, Gallus and Julian, were then re-united and spent the next eight years in Macellum in Cappadocia, where Julian received his first insight into the glories of classical literature by taking advantage of the resources of George of Cappadocia's library. In March 351 Gallus was appointed Caesar and went to rule at Antioch where he became immensely unpopular because of his tyrannical government (3). Julian subsequently pursued his studies at Nicomedia and Athens, where he encountered Basil and Gregory Nazianzen as fellow-students, and resisted Gallus' attempts to recall Julian to Christianity through the influence of the Anomoean, Aetius whose rise and temporary good fortune he had secured (4). So far as Julian was concerned, Christianity was the religion which had destroyed his family; its basic tenets were controversial and its past history ugly. What really attracted him was pagan Neoplatonism, and particularly the mysticism and frank occultism of Iamblichus. While Constantius lived, Julian was

forced to remain officially a Christian, but no sooner had he arrived in Constantinople after his uncle's death in 361 when he began his anti-Christian activities in earnest. He suppressed the privileges of the clerics and forbade Christians to teach grammar and rhetoric, and his attempts to restore pagan cults at Antioch were extremely unpopular and were strongly resisted.

His edict recalling exiled bishops, which has been mentioned previously, was not inspired by any genuine spirit of toleration. His real motive was to let the various factions tear each other to shreds to the detriment of Christianity, but in fact his action accomplished precisely the reverse, in that it allowed the Catholic Church to regain her strength against the Arians.

An important development in repairing doctrinal division among opponents of Arianism, who were no longer hindered by the arch anti-Nicene Constantius, proceeded from the Council of Alexandria assembled by Athanasius shortly after he returned from his third exile in 362. According to the leading signatures of the Synodal letter, only twenty-one bishops were present at the Council, but delegates were sent from many churches interested in restoring peace: monks from Apollinarius; representatives from Paulinus of Antioch; and letters professing the loyalty of the Meletians (5). Proceedings began by a solemn confirmation of the Council of Nicaea, whose profession of faith was judged sufficient to resolve all controversial questions. After some debate, it was agreed that all those who had only been contaminated by communion with heretics and had not actively propagated Arianism

could re-enter communion with the orthodox by acknowledging the Nicene faith and anathematising the Arian heresy. This was a vitally important decision for many Eastern bishops whose lives were otherwise irreproachable and whose doctrine was really orthodox. It was a decision particularly relevant to the situation at Antioch.

Next came the question of doctrinal definition. In his De Synodis of 359, Athanasius had already saluted the Homoeousians as brothers, since they recognised the Son was 'out of the Father's ousia and not from another hypostasis', and in this he was supported by Hilary of Poitiers who conceded that the homoousios lent itself to Sabellian interpretations unless safeguarded by proper stress on the distinction between the Persons of the ingenerate Father and the generate Son. Hilary even allowed the homoeousios with its anti-Sabellian emphasis on the three Persons, understood in the sense of a perfect equality which strictly entailed unity of nature. This paved the way for the formal recognition by the Council that theological divisions were created and kept alive by the use of different and mutually confusing theological terms, and what mattered most was not the language used, but the meaning underlying it (6).

Many in the East, including Meletius and his friends, were accustomed to speaking of three hypostases in the Godhead. This seemed suspect to strict Nicenes because it sounded in their ears like three ousiai, that is, three divine beings; but it really followed Origen's use of the term hypostases in the sense of 'persons'. Even Athanasius occasionally used it in this sense, and approved of others employing it provided that

it did not carry the Arian connotation of 'utterly distinct, alien hypostases different in substance from each other, but simply expressed the separate subsistence of the three Persons in the consubstantial Triad.' On the other hand, Paulinus and his friends used the older phrase, 'one hypostasis' which was equally disturbing to the anti-Nicenes since it opened the way to a Sabellian interpretation. This too was pronounced legitimate, providing it was used in the sense of substantia to bring out the unity of nature between the Father and the Son.

Having examined the teaching expressed by both parties, Athanasius considered them really at one and he outlined his conclusion in the Tomus ad Antiochenos, the only document to come down to us from the Council, and one of the decisive documents of the Arian controversy (7).

> Unite (as many then as desire peace with us)with our beloved Paulinus and his people, without requiring more from them than to anathematise the Arian heresy and confess the faith professed by the holy Fathers at Nicaea... For as to those whom some were blaming for speaking of three hypostases, on the ground that the phrase is unscriptural and therefore suspicious... we made enquiry of them, whether they meant, like the Arian madmen, subsistences foreign and strange, and alien in essence from one another, and that each hypostasis was divided apart by itself, as is the case with creatures in general and in particular with those begotten of men, or like different substances, such as gold, silver or

> brass, or whether, like other heretics they meant three beginnings and three gods by speaking of three hypostases. They assured us that they neither meant this nor had ever held it (8). Having accepted then these men's interpretation and defence of their language, we then made inquiry of those blamed by these for speaking of one hypostasis, whether they use the expression in the sense of Sabellius, to the negation of the Son and the Holy Spirit, or as though the Son were non-substantial or the Holy Ghost impersonal. But they in turn assured us that they neither meant this nor had they ever held it; but, 'We use the word hypostasis thinking it the same thing to say hypostasis or essence (ousia).' (9).
>
> Well, thereupon they who had been blamed for saying there were three subsistences agreed with the others, while those who had spoken of the one Essence, also confessed the doctrine of the former as interpreted by them... And all, by God's grace, and after the above explanations, agree together that the faith confessed by the Fathers at Nicaea is better than such phrases, and that for the future they would prefer to be content to use its language.

According to this explanation, both parties at Antioch had shown themselves to be orthodox; it was only necessary to state in which sense they used the term hypostasis. In effect, both

sides had accepted the position subsequently formulated in the Quicunque Vult: 'The Catholic faith is this, that we worship the one God as a Trinity, and the Trinity as a unity.' At this Council of Alexandria in 362 was foreshadowed the formula which became the badge of orthodoxy: 'one ousia, three hypostases.' Thus, for practical purposes of reconciliation, misunderstanding over doctrinal matters was removed, and at the close of the synod Eusebius of Vercelli and Asterius were sent to Antioch bearing a copy of the Tome with a view to unifying the Meletians and the Paulinians (10).

However, whatever doctrinal concessions were made in the Tome, the personal problems remained, and these were to prove the decisive factor. The suggestion in the letter that Paulinus should communicate with the Meletians was a generous move and a wise one; but it was a mistake in tactics. To be successful, the synod should have addressed itself to the Meletians, as they formed the main body of the Church - though it is hard to see how it could have done so without apparently betraying Paulinus, even though he was still only a presbyter leading a minority group. The situation was made even more delicate by the fact that Meletius was invited to visit meeting-places used by the Paulinian party to hear the Alexandrian proposals. Ideally, these should have been offered to Meletius in his own church, and at very least on neutral ground (11). Had the Meletians been approached first, communion between them and Alexandria, and then Rome, might have been restored, and the Paulinians might have come round in time.

In any case, these valiant attempts at unification were rendered null and void because of the untimely and foolish

intervention of Lucifer of Cagliari (12), a fanatical zealot for orthodoxy, who wished to end the schism in the interests of the Catholics. He had repeatedly exhorted each party to union, but as the Paulinians opposed this, he took matters into his own hands. Impressed by the way Paulinus' party had steadfastly refused to have any dealings with the Arians; employing the same theological terminology as they did; impatient with heretics as they were; and mistakenly believing the issue was purely doctrinal, Lucifer could not help regarding their rivals, the Meletians, as turncoats and traitors, and without waiting for the decisions of the Council of Alexandria, the bishop of Cagliari consecrated Paulinus bishop of Antioch.

When Eusebius of Vercelli arrived in Antioch, confident of resolving the deadlock there, he was distressed to find his mission anticipated in such a way by Lucifer, but unwilling to come into open collision with his friend, he retired immediately. According to Socrates (13) Eusebius promised the Antiochenes he would arrange everything in a council and try to find some way of reconciliation.

Lucifer himself seems to have been highly agitated, partly perhaps by Eusebius' tacit disapproval, but above all by the mild way in which penitent Arians had been treated at the Council of Alexandria; and though he dared not withdraw his signature given there by his two representatives, he nevertheless declared that he was not prepared to hold communion with Eusebius or anyone else who adopted this policy; returned to Sardica; and continued to occupy his own see (14).

Lucifer was not made for the role of mediator, and although he had tried sincerely to meet a need, his intervention at Antioch was a grave mistake. In the eyes of most Eastern supporters of Nicaea there was already a legitimate bishop there - Meletius - and Lucifer's action cast aspersions on his faithful congregation, suggesting that orthodoxy was solely on the side of the small church of the Eustathians. It is incomprehensible why this consecration was subsequently recognised by Alexandria and Rome, since consecration by a single bishop was against canon law. (There was a provision that during times of persecution, established rules might be bypassed for the sake of the well-being of the Christian population, but this was hardly the case at Antioch.) However, after this action by Lucifer there was no longer any means of coming to an understanding. Gregory of Nyssa subsequently described Lucifer's intervention as an attempt to corrupt the chastity of the Church of Antioch (15), and indeed that bishop must take a good share of the blame for actually prolonging the schism which dragged on for a further fifty years. It was all the more regrettable since everywhere else Athanasius' great effort at Alexandria, sanctioned by the authority of Pope Liberius and endorsed by many provincial synods all over the Christian world, had consolidated a magnificent Nicene bulwark against the power of Arianism.

Julian's persecutions, made impartially against orthodox and heretical Christians alike, continued until the end of June 363. The Emperor records the resistance made by Diodore at

Antioch:

> Diodore...to the detriment of the public,...had made contact with poets and has armed his odious language with rhetorical inventions against the celestial gods, but being very ignorant of pagan mysteries and completely prejudiced, has corrupted sinners and ignorant theologians alike...Diodore, the magician of the Nazarene...appears as a glib sophist of a gross religion. Thus he has been for a long time punished by the gods. For several years he has been in grave danger owing to decaying lungs...his whole body is fading away; his cheeks are hollow; his wrinkles are deeply ingrained; all this does not testify to the life of philosophy he wishes to represent to those he wrongs, but rather the judgment and punishment of the gods(16).

Meletius had by now returned to Antioch, and is mentioned personally in two incidents which took place about this time: he assisted with his faithful followers at the martyrdom of two soldiers, Bonosus and Maximilian (17); and he went with Cyril to Jerusalem on the occasion of the sacrifices in the temple at Daphne (18). One source (19) states that all clerics fled from Antioch at this time, giving rise to the view that Meletius entered upon a second exile, but this is entirely unsupported by other documents.

When Julian was killed in battle in 363, the Christian Jovian was elected in his place, and a change in imperial policy determined the next stage of the schism at Antioch. The new Emperor immediately

set about righting the wrongs which had been committed against orthodox bishops, and desiring to receive instruction about correct doctrine, found himself involved in theological disputes. Guided by an exposition of the correct faith written by Athanasius, who had once more returned from exile, and by an interview with that bishop in September 363, Jovian declared that he preferred the homoousian doctrine above all others. Meletius, who had already made a good impression on the emperor, immediately gave his formal acceptance of the Creed of Nicaea at a synod held in Antioch at the end of 363, but the integrity of this move was rendered suspect by the involvement of Acacius of Caesarea.

Known variously as ὁ μονόφθαλμος because of a personal defect, and 'the tongue of the Arians' (20), Acacius was a man of great intellectual ability; but he was also unscrupulous, and headed the turbulent party (called after him the Acacians) which had rejected the homoousios and the homoeousios at Seleucia in 359 (21). It was mainly through his intrigues that the Council of Constantinople of 360 accepted the Confession of Rimini by which, in Jerome's often-quoted words, 'the whole world groaned to find itself Arian'. (22); but the bishop and his friends found it convenient to change their views when the orthodox Jovian filled the imperial throne. It is entirely in keeping with his character that Acacius went over to the more powerful side again, making common cause with Eudoxius on the accession in 364 of the Arian Valens (23).

Wishing, as usual, to be on the winning side, Acacius joined Meletius in professing the Nicene faith at Antioch in 363, and a synodal letter was despatched to Jovian (24)

defining the homoousios in the following words:

> The term therein contained which is approved by some - to wit, the term homoousios - has received from the fathers a safe interpretation, which shows that the Son was begotten from the being (essence) of the Father, and that he is like the Father in being (essence)...not indeed as though any passion were thought of in regard to that ineffable generation, nor according to any Grecian usage is the term ousia taken by the Fathers, but for the refutation of the impious and daring assertion of Arius concerning Christ, that he was 'out of nothing' (out of that which was non-existent), which the modern school of the Anomoeans yet more hardily and daringly proclaim to the destruction of the concord of the church.

Hefele maintains (25) that by his gloss Acacius meant to leave a loophole for himself, intending 'somewhat to weaken and semi-Arianise the expression homoousios'so that it implied 'the Son is born of the essence of the Father and in respect of essence is like Him,' thus qualifying a Nicene term in a homoeousian sense; and Meletius had apparently endorsed his views. Indeed, at the time an anonymous pamphlet entitled Refutation of the hypocrisy of Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata, which has come down to us in the works of Athanasius (26) and is attributed, without proof, by Benedictine editors to Paulinus or to one of his adherents, pointed out with great satisfaction all the possible homoean elements contained in the letter.

Bethune-Baker, at variance with Hefele, believes the gloss refers to the phrase ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς ... ἐγεννήθη, and was intended 'to guard the conception of the generation and to exclude all materialising speculation'. Thus, the doctrine expressed in the letter was completely in accordance with Athanasius' own desire to exclude the conception that Christ's origin was in any way external to the Father. If Bethune-Baker is correct, then the pamphlet denouncing Meletius is perhaps indicative of the spirit of orthodox opposition ranged against Meletius, and the eagerness to interpret any connection with Acacius in the worst possible light. In any case, at the Council of Paris (360) and Alexandria (362), the idea that the homoeousios accentuated was admitted to be a useful and necessary explanation of the homoousios.

Meletius, without worrying about the attacks made against him, profited by the peace effected by Jovian to consolidate his own affairs at Antioch, obtaining a new church (27) and ordaining Flavian and Diodore priests. At this point Athanasius himself appeared willing to communicate with Meletius. The way seemed open for the union, so warmly recommended by the Council of Alexandria the year before, to be realised and the schism at Antioch healed. Our knowledge of what actually happened is incomplete, being based on a few sketchy references made by Basil of Caesarea in his letters, but it seems that in 372 Basil wrote to Meletius, apparently after preliminary negotiations with Athanasius:

> As to what concerns the right reverend bishop Athanasius, your intelligence

> is already aware of what I will mention, that it is impossible for anything to be advanced by my letters, or for any desirable objects to be carried out, unless by some means or other he receives communion from you, who at that time postponed it. He is described as being very anxious to unite with me, and to be willing to contribute all he can, but to be sorry that he was sent away without communion, and that the promise still remains unfulfilled (28).

Our next piece of evidence appears in a letter written by Basil to Count Terentius in 375. The bishop of Caesarea, who consistently defended Meletius, is commenting on the ignorance and bias which dominated the whole course of the schism at Antioch: '...it is only what one might expect that they (the Paulinians) should either be ignorant of the truth, or should even endeavour to conceal the reasons which led the blessed Bishop Athanasius to write to Paulinus.' (29).

Finally, Basil wrote to Epiphanius, who had pleaded Paulinus' cause to the bishop of Caesarea, respectfully but firmly declaring he could not abandon the cause of Meletius. '...the very blessed Athanasius came from Alexandria, and was most anxious that communion should be established between Meletius and himself; but by the malice of counsellors their conjunction was put off to another season.' (30).

From these references it appears that in 363 Athanasius, perhaps worried by the irregularity of Paulinus' consecration and recognising the perfect orthodoxy of his rival, very much desired to communicate with Meletius and thus reconstitute the

unity of the Church in the East. However, it seems that some check was placed in the negotiations by Meletius' counsellors who, while not advocating absolute refusal, advised delay - perhaps because Athanasius had not yet publicly separated Marcellus of Ancyra from his communion. Grieved by Meletius' coolness and perhaps now worried by his association with Acacius in respect of the gloss of 363, Athanasius sought another way of bringing about unity at Antioch. The bishop of Alexandria had been in communion with Paulinus' party since his return from exile in 346, and overlooking their leader's irregular consecration he now asked Paulinus to establish his orthodoxy by signing the Tome of Alexandria of 362 (31); this done, Athanasius recognised him as the lawful bishop of Antioch.

The tragedy is that had Athanasius' attempt to communicate with Meletius succeeded, the West would probably have accepted his decision and the schism of Antioch would have come to an end. However, Paulinus had immensely strengthened his position in the eyes of the world by signing the Tome, for he thus broke with Lucifer, acquired Athanasius as an ally, and cleared himself from any possible suspicion of Apollinarianism. A minority of those attached to Paulinus did indeed withdraw from him saying that he had compromised himself by subscribing to the Tome with its 'concessions' to non-Homoousians. Thus there was yet another break at Antioch.

With a declared Nicene like Jovian in control, all hopes for reunion would not have been lost. However, Jovian died in an accident on his way to Constantinople in February 364, and Valentinian, an officer of his guard, took his

place, choosing to rule in the West himself and entrusting his own brother Valens with the government of the East. Valens was a moderate Arian, and adopted the Homoean formula of Rimini as the criterion for orthodoxy. In May 365 he banished afresh all those who had been deposed by Constantius and restored by Julian, among them Meletius (32), whose followers were now expelled from their churches and had to meet in the open countryside, even in winter (33). Paulinus was not disturbed and his few adherents (34) continued to worship in a little church in Antioch; but Euzoius the Arian again became the officially-recognised bishop of Antioch.

Theodoret recounts the only major episode which took place at Antioch during this persecution: the visit of the celebrated anchorite, Julian Sabas, to the Meletian community, when he prayed with the persecuted, and reputedly performed many works of healing. But nothing of the lot of the Meletians had changed when the monk returned to solitude (35).

The persecution was violent, but it ended quickly when Valens became preoccupied by the rise of Procopius in September 365 and the war against the Goths (367-70). Meletius now returned to Antioch where he resumed guiding his community and deeply impressed by his holy life and sermons, baptised and ordained as a reader a certain John, the future Chrysostom.

Meanwhile in the West the Latin prelates, ruled by the catholic and tolerant Valentinian, were too concerned with eradicating Arianism in their own part of the world to care much about the East. Thus when in 366 a delegation of three bishops (Eustathius of Sebaste, Silvanus of Tarsus and Theophilus of Castabala) was sent to Pope Liberius from the

Homoeousian group, which had also been persecuted under Valens, they were received into communion with Rome on the basis of acceptance of the Nicene Creed (36) - though Valens, under the influence of Eudoxius who was now bishop of Constantinople, forbade their meeting at the council which they requested should be held at Tarsus to consummate the work of unification - and the Pope wrote to the Easterns, whom he admitted fully into communion, and confirmed in their sees all those who adhered to the same faith; but neither he nor Damasus, who succeeded him later the same year, announced any definite decision about the particular difficulty at Antioch.

When in the Spring of 367 the newly-declared-orthodox bishops returned to the East, they were welcomed with enthusiasm, and at the Council of Tyanus that year (which Meletius did not attend, perhaps because he was still in exile, though several of his friends were present (37), great numbers became united in the faith, and hopes ran high that a union would be established which would make more concerted the fight against Arianism.

But when Valens was delivered from the Gothic peril in 369, he renewed his persecutions; Meletius was banished for the third time to Armenia (38), and there seemed very little chance at all for an early - or even an eventual - settlement at Antioch.

CHAPTER THREE

370 - 381

The schism at Antioch entered a new phase in 370 when Basil succeeded Eusebius as bishop of Caesarea and took a vigorous part in trying to heal the controversy.

Basil was born about 330, the eldest son of a much respected family which had originated at Caesarea in Cappadocia, and which had long been Christian - his grandparents on both sides had suffered during the Maximian persecution. He was brought up by his grandmother Macrina, and was educated, first at Caesarea (1) and Constantinople (2), and then at Athens (351 - 355), where he studied chiefly under the sophists Himerius and Prohaeresius, becoming a master of heathen eloquence and learning, and developing a deep and long-lived friendship with Gregory of Nazianzus. He also met as a fellow-student Julian, the future emperor, who apparently conceived a warm attachment for Basil (3). After teaching rhetoric at Caesarea (4), Basil was eventually persuaded by Macrina to devote himself to the religious life, and was baptised there, probably by the bishop Dianius (5). He was profoundly determined in his life of devotion, and the severe bodily austerities he practised emaciated him and ruined his already feeble health. His friend Gregory describes him as 'without wife, without property, without flesh, almost without blood'. (6).

When Eusebius died in 370 Basil, believing his own succession to the see of Caesarea was vital to the cause of orthodoxy in Asia Minor, used his father's influence as an advocate of high repute to secure his consecration, despite objections made about his health (7). His election filled the orthodox with great joy, and as bishop of Caesarea, metropolitan of Cappadocia and exarch of Pontus, his influence

quickly spread over more than half of Asia Minor; and although Valens regarded him as a serious check to the triumph of Arianism and an opponent not to be despised, the emperor's attempts to remove him failed (8), and Basil was left inviolate. In fact, the bishop even received an imperial commission in 372 to set in order the religious affairs of Armenia and to ordain bishops there, and Valens also contributed generously to Basil's hospital mission.

A double goal determined all Basil's efforts at Caesarea, though, tragically, his labours bore fruit only after his death. The Church, he believed, needed unity above all else to survive Valens' persecution, so links with the West must be renewed; and secondly, the orthodox in the East (and particularly in Antioch) must be pacified. Firmly convinced that Meletius was the sole legitimate bishop of Antioch (9) and the only acceptable one for the East, Basil's hope was centred on Athanasius, the doyen of the Nicene party (10) who was respected by Valens and admired by the Eastern Nicenes. Since he also enjoyed the confidence of the West, he was the man best qualified to heal the breach and to seek the aid of the bishop of Rome who was officially neutral. Therefore, in 371 Basil wrote to the bishop of Alexandria, describing with poignant emotion his sorrow for the state of the East, begging him to stir up in the West an interest in their affairs and thus bring about the union of the orthodox in Antioch.

> No one, I feel sure, is more distressed at the present condition, or, rather to speak more truly, ill condition of the Churches than your excellency...You are well aware that if no check

> is put to the swift deterioration which we are witnessing, there will soon be nothing to prevent the complete transformation of the Churches....I myself have long been aware... that the one way of safety for the Churches of the East lies in their having the sympathy of the bishops of the West... But, to carry out these objects, who has more capacity than yourself, with your intelligence and prudence? ...O most honoured father...despatch from the holy Church placed under your care men of ability in sound doctrine to the bishops in the West. Recount to them the troubles whereby we are beset. Suggest some mode of relief... plainly the discipline of the Church of Antioch depends upon your reverence's being able to control some, to reduce others to silence, and to restore strength to the Church by concord...Truly the diseases of that city, which has not only been cut asunder by heretics, but torn in pieces by men who say that they are of one mind with one another, stand in need of your wisdom and evangelic sympathy (11).

Meanwhile, Basil also wrote to Meletius, who was now in exile for the third time, expressing his veneration for the bishop of Antioch, and announcing in veiled words an important project which prudence advised him not to commit to writing, but about which Theophrastus, the bearer, would give him instructions (12). This letter was followed up the following year by Basil's visit to Meletius at Getasa (13).

A favourable reply from Athanasius conveyed by Peter (14), one of his priests, encouraged Basil to write again to Meletius (15) advising him to supplement Athanasius' goodwill by sending a delegation to Rome' to move some of the Italians to undertake a voyage by sea to us, that they may avoid all who would put difficulties in their way. My reason for this course is that I see that those, who are all-powerful with the Emperor, are neither willing nor able to make any suggestion to him about the exiled, but only count it so much to the good that they see no worse thing befalling the Churches.'

Meletius could not go himself, but placed at Basil's disposal one Dorotheus, a deacon of Antioch, who now carried a new batch of letters to Alexandria. This time, Basil was much more explicit, and suggested (16) that the schism might be healed by the West's recognition of Meletius (rather than Paulinus), the very man who had refused to communicate with Athanasius in 363.

> All that portion of the people of the holy Church of Antioch who are sound in the faith, ought to be brought to concord and unity... the sections, now divided into several parts ought to be united under the God-beloved bishop, Meletius...just as smaller streams with great ones.

Basil hoped Athanasius would send Dorotheus by the first boat to Rome, where he would deliver letters to Damasus which mentioned the affairs at Antioch only generally, but

requested that orthodox and peacable persons be sent to the city to restore concord.

> I have been constrained to beseech you by letter to be moved to help us, and to send some of those, who are like minded with us, either to conciliate the dissentient and bring back the Churches of God into friendly union, or at all events to make you see more plainly who are responsible for the unsettled state in which we are, that it may be obvious to you for the future with whom it befits you to be in communion(17).

But Athanasius was probably aware that to allow Dorotheus to go to Rome would be tantamount to acknowledging the authority of Meletius, and this was against the bishop's principles. Accordingly, he attempted to satisfy Basil without compromising his own attitude to Meletius by sending Dorotheus back to Caesarea in 372 accompanied by Sabinus, a Milanese deacon who later became bishop of Piacenza, and bearing Pope Damasus' letter Confidimus Quidem, a document concerning the Roman councils convened by Damasus to investigate the errors of the Arian Auxentius of Milan (18). The aim of this arrangement was to allow Basil to communicate with the West without Athanasius challenging Meletius; and the bishop of Caesarea was gratified to receive at last a Latin cleric who might be able to report to Rome the pitiable state of the Eastern church.

Basil now wrote to Meletius recommending him to write

to the Westerns himself, and criticising his unhelpful attitude towards Athanasius (19).

W. A. Jurgens believes that Epistle 92 in the correspondence of Basil was actually written by Meletius in response to this request (20). Carried to the West by Sabinus, the letter laments the fact that the help for which the Orientals had been waiting for so long has not been granted, and suggests that a full synod should be held, not only to re-establish the Creed of Nicaea and to extirpate Arianism, but also to discuss with the Churches matters pertaining to peace, 'bringing into agreement all who are of one mind...For the saddest thing about it all is that the sound part is divided against itself, and the troubles we are suffering are like those which once befel Jerusalem when Vespasian was besieging it... In our case, too, in addition to the open attack of the heretics, the Churches are reduced to utter helplessness by the war raging among those who are supposed to be orthodox.'

About this time a private letter was sent to Basil from Valerian, bishop of Aquileia from 369 to 388, whom he regarded as being next to Damasus in importance (21). This brought assurances of the warm attachment and sincere sympathy of the Western church, but kind words were ineffectual in healing the breach. Nor did they please Basil, since they were followed by a statement that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all of one divinity, one sole virtue, one sole image, onewhole substance. Basil could not admit this statement, except by liberal interpretation, but holding the common view that Latin was theologically and philosophically a comparatively poor language, and that in particular any precise equivalent for

the term ousia was lacking, he accordingly raised no objections but instead responded by writing to the Latins in general, avoiding all awkward refinements of expression, and merely asking for the compassion of the West and requesting that someone might be sent to investigate the position and bring about peace before 'utter shipwreck' took place in Antioch. Basil's desire was for a body of Western bishops to sit in synod with the East (22).

Sabinus carried his letters to the West after Easter of 372 and arrived in Rome in the summer of that year. For some reason the letters'did not give satisfaction' to Pope Damasus, and he put them aside for a year. At last, in June 373, he sent them back by Evagrius (23), a Eustathian deacon of Antioch who had followed Eusebius of Vercelli to Italy eleven years before and now, after Eusebius' death, was returning home. Among documents for Basil's attention, Evagrius carried a formula for signature, not a word of which might be changed, and a demand that a commission of men of repute should go from the East to Rome in order that there might be some reason for making them a return visit (24). This was indeed a discourteous reply to cries of help. Basil was offended, and thereafter had only a poor opinion of the bishops of the West. He believed their leader Damasus to be a man of 'haughty and merciless temper' and therefore refused the formula.

This was a bad tactical move on Basil's part seeing that Paulinus had signed his name at the bottom of this declaration of faith, and had declared that his party had never mentioned the word 'creature', but recognised as consubstantial the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, three

hypostases and one substance. Piously, Paulinus had expressed the hope that the orthodoxy of Meletius was as sound, and regretted that several of those in communion with him had blasphemed the Holy Spirit, treating him as a creature estranged from God: an allusion to Eustathius of Sebaste, who at one time had been in communion with Meletius and whom Basil himself had supported - believing him to be orthodox, despite objections raised by Meletius (25) - by obtaining his signature to an elaborate formula of faith drawn up by Theodotus, bishop of Nicopolis (26). This association was unfortunate, and must have further discredited Basil in the eyes of the West for, after refusing to appear at a synod to confirm his orthodoxy, Eustathius had opehly charged the bishop of Caesarea with heterodox views and with haughty and overbearing behaviour towards his fellow-bishops (27). He then had published a letter which Basil had written to Apollinaris twenty-five years before when both had been laymen and the heresiarch, still highly esteemed by Athanasius, had not yet developed his heretical views; but Eustathius appended to the letter some of Apollinarius' later expressions, and in many circles these were suspected as Basil's own (28). Eustathius continued to harass his victim until Basil's death in 379.

Besides ignoring the formula, Basil refused to send an embassy to Rome, on the ground that Meletius was in Armenia and communications were impossible seeing that it was winter. Basil's attitude could not help his cause, and he was strongly rebuked in a letter from the courier Evagrius, who had by now (374) arrived in Antioch, for being a lover of controversy and being unduly swayed by personal partialities. If he really desired peace, let him come to Antioch and endeavour to reunite the

Catholics, or at least write to them, and use his influence with Meletius to put an end to the dissension. Basil's reply (29) is a model of courteous sarcasm. If Evagrius were a great lover of peace, why had he not communicated with Dorotheus, the present head of the Meletian party in Antioch? Evagrius responded by making a definite alliance with Paulinus, and much later, in 388, in spite of his professed desires for peace, actually prolonged the schism at Antioch by being consecrated bishop of that city by the dying Paulinus.

Negotiations between Basil and the West had come to a halt for a while after the death of Athanasius on 3 May 373, as he had been the only intermediary who carried weight with both sides. Peter of Alexandria, 'honoured for his grey hairs' (30), was his successor but, a victim of Arian hostility and replaced by their choice Lucius, was forced to flee to Rome where he remained for five years in close association with Damasus. His relations with Basil were kindly - their common love for Athanasius drew them into correspondence (31) - but Peter firmly regarded Paulinus, and not Meletius as the true bishop of Antioch. In a letter (32) addressed to the exiled Egyptian confessors at Diocaesarea he writes: 'I ask your advice under the trouble that has befallen me: what ought I to do when Timotheus gives himself out for a bishop, that in this character he may with more boldness injure others and infringe the laws of the Fathers? For he chose to anathematise me, with the bishops Basil of Caesarea, Paulinus, Epiphanius and Diodorus, and to communicate with Vitalis alone'. Later, at the Council of Rome in 377, Peter fired up at the name of Meletius and exclaimed, 'He is no better than an Arian'. (33).

A council was convoked by Damasus in Rome in the Autumn of 374, and afterwards Dorotheus was sent back to the East with a letter (34) which was far from conciliatory, since it dogmatically declared the standard Western formula of one ousia and three personae, and ostentatiously avoided the use of the crucial term 'three hypostases' which Basil and Meletius employed. Damasus also referred to canonical regulations about ordination, clearly aiming his criticism at Meletius, declaring that those who failed to observe canonical rules as to the ordination of bishops and clergy could not readily be admitted into communion - an objection which applied to Paulinus no less than Meletius! Basil's repeated requests that a Western delegation should be sent to investigate the situation thoroughly were ignored. The West gave assurances of sympathy, but nothing more. It was regrettable that Damasus was not sufficiently magnanimous to overlook questions of etiquette and intervene effectively in favour of the persecuted people. The implications of this exchange were clear: in Rome's eyes Paulinus was still the canonical bishop of Antioch.

The following year, this impression was confirmed by the news that Damasus had at last written to Paulinus, granting him full communion with the West.

> ...In order to remove all doubt and to prevent your praiseworthy prudence putting off people who may be wish to unite themselves to your church, we have sent to you our profession of faith, not so much for you yourself to unite with us by the communion of this faith, but rather that those who, by subscribing to it, might

> communicate with us through you, a very brother... We must tear out completely this heresy which has been gaining ground in the East...If anyone affirms that it is the Word who has taken the place of the human mind in the Lord Incarnate, the Catholic Church anathematises him. She anathematises also those who recognise two sons in the person of the Saviour, the one before the Incarnation and the other after having been made flesh of the Virgin, and who do not recognise that he is the same Son of God before and after. Whoever wishes may subscribe to this letter, but first of all he must subscribe to the ecclesiastical canons, which you know perfectly, and to the faith of Nicaea; then you may without any hesitation receive him....(35).

Until now there had been no explicit approbation given by the West to the election of Paulinus, and thus a considerable step had been made in connection with the schism; but in fact, the dénouement was as far away as ever. It was disastrous as far as Basil was concerned, and a mockery of his special knowledge of the needs of the East and of his veneration of Meletius; his deep discouragement runs through all the letters he wrote during this period. One of these, addressed to his friend Count Terentius (36), is perhaps the most explicit and most illuminating document concerning the schism, and shows the complications occasioned by doctrinal issues which had been exaggerated in attacks made by adversaries, even though both parties had satisfied Athanasius in 362.

But a further rumour has reached me that you are in Antioch and are transacting the business at hand with the chief authorities. And,besides this, I have heard that the brethren who are of the party of Paulinus are entering on some discussion with your Excellency on the subject of union with us; and by 'us' I mean those who are supporters of the man of God, Meletius the bishop. I hear, moreover, that the Paulinians are carrying about a letter of the Westerns, assigning to them the episcopate of the Church in Antioch, but speaking misleadingly of Meletius, the admirable bishop of the true Church of God. I am not surprised. They, (the Westerns) are totally ignorant of what is going on here; the others, though they might be supposed to know, give an account to them in which party is put before truth; and it is only what one might expect that they should either be ignorant of the truth, or should even endeavour to conceal the reasons which led the blessed Bishop Athanasius to write to Paulinus. But your Excellency has on the spot those who are able to tell you accurately what passed between the bishops in the reign of Jovian and from them I beseech you to get information. I accuse no one; I pray that I may have love to all, and especially unto them who are of the household of faith; and therefore I congratulate those who have received the letter from Rome. And, although it is a grand testimony in their favour, I only hope it is true and

> confirmed by the facts. But I shall never be able to persuade myself on these grounds to ignore Meletius, or to forget which Church is under him, or to treat as small, and of little importance to the true religion the questions which originated the division. I shall never consent to give in, merely because somebody is very much elated at receiving a letter from men. Even if it had come down from Heaven itself, but he (the recipient) does not agree with the sound doctrine of faith, I cannot look upon him as in communion with the saints.

Basil complains that his enemies' sole occupation in discourse on theological matters seemed not to establish their own position, but to attack his and that of Meletius.

> What better calculated to disturb the faith of the majority than that some of us could be shewn to assert that there is one <u>hypostasis</u> of Father, Son and Holy Ghost? We distinctly lay down that there is a difference of Persons; but this statement was anticipated by Sabellius, who affirms that God is one by <u>hypostasis</u>, but is described by Scripture in different Persons, according to the requirements of each individual case; sometimes under the name of Father, when there is occasion for this Person; sometimes under the name of Son when there is a descent to human interests or any of the operations of the economy; and sometimes

> under the Person of Spirit when the occasion demands such phraseology. If, then, any among us are shewn to assert that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one in substance, while we maintain the three perfect Persons, how shall we escape giving clear and incontrovertible proof of the truth of what is being asserted about us?

Basil points out in his letter that the two parties (that of Meletius and that of Paulinus) are really at one, doctrinally speaking.

> The non-identity of <u>hypostasis</u> and <u>ousia</u> is, I take it, suggested even by our western brethren, where, from a suspicion of the inadequacy of their own language, they have given the word <u>ousia</u> in the Greek,-to the end that any possible difference of meaning might be preserved in the clear and unconfounded distinction of terms.

Then follows Basil's explanation of his own doctrinal position on the difference between <u>ousia</u> and <u>hypostasis</u>.

> ...<u>Ousia</u> has the same relation to hypostasis as the common has to the particular. Every one of us both shares in existence by the common term of essence (<u>ousia</u>) and by his own properties is such an one and such an one. In the same manner, in the matter in question, the term <u>ousia</u> is common, like goodness, or Godhead, or any similar attribute, while <u>hypostasis</u> is contemplated in the special property of

> Fatherhood, Sonship, or the power to sanctify. If then they describe the Persons as being without hypostasis, the statement is per se absurd; but if they concede that the Persons exist in real hypostasis, as they acknowledge, let them so reckon them that the principle of the homoousion may be preserved in the unity of the Godhead, and that the doctrine preached may be the recognition of the true religion, of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in the perfect and complete hypostasis of each of the Persons named.

Terentius was deeply moved by Basil's letter, and it appears that he interceded courageously for the Meletians to Valens. When the Emperor asked him to choose a reward as a recompense for the services he had just performed in the East, Terentius requested that a single church be granted to those in Antioch who fought for the cause of orthodoxy. Furious, Valens tore up the supplication and requested the general to make another choice. Terentius refused (38).

Deeply regretting the added sufferings Meletius would have to endure while Paulinus lived tranquilly at Antioch, Basil assured the exiled bishop he would make further efforts on his behalf (39), and he undertook long journeys in Pisidia and Pontus, where more of Meletius' followers had been bitterly disappointed by Rome's decision.

The lot of the Meletians in Antioch had not been changed since their bishop was exiled - they were still led by Flavian and Diodore, and Basil wrote them affectionate letters

encouraging them during this difficult time (40) - but even after Damasus' letter to Paulinus they did not give up hope of obtaining help from the West. Dorotheus himself proposed another visit to Rome, and despite Basil's discouraging response (41) he set out in the spring of 376 with a letter from the bishop of Caesarea (42) which was in effect a long recital of discouragement and weariness. Basil complained how often he had appealed for help in the past; again he requests that delegates should be sent from Rome to see for themselves what could not be made clear in letters; he speaks of bishops exiled by force with no trial, having to live the rest of their lives in solitude; he writes of evil spreading like wildfire, affecting all churches everywhere, and warns that it is no earthly force which attacks them, but rather the enemy of souls who is launching an attack on the common wealth of the paternal treasure of the orthodox faith. The pillars of the faith were dispersed, and it was a sure sign of the gravity of their situation that they were not able to leave the East to visit Rome themselves, for they would leave their churches open to ambushes. This letter too, was unavailing, and Basil's bitterness is expressed in a letter he wrote to Eusebius of Samosata who was then in exile in Thrace.

> I am moved to say, as Diomede did (about Achilles in the Iliad), 'Would that you had not asked him, for he's proud.' For, in truth when proud characters are courted, they become haughtier than ever. If the Lord be propitious to us, what other assistance do we need? If the anger of God continues, what help can we have from the supercilious frown of the West? Men who do not

> know the truth, and do not wish to learn it, but are prejudiced by false suspicions, are doing now what they did in the case of Marcellus, when they quarrelled with those who told them the truth, and themselves strengthened the cause of heresy(43).

In a letter to Meletius in 376 Basil declared he was not prepared to write again to Rome, since his previous efforts were all in vain. He suggests that Meletius (with whom Sanctissimus, a Western presbyter, was now staying) should write himself, warning the West not to receive into communion indiscriminately those who came from the East, but after having favoured one party 'not to receive others on that party's recommendation alone, and not to give protection to anyone who writes a profession of faith under the pretext of orthodoxy. It is thus they find themselves communicating with people who frequently profess the same words but who fight each other like the most determined adversaries'(44). Basil's bitterness was indeed profound.

In the same year a further complication arose when yet another priest was consecrated bishop at Antioch. This was a certain Vitalis who had been ordained presbyter by Meletius (45) but who had deserted his bishop after a quarrel, and had fallen under the influence of Apollinaris of Laodicea. His sympathies with Apollinaris were unsuspected by Damasus, who had entrusted him with the letter of communion he sent to Paulinus, and his holy life and pastoral zeal gathered a large number of followers at Antioch. Eventually Vitalis attracted the attention of Epiphanius, who arrived in Antioch after an urgent letter from Basil (46), and a conference revealed that although the presbyter was completely orthodox in every other respect, he taught that Christ's

divinity took the place of a human mind in the Incarnate Word (47). He was immediately denounced, and a wiser Damasus passed instructions that he could be admitted to orthodox communion only if he repudiated his error. The heretical group formed yet another schismatic church, and Vitalis was consecrated their bishop by Apollinarus . There were now three allegedly Nicene bishops of Antioch as well as the Arian official bishop Euzoius. Vitalis' successors were still present at Antioch when Sozomen wrote his Ecclesiastical History (48).

After this, Basil's letters are chronologically obscure. We know that he repeated his efforts, informing the West that although Arius no longer troubled the Church, peace was nevertheless broken by Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, by Apollinarius and by Paulinus, 'who is now showing an inclination for the doctrine of Marcellus' (49). This remark was another tactical error in view of Rome's recent recognition of Paulinus, and it ensured that the letter would be unavailing. The Roman Church replied simply by repudiating the errors attributed to Eustathius, Apollinaris and Marcellus, but would not condemn absent persons by name when they could not explain themselves in a debate. But no such debate ever took place.

The Council of Rome held towards the end of 377 marks the next stage of the Schism. It was here that Dorotheus was shocked to hear Peter of Alexandria speak of Meletius as an Ariomaniac without any protest from Damasus, who was presiding over the Council (50). To judge by the two extant fragments of the Synodical letter (51), the assembled bishops decided that they could not possibly help the Eastern bishops apart

from recognising their right beliefs. 'It is impossible for us to grant you even the slightest relief. However, happily you have gained a valuable consolation for, having recognised the integrity of our faith, you may now glory in being united with us in the same belief, and you may rest assured that we entertain great concern for all our members.' A brief affirmation of doctrine contrary to the views of the Pneumatomachians, of Marcellus and of Apollinarius accompanied this declaration. The situation seemed impossible.

Basil did not live to see the end of the confusion, although he had witnessed the end of Arianism proper. A chronic invalid constantly subject to liver attacks (52), Basil died aged fifty on 1 January 379. He had worked himself to death trying to bring about a reunion. His temperament had been both too sensitive and too pugnacious, and he therefore experienced a constant series of failures. This is exemplified by the fact that he had obstinately contended for the recognition of Meletius as bishop of Antioch without considering the difficult position in which the churches of Rome and Alexandria would be placed by such a recognition. When opposed, he lost his temper. Even in his own country and ecclesiastical circle his influence was vigorously contested, for his orthodoxy was suspected by many, and his assistant bishops troubled him by indulging in simony and scandal. He had also quarrelled with his friend Gregory of Nazianzus. Had his health been better, Basil might have risen above these troubles. His motives had been sincere: 'I declare that in my heart there is such an emotion that I would willingly sacrifice my life if I could extinguish this flame of hatred which has been kindled by wicked men.' (53). But in practice Basil had not been very effective. His activity shows how

fruitless it was to attempt to heal this schism by conciliatory means. It also shows the difficulty of disentangling the issues involved. For instance, the lawfulness of Meletius' position was affected by the question of his orthodoxy and his past life; and Basil's failure provides a demonstration that the Antiochene dispute could not be decided by the Pope - when Damasus openly supported Paulinus, the Asiatics stuck by Meletius.

Ironically, the union which Basil had striven for was precipitated by a military disaster when on 9 August 378 Valens was killed at the Battle of Adrianople, and the whole structure of Arian rule collapsed in the East. Two years before Valens' death, the Goths established beyond the Danube found themselves attacked by the Huns who had come from the Eurasian Steppes. Driven back by these savage hordes, they had asked for shelter on Imperial territory, and had been allowed to settle in Thrace upon certain conditions, which were effected by Valens' government with so little conscience and humanity that the immigrants revolted, and Valens found it necessary to undertake a campaign against them. On 9 August, the Romans were defeated, and Valens himself perished, either because his corpse could not be recognised among the dead or, according to popular legend, he died in the burning of a cottage where he had been carried in order that his wounds might be cared for.

Valentinian's son Gratian, who had succeeded his father in 375 and was not yet twenty, was now left as sole ruler of the Roman world. He did not feel strong enough to govern both parts of the Empire himself, and accordingly summoned from Spain one of his successful generals, Theodosius, at that time living in retirement, and proclaimed him Augustus of the East

at Sirmium on 19 January 379. A tolerant Nicene Catholic, Gratian recalled all exiled bishops, including Meletius (54), and it was a bitter day for the Arians of the East when they heard of their rivals' reprieve. They knew where the sympathies of Gratian lay, and expected worse to follow.

When Meletius arrived home in Antioch, he met a splendid reception which must have reassured him that although he had been rejected by Rome and the West, he was now accepted by most of the East. He began immediately to make reparations; several churches were without bishops (55), and it was on Meletius' initiative that Diodore was put in charge of Tarsus. The bishop of Antioch quickly grasped that his best plan was to come to an understanding with Rome through the influence of Gratian and Theodosius, even though Basil was no longer there to help him. It was clear that Meletius was the effective bishop of Antioch and that the rival church there existed only by the favour of Alexandria and the West, which was concerned solely with theoretical right and with regard to details accepted the Alexandrian view of the situation.

About nine months after the death of Basil, Meletius further strengthened his position when in September 379 he convened a Council at Antioch. Little is known about this Council apart from some incidental references made at the better-known Council of 382, a few fleeting remarks made by Gregory of Nyssa who apparently was present (56), and a collection of Roman writings preserved in the papal archives (57). From these scanty references it appears that the hundred and forty six prelates (58) who attended the Council followed the example of Meletius, whose signature appears first, and

signed a dogmatic letter - known as the 'Tome of the Westerns' in the fifth canon of the Second Oecumenical Council - which had been drawn up two years before by the council held at Rome under Damasus. Eusebius of Samosata immediately sent the signed document to Rome as a testimony of the adhesion of the Antiochene Council to the orthodox faith. The Council had accepted the homoousios, the oneness of the deity and the substance of the Trinity, and it rejected Apollinarianism, Pneumatomachianism and Sabellianism (59).

These proceedings anticipated the intentions of Theodosius, who on 27 February 380 issued the edict Cunctos populos (60) commanding all his subjects to 'practise that religion which the divine Peter the Apostle transmitted to the Romans, as the religion which he introduced makes clear even unto this day. It is evident that this is the religion that is followed by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity'. That party alone - according to the edict - had any right to the title 'catholic', and all others were heretics.

In the West, however, a fifth Roman synod assembled by Damasus in 380 dealt once more with current heretics, among whom was numbered Meletius. This was proof that although his faith was accepted by the Apostolic see as sound on its reception of the document with the 146 signatures, Meletius himself was still regarded as outside its communion. A pertinent comment was made by Gregory of Nazianzus in his sermon preached with the divisions of Antioch in mind: 'They are all agreed about doctrine; why are they divided about the men?' (61).

A new development once more reinforced the strength of Meletius' position. Theodosius convened a series of councils in the East to clear away the disorders which Arianism had left behind, since the emperor had found that the theological situation was not as simple as he had supposed when he had issued Cunctos populos, and that Rome and Alexandria were not universally recognised as the only, or even the best, guides to orthodoxy. The result of Theodosius' efforts was an edict Nullus haereticis (62), which made it quite clear that substantia does not represent hypostasis, but ousia. In fact, the mia hypostasis of Sardica was rejected and the way opened for men to accept the treis hypostases, which was to be consummated in the decisions of the Council of Constantinople in 381 when the Cappadocians had differentiated between ousia and hypostasis which had been equated in the Nicene anathemata, so that it became orthodox to speak of mia ousia and treis hypostases (although it was heresy to speak of tres substantiae). By the terms of Cunctos populos Paulinus had been the lawful bishop of Antioch; by Nullus haereticis he lost his privileged position.

In February 381 after the councils, Theodosius charged the general Sapor (63) to go to Antioch and by restoring the churches there, to implement the edict of 10 January. The Arian bishop Dorotheus, who had succeeded Euzoius in 376, and his supporters had been expelled and their wealth was to be redistributed. Sapor found this a difficult task, since three communities of alleged catholics claimed it, namely those of Vitalis (64), Paulinus, and Meletius, each of whom declared himself to be a genuine catholic bishop; but the general's handling of the problem was to bring the schism at Antioch

one step further towards its denouement. The three bishops first had to prove their communion with Damasus according to the rule formulated by Theodosius. Vitalis was easily disposed of as an Apollinarian, since he had proclaimed that Christ did not have a perfect human nature, but a good deal of dubious material makes it difficult to determine what actually happened with regard to Meletius and Paulinus.

According to Socrates, when Meletius came back to Antioch, his rival Paulinus was already old so that all his partisans eagerly tried to make the two bishops join forces and act as colleagues in leading the Antiochenes. Paulinus, however, declared it was contrary to ecclesiastical canons to have as a colleague someone ordained by Arians. The populace became violent and a great dispute followed. Six possible candidates for the see were brought forward and were bound by an oath not to accept consecration after the death of Meletius or Paulinus but to recognise the survivor as the rightful bishop of the see (65). Sozomen's account (66) agrees with this, except for one detail: it was Paulinus' followers, and not the bishop himself, who refused to allow Meletius to become a colleague of Paulinus. On the other hand, Theodoret's account (67) suggests that Meletius himself intervened in the debate, and made the proposal to Paulinus that they should govern their flock together with the Book of the Gospels between them seeing that their faith was the same. If the episcopal throne was an obstacle to unity, let it disappear. Whoever survived the other's death would take care of the whole see.

> Meletius, who of all men was most gentle, thus kindly and gently addressed Paulinus. 'The Lord

> of the sheep has put the care of these sheep in my hands: you have received the charge of the rest: our little ones are in communion with one another in true religion. Therefore, my dear friend, let us join our flocks; let us have done with our dispute about the leading of them, and, feeding the sheep together, let us attend them in common. If the chief seat is the cause of strife, that strife I will endeavour to put away. On the chief seat I will put the Holy Gospel; I make a plea to you that we sit on each side of it; should I be the first to pass away, you, my friend, will hold the leadership of the flock alone. Should this be your lot before it is mine, I in my turn, so far as I am able, will take care of the sheep.' So gently and kindly spoke the divine Meletius, but Paulinus did not consent. The general passed judgement on what had been said and gave the Churches to the great Meletius. Paulinus still continued at the head of the sheep who had originally seceded.

Whatever version is correct, it seems possible that 'some compact was made between Meletius and Paulinus, of which the principal item was that the survivor should be generally recognised as Bishop of Antioch'. (68) Such a compact would explain Socrates' assertion (69) that the Luciferians began to fall away from Paulinus at this juncture. (They would not tolerate any compromise with a man who had been ordained by Arians, and they

would regard Paulinus as having betrayed the cause by entering into an agreement with his rival.) Furthermore, evidence concerning the compact is provided by two references in a synodal letter sent to the West from the Council of Aquileia, which met in September 381 under the leadership of Ambrose of Milan. The Emperor Gratian, Valentinian II and Theodosius were requested to take care that the Church did not consecrate another bishop if one of the Antiochene bishops died (70). Perhaps Paulinus now felt very much left out in the cold, especially when, shortly afterwards, Meletius' summons to the Council of Constantinople arrived, and in these circumstances it is likely that his eyes would have been opened to the advantages of Meletius' offer. Thus it is possible that when Meletius left Antioch for Constantinople about the beginning of April, the two bishops had come to an understanding along the lines originally proposed by Meletius.

In any case, Sapor received a bad impression of Paulinus and followed the conclusion he had already reached by considering the number of Meletius' supporters. Accordingly he gave the charge of the churches to Meletius; Paulinus now had only one small building inside the city boundaries. S. Ambrose tells us that the bitter discord between the two men continued (71). Although each knew himself to be orthodox, neither could overcome difficulties occasioned by the personality clash which had been aggravated over the years, and even now Paulinus denounced Meletius and his followers as disguised Arians and Pneumatomachians, while he in turn was reproached by Meletius for being Sabellian.

This made no difference to Theodosius, who was satisfied by the Imperial commission of investigation at Antioch and, passing over Paulinus, he recognised Meletius as rightful bishop, inviting him - despite the fact he was not in communion with Rome - to convene a council at Constantinople in order that a new bishop be elected to that see and to regulate religious matters. 'No better honour could have been paid to Basil's illustrious memory.' (72).

Apparently Damasus had made several of his own recommendations for the Council to the bishop of Thessalonica. 'I have learned of your hope to hold a reunion at Constantinople. I hope your sanctity arranges for an irreproachable prelate to take part in this election...take care and allow no anti-canonical translation from one city to another; that no bishop abandons the people confided to him to realise his ambition in another. In this way grave contentions arise and produce schisms of the most serious kind.' (73). This may be a reference to Meletius; but as Damasus had been pope for twenty years he must have observed other examples, and he could well have been speaking of Gregory of Nazianzus who had been translated from Sasima and was a possible candidate for the see of Constantinople.

A legend recorded by Theodoret (74) informs us why Theodosius, ignoring any objections which may have been made by the West, gave such an honour to Meletius. While Theodosius was still a general, before he became emperor, the Eastern bishop had appeared to him in a dream and had crowned him. A few days later Gratian had given him half his empire. Theodosius recognised Meletius as the man in his dream.

Only bishops from the East were invited to Constantinople, hence it is probable that Damasus was not invited and was not represented (75); neither was Paulinus of Antioch nor bishops of his communion. In the absence of the bishop of Alexandria, the presidency fell by right to the bishop of Antioch - to Meletius.

The first task of the Council was to elect a bishop for Constantinople now that the Arian occupation of its churches had come to an end. Gregory of Nazianzus, who had acted there as a missionary bishop among the Catholics, was nominated and consecrated bishop in response to popular demand and Theodosius' wish. The Council Fathers were aware of the Nicene canons concerning translations but, realising that Gregory had never actually lived at Sasima but instead had accomplished a great deal in his struggles against Arianism at Constantinople, considered that the good of catholicism justified waiving the letter of the law.

The Council also solemnly condemned and annulled the ordination of Maximus the Cynic, one of the most impudent and disreputable of ecclesiastical adventurers, who had somehow won the confidence of Gregory and, with the help of Peter of Alexandria, had plotted to intrude into his place as bishop of the Catholics at Constantinople.

Suddenly, at this moment when the solution to the problem at Antioch seemed to have been resolved, a great blow fell upon the New Nicene party of the East. Meletius, 'the saintly president of the Council, the wise and peace-loving man to whom everyone looked for the re-establishment of concord and the salvation of the church' (77) was taken ill and, a very short

time afterwards, died (78).

During the entire twenty years as bishop of Antioch, Meletius had been out of communion with Rome, and during the last six years his rival Paulinus had been recognised as the legitimate bishop by the Pope; but as if in recompense, his supporters showered honorific tributes upon the dead bishop. Theodosius assisted at the funeral and stood at the front of the crowd which flocked to the Church of the Apostles to pay a last tribute to Meletius and to hear his funeral orations. Gregory of Nyssa's oration was an eloquent echo of the common sorrow, and although his words were flowery, his sentiments were sincere and profound. He describes Meletius as 'a new apostle and a saint' (79) and his survivors as orphans whose only consolation was that their dead bishop would intercede for them. Sozomen (80) recounts how, against custom, the gates of the city were opened so that all could enter and venerate the remains of Meletius.

The great bishop received similar tribute when his body was taken to Antioch five years later and placed near those of the martyr Babylas (81). Ultimately even Rome altered her views, and Meletius' name was inserted in the Roman Martyrology and his festival is now celebrated on 8 February.

CHAPTER FOUR

381 - 414

Meletius' position as leader of the Council of Constantinople now fell to Gregory of Nazianzus who had accepted the see in submission to the Emperor's request (1), but only after some hesitation, not being by nature a person who desired office and authority. His presidency, though short, was a turbulent one. Gregory was anxious to recognise Paulinus as the rightful bishop of Antioch according to the previously proposed agreement between the two rivals, and stated his views to the members of the Council: 'Now God had given the means of peace, let them confirm Paulinus in the episcopal office, and when he should pass away, let them elect a new bishop...' (2). But the prevailing attitudes at Constantinople were altogether prejudiced against Paulinus.

First - and most important, so far as the majority of the Eastern bishops was concerned - was the question of principle. In their eyes Paulinus had never been bishop of Antioch, and never deserved the title less than he did at that time. He was an intruder. Basil himself had never coupled his name with the title of bishop, but treated him rather as a traitor who should be refused communion. The day after Meletius' death no one - and especially the new bishops who owed their election to him - found it possible to install in his place his life-long enemy. Moreover, the tribute accorded to Meletius at his funeral would only set Paulinus himself even more against his rival and make him less willing than ever to step into his shoes.

Secondly, the Meletians had been kindled afresh by the new favour shown them, especially after the coolness with which

they had been treated by Alexandria and the West, and therefore they over-ruled Gregory, who appealed in vain to the fact that the quarrel had been fed by a clash of personalities and that there was now no reason why the schism should be prolonged. Some of the bishops at the Council even argued that to acknowledge Paulinus would be to give the triumph to the West, though this must have been a minority view since at the Second Oecumenical Council held the following year, Paulinus was not rejected because the West supported him, but although the West supported him.

Gregory, and some of his supporting prelates, tried valiantly to battle against these ideas since they were sensible of the lamentable consequences which would follow the prolongation of the schism. Above all, they feared a split with the West at a moment when, with peace restored to the church, all its members should be united in order to encourage a flourishing Christian life. Gregory might have persuaded the Council to accept his viewa despite the prevailing partisan feeling, but by now the assembly had become emotional, and more important, the new president's temperament was not equal to the task. He had not the necessary subtlety to parry the passionate attacks made against him; he lacked a positive argument and, when his adversaries pointed out the irregular election of Paulinus, Gregory and his friends could not reply except by an ineffectual appeal to matters of convenience. Gregory's words, instead of reconciling the council members to his point of view succeeded only in alienating them completely. 'It is the work of factious and wicked men to raise up another bishop while one still remains alone on the

throne...Are you not aware of how the West accepts him?... Accept my discourse, wiser in its prudence than that of young men...We older people do not encourage passionate enthusiasm..' (3).

Sincere as he was, Gregory was entirely unfitted to take over from Meletius at this council, and one final attack proved fatal to a man already weak with illness and the fatigues of his ministry. This was the late arrival at the Council of Acholius of Thessalonica and Timothy of Alexandria, who in February had succeeded his brother Peter as bishop. These two immediately contested Gregory's rights to the see of Constantinople on canonical grounds (4). The new president was overcome, and sought the Council's permission to resign the office which it had conferred upon him: 'he would gladly retire to some desert away from evil men' (5). Immediately 'there arose a cry like that of a number of jackdaws, and the younger members attacked him like a swarm of wasps' (6). Gregory left the Council, never to return to it, and for a while illness was opportunely the reason for his absence (7); but later when a new successor, Flavian (who had accompanied Meletius to Constantinople), was nominated bishop of Antioch, Gregory again found that his opinion carried little weight and withdrew altogether (8). In vain his friends appealed to him to continue in his office, but eventually they andTheodosius were forced to agree to his abdication(9). Acholius and Timothy reassured Gregory that his sacrifice would ensure reconciliation among the members of the Council. In a moving farewell discourse in June (10), Gregory reminded the people of all he had accomplished, again exhorted union, and retired to Nazianzus. That Gregory

entertained only goodwill to all who had abused him is evident from the letters he wrote to his successor Nectarius (11).

This third president was an elderly senator of Constantinople who was not connected with any party. Born of a noble family at Tarsus in Cilicia, his admirable character had so impressed Diodore that it was he who advanced his name as a candidate, despite the fact that the official was not yet baptised. This was soon rectified when Theodosius approved the choice, and from this time onwards, Nectarius was in communion with Damasus, ruling as an admirable prelate until, on his death sixteen years later, he was succeeded by John Chrysostom (12).

After all the disturbances occasioned by the succession of presidents at Constantinople, the Council continued, and the climax, doctrinally speaking, was the reissue of the Nicene Creed of 325 and the reaffirmation of the Nicene faith in terms which had been analysed and developed in the preceding decade by the Cappadocians - Basil and the two Gregories, the 'New Nicenes' - partly at least because of the doctrinal issues raised by the schism at Antioch. The theology which they asserted, and which prevailed at Constantinople, was very similar to that which Athanasius had promulgated, though a different angle of approach was used. The starting point became the three <u>hypostases</u> rather than the one divine substance and consequently the formula produced by the Council maintained 'one <u>ousia</u> in three <u>hypostases</u>', with the emphasis specifically on the latter term.
The newly-modified orthodox position as regards doctrine has been summarised by Prestige (13): 'The whole unvaried substance, being incomposite, is identical with the whole unvaried being of each Person...the individuality is only the manner in which the identical substance is objectively presented in each

several Person.'

There followed a general denunciation of all heresies which had arisen since Nicaea; bishops were forbidden to go outside their civil dioceses into churches beyond their boundaries for purposes of ordination unless invited to do so; and finally the famous canon was enacted which declared that Constantinople was to have primacy in honour immediately after Rome, as it was the 'New Rome' (14). Although its ancient prestige as metropolis of the East had been sacrificed, Antioch accepted this quietly enough, since it had been greatly weakened by schism. Alexandria was naturally jealous and waged savage war with Constantinople during the Fifth century. Rome too saw Constantinople as a new threat, since the canon insinuated that ecclesiastical authority might be deemed proportional to secular authority and therefore variable. What if Rome ceased to be capital?

As for the new bishop of Antioch, although there seems to be some doubt about exactly when he was consecrated (the Church Historians (15) report that Flavian was elected at the Council, but Cavallera (16) maintains that he was merely nominated at Constantinople, the actual consecration not taking place until the bishops of the East (17) met at Antioch in July for this purpose), it seems that Flavian had every possible recommendation as regards personality to fill his new position although (according to current report) he had formerly bound himself by an oath not to allow himself to be put forward as a candidate for the bishopric (18). Chrysostom describes (19) how the sorrow of the faithful was changed to joy by the consecration of Flavian. It seemed to them that Meletius had

risen from the tomb, and in the person of Flavian was seated once more in the pontifical chair.

Naturally Paulinus protested against Flavian's election, but in fact the conditions of the new bishop's consecration would ensure Rome and Alexandria's disapproval of him, for the choice should have been made within the diocese of Antioch itself and not at Constantinople. Accordingly they refused all intercourse with Flavian, steadfastly continuing to support Paulinus.

The Western bishops led by Ambrose of Milan meanwhile assembled at the Council of Aquileia in April 381 (20), intending to deal with the problem of Arianism in the West and also to investigate the affairs of the East. As yet they were unaware of Meletius' death and the election of Flavian. It was here that Maximus the Cynic claimed to be the lawful bishop of Constantinople, despite the fact that he had been condemned by Damasus at Rome, and hoodwinked the assembly of Italian bishops by giving them a plausible account of his consecration and by producing letters once written to him by Peter of Alexandria as proof that he was in communion with that church.

The course of events following the Council sheds some light upon the relations between West and East at this time. First of all, Ambrose wrote to Theodosius (21) expressing the concern felt in the West about the unrest in the East caused by the 'catholics',who were now agreed as regards the faith. The problem raised by the refusal to recognise Paulinus in Antioch disturbed the minds of the bishops assembled in Aquileia; they therefore proposed that a general synod of the Empire should meet in Alexandria to settle the questions of

the dispute. Not a word was said, yet, about Flavian or Nectarius, and no mention was made of Maximus. However, a council held in Alexandria was about the last thing the bishops in the East would have found agreeable; on the other hand, Theodosius realised that any continuation of the antagonism of the West would postpone his work of uniting the East, and he therefore invited the delegates from the First Oecumenical Council of Constantinople to meet again at that city in the Summer of 382.

Ambrose retaliated by arranging a synod at Rome and wrote again (22) to Theodosius complaining that 'despite the requests and advice of the West they had ordained a priest against Paulinus, and that was done on the advice of Nectarius who had been named at Constantinople in place of Maximus, whose rights seemed to the Fathers of Italy to be incontestable'. He made it clear that the Western bishops were willing to receive Paulinus' opponents into communion only if the latter showed themselves conciliatory and proved to be orthodox in the faith. But because of his uncharacteristic lack of discretion in championing Maximus, Ambrose's efforts were not welcomed; Theodosius would not agree to this ultimatum, but continued with his arrangements for the Council to be held in Constantinople.

Very little is known of this Council except that Gregory of Nazianzus was invited twice, but each time excused himself on account of his weak health (23). Theodoret recounts (24) how on arrival the Eastern bishops were invited to attend the Western synod arranged by Ambrose to be held at Rome in the Autumn to enquire into the opinions of the bishop Apollinaris. The bishops declined, feeling it their duty 'to stay at home

and attend to the business of their own churches'. Besides, they had made arrangements only for a shorter journey and had been authorised by their colleagues to act only at Constantinople. 'These reasons, and many others, prevent us from coming to you in a greater number. Nevertheless, to improve the situation, and to show our affection for you, we have entreated our brothers in the episcopate, Cyriacus, Eusebius and Priscian, to be so good as to undertake the journey. Through them, we manifest our desires as being peaceable and in the direction of unity, as well as our zeal for the true faith'. At this point, the Constantinopolitan Fathers set out the faith of the Eastern Church in conformity with the creed of Nicaea: the Trinity consubstantial with the three hypostases, the Incarnation of the perfect Word with a perfect humanity. For details the Western bishops were referred to the Tome of Antioch of 379 and to the Tome drawn up at the Council of Constantinople held the previous year. The Fathers denounced the heresy of the Sabellians, the Eunomians, the Arians and the Pneumatomachians, and sought by appealing to the canons of Nicaea to justify the elevations of Flavian to the see of Antioch and Nectarius to the see of Constantinople. The letter concluded with the pious hope that the East would henceforth be united in sound faith and in love, to the exclusion of all private partisanships and partialities (25). This calm letter with its scornful overtones had shown that no difference with regards to faith divided the East from the West, but refused the West any right to interfere in their internal affairs.

In the Autumn, the Westerns held their fifth synod at Rome as planned. In order to further his cause, Paulinus arrived there, despite his old age, accompanied by Epiphanius and Jerome (26),

and his virtuous personality engaged the sympathy of the Italian bishops at once. Jerome proved a most influential power in his role as secretary to Damasus (27). A step towards unity in the Catholic church as a whole was made when this Council abandoned Maximus, but the Antiochene schism remained unhealed, for the bishops confirmed Paulinus' position as bishop of Antioch, ignoring Flavian and excommunicating his consecrators, Diodore of Tarsus and Acacius of Beroea. 'The bishop of the Romans and all the priests of the West were not a little indignant, and they wrote the customary synodical epistles to Paulinus, as bishop of Antioch, but they entered into no communication with Flavian; and they excommunicated Diodore of Tarsus and Acacius of Beroea, and those who acted with them, the consecrators of Flavian, as guilty persons, and they held them to be excommunicate.' (28).

Ambrose now replied to the document which had reached him from Constantinople, describing the Emperor's objections as beside the point; everything that had been done was solely due to a love of unity; they had desired to avoid a breach with the East, and did not regret the attempt which they had made; in any case, it could no longer be said that the West had no interest in Eastern bishops; above all else, the essential purpose of the whole enterprise was an inquisition into the case of Apollinaris the heretic. Ambrose concluded, 'We pay to Your Majesty our due respects, and assure you of our love of peace and quietness.' (29). This letter put an end to this particular quarrel for the time being, although the fires continued to smoulder. The West found that although it was impossible to intervene effectively in the East, their decision was accepted by Paulinus' followers, by the Egyptians, and by the Church of Cyprus; but Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor and Thrace, all remained faithful to Flavian. The latter,

who had no intention of going to Rome to defend his rights, took a passive attitude from then on, and retained it to the end. To have entered into a dispute, he maintained, would have suggested that there was some doubt about his position. A good peace-making pastor, he continued at Antioch, and achieved tremendous popularity by his appeal to Theodosius which spared his city the penalties of high treason in the affair of the imperial statues in 387 (30).

Throughout his twenty-three years as bishop at Antioch, Flavian was supported by John Chrysostom (31), who never failed to express in his sermons the veneration and affection he felt towards his bishop. Chrysostom, who himself had been out of communion with Rome so far all his life, earnestly warned his flock against the dreadful sin of going over to the Eustathian schismatics who paradoxically enjoyed the communion of Rome... 'If on the one hand those persons have doctrines also contrary to ours, then on that account further it is not right to mix with them; if, on the other hand, they hold the same opinions, the reason for not mixing with them is greater still. And why so? Because then the disease is from lust of authority.' (32).

Meanwhile the aged Paulinus still maintained his position against Flavian. As he felt death approaching, not willing to accept the fact that his adherents would in all probability not survive without his leadership, and feeling that a serious appeal by his rivals would unite them with the Great Church once more, he arranged for a successor and consecrated him before he died in 388 (33). This was Evagrius, a native of Antioch, a former friend of Eusebius of Vercelli, and a friend of Jerome.

Evagrius himself, of course, accepted the ordination,

and it may be that he hoped the Meletius-Paulinus 'agreement' would apply to him and Flavian now - although the latter had different ideas: he defended his own election which was, he pointed out, made with the consent of the whole of the East and, what was more, according to canon law. But Evagrius' consecration had taken place without the help of another bishop (34), and it violated three rules. Firstly, the consecration of a successor by a bishop in his own lifetime was to be treated as null and void, in accordance with the decree at the Council of Antioch of 341. Secondly, all comprovincials, or as many as possible, ought to have met for an episcopal appointment, as decreed by the Council of Nicaea of 325. Thirdly, the Council of Arles of 314 had decreed that three consecrators were necessary. These facts should have eliminated the Paulinian group together with their leader, and Paulinus must have known this.

Egypt and Theophilus of Alexandria, who had communicated with Paulinus as long as he had lived, witheld their communion from his successor from the first; but the West's attitude to Evagrius is not very clear from the sources available. Theodoret (35) asserts that they offered their communion to the bishop, but Ambrose (36) suggests they witheld their communion from Evagrius as well as from his rival Flavian. Eventually, perhaps fearing to appear inconsistent seeing that they had objected to a successor being appointed in Meletius' place, the West declared that the new bishop's case must be put to a council which would decide between him and Flavian. This was a strange decision, considering that Evagrius had no canonical right to be considered a bishop. Perhaps it was hoped that if Evagrius had to defend his position he would condemn himself by reference to the illegality of his ordination, or perhaps the Western

bishops thought this procrastination preferable to acknowledging Flavian. Accordingly, Flavian and Evagrius were summoned by Theodosius to Constantinople in 388 to justify their elections (37). Evagrius, counting on his early relations with the West, accepted at once, but Flavian, continuing to hold aloof, evaded the summons by pleading infirm health, that the season was not favourable for travelling; and that he preferred to attend the following spring. The affair ended there for the time being, but a few months later Pope Damasus requested Theodosius to summon Flavian and Evagrius again so that the two elections might be examined and a judgment made as to which complied with the canons of Nicaea.

Flavian continued to stand on his dignity, agreeing to present himself 'if my faith or the dignity of my life is involved. But I will not allow my ordination to be questioned. I should prefer to abdicate from my see to whoever wishes to take it.' (38) He again pleaded that the winter was too much for his age, but sent no one to represent him. Theodosius, who already admired Flavian's virtue and devotion, was impressed by his lack of vulgar ambition: the bishop obviously believed he was in the right; and it was useless to upset the inhabitants of Antioch by imposing force on him. Theodosius therefore acquiesced in Flavian's refusal.

Evagrius, however, did respond to the summons - a gesture which was appreciated in the West - by attending the Council of Capua in December 391 (39). But the council lacked sufficient information, and in the end all it could do was to grant communion 'to all throughout the whole of the East who confessed to the Catholic faith'. The case was now referred to Theophilus

(who had been a leading member of the Alexandrian clergy and had succeeded Timothy as bishop in 385) as he was nearer Antioch and because he was supposed to be impartial, being in communion with neither party. This was not a wise choice, however, since for years Alexandria had been communicating with the schismatic Eustathians; but the West still thought of the Egyptian capital as the natural means of communication with the Greek-speaking East.

Theophilus now wrote to Ambrose, advising that Flavian and Evagrius be summoned again - this time to Alexandria. When Flavian received the request, he wrote directly to Theodosius, stating that he wished to appear before an oecumenical council (if at all), and not to a prejudiced gathering of Western or Egyptian bishops. He declared that he would sooner resign the throne of Antioch altogether than submit his right to occupy it to the judgment of Theophilus. Flavian was again excused by the Emperor, who had little sympathy with Theophilus and was not much attracted by Ambrose's idea of an Alexandrian Council. Ambrose was very much irritated by the whole affair: 'During all this time, Flavian alone is under the laws; but wilfully absents himself when we meet together...It suits Flavian alone to be independent of the episcopal community, and he obeys neither imperial decrees or councils.' (40). He adds that Evagrius' case is made no better for all that, and advised Theophilus to decide the case without Flavian seeing that bishop persistently refused to appear.

Accordingly, Theophilus convened a Council at Caesarea in Palestine in 393, but diplomatically excused himself from attending: he could not preside, he said, because of his struggles with paganism in Alexandria, but he affirmed there should be no

infringement of the canons of Nicaea. This council was only known about after the publication, at the turn of this century, of a letter written by Severus of Antioch (41), who mentions instructions sent by Pope Siricius - who had succeeded Damasus in 384 - to the effect that there should be only one bishop at Antioch, legally installed and conforming with the Nicene Canons; an election carried out by one bishop would not be permitted. 'In consequence...we have decided legitimately and justly that we acknowledge only one bishop at Antioch: the holy bishop Flavian.'

At long last, a council held with the consent of the West had supported the 'Meletian' bishop, the decision was accepted immediately by the Council and Theodosius was notified. Socrates and Sozomen (42) relate that the absent Theophilus was not reconciled to Flavian until 398 when he was induced to become so by Chrysostom at his consecration, but Theodoret (43) suggests that Theophilus and Flavian were on good terms - diplomatically, at least - at a Council convened by Siricius at Constantinople in September 394 to examine a conflict between two Egyptian bishops, where Theophilus openly acknowledged Flavian (who also attended the Council), and the bishop of Antioch responded by speaking of 'the very saintly and pious bishop Theophilus'.

Despite Siricius' declaration, the other Western bishops delayed a long time before giving their formal ratification to the decision passed at the Council of Caesarea. However, the situation was considerably simplified when Evagrius died shortly after the Council, and Flavian was able to prevent any bishop being appointed to carry on the Eustathian succession. But the schismatic party still refused to recognise Flavian and continued to worship in separate assemblies under their leading

presbyters (44). The lack of agreement between the two groups of clergy was partly Flavian's own fault, for he was not generous in his victory, and refused to accept into communion those who had been ordained by Paulinus and Evagrius.

Theophilus felt impelled to write to Flavian, asking him to be more conciliatory and to accept without re-ordination those who had been ordained by his rivals. He pointed out that the Roman bishop Anastasius was making similar concessions 'on the ground of policy'. (45). But Flavian refused, quoting his precedent in the words of John Chrysostom's sermon, preached while he was a presbyter at Antioch: 'Is it enough to say that they are orthodox, when the force of their ordination is null? We must be as jealous for a true ministry as for a true faith!' One wonders whether Flavian was aware that this was precisely the argument used by the Eustathians in 361 against his great predecessor, the venerable Meletius!

As far as oecumenical 'politics' were concerned, Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch all became united in a league of peace when the Emperor Arcadius (the son and successor of Theodosius) summoned Theophilus to Constantinople to act as John Chrysostom's principal consecrator in 398; and it was Chrysostom's influence which also finally pacified the West. He sent Acacius of Beroea (one of Flavian's consecrators) and Isidore (a priest of Alexandria) to convey to the Pope the announcement of his election to the throne of Constantinople together with documentary proof that Flavian was in full communion with Theophilus. Pope Siricius seems to have made no difficulty about receiving Chrysostom into his communion at last, and the two legates were able to return from Rome

and Egypt bearing letters of communion for Flavian and his flock from all the bishops of the West and of Egypt (46). The Catholic Church was once more united for a short time at least, after the lengthy vicissitudes occasioned by the eruption of the Arian heresy so many years before.

At Antioch, Flavian now showed that all ill-feeling had ceased by adding to the diptychs the names of Paulinus and Evagrius (47). The aged bishop lived long enough to see the deposition and exile of John Chrysostom, against which he protested with his last breath; and after sixty-seven years outside the communion of Rome, Flavian enjoyed a few years of peace before his death in 404 (48). The Christian church commemorates him on 26 September.

Many of the Eustathians still remained in a state of schism, and the activities of Flavian's successor, Porphyrius, apparently intensified the division - as well as causing others - which was extremely unfortunate after the valiant efforts of those who had striven to end the troubles at Antioch. The chief source of information about the new bishop is a violent pamphlet written by Palladius, whose warm partisanship for John Chrysostom leads him to blacken unduly that saint's opponents, and we must temper his remarks with Theodoret's statement (49) that Porphyrius left behind him at Antioch many memorials of his kindness and of his remarkable prudence. The same historian remarks in a letter to Dioscorus (50) that the bishop of Antioch was 'one of blessed and holy memory, who was adorned both with a brilliant life and an acquaintance with divine doctrines'.

Porphyrius was described by Palladius (51) as a man of infamous character, who had disgraced the clerical profession by intimacy with the scum of the clergy. By adroit and

clever flattery, he obtained considerable influence with the city magistrates, and enjoyed the confidence of some of the leading bishops of the province. On Flavian's death, Porphyrius became involved in a plot to remove a certain Constantius, the trusted friend of Chrysostom, whom the people of Antioch had marked out as Flavian's successor, and by using his influence at court, the designing presbyter obtained an imperial rescript banishing Constantius to the Oasis - a fate he escaped by fleeing to Cyprus. Porphyrius then seized all the presbyters of the orthodox party at Antioch who were likely to be troublesome, and during the Olympian festival when the population was engrossed, he locked himself with three consecrators - Acacius, Antiochus and Severianus - in the chief church and received consecration at their hands. Next morning the indignant Antiochenes attacked Porphyrius' house, seeking to burn it over his head, but the new bishop managed to secure the help of a savage officer, who with his guards drove the people away by threats and violence. Porphyrius' request for communion with Rome was received in silence by Pope Innocent, who had been forewarned of his real character and the new bishop was deserted by all the chief clergy of Antioch - as well as by the ladies of rank. In revenge, he obtained a decree issued by Arcadius on 18 November 404 sentencing all who refused communion with Arsacius (the intruder whom Theophilus had installed in place of the exiled Chrysostom), Theophilus and Porphyrius to be expelled from their churches, and forbidding them to hold meetings elsewhere (52).

Predictably, Porphyrius found all his efforts for recognition by the Antiochenes fruitless; and to his chagrin, he found that Chrysostom's spiritual power in exile became

greater for all his efforts to crush it. In fact, many of John's orthodox supporters abandoned the official church, and under the name of Joannites, celebrated the eucharist apart (53) and refused Porphyrius communion as long as he lived.

When he died in 413, the turbulent bishop was succeeded by Alexander, by whom the church of Antioch was finally united. From his election he worked actively to recall all dissidents in the interests of peace - a condition imposed upon him by Pope Innocent I - concentrating especially on the Joannites and the Eustathians. To reconcile the Joannites, Alexander had only to inscribe the name of John Chrysostom on his diptyches (54); and the 'Eustathian' clergy were mollified by being given offices within the city among the other priests. Thus, his repeated efforts were crowned with success, and Theodoret writes (55): 'His persuasive exhortations reunited the Eustathians to the rest of the church, and they made a celebration of a scale that no one had ever seen before. At the head of all the faithful, clergy and laity, Alexander proceeded to the place where the Eustathians met. He took them into his procession, they sang hymns, they chanted in unison, from the Western gate right up to the Great Church; the market place was filled with men, and a human current appeared winding the whole way along the main thoroughfare. Jews, Arians and several pagans who lived at Antioch, seeing the spectacle, moaned and lamented: all the rivers were coming in this way to empty themselves into the ocean of the church! '

Pope Innocent, happy because of the great news, congratulated the bishop of Antioch in letters (dated 414) which marked the definitive end of the schism: 'All has been accomplished by piety and patience; may God be praised. The

success is due to your efforts and because, loving peace with all your might, you sought out this great number and, having found them, you exercised towards all of them sovereign charity, especially towards those who in former times were known under the name of the bishops Evagrius and Paulinus. It is the culmination of all my desires to see thatdisappearanceof this old blemish accorded in your time and due to your merits' (56). In a private note to Alexander the Pope writes: 'I greet you as a brother in Christ. Write to us more often!'

After the great celebration at Antioch, a very small group of Eustathians remained irreducible; but towards 482, the powerful memory inspired by a bishop who spent only three years at Antioch before dying in exile, suggested a way of recalling these last few dissidents. Kalendion obtained permission from the Emperor Zeno (474-491) to bring back to Antioch from Philippi the relics of Eustathius. The whole town showed up to watch from a distance, and the last of the Eustathians conceded to join the main body of the church.

CONCLUSION

'It was the achievement of the Antiochene School, in the last decades of the fourth and first half of the fifth centuries, to supply...a thoroughly realistic acknowledgement of the human life and experiences of the Incarnate and of the theological significance of his human soul.' (1). Although the great Eustathius lived almost a century before theologians actually applied themselves in earnest to 'Christological' problems, the bishop of Antioch had already begun to anticipate their thought. Eustathius was eager to distinguish the two natures in Christ (as opposed to his adversaries who taught that the Logos took the place of the human soul in Christ), and remarks, when writing of the Temptations of Christ: 'The devil gazing into the Person of Christ saw within God in fact and operation, and true Son of God by nature, beholding Him clothed without a Man, holy, undefiled and spotless, even a most beautiful temple, consecrated, inviolate.' (2). The bishop also holds that the divine and human natures come together in the Person of Christ, and speaks of ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Χριστοῦ when referring to His human nature, and of τὸ θεῖον τοῦ Χριστοῦ πνεῦμα when referring to His divine nature (3). Again, beginning with his belief that God is impassible, Eustathius separates the natures in Christ, lest the divine should be said to have suffered. Thus, when interpreting Psalm 92 he says, 'Moreover, the prophet Isaiah following the tracks of his sufferings, among other utterances exclaims with a mighty voice, "And we saw Him, and He had no form nor beauty. His form was dishonoured and rejected among men" (Isa. 53,2f.), distinctly showing that the marks of indignity and the sufferings must be applied to the Man and not to the divine, adding immediately afterwards: "Being a man under stroke and able to bear infirmity" (Isa. 53,3).' When considering the

personality of Christ and the union of the two natures, Eustathius maintained that the divine in Christ was not the personal Son of God, but merely God in his activity. The Logos indwelt the human form κατ' ἐνέργειαν ; it therefore followed there was no true ἕνωσις of the two natures, but merely a συνάφεια or a moral union of the man with the impersonal Logos. The Logos assumed the Man a t the time of his beginning within the womb of the Virgin, and the Man goes into the highest heaven (in virtue of the soul) and is enthroned with the divine spirit. Eustathius' Christology failed to express the central theme of the Christian gospel: Redemption; but this was a failing of many other Antiochene theologians.

The views of Eustathius were adopted and developed by Diodore and Flavian, even though they were not members of the Eustathian party at Antioch and probably did not borrow directly from the former bishop. Thus Diodore remarks: 'The Man from Mary is Son by grace, but the God-Logos is Son by nature.' (4); and Flavian teaches: 'What is akin to us, and not to the invisible nature is anointed with the Spirit.' (5). He describes the manhood of Christ as the temple of the Logos (6), and maintains strongly like Eustathius, that the divine does not suffer: 'When you hear of the Lord being betrayed, do not degrade the divine dignity to insignificance, nor attribute to the divine power the sufferings of the body. For the divine is impassible and invariable.' (7)

Eustathius' principles were subsequently accepted by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 'the crown and climax of the school of Antioch' (8), and set out in accordance with the doctrinal thought

of the age. Beginning with the same insistence upon divine omnipresence and divine indwelling, Theodore draws a distinction between God's metaphysical and God's moral presence. God is present everywhere κατ' οὐσίαν (according to his being) or κατ' ἐνέργειαν (according to his activity) but is present in his saints κατ' εὐδοκίαν (according to his good pleasure) and it is in this way he dwelt in the human Jesus. He insists, as Eustathius did, on Christ's complete manhood, consisting of rational soul and human body. He was tempted and endured the intense inward struggles which were his, seeing he possessed a rational soul. Theodore thus maintains the doctrine of a human soul against his Apollinarian adversaries - just as Eustathius maintained it against the extreme Lucianists.

Regarding the Person of Christ, which was by now a vital issue, Theodore's doctrinal position was again very similar to that of Eustathius. The union of the two natures in Christ is like that between man and wife, who are no longer twain, but one flesh. There is the person of God - Logos, and there is the person of the Man, yet having regard to the conjunction, there is one person. Thus, although Theodore insists upon one Person, one will, one activity, in reality he posits two persons, the one human the other divine, who always will act in the same way. Had Eustathius lived a century later, it is possible that his answer would have been the same.

However, for all this, the Antiochene School was still unable to provide ultimately definitive Christological solutions, though what was accomplished at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 is often described as the triumph of Western and Antiochene theology. So far as the Antiochene doctrinal position is concerned, if it was victorious, it was so 'only after absorbing

and being itself modified by the fundamental truths in the Alexandrian tradition.' (9).

It now remains to make some kind of evaluation of the complicated course of events characterising the Meletian schism at Antioch. At once, two main factors emerge as the main determining forces: the question of doctrine, and the interaction of the personalities involved. From the discussion of doctrinal issues at appropriate points in the text above, it is evident that the schism was precipitated when the Lucianist tradition prevailing at the school of Antioch produced the extremist, Arius, whose influence the Nicene Fathers attempted to smother by the inflammatory homoousios. The resulting explosion rocked the see of Antioch so that the tremors were still felt eighty-four years later, and equilibrium was in no way restored when an orthodox bishop was again installed at the capital. The numerous demonstrations of Meletius' orthodoxy - at councils and in letters, by the fact he was deposed by the Arians, by Basil's unswerving loyalty, by Sapor's decision in 381, and by the choice of Meletius as president of the Council of Constantinople - were apparently insufficient in the eyes of the Eustathians to atone for his dubious doctrinal past and the fact that he was consecrated by Arians. The confusion, too, over hypostasis and ousia proved to be a real barrier against reconciliation because neither party, apparently, was gifted with the insight possessed by Athanasius. But this is only part of the story, since this doctrinal difficulty was exacerbated and the conflict sustained by the personal characteristics of those involved. In the initial clash with the Arians, Eustathius was attacked for his doctrinal views; but the doctrinal tradition

he maintained was orthodox, and his followers may well have thought their uncompromising attitude justifiable. Nevertheless, while professing loyalty to him, they revealed their lack of confidence in his judgment by disobeying his instructions. Had a man of suitable character assumed leadership over the Eustathians after their break with the official church, their over-enthusiasm for orthodoxy might have been moderated; but Paulinus, no less zealous than they, was a man whose acceptance of an uncanonical ordination performed by a fanatic suggests a character fired by ambition rather than by a desire for peace in the church. His unaccommodating behaviour towards Meletius (even after the latter's rejection by the Arians) suggests a prejudiced outlook - Paulinus and his followers never seriously challenged any of the other numerous 'Arian' consecrations - and the uncanonical ordination of Evagrius was the action of a proud and stubborn man.

Thus Paulinus kept the schism alive as long as he lived, and in this he was aided by the unhelpful attitude of the West towards Eastern affairs. Preoccupied by struggles against Arianism in its own region, misinformed by its counsellors, persistently believing doctrine alone to be at the root of the trouble, Rome was ignorant of the complexity and the intensity of the difficulties at Antioch. Consequently, appeals for help invoked only an incomprehensible approval of an uncanonical ordination; an unreasonable refusal to recognise Meletius' orthodoxy, even after countless proofs; a tactless attempt to subject Antioch to the judgement of Alexandria; an uncompromising reluctance to send envoys to investigate the situation; and an evasive procrastination about Evagrius.

This Western prejudice against Meletius contrasts strongly

with his manifest popularity in the East, and one wonders whether the bishop might have helped in his own case had he made more effort to write to the West and to send an envoy as Basil suggested; and, of course, he lost a powerful ally by his puzzling slight against Athanasius. It is sad indeed that Basil, for all his admirable efforts to promote Meletius' cause, succeeded only in further alienating the West by his tactlessly outspoken preferences - but he is nevertheless the only individual to emerge from this account with an enhanced reputation.

It is scarcely credible that even after Pope Siricius' recognition of Flavian in 393 the schism dragged on because the bishop's pride forbade him to receive Eustathian clergy into his communion - it was precisely this aspect of Paulinus' character which had prevented any reconciliation with Meletius so many years before - and it was finally left to fair-minded men who were not personally involved in the schism to bring the whole unedifying course of events to a close.

If the disagreement had taken place anywhere else but at Antioch, no doubt there would have been no more fuss made than is usual over banal dissensions, but the capital of Syria was still the Queen of the East, and at no time was her political, intellectual and religious influence so considerable. And so it was that the schism occupied at some time in their lives many of the great figures of ecclesiastical history - Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Chrysostom were all involved - and provided a palpable link with the theological views of later Antiochenes.

NOTES.

NOTES: CHAPTER ONE

1. Misopogon, 361A - 363A

2. 'For he was ridiculed as an ape; again, as a dwarf spreading out his narrow shoulders, wearing a beard like that of a goat, and taking huge strides, as if he had been the brother of Otus and Ephialtes, whose height Homer speaks of as enormous. At another time, he was the "slaughterer" instead of the worshipper, an allusion to the number of his victims; and this piece of ridicule was seasonable and deserved, because out of ostentation he was fond of carrying the sacred vessels in place of the priests, attended by a train of girls. And although these and similar jests made him very indignant, he nevertheless kept silence, and concealed his emotions, and continued to celebrate the festivals.' (Ammianus Marcellinus, Res Gestae, xxii, 14.3. Printed in Stevenson, Creeds, Councils and Controversies, p.64.)

3. G. Downey, Antioch in the Age of Theodosius the Great, p.94

Nevertheless, Antioch's reputation in this sphere was not quite up to that of Alexandria's. The absence of a philosophical school in Antioch may possibly account for the tendency of Antiochene theology to be preoccupied with the literal understanding of the Scriptures, as opposed to the philosophical speculation of Alexandria.

4. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, even called the Arian heretics by the name of Lucianists (Ep.ad Alexandr.) -

although, of course, not all Lucianists accepted Arius' teaching unreservedly - and Arius himself termed his followers Collucianists (Ap. Epiph. Haeres. lxxix). Furthermore, the Creed presented at the Council of Antioch in 341, which is extremely anti-Sabellian, purported to be drawn up by Lucian; and indeed the fact that Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea were his disciples and both called him their master, did somewhat blemish his name. But it seems that much of the damage his reputation suffered was due to his enemies taking advantage of a few incautious phrases used by him in theological dispute; and in fact Athanasius (who had no need to go out of his way to defend a priest of Antioch) mentions Lucian in the highest terms.

More recent theologians express differing views about Lucian's doctrine. Harnack and Bethune-Baker (quoted in R. V. Sellers, Eustathius of Antioch, p.9) consider his views to be the meeting place of the teaching of Origen and that of Paul of Samosata, whence Arius derived his system. Gwatkin (Studies of Arianism, p.18,n.)holds 'there is nothing against him but the leanings of his disciples to Arianism', and Sellers himself concludes that there is no need to make Lucian the source of the Arian plague, since Hellenic thought was already heading in that direction. Loofs (quoted in Sellers, Ibid.,p.10)maintains that it was not this Lucian, but Paul's episcopal successor over the Paulianists, who was connected with Paul of Samosata; and Bardy (Recherches sur Lucien et son école) also suggests there may have been in fact two Lucians, one the biblical scholar and martyr and the other the

founder of Arianism. Despite the controversy provoked, the suggestion cannot really be said to have prevailed.

Lucian is still commemorated as a saint on 7 January.

5. It must always be remembered that Origen was a pioneer in matters of theology, and his representations were often hazarded to stimulate further enquiry rather than to enable men to dispense with it. This is why the authority of Origen was so often invoked by both sides in the Arian dispute.

6. Fergus Millar (in his article, 'Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian', Journal of Roman Studies lxi (1971), 1 - 17) challenges any simplistic deductions made about the 'dual tradition' in the church of Antioch. He indicates that, at a time when great cultural changes were taking place in the Middle East, pre-Hellenic cult-centres did manage to survive, and, furthermore, a whole class of educated Aramaic-speaking persons preserved their language in Roman Syria. However, Millar produces evidence which suggests that it was a rustic vernacular, with no claim to rival Greek as a language of culture, and that it was not until the Fifth Century that it became the vehicle of literature written in Roman Syria. The appearance of Christian Syriac literature in Edessa in the Second or Third Century, although of great interest and importance, should be regarded as an off-shoot of, rather than a rival to, Christian Greek culture. The most we could claim from parallel and later

evidence, for the church at Antioch, is that in the Third Century it may have begin to penetrate to the non-Hellenised strata of the population.'

Applying his discoveries to the specific case of Paul of Samosata, Millar dismisses any political complications, and maintains that it is facile to see in the bishop's deposition the suppression of a strain of local belief and liturgical practice by the prevailing orthodoxy of the Greek church. Thus, although Paul's opponents included Malchion, chief teacher of rhetoric at Antioch, and although his teachings have a definite connection with Jewish beliefs (Epiphanius (Panarion. 65. 2. 5) says the followers of Paul differ from the Jews only in not observing the Sabbath or circumcision), this line of attack was not used by his contemporaries, who regarded his heresy as a revival of Artemon. Moreover, the Adoptionist heresy (referred to by Eusebius, HE vii, 30) seems to have originated in the late Second Century at Rome, under the impulse of Theodotus of Byzantium. Any 'local' element in the nature of Paul's heresy is rather to be found in its resemblance to that of Beryllus of Bostra, who thought that Christ did not pre-exist his birth, and had no divinity except that of the Father dwelling in him - and was duly corrected by an assembly of bishops assisted by Origen in 238 - 244.

Millar admits that Paul made some innovations in liturgy and church practices, which may have had a 'local' origin, but on the whole, any Syrian deviations in Paul's beliefs and practices are only hinted at in the evidence; and in conclusion, he remarks that the culture of the

Fertile Crescent was so complex at that time as to preclude any simple deductions being made: that we are still a long way from understanding the nature of the Aramaic-Greek culture of Syria and Mesopotamia and how it affected the attitudes and beliefs of those who grew up in it.

7. Although Arius was an Egyptian priest, he was the product of the school of Antioch (as were the other leaders and supporters of Arianism, including Eusebius of Nicomedia, Leontius of Antioch and Asterius, who all appealed to Lucian as their authority), and there has been, in the past, much discussion as to whether Arianism was really an Alexandrian or an Antiochene movement. Most scholars today accept the view that it was Antiochene, and it comes as something of a surprise to modern readers to find John Henry Newman taking a great deal of trouble to show this in his book, The Arians of the Fourth Century, which was first published in 1833: 'Though the heresy openly commenced, it but accidentally commenced in Alexandria;... no Alexandrian of name advocated it, and...on its appearance, it was forthwith expelled from the Alexandrian church, together with its author'.

Objecting to Gwatkin's summary of Arianism as 'a mass of presumptuous theorising...a lifeless system of unspiritual pride and hard unlovingness' (Studies of Arianism, p. 274), and to recent articles by Pollard which reinforce this assessment, Maurice Wiles ('In defence of Arius', JTS NS xiii, 1962, pp.339-347)

produces evidence which suggests that the difference between the two sides (represented by Arius and by Athanasius) is not as absolute or as clear-cut as has traditionally been assumed. Wiles concludes by pointing out that the Egyptian priest, severely inhibited by the rigidity of the philosophical framework within which he was operating, did indeed produce an inadequate account of the Christian truth - though not to such a degree as to merit the description 'utterly illogical and unspiritual' applied by Pollard. Wiles' view, however, does not represent the consensus of modern scholarly opinion.

8. Not 'there was a time when the Son was not.' Athanasius notes, 'they carefully avoid using the word time.' (Ath., Apol. Contr.Arian. i, 14).

9. Eusebius of Nicomedia may have received his first ecclesiastical appointment at Berytus through Constantia, the sister of Constantine and the wife of Licinius, but it is uncertain how he came to be translated to Nicomedia, a city which was then the principal seat of the imperial court. The bishop seems to have exercised great fascination over the minds of both Constantine and Constantius, and to have enjoyed great influence at court. It is thought he was possibly a relative of the Emperor Julian (so Sellers, Ibid., p.17 n.6), and it seems he was capable of using intrigue when occasion demanded it.

10. Theod., H.E. i,5.

11. Soc., H.E. i, 6.

12. Because of the esprit de corps among the Lucianists, they loyally supported any of their group, even Arius.

13. Epiph., Haer. lxix, 4.

14. Sellers, Ibid., p. 20.

15. De Decret. Nic.Syn., 19,20; Ep.ad Afr.Episc.,5,6.

16. Of course, the Council was not summoned simply to deal with Arius; the Paschal problem was an important consideration also; and it is possible that the Council may have been a sort of 'ecclesiastical victory parade', celebrating Constantine's triumph over Licinius, and the victory of his chosen religion over paganism.

17. Up to 325 the bishop of Cordova enjoyed close relations with Constantine and acquired great influence over him, and it is widely held that it was Ossius who was behind the Emperor's patronage of the term (rather than Athanasius who was such a very junior ecclesiastic in 325). This theory is supported by Athanasius' remarks: 'It was he (Ossius) who put forth the faith accepted at Nicaea.' (Contr.Arian. 23. P.G. 20,23)

Philostorgius, the Arian historian, recounts how Ossius and Alexander reached an understanding on the use of the term homoousios together in Nicomedia before the Council (H.E., 1,7). The implications of the term for Alexander is possibly revealed by the bishop's conviction of the inseparable unity formed by the Father and the

Son. Thus, 'the Father and Son are two, inseparable beings between whom no interval can be thought, and the Son is of the being of the Father.' (Ep. ad Alex. Byz. P.G. 65, 473). F. Loofs (Festgabe für K.Müller, Tübingen 1922, 78f.) indicates, however, that Alexander's thought was not a logically coherent system by referring to other places where Alexander's theology is markedly Origenistic in complexion, with a stress on the eternal generation of the Son, and its insistence that the Father and Son were two hypostases (Soc., H.E.,1,6; Theod.,H.E., 1, 4).

Athanasius paid this tribute to the bishop: 'of the great Ossius...it is superfluous of me to speak, for he is not an obscure person, but of all men the most illustrious.' (Apol. de Fuga, 7). Dean Stanley remarks: 'It may be doubted whether in his own age the authority of Ossius in the theological world was not even higher than that of Athanasius.' (East Ch.lect: vii,3, quoted in Dictionary of Christian Biography, Wace & Piercey, p.501)

Ossius seems to have been born about 256, was possibly a native of Spain and was a confessor under Maximian. After the Council of Nicaea he returned to Spain and there is no trace of any return to the imperial court. We hear of him again in relation to the preparations for the Council of Sardica in 343 (Ath.,Contr.Arian.,44). Aged about 100 he consented under torture to communicate with Ursacius and Valens (Ath., Hist.Arian.,45), a lapse magnified and misrepresented by subsequent writers such as Hilary of Poitiers (De Syn.,91). It is not certain

whether Ossius died as a result of the violence he suffered at Sirmium in 357 or whether he died a few years later in Spain. His life has been investigated at depth in 'Ossius of Cordova', the huge biography by V. C. de Clercq, and there is also an article by G.S.M. Walker, 'Ossius of Cordova and the Nicene Faith' in Studia Patristica, Vol. ix (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur Band 94, Berlin 1966, pp 316-20).

18. Euseb., Ep. ad Caesar. in Soc. H.E., i, 8.

19. Ath., Ad Afros., 6. P.G. 26.

20. Ath., De Decret. Nic.Syn., 25.

21. Ath., De Sententia Dionysii, 13.

22. Apologia Origenis , 5.

23. Irenaeus, Adv.Haer; Hippolytus of Rome, Adv.Haer; Tertullian, Adv.Valentin.

24. Tertullian, Adv. Prax.

25. i, 9, 1.

26. Theod., H.E. II, 8, 38 (in Stevenson, Creeds, Councils and Controversies No. 11, pp.16,17). The point of the equation of ousia and hypostasis gave an argument to obstinate Latins like Jerome, who could see that the New

Nicenes held the same doctrine as themselves in essentials, but who declined to accept it on the ground that 'one ousia, three hypostases' violated the sacred formula of Nicaea.

27. That is, the Person of God as distinct from the Person of Christ, who was again distinct from the Holy Spirit. In this sense, hypostasis denotes an independent concrete external, which Aristotle called 'primary substance'. Thus Methodius (De Res. 3,6,4) gives the following illustration: when a bronze statue is melted down, the form is abolished altogether: it has no hypostasis, or objectivity of substance.

28. Apokritikos, iii, 43.

Macarius Magnes was probably the bishop of Magnesia numbered among the enemies of John Chrysostom at the Synod of the Oak.

29. 2,1.

30. Origen, Frag. in Hebr. (P.G.14, 1308). So broad was Origen's thought that on the one hand he used ousia (and its synonym hypostasis) in Aristotle's first sense of 'concrete, individual being' (De Orat.15.1.), while on the other he maintained that despite the strong subordination of the Son to the Father, the Son as begotten is of the same substance as the Father. Here Origen was using Aristotle's second sense of a generic existence which could be shared by many. (De Princ. 2.6.1.) Because Origen's thought compassed so much, in the next century

more than one of the parties involved in Christological controversy could claim their beliefs were the logical development of Origen's. 'A debased and misunderstood Origenism of a strongly binitarian character became for nearly a century the orthodoxy of Greek Christianity.' (Green in Rawlinson, Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, p.260). 'It is Origenism of this sort,' claims Wallace-Hadrill (Eusebius of Caesarea p.125), 'that we find in Arius, in the early Athanasius and his bishop Alexander, and in the middle party of Eusebius' (who later attacked Eustathius of Antioch so bitterly).

31. J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines p.235. V.C. de Clercq, Ossius of Cordova p.249 maintains that there was no official sanction of homoousios before Nicaea, and that it was not a central issue until the Council itself.

32. De Fid., 3, 15, 125.

33. 'Athanasius' in Byzantine Studies and other Essays p.369. Baynes supports his theory by a passage quoted from Eustathius of Antioch by Theodoret: 'Some at the Council craftily under the pretext of establishing peace silenced all those who were accustomed to speak to their best purpose.' (Theod., H.E., i, 7)

34. In his letter to Paulinus of Tyre (Theod.,H.E. 1,5).

35. Ibid., p. 233

36. Eusebius of Caesarea, also known as Eusebius Pamphili, was born about 260. Having spent his early life in Caesarea where he owed a great deal to the saintly student Pamphilus, he was elected to the see of Caesarea in 313 where he presided for more than twenty-five years winning the respect of all, until his death. Eusebius seems to have been especially zealous on behalf of Arian doctrines at the time, according to his namesake Eusebius of Nicomedia (Theod., H.E. i, 5), but his attitude suggested to the bishop of Nicomedia that he was not motivated so much by any real accordance with Arius' views as by his desire (born of personal association) to secure liberal treatment for the heresiarch. Arius himself claimed to have Eusebius of Caesarea on his side, and it is true that the bishop took up Arius' cause in a letter to Alexander the bishop of Alexandria (Theod., HE. i, 4).

Athanasius mentions Eusebius rarely, and then without bitterness, and the 'Eusebians' for him always suggested the partisans of the bishop of Nicomedia. The bishop of Caesarea, however, was used as a tool by the Arians and must bear the reproach for too easy a compliance with their actions. He took part in the Council of Constantinople in 336 where the chief work was to condemn Marcellus of Ancyra, the uncompromising opponent of the Arians.

At Nicaea, Eusebius of Caesarea took a leading part in his own right (his bishopric, though important, did not rank with the great sees of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch) as a man of elaborate learning and the

most famous living writer in the Church at that time. He was highly esteemed by Constantine and returned this admiration, although we have no knowledge of personal meetings except at Nicaea and at the Tricennalia in 336. He was also friendly with the Empress Constantia, the sister of Constantine and the wife of Licinius, who wrote to him on matters of religious interest.

Acacius, his pupil of more decided Arian views, took his place as bishop of Caesarea when Eusebius died at the end of 339 or the beginning of 340.

37. When he was head of the Catechetical school of Alexandria, Dionysius succeeded as bishop in that city on the death of Heracles in 233, and retained his position until his own death in 265 (Euseb., H.E. vii,11). He followed Origen's teaching faithfully to the last, but his own orthodoxy was sometimes impeached, especially when he was controverting the false teaching of Sabellianism, so that he was charged with teaching tritheism. Basil of Caesarea, on hearsay, believed Dionysius sowed the seeds of the Anomoean heresy (Ep.i,9), but Athanasius, with fuller knowledge, vindicated his perfect orthodoxy.

38. The letter of Eusebius to the Caesarean Church (Ep.ad Caes. 5; 7) reveals his own interpretation of the word homoousios. The word implied that the Son was 'from the Father' and 'like the Father in all respects'. The homoousios was not to be taken in any corporeal sense, nor as suggesting that the Father's substance had undergone any change or division.

Rather it indicated that the Son bore no resemblance to creatures, but was in every respect like the Father and that he came from him and 'not from any other hypostasis or ousia'. However, within five years, Eusebius found the assurance given him at Nicaea was worthless, and when Eustathius of Antioch began pushing his interpretation of the creed to an extreme, Eusebius believed him to be indulging in Sabellian doctrines. The Caesarean bishop's anger against Eustathius may have been connected with regrets at having signed the creed too hastily. Gwatkin comments: 'Athanasius had pushed the easterns further than they wished to go, and his victory recoiled on him'. (Studies of Arianism p.54).

39. Prior to Nicaea, Christians seemed to borrow the meaning applied to ousia from the Gnostics who took it to signify the relationship between beings compounded of kindred substance. In such a way was Achamoth related to the spiritual part of the world. (Ap. Iren.Haer., 1, 5, 1.)

40. Although this was probably not expressed at the Council, Athanasius later wrote (De Decret.,20) that homoousios succeeded in indicating that the Son is not merely similar to the Father from whom He proceeds, but is identical in similarity, and shows that the similarity and immutability of the Son imply something different from the imitation which is attributed to men and which they acquire by means of virtue.

41. Euseb., De Vita Const., 2, 56.

42. Euseb., Ibid., 3, 10.

43. A letter sent by Ossius to Alexander and Arius in 324. (Euseb., Ibid., 3, 6.)

44. Thus, 'it required no sacrifice of conviction when he passed from the orthodox to the Arian side in the great controversy.' A. E. Burn, The Council of Nicaea, p.3.

45. John Holland Smith, Constantine the Great, p.196.

46. Theod., H.E., i, 21.

47. Details concerning the Antiochene succession at this time are very unsatisfactory, for Theodoret makes Eustathius the immediate successor of Philogonius (H.E., i, 7; v, 40), but Jerome (Chronicon. P.L. xxvii, 677) and Sozomen (H.E., III, 11) insert a certain Paulinus who held office between them. From the synodical letter of the Council of Sardica in 343 it seems that Paulinus somehow incurred the wrath of the Lucianists and was consequently removed from his see through the influence of Macedonius of Mopsuestia, a supporter of Eusebius of Nicomedia. It is interesting that Arius states in a letter to the bishop of Nicomedia (Theod. H.E., i,5) that all the bishops in the East are in agreement with him save Philogonius of Antioch, Hellanicus of Tripolis and Macarius of Jerusalem. So

it seems that when Eustathius began his struggle against Arianism at Antioch, he was continuing what his predecessors had already begun.

48. Jerome, De Vir Ill., 85; Soc. H.E., vi, 13.

49. Theod., H.E., i, 3.

50. Sozomen (H.E. i, 2) asserts that Eustathius was translated to Antioch by the Fathers of Nicaea, but Theodoret (H.E. i,6) states more correctly that he sat at the Council as bishop of Antioch and that his election to that see was the unanimous act of the bishops, presbyters and faithful laity of the city and province. A synodal letter of the Council of Antioch 324, found in the Syriac Codex Parisinus (62), suggests it was this council which elected Eustathius, and thus this choice was merely confirmed by the Council of Nicaea. It is hardly likely that the Council would have originated a translation when, in their 15th canon, the Fathers so strenuously opposed this practice. On the other hand, it might well have confirmed a recent translation like that of Eustathius. Theodoret (H.E. i,6) affirms that he pronounced a panegyric before Constantine, and this would have been fitting in virtue of his rank, since Antioch was the third city of the Roman Empire, and Rome was represented only by presbyters (Sellers, Ibid., p.25 suggests that perhaps Ossius was responsible for this choice, in the same way that he may have been for Eustathius' appointment as bishop of Antioch.) Theodoret's

view is contradicted by Sozomen (H.E. i, 19) who assigns the speech to Eusebius of Caesarea. Cavallera believes the address was wrongly attributed to Eusebius because of a false interpretation of De Vit Const.III,11. Whatever the truth may be, it seems that Eustathius, together with Ossius, enjoyed a prominent position at the Council (Facundus, P.L. lxvii, 711); Theodoret states (Ep.151) that he actually presided. Whether or not the bishop was president, he and Ossius (who had come from the West where una ousia was secured) were steadfast in maintaining the doctrine of the divine unity, and Eustathius himself was a man of too much mark long to escape the persecution of the Arians.

51. John Chrysostom, In Eustathium, n.3. P.G. 50, 602.

52. Jerome, De Vir. Ill., 85; Ep.70 P.L.22, 667-68.

53. Theod. H.E., i, 8.

54. Homily on Proverbs, Chapter 8. (Soc. H.E. i,23; Soz.H.E. ii, 8) Socrates misunderstands the doctrinal aspect of the quarrel, as he believes they were both orthodox in that each maintained the personal existence of the Son and one God in three hypostases, and thus he admits he cannot understand why they did not agree. In fact Eustathius failed to posit the Son's personal existence, while Eusebius on his side maintained the subordinationist teaching of the East.

55. Athanasius, De Decretis, 3. Sellers (Ibid., p.28)

maintains that Eusebius' creed was probably not thorough-going Arianism, but more likely an embodiment of the thought of the Lucianic school. Theodoret's account (H.E. i, 7)that the creed was immediately torn up in disgust depends, he believes, upon the testimony of Eustathius who was prejudiced.

56. Athanasius, Hist. Arian., 5.

57. The date of the synod is difficult to ascertain. It was before the serious attacks on Athanasius at the end of 330, but after the return of Eusebius of Nicomedia from exile in 328, and after sufficient time had elapsed for Eusebius to gain the confidence of Constantine. Athanasius (Hist.Arian., 5) says Eustathius was deposed under Constantius. J. M. Neale in Patriarchate of Antioch n. i, p.88 maintains Eustathius was deposed in 331, he endeavoured to re-ascend the throne in 340; the charge about the Emperor's mother was added, and Constantius affirmed the deposition pronounced first by his father.

We do not know who convoked the synod, as there are several accounts and it is clear the official record is lost.

The Arian Philostorgius, at variance with the other historians, says the synod was held at Nicomedia (H.E., ii, 7). According to him 250 bishops were present, but this is surely an exaggeration. He is possibly confusing this synod with that held in 331 where Athanasius defended himself. Alternatively, it is possible that the decisions of the Antiochene synod were confirmed at Nicomedia.

58. Recorded in Socrates H.E., i, 24. Socrates himself does not see any truth in this story, as George of Laodicea then goes on to recount how Cyrus, bishop of Beroea (who had charged Eustathius with being Sabellian), was condemned and deposed on a similar charge. This seems so unlikely to Socrates that he believes Eustathius was deposed on other grounds, and leaves the matter there.

59. Theod., H.E., i, 21. This is the popular tradition, and perhaps contained an element of truth.

60. Theod., H.E., i, 22.

61. Hist. Arian., 4.

62. Soz., H.E., ii, 19.

63. Sellers, Ibid., pp. 42ff.

64. We are not sure exactly where he was exiled. Jerome believes it was Trajanopolis (De Vir. Illustr., 85), while the Chroniclers (Theodorus Lector, Theophanes and Victor) say he was buried at Philippi of Macedonia, whence his remains were brought back to Antioch about 482 by Calendion, patriarch of Antioch from 482 to 486. (P.G. 86, 183). Chrysostom mentions Thrace as the place of his banishment (P.G. 50, 587-606), and Socrates mentions Bizya, a city in Thrace, while Sozomen merely says he was exiled in the West. (Soc. H.E. iv; 15; Soz. H.E. vi. 13).

There are also some doubts about the date of

Eustathius' deposition. Hamilton Hess (The Canons of the Council of Sardica, pp. 148-50) questions the common view that the bishop was condemned about 330 or 331. Bearing in mind that the real reason for the attack against Eustathius was his outspoken opposition to Arianising doctrines, and maintaining that the exchanges between the two groups must have begun before the restoration of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea (for while the activities of Eusebius of Caesarea and his partisans are vividly described by Eustathius (Theod. HE. i. 7), he makes no allusion to the return of the exiles), Hess believes that with the return of Eusebius and Theognis, Eustathius' enemies were emboldened to make direct attack, and that his deposition took place in the latter part of the year 328. Hess further supports his theory by reference to the relationship between the fall of Eustathius and that of Asclepas of Gaza. The Encyclical letter of the Eusebians at Sardica states that Asclepas was deposed seventeen years prior to the Sardican synod (C.S.E.L. lxv. 56), and the Western Encyclical informs us that judgment was delivered at Antioch under Eusebius of Caesarea (Ibid., p.118). This would place Asclepas' fall in the year 326. Hess points out that it is difficult to imagine Asclepas being deposed at a synod which met at Antioch while Eustathius was still in possession of the see; but referring to another passage in the Eusebian letter which indicates that Asclepas was deposed after Athanasius' consecration in 328 (C.S.E.L. lxv.57), and to Athanasius' own view that

Asclepas' fall took place after that of Eustathius, Hess finds good reason to doubt the reliability of the seventeen years' interval stated by the Eusebians. (N.B. Philostorgius H.E.ii,7, supported by Socrates H.E., i, 23-24 and Sozomen H.E., ii, 16-19 states that the deposition of Eustathius occurred after Eusebius' return to Nicomedia from exile late in 327 or 328).

65. Soc., H.E., i, 24; Soz., H.E., ii,19; Theod., H.E., i,21.

66. The exact date of his death is controversial. Cavallera points out the unlikelihood of Eustathius being still alive when Lucifer of Cagliari consecrated Paulinus in 362. (Le Schisme d' Antioche, pp. 65f.) Tillemont in the Seventeenth century and Sellers more recently reason that he must have died before 337 as he did not return with the other exiled bishops, or with those recalled by Julian in 360. His name is not mentioned in the letter of the Council of Sardica 343, where his principles were maintained and his downfall virtually avenged (Sellers, Ibid., pp. 54-56), apart from one passage which speaks of him as though he were dead: 'Sed et Eustasio et Quimassio (Ossius) adhaerebat pessime et carus fuit, de quorum vita infami acturpi dicendum nihil est: exitus enim illorum eos omnibus declaruit.' (Hilar. Fragm.3, P.L. x.) C.S.E.L.65,66 Athanasius (Hist.Arian.,4) shows that at the time of writing (358) Eustathius had been dead a long time and had been forgotten, although Gwatkin (Studies of Arianism p.74 n.) uses a similar passage from Athanasius which omits to mention Eustathius' death as evidence that the deposed bishop

had not yet died.

Socrates (H.E., iv,14) and Sozomen (H.E.,vi,13) suggest Eustathius was alive in 370 when, recalled from exile by Jovian, he ordained Evagrius bishop of Constantinople on the death of Eudoxius. Sellers (p.54 n.1) wonders whether this Evagrius was confused with the Evagrius who was made bishop of the Eustathian part in 388. He points out that Eustathius may well have been middle-aged by the time he came to Antioch, as he was a Confessor and had already gained a reputation as an exegete someyears before 325.

Theodoret's account (H.E., iii,2) that Eustathius died just before the election of Meletius in 361 is dismissed by Sellers (p.55). Even early historians,he maintains, found it difficult to secure exact details of the life of Eustathius; it is possible that, not knowing when he died, Theodoret liked to think that 'the divine Meletius' was his spiritual successor. Fragments which Eustathius was supposed to have written against Photinus, and which did not come into prominence until 343 are shown to be spurious. (pp.66f.)

67. Raven, Apollinarianism, p.118.

68. Sellers, Ibid., p.58.

69. Theod., H.E., i, 21.

70. Duchesne (Early History of the Christian Church, Vol.II, p.131) notes this paradoxical situation: 'For some two years, the Church had been passing through a singular

crisis. Orthodoxy, as presented by the Council of Nicaea, was everywhere dominant, in the sense that no bishop dared openly to confess himself hostile to that assembly; it was everywhere abolished, in the sense that no bishop in possession of his see dared to defend the creed which it had put forth. The tactics of the aged Eusebius of Nicomedia had completely succeeded!'

71. Euseb., H.E., x, 4. Duchesne (Ibid., p.130)suggests that Paulinus may have been a 'provisional administrator' and not the consecrated bishop of Antioch, since Socrates (H.E., i,24) states that the see of Antioch was vacant successively for eight years. But Flacillus seems to have been bishop of Antioch when he presided at the Council of Tyre in 335, so perhaps the interregnum was not as long as Socrates suggests.

72. Theod., H.E., i, 5.

73. Euseb., In Marcell., i,4.

74. Euseb., H.E., x,i. Although Eusebius regarded Marcellus as a Sabellian, Marcellus regarded himself as a loyal defender of orthodoxy, while modern scholars are apt to see him as an Economic Trinitarian surviving in a world which had moved on, theologically speaking, and being in consequence misunderstood.

75. There is some confusion over the length of Paulinus' office. The lists of the bishops of Antioch assign him an episcopate of five years, while Jerome, in his

Chronicle, places Paulinus before Eustathius. Theodoret (H.E., i,24) does not mention him. Philostorgius (H.E., iii, 5) places Paulinus immediately before Eulalius and says he died after six months of authority.

76. The Dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie ecclesiastique, iii, (1924) col.698 gives his dates as 330/331 - 332/333.

77. Adv. Marcel., i,4.

78. D. S. Wallace - Hadrill, Eusebius of Caesarea, p.34.

79. Euseb., Vit.Const., iii, 61

80. The nominal occasion of this Council was the dedication of the 'Golden Church' sponsored by Constantine ten years before. At least ninety bishops were present (Soz. H.E.iii, 5; Soc. H.E.,ii,8), among whom sixteen Eusebians or semi-Arians composed a formidable minority. Four documents are associated with this Council, of which only 1 and 2 emanate from the whole council; 3 is the Creed of Theophronius of Tyana, who had been accused of heresy, and 4 was drawn up by a committee of bishops some months afterwards. In the first Creed, the Arians claimed they had never been followers of Arius - for how, being bishops, should they follow a presbyter? (Ath. De Syn.22; Soc. H.E. ii,10). The second creed, attributed to Lucian, but possibly 'touched up' by the Arian sophist Asterius, comprises terms carefully

selected from Scripture and asserts the exact likeness of the Son to the Father's essence, without either affirming or condemning the homoousios. This marks the beginning of a doctrinal reaction: the omission of 'of one essence' and the inadequacy of the anathemas. This creed was later used by Basil of Ancyra and the homoeousian party at the Councils of Ancyra (358) and Sirmium (358); and was also used by the Council of Seleucia in 359. The creeds are printed in Stevenson, pp. 11-14. At this Council the Emperor's ratification was procured to the deposition of Athanasius, and Gregory intruded into Alexandria.

Another Arian council was held at Antioch, either at the conclusion of Flacillus' episcopate, or at the commencement of his successor's (Soz. H.E., ii, 10; Soc. H.E., ii,15), and the creed drawn up here was the Macrostichus or 'long-lined' creed, expressed in purely Scriptural terms and claiming the Son was like the Father. It contains no reference to 'essence' or 'substance'.

81. Hist. Ar., 20-21.

82. Theod., H.E., ii, 10.

83. Philost., H.E., iii,15.

84. Ath., Apol. de Fuga, 26.

85. Theod., H.E., ii, 19.

86. Soz., H.E., iii, 15.

87. Flavian and Diodore were to become bishops of Antioch and Tarsus respectively, but at this point they were lay ascetics who held great influence because of their holy lives. Theodoret ascribes to them the invention of antiphonal psalmody, a practice which legend soon attributed to the martyr-bishop of Antioch, Ignatius (Soc. H.E., vi, 8); and Theodoret (H.E., ii,19) relates how Flavian and his friend Diodore at first left Antioch while Leontius was the intruding bishop there, and adopted the solitary life; but they felt compelled to return to keep alive the orthodox remnant.

88. Aetius was banished by the Council of Constantinople to exile in Mopsuestia and then Pisidia, but on the death of Constantius in 361 was presented by Julian with an estate on the island of Lesbos (Philost., H.E., ix, 4) and his exile ended. Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, compiled a defence of Aetius' doctrines and ecclesiastical censure was thereby removed from him (Philost. Ibid., viii, 2). According to Epiphanius he was consecrated bishop at Constantinople, though not to any particular see, and with Eunomius he consecrated bishops for his own party. Aetius retired in disgust to Lesbos when Valens favoured Eudoxius rather than himself in a schism which had arisen, but later returned to Constantinople where he wrote several letters to Constantius on the nature of the Deity and three hundred heretical propositions. (Soc. H.E., ii, 35; Epiph., Haer., lxxvi,10).

89. Theod., H.E., ii, 19: Soz., H.E., iii,20,Philost., H.E., iii,13.

90. The 'Blasphemy' was approved at Antioch, but condemned in Gaul and at Ancyra at a synod under Basil, bishop of Ancyra, who persuaded Constantius to withdraw his signature from the Blasphemy and to banish the leading Anomoeans.

91. J. Gummerus gave an accurate estimation of the 'Blasphemy's' character when he wrote (Die homöusianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius, Leipzig, 1900, p.57): 'Without directly preaching Ariansim, the formula was an edict of tolerance in its favour, while the Nicene party found itself excluded from that tolerance.' (Quoted in Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, p.287). It need not be described as a Homoean formula. Its most sinister feature was the ban on the homoousios, which opened the way to a direct assertion of pure Arianism at some future date. It incidentally opens the question of whether Uraacius and Valens privately thought the homoios went too far, and yearned for the doctrines of Aetius and Eunomius. It was Hilary who first called the manifesto 'the Blasphemy.' (De Syn x.P.L.x,487 A.)

92. Theod., H.E., ii, 20; Soc. H.E., ii,37; Soz., H.E., iv, 12.

93. Soz., H.E., iv, 26; Soc., H.E., ii, 19; Theoph., Chronogr., 38; Niceph. Callist., H.E., xi, 4.

94. De Synod., P.L., x, 471.

95. Theod., H.E., ii, 25; Haer.Fab., iv, 3; Epiph; Haer., lxxii, 2. Eudoxius had a point in that if God is utterly transcendent and ineffable - a perfectly 'respectable' Christian tenet - it follows that all human predicates are inapplicable to Him. Thus, one cannot say that one 'Knows God', nor should one properly say that 'God knows' anything, including Himself, because this is to apply human language to Him. In that sense only, Eudoxius 'knew God' as much as God 'knew' Himself. But this sort of apophatic language must be properly balanced to avoid absurdity. Thus, if we say that God does not know in the human sense, we must add that this does not mean that he is by human standards ignorant.

While the Arians' remarks were often quite sensible in themselves, they contrived to give the appearance of flippancy, and were easily misrepresented as foolishness by orthodox contemporaries as well as by more recent historians.

96. The Homoeousians, unfairly called Semi-Arians by Epiphanius, constituted the conservative group led by Basil of Ancyra which was anti-Nicene, but some of them were divided from the Nicenes only by their dislike of the homoousios. The title 'Semi-Arian' is more appropriate to designate the group led by Ursacius and Valens which ultimately held to the Creed of Constantinople of 360. These persons were Semi-

Arians in that they did not accept the Anomoean view and preferred to say that the Logos was like the Father rather than unlike Him; but clearly they stood nearer the views of Arius than did Basil of Ancyra. They were known as Homoeans: 'the Son is like the Father but not identical with Him'.

97. According to Sozomen (H.E., iii, 4, 16), the Council of Seleucia (originally planned to take place at Nicomedia) was summoned by Constantius to end the Anomoean doctrine, but Socrates (H.E., ii, 17), probably more correctly, writes that the Emperor was trying to restore universal peace among the Arianising parties by means of a General Synod. Ursacius and Germinius of Sirmium persuaded the Emperor to hold a double synod, and to assemble the Western bishops at Ariminum while the Eastern bishops met at Seleucia. The so-called 'Dated Creed' of 359, or the Fourth Sirmium Formula, drawn up by Bishop Marcus of Arethusa (Ath., De Synodis, 8; Soc., H.E., ii, 37), an ambiguous formula recommending that the homoousios be discontinued,

which

satisfied the Emperor but did no harm to the Anomoeans, was at first rejected by the Western bishops at Ariminum, but after weeks of negotiation and intrigue was accepted under extreme pressure in a revised edition - which was in fact less orthodox than the 'Dated Creed' since the words 'in all things' were omitted after 'like' - at Nice by deputies of both sections. Jerome (Dial. C.

Lucif., 19) declared that when the 'Dated Creed' in a slightly altered version was ratified by the Council of Constantinople in January 360, 'the whole world groaned to find itself Arian'. In the East, the Homoean supremacy lasted 30 years.

98. Hil., Adv. Const., 26.

99. Acacius was bishop of Caesarea in Palestine from 341 to 365.

100. On 15 February Eudoxius attended the dedication of the Church of the Divine Wisdom (St. Sophia), sponsored in 342 by Constantius, and in his address as spokesman he began,'the Father is impious (ἀσεβής) the Son is pious (εὐσεβής)'. Murmurs and laughter greeted his remarks, and Eudoxius tried to explain what he meant: the Son reverences the Father while the Father has no one to reverence. Socrates comments (H.E., ii,43): 'Thus these heresiarchs tore the Church to pieces by their captious subtleties,' and Duchesne remarks (Ibid.,p.246): 'This miserable quip, the memory of which was preserved in Constantinople, gives us a fair idea.... (of) what kind of priests were filling the higher positions in the Church of the East.' In his new position, Eudoxius succeeded in consecrating his friend Eunomius (a disciple of Aetius) to the see of Cyzicus, but was forced to remove him under pressure from George of Laodicea in the Spring of 358. (Epiph., Haer., lxxiii, 2-11). In 365 Eudoxius became the victim of attacks

made by the Semi-Arians, now called the Macedonians, but Valens refused to confirm their denunciation made at Lampsacus, and in fact the Emperor was induced by his wife to receive baptism from the former bishop of Antioch. In the same year (367) Valens issued an order, perhaps on the advice of Eudoxius, that all bishops who had been banished by Constantius and then returned by Julian should be exiled again.

Eudoxius died in 370, well deserving (in the opinion of many) the character given him by Baronius: 'The worst of all the Arians'. (Soc., H.E., iv, 14; ii, 19 37, 40,,43; Theoph., Chronogr., 38).

101. Soz., H.E., iv, 18; Theod., H.E., ii, 31. Socrates (H.E., ii, 44) suggests that Meletius retired from Sebaste to take up the position of bishop of Beroea in Syria, and Loofs (RE v. Eustathius and Meletius) and Tillemont (Memoires t. viii, S. Meletius 1 p.147) accept this. Cavallera (Le Schisme d'Antioche p.94) tries to show that perhaps Socrates was mistaken, since later the historian does not mention Meletius' supposed translation to Beroea, even in a chapter (H.E. vii, 36)where it would naturally have been in place, since he was committed to reviewing examples of translations in the Fourth century.

102. Greenslade, Schism in the Early Church, p.121.

103. In 359 Eustathius took part in the Council of Seleucia in the ranks of the homoeousian majority. Later Meletius

regarded him with disfavour.

104. Socrates (H.E., ii, 44) expressly mentions him, but his signature is not in the list received by Epiphanius (Haer., 73, 26).

105. Duchesne, Ibid., p. 245.

106. Greg. Naz., Carm. Vit., xi, 1591-1679, Op., ii, 759-763.

107. Epiph., Haer., 73, 75.

108. Soz., H.E., iv, 28; Theod., H.E., ii, 27.

109. Soc., H.E., ii, 44; Soz., H.E., iv, 28.

110. Epiph., Haer., 73, n.29, printed in P.G.xlii, 457-465.

111. P.G. xlii, 460.

112. Taken from Cavallera's translation (Ibid., pp. 80-82).

113. Theod., H.E., ii, 27.

114. Basil, Ep. 258.

115. As Meletius' nomination is ascribed to Acacius by Epiphanius, Jerome and Philostorgius, we may presume that his removal was the work of another party. Gwatkin (Ibid., p. 183) postulates a possible Homoean division rather than the duplicity of Acacius.

116. Philost., H.E., v, 1.

117. Theod., H.E., ii, 27.

118. Soz., H.E., iv., 21.

119. Chrysostom, In S. Melet., 517.

120. Soc., H.E., ii, 44.

121. Philost., H.E., v, 5.
It was while Euzoius was bishop at Antioch in 361 that the Acacians met in the city and not only confirmed their decision that ὁμοιος ought to be erased from the formula which had been published both at Ariminum and at Constantinople, but openly contended that the Son was unlike the Father respecting both essence and will. They also declared, like the Arians, that the Son was made out of nothing (Soc., H.E., ii, 45).

NOTES: CHAPTER TWO

1. Tomus ad Antiochenos, P.G. 26, 796 - 809.

2. Although Constantius may be called Julian's cousin for convenience, their actual relationship was more complicated. According to the pedigree by A. H. M. Jones in Constantine and the Conversion of Europe (London 1948, p. 261), Julian was descended from the second wife of Constantius' grandfather, Flavius Constantius Valerius. Gallus was Julian's half-brother, the child of his father Julius Constantius' first wife Galla. Julian was the only child of the second wife, Basilina.

3. E. A. Thompson (The Historical work of Ammianus Marcellinus, pp. 56-71) believed that Ammianus painted far too gloomy a picture of the brief reign of Gallus at Antioch, and that his writing is full of unspecific sweeping charges and of contradictions, and is tendentious rather than impartial history. Thus, although Gallus' behaviour was, on occasions, harsh and repellant, and although he was disliked by many among the upper classes, Ammianus underplays the guilt of those brought to trial by the Emperor; he obscures Gallus' popularity with the lower classes, both civilian and military; he omits to mention all those friends of Gallus who were above reproach and who would not have tolerated his tyranny. Thompson believes that the historian's view was partly influenced by the violent hatred which his admired superior, Ursicinius, felt towards Gallus who had been appointed over his head to repel the Persian menace.

4. The disgrace and execution of Gallus in 354 put an end to the political hopes of the Anomoeans.

5. Most of the bishops at the Council had been recalled from exile, but since they did not all return at once, it is impossible to say exactly when Meletius was recalled and allowed to go back to Antioch, but he did not attend the Council, and neither did Paulinus, although the latter subsequently signed the Tome.

None of the Antiochene parties was in communion with Rome at this time, but the Paulinian party was in communion with Alexandria which in turn was in communion with the West who regarded her as the representative Church of the East.

6. The reluctance of many of the orthodox in accepting the term hypostasis and the difficulty they experienced in using the word is reflected in the famous letter (Ep.20) sent by Jerome to Pope Damasus in 376/7 where he remarks: 'Just now, I am sorry to say, those Arians, the "men of the Plain", are trying to extort from me, a Roman Christian, their unheard-of formula of"three hypostases"! In the whole range of secular learning, "hypostasis" never meant anything but "essence". And can anyone, I ask, be so profane as to speak of "three essences" or "substances" in the Godhead?...Let us keep to "one hypostasis", if such be your pleasure, and say nothing of three.'

7. P.G. 26, 796-809.
The Tome was addressed ostensibly to the Nicene bishops at Antioch, but in reality to Paulinus who had long been

recognised by Athanasius as the true leader of the Nicene party there. The heading of the letter has raised unnecessary doubts, as it purports to proceed from Athanasius, Eusebius, Asterius and others, while at the same time Eusebius and Asterius are mentioned among others as those to whom the letter is addressed. The apparent contradiction arises from the fact that the Tome is at once a synodal letter - and as such proceeds from Eusebius and Asterius - and an instruction according to which Asterius and Eusebius were to bring about the reunion of the Antiochenes.

Asterius was a bishop of Arabia - he is called the bishop of Petra in the Tome - who had accompanied the Eusebians to the Council of Sardica in 343, but had separated from them along with bishop Macarius, complaining of the violent treatment to which the deputies had been subjected with the view of driving them into supporting the Eusebian faction (Theod., H.E., ii,8). The Eusebians banished the two bishops to Libya where they endured much suffering (Athanasius, Hist. Arian., 18) until Julian's edict of 362 enabled them to return and take part in the Council of Alexandria.

8. Tom. ad Antiochenos, 3-7

The Tome continues: 'But upon our asking them "what then do you mean by it, or why do you use such expressions?", they replied, Because they believed in a Holy Trinity, not a trinity in name only, but existing and subsisting in truth, "both a Father truly existing and subsisting, and a Son, truly substantial and subsisting and a Holy Spirit

subsisting and really existing do we acknowledge," and that neither had they said there were three gods or three beginnings, nor would they tolerate such as said or held so, but they acknowledged a Holy Trinity but One Godhead, and one beginning, and that the Son is coessential with the Father, as the Fathers said; while the Holy Spirit is not a creature, nor external, but proper to and inseparable from the essense (ousia) of the Father and Son.'

9. Ibid., 6

'But we hold that there is One, because the Son is of the Essence of the Father, and because of the identity of the nature. For we believe that there is one Godhead, and that it has one nature, and not that there is one nature of the Father, from which that of the Son and of the Holy Spirit are distinct.'

10. B. J. Kidd (A History of the Church to A.D.461, Vol II, p.212) maintains that the Council did not succeed in arriving at its objective because it did not say that the term hypostasis could be used in either sense, although Gregory of Nazianzus reports that it did (Orat., 21, 35); and it certainly did not proscribe its use altogether, as Socrates asserts (H.E. III, vii, 14). What it did do, according to Kidd, was to throw the weight on the Nicene use of the term, and merely tolerate the other. Nevertheless, it is clear that Athanasius and his supporters had satisfied themselves that those who spoke of three hypostases were in

agreement with those who acknowledged one, the one party applying the term hypostasis to the Persons, the other to the divine Essence; and since Athanasius' policy at this time was to attract all possible support for the fundamentals of Nicene orthodoxy, it is difficult to see why the council should have been summoned in the first place, if it were not to be conciliatory.

11. In fact, Meletius is not mentioned by name, and his party is indicated by 'those who met at the Palaia (the Old Church)'. Cavallera points out that this was because Meletius had not yet returned to Antioch, and he follows Tillemont's view that both parties were treated with an almost perfect equality, and when the question arose about where to meet after the union, it was left, not to the discretion of Paulinus, but to the consent of all the people. (Ibid., p.110)

12. In 354 Lucifer had resisted the condemnation of Athanasius with such vehemence that he was confined to the Palace and subsequently exiled by Constantius to Palestine where he composed invectives against the Emperor. Athanasius, naturally, thought highly of him as 'the Elias of the age.'

13. H.E., III, 9.

14. How far Lucifer was an actual schismatic remains obscure. Rufinus (H.E., i, 30) says the break consisted of a

refusal to communicate with the Alexandrian bishops, while Theodoret (H.E., iii, 2) maintains that a schism was provoked by Lucifer, who made doctrinal statements on his return to Sardinia. Ambrose reports: 'He had separated himself from our communion.' (De Excessu Satyri, i , 47), and Augustine supports this view with his comment: 'He fell into the darkness of schism, having lost the light of charity.' (Ep. 185 n.87). On the other hand Jerome calls him 'beatus' and'bonus pastor' in his dialogue against the Luciferians (20), and Lucifer's followers, if ever they formed a distinct organisation, disappeared within a few years. Jerome's dialogue purports to be a discussion between an orthodox Christian and a Luciferian, and was written in 378, about seven years after the death of Lucifer. Five or six years later, an appeal was made to the Emperor by Luciferian presbyters, and nothing more is heard of them.

15. Orat. Funebr. in S.Melet., iii. Puller(The Primitive Saints, pp. 256-57) came to the conclusion that the reference is more likely to be to Euzoius than to the consecration of Paulinus.

16. Julian, Ep.55.(Wright),Bidez-Cumont,90. Preserved by Facundus.

17. Bonosus, an officer in the army and Maximilian had been ordered by Julian to erase from their ensign the sign of Christ which had figured there since the time of Constantine. On their refusal, they were

brutally tortured and then executed. Tillemont raised difficulties about certain aspects of the martyrdom, although the Dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie ecclesiastique (Tom.ix, col. 1094) thinks there is a basis of fact.

18. Theod., H.E., iii, 10.

19. Passio S. Theodoriti, in Ruinart. Acta primorum martyrum selecta (ed.1713), p. 588. Quoted in Cavallera, Ibid., p,121 n.4.

20. Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi, 21.

21. Ath., De Syn., 29; Soc., H.E., ii, 40.

22. Jerome, Dial. ad. Luc., 19.

23. Soc., H.E., iv, 2. Acacius has traditionally been regarded as a prominent leader of the Homoean party, and was little respected by historians, who accorded their sympathy instead to his colleague Basil of Ancyra. J. M. Leroux ('Acace, évêque de Césarée de Palestine 341-365', Studia Patristica Vol.viii, pp.82-85) attempts to show that although there is much to regret about his character, he may not have played such a very great rôle in his party. Athanasius (De Syn., 12) indeed considered him to be one of the leaders of the Arians, but Socrates (H.E., iv, 25) and Theodoret (H.E., ii,31)say simply that he was 'suspected' of Arianism. It is not possible to assess the rôle he took at the Council of the

Dedication in 341, or at the Councils of Sardica and Philippopolis 343. It seems he was present at the latter council (Hilar Frag. iii,29, PL x,676B) and signed the synodal letter of the Orientals (Theod., H.E., ii,8.28. GCS 19,109. (ii,6. PL. 10, 676 B). and he was deposed at Sardica (ii,6). But no replacement was made, and he continued peacefully in his see. He was a cultivated intellectual and restored and replenished the library at Caesarea. Sozomen (H.E. iv, 23) tells us that he was a disciple of Eusebius of Caesarea, and he seemed to adopt his teaching, at least in the first years of his ministry, which means he was not an Arian but was nevertheless opposed to the Nicene faith. About the year 350, Acacius participated in the eviction of Maximus and consecrated Cyril bishop of Jerusalem in his place. (Soc., H.E., ii, 38; Soz., H.E., iv, 20). But Jerome records (Vir.Ill., 98) that he also assisted in the election of the Antipope Felix. In 358 he assisted at a council convoked by Eudoxius against the adversaries of Nicaea, and in particular against the views propagated by Basil of Ancyra, andin the same year Acacius was prominent at the council convoked by the Emperor at Seleucia. Here, Acacius aroused the contempt of all because of his guile (Philost., H.E. iv, 12), and he opposed all who wished to adhere to the symbol of the Dedication Council of Antioch of 341 (Soz., H.E., iv, 22). Instead, Acacius wished to reconcile everyone by formulating an indefinite symbol to accommodate all (Soz., H.E., iv,22), but eventually he agreed to the Creed of Sirmium. After being deposed by this Council, Acacius returned with his friends to

Constantinople, where he approved the formula of Rimini (Soz., H.E., iv, 24), and condemned Aetius. He also used his influence here to effect the exile of Eudoxius and Eunomius, and installed bishops of his own party in their place. In 363 Acacius subscribed to an orthodox profession of faith at the council convoked by Meletius at Antioch, but he was deposed at Lampsacus in 365 by the Macedonians (Soz., H.E., vi,7; Soc., H.E., iv, 4), and after this we lose track of the bishop of Caesarea.

Having reviewed this evidence, Leroux concludes that there is nothing to suggest that Acacius was the unscrupulous and powerful leader which historians often suppose him to have been, but rather an intellectual, faithful to the tradition of Antioch, who was deluded by vanity into believing he had sufficient puissance to bring about unity, but succeeded only in attracting about him a circle of friends who for the most party rallied round the orthodox faith.

24. Soc., H.E., iii, 24; Soz., H.E., vi, 4.

25. A History of the Councils of the Church, ii, p.282.

26. P.G., 28 Ath., opp. iv, 85-88.

27. Theod., H.E., iv, 21.

28. Ep. 89.

'Tillemont contends that this cannot apply to the great Athanasius, to whom Meletius is not likely to have

refused communion, but is more probably to be referred to some other unknown Athanasius. Maran, however, points out (Vit. Bas., xxii) not only how the circumstances fit in, but how the statement that communion was refused by Meletius is borne out by Ep. 258.' (The Nicene and Post.Nicene Fathers, Vol.VIII, p. 176, n.1).

29. Ep. 214.

30. Ep. 258.

31. Epiph. Haer., 77, 20.

32. Soc., H.E., iv, 2; Soz., H.E., vi, 7.

33. Theod., H.E., iv, 21.

34. Ruf., H.E., i, 30; Soc., H.E., iv, 2; Soz., H.E., vi,7; vii, 3.

35. Theod., H.E., iv, 24.

36. Soc., H.E., iv, 1-3; Soz., H.E., vi, 7, 10-12.

37. Soz., H.E., vi, 12.

38. Greg. Nyss., De S.Meletio,ii mentions three exiles: 360 365 and 372. The second exile could have lasted only a short time, since John Chrysostom supposes the presence of Meletius at Antioch from 367-370. Only two exiles

are mentioned by Ruf. H.E., ii, 3-13; Soc., H.E., iv, 17-38; Soz., H.E.,vi, 13-40; Theod., H.E., iv, 21-32.

NOTES: CHAPTER THREE.

1. Greg. Naz., Orat., xx.

2. Bas. Epp. 335-359; Liban., Vita. 15.
Gwatkin (Studies of Arianism, p.242)suggests that Basil was friendly with Libanius at Constantinople, but Downey (Antioch in the Age of Theodosius the Great,p.90)points out that Libanius settled at Nicaea in 346; and the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire suggests that Libanius left Constantinople about 342-3, so there is no possibility that Basil and the rhetorician coincided at the capital.

3. Greg. Naz., Orat., iv.

4. Greg. Naz., Ibid., xx, 334.

5. De Spir. Sancto, xxix, 71.

6. Greg. Naz., Ibid., xix, 311.
In 359 Basil was summoned from his monastic life to accompany Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste (who had been delegated by the Council of Seleucia) to communicate the conclusions of that meeting to Constantius at Constantinople. Basil avoided taking part in the discussions at the Council of 360 where the Acacians triumphed, but when Constantius tried to make those present sign the creed of Ariminum, Basil left and returned to Cappadocia (Greg.Nys., In Eunom., 310,312; Philost., H.E., iv, 2). Here, against his will, he was

ordained priest by Eusebius of Caesarea who availed himself of Basil's theological knowledge and intellectual powers until jealousy marred their partnership and Basil returned to Pontus (Greg.Naz., Orat., xx, 336,337; Soz., H.E., vi, 15). In 365 Basil was invited back to Caesarea as a bulwark against Valens (Greg.Naz., Ibid., xx,339), and during the revolt of Procopius he organised the orthodox resistance against the Anomoeans (Amm.Marc., Res Gestae, xix, 310).

7. Greg.Naz., Epp. 22,23.

8. Greg. Naz., Orat., xx.

9. It is unknown when Basil first met Meletius. Socrates (H.E., iv, 26) suggests that Meletius ordained Basil deacon when he left his study of rhetoric for theology, but Philostorgius (H.E., iv,12)says that when Basil assisted at the Council of Constantinople, he was already a deacon (Meletius was not appointed to Antioch until several months later). The statement in Ep. 57: 'Should I, however, be permitted, in answer to your prayers, while I live on this earth, to meet you face to face, and to enjoy the profitable instruction of your living voice... I should count this indeed the best of blessings...' written in 371 seems to suggest that the two had never actually met, but Cavallera (Le Schisme d'Antioche, p.381 n.1) does not regard this as conclusive evidence.

10. Bas. Ep., 154 (Printed in The Nicene and Post-Nicene

Fathers, Vol.VIII, pp.209f.).

11. Ep. 66 (Ibid., pp.163f).

12. Ep. 57.(Ibid., p.159).

13. Ep. 99 (Ibid., p.183).

14. Ep. 69 (Ibid., p.165).

15. Ep. 68 (Ibid., pp.164).

16. Ep. 67 (Ibid., p.164).

17. Ep. 70. This letter carries no address but is 'obviously addressed to Pope Damasus'. (Ibid., p.166).

18. M. Richard ('Saint Basile et la mission du diacre Sabinus,' Analecta Bollandiana, 1949, pp. 178-202) shows that it was not Rome which authorised Sabinus to go to Caesarea, but that Athanasius, empowered by his considerable authority, had probably persuaded him to do so. Richard's evidence supports the view (discussed by M. Loofs in Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius Briefe) that Dorotheus' journey ended at Alexandria, but conflicts with Cavallera's view (Ibid., p.147 n.2) that the Antiochene deacon probably did arrive at Rome where he successfully delivered Basil's letters.

19. Ep. 89 (Ibid., pp.175f). Quoted on pp. 61-62 above.

20. J.W. Jurgens ('A letter of Meletius of Antioch',

Harvard Theological Review 53) suggests the following internal evidence as to why the letter is non-Basilian:

a) The Benedictine editors of Basil's letters express surprise at Basil's agreement with the phrase τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας which is not typical of Basil's theology.

b) The style of the letter is non-Basilian (Jurgens refers to Sister Agnes Clare Way's article in the American Journal of Philology, 1931). The very formal greeting which was quite common in Greek letters of Basil's period occurs in only three authentic Epistles (264, 243, 92).

c) The list of signatories to the letter includes Meletius' name first - precisely where we should expect the author of the letter to sign. This is followed by Eusebius' signature, with Basil's appearing third on the list. Jurgens argues that Meletius would have sent the letter first to Eusebius, who would then send it on to Basil who signed and then sent it quickly on to the other bishops in their communion.

d) The content of the letter is surely what Meletius would have written.

e) The date of the letter must have been before early 373, as Basil and Eustathius of Sebaste both sign. In the Spring or Summer of 373 Eustathius was excommunicated by Basil.

Jurgens maintains that the letter is unrecognised as belonging to Meletius because it has been published in a corpus of Basil's letters, but it

is exactly the kind of letter we might have expected Meletius to write.

The Epistle is printed in Nicene Fathers Vol.VIII pp.177-9.

21. Ep. 91 (Ibid., p.177).

22. Ep.90 (Ibid., pp.176f). Basil must have realised that Athanasius, and not Rome, was responsible for sending Sabinus, as in his letters he does not thank the West for sending the Milanese deacon.

23. This was the bishop whose consecration by the dying Paulinus in 388 prolonged the schism at Antioch.

24. Ep. 138, written to Eusebius of Samosata in the Summer of 374 (according to Cavallera's dating) or 373 (according to Nicene Fathers p.202).

25. Ep. 99 (Ibid., pp.182-184).

26. Ep. 125 (Ibid., pp. 194-196).

27. Ep. 223 (Ibid., pp. 262-265).

28. Gwatkin (Ibid., p.242 n. 3) attempts to show by doctrinal statements taken from Basil's epistles that the bishop of Caesarea held a Semi-Arian position modified by an Athanasian influence.

29. Ep. 156 (Ibid., pp. 210f).

30. Greg. Naz. Orat., 25, 12.

31. Ep. 133 (Ibid., pp. 200, 305f).

32. Part of this letter is quoted by Facundus of Hermiane in his 'Defence of the Three Chapters' (Pro Defens. Trium. Capit., iv, 2).

33. Bas. Ep. 266 (Ibid., p.306). In his letter, Basil approaches this question with the utmost delicacy, without directly charging Peter.

34. Ea Gratia, Dam., Ep. 2, Fr.i (P.L., 13, 350).

35. Dam., Ep. 3 (P.L., 13, 356).

36. Count Terentius was a General in Armenia and a friend of Basil. He was very severely judged by Ammianus Marcellinus (Res Gestae, xxx, 1,2), who presented him as a hypocrite, bloodthirsty and perfidious beneath his grave exterior. Basil, however, spoke well of him and presented him as a fervent Christian deeply concerned about the health of his own soul, but also setting public service before his own interests. Terentius was influential with Valens, and helped in appointing a ruler for Armenia. He retired in 375.

37. Ep. 214, printed in Stevenson, Creeds, Councils and Controversies, p.117.

38. Theod., H.E., v, 23.

39. Ep. 216 (Nicene Fathers, p.255).

40. Ep. 140 (Ibid., pp. 203f).
Theodoret records a (legendary) tale about this phase of the schism. The monk Aphraates, who had left his cell to help Diodore and Flavian, one day met the Emperor who asked him where he was going. The monk replied he wished to pray for the Empire. When Valens observed that he could have remained in his cell to pray, the monk remarked that when the house is on fire, even the young daughter must leave her room and help put out the fire. 'This is what I am doing, Emperor. You have set fire to our paternal home; we run from all sides to put out the fire.' The Emperor made no reply; but a chamberlain who had mocked Aphraates was later found strangled in a bath he had been preparing for Valens (Theod., H.E., iv, 23).

41. 'I cannot understand how it is that no one has told you that the road to Rome is wholly impracticable in winter, the country between Constantinople and our own regions being full of enemies.' (Ep. 215, Ibid., p.254).

42. Ep. 243 (Ibid.,p.282. n.6 states that Maran places this letter not earlier than Easter 376 and objects to the earlier date (372) assigned by Tillemont, which has been followed by Loofs and by Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D.461, Vol.II, p.263).

43. Ep. 239 (Ibid., pp.280f.)

44. Ep. 129 (Ibid., pp. 197f).

45. Theod., H.E., v,4; Soz., H.E., vi, 25.

46. Ep. 258 (Ibid., pp. 294-296).

47. Epiph., Haer., 127, 20-23.

48. Soz., H.E., vi, 25.
Among those whom the disputes at Antioch troubled was S. Jerome (whose view of the doctrinal aspect has already been noted) who arrived in the city about this time to practise the ascetic life among the monks who lived in the desert of Chalcis. As a member of the Church of Rome, he naturally sided with Paulinus, but he observed that most of his fellow-monks were in communion with Meletius. In a letter which Puller (The Primitive Saints, p.161) considers to exaggerate the importance of the Roman see at this late date, Jerome asked advice from the Pope: 'Since the East tears into pieces the Lord's coat...therefore by me is the chair of S.Peter to be consulted...I know not of Vitalis; I reject Meletius; I am ignorant of Paulinus.' (Ep.20) Tillemont dates this letter 376. The outcome of the correspondence was that Jerome communicated with Paulinus.

49. Ep. 263 (Ibid., pp.301-3).

50. Bas., Ep. 266 (Ibid., pp.305-6.)

51. Illud sane miramur and Non nobis quidquam, (Dam.Ep.2, Fr. ii, iii, P.L. 13, 352-4). Printed in Stevenson,

Ibid., pp.87f.

52. Ep. 138 (Ibid., pp.202f).

53. Ep. 128 (Ibid., pp.196f).

54. According to Rufinus (H.E., ii,3)it was Valens who recalled the exiles before his death; but this measure was accorded to Gratian by Socrates (H.E., v,2) and Sozomen (H.E., vii, 1). Gratian's edict of 3 August 379 (Cod.Th., xvi, 5,5) shows the Emperor was content with a general measure for peace in which only certain heretical sects were excepted: the Sabellians (followers of Photinus) and the Eunomians (extreme Arians). The redistribution of churches was not officially imposed until the edict of Theodosius (10 January 381), but we know of other occasions where bishops resumed their churches without official edict (for example, when Peter returned to Alexandria on 12 December 378: Soc., H.E., iv, 37; Soz., H.E., vi, 38). It is unlikely that Meletius met at the synod of October 379 without having regained his church.

55. Eusebius of Samosata collaborated actively in this restoration. He ordained Acacius at Beroea, Theodotus at Hierapolis and Eusebius at Chalcis. He died in 379 of a blow adminstered by an Arian woman while he was visiting Dolicha to install Maris there (Theod., H.E., v, 4).

56. Greg. Nys., Vita Macrin., P.G., 46,973.

57. Printed in P.L., xiii, 353-354; lvi, 143-148. They include Confidimus Quidem - a letter of Damasus - and three fragments, Ea gratia, Illud sane miramur and Non nobis quidquam. Duchesne (Early History of the Christian Church, Vol.II, p.336) believes these represent only an extract from a more extensive collection, as the Easterns would not have signed Confidimus if it stood alone, for in it we find the term una substantia (=μία ὑπόστασις), against which they had always protested. But this term might be considered explained by the subsequent letters, in one of which it was replaced by the expression unaousia. It is possible, therefore, that their adhesion was given to the dossier as a whole.

58. The Codex Vaticanus gives the number as 163.

59. Merenda in his Gesta S. Damasi (P.L., xiii,19,191), mentioned by Puller (Ibid., p.241), thinks the 'Tome of the Westerns' really consisted of three dogmatic letters put forth by Roman Councils in 369, 374 and 377. The first of these letters is extant, and fragments of the others remain, The subscriptions of the Antiochene Fathers immediately follow the fragments of the synodical letter of 377; Puller believes it was that letter, and no other, which was signed at Antioch. He argues further (pp.242-244) that the fact that a copy of this letter bearing Meletius' signature was preserved at Rome in the archives of the Church does not prove that Meletius had been received into communion with Rome.

60. Cod. Theod., xvi, 1,2.

61. Greg. Naz., Orat., 23, 4.

62. Cod. Theod., xvi, 5,6. The edict was issued on 10 January 381.

63. Named Sapores in the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, he was a friend of Libanius the rhetorician, and Magister Militum by rank.

64. Theodoret (H.E., v, 3) speaks of Apollinarius, and mentions Vitalis only incidentally in another chapter. It is improbable, however, that Apollinarius had personally reclaimed the churches at Antioch.

65. Soc., H.E., v, 5.

66. Soz., H.E., vii, 3.

67. H. E., v, 3, 9-16.
Puller (Ibid., p.339) believes it is 'practically certain that the compact was made at some time during February or March 381' since Theodoret's account shows that the proposal was connected with Sapor's enquiry. He considers the general to have arrived in Antioch at the beginning of February 381 (p. 337).

68. Greenslade, Schism in the Early Church, p. 163.

69. Soc., H.E., v, 5.

70. Coletti, ii, 1186. Mentioned by Puller, Ibid., p.247.

71. Ep. 12.

72. Duchesne, Ibid., p. 344.

73. Dam., Ep. 5.

74. Theod., H.E., v, 6-7.

75. In the oldest Latin translations there appear the names of three Roman legates, Paschasinus, Lucentius and Boniface, but Hefele (A History of the Councils of the Church, p.242, n.7)believes this was a mistake and that they were present instead seventy years later at the Fourth General Council.

76. Greg. Naz., Carm.Vit., 1525.

77. Cavallera, Ibid., p.222.

78. Carm. Vit. places the death of Meletius before the end of May 381.

79. Greg.Nys., De Meletio,(Op.iii,587 A; P.G.,xlv,852 A)

80. Soz., H.E., vii, 10.

81. John Chrysostom, Panegyric on Meletius, P.G., 1,519.

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR

1. Soz., H.E., vii, 7.

2. Greg. Naz., Carm. Vit., xi, 1591 - 1679. Or.ii,759-763.

3. Greg. Naz., Ibid., 1583.

4. It is possible that this challenge, although canonically fully justified (since Gregory had been constrained by Basil to be ordained bishop of Sasima; but he had never gone to that see, remaining instead at Nazianzus to assist his father who was bishop there), was made out of pique that Peter's own choice of candidate for the see, Maximus the Cynic, had been rejected. Maximus had always been most attentive to Gregory's sermons and had applauded him in church, while Gregory treated the philosopher as a confessor of the faith and an intimate friend, and had honoured him in a fine panegyric (Or. 25). However, Maximus, on being illegally consecrated in the Church of the Anastasis, was repulsed harshly by Theodosius and was banished.

It is sometimes thought that Timothy's late arrival at the Council was occasioned by his need to secure his inheritance after his predecessor Peter; but it seems at least as likely that Acholius and Timothy were only summoned to give the appointment of Gregory as bishop of Constantinople an oecumenical flavour. Hefele (A History of the Councils of the Church, p.343) believes it is possible that Theodosius originally intended to hold a General Council for the East, and not an Oecumenical one, although Baronius (Annales Eccl. ad ann. 381, n.19,20)

tried to show it was Damasus who summoned this synod since its members themselves had said 'they had assembled in Constantinople in accordance with a letter from Damasus to the Emperor Theodosius the Great'. This synodal letter is indeed found in Theodoret (H.E.,v.9), but Hefele shows that this emanates from the Council of the following year.

5. Carm. Vit., xi, 1591-1679.

6. Ibid., 1680 - 1690.

7. Ibid., 1745.

8. Ibid., 1778.

9. Ibid., 1837.

10. Orat., xlii.

11. Epp. 88, 91.
The Church at Nazianzus was in a state of confusion owing to Apollinarian activity there, but Gregory soon had to appeal to the bishop of Tyana asking to be relieved of his duties because of illness, and eventually Eulalius, Gregory's colleague and relation and the man of his choice, was elected instead. Gregory withdrew to Nazianzus, where he spent the last six years of his life in illness and suffering. His chief contribution to the life of the church was as a theologian.

12. Soz., H.E., vii, 8.

13. God in Patristic Thought, p. 244.

14. Canons of Constantinople, printed in Stevenson, Creeds, Councils and Controversies, pp. 147-150.

15. Ruf., H.E., ii,21; Soc., H.E., v,9; Soz.,H.E.,vii,11; Theod., H.E., v,23.

16. Le Schisme d'Antioche, p.254 n.3. Cavallera bases his evidence on a different interpretation of the synodical document from the Council of 382 (Theod., H.E., v,9), and on the fact that Flavian signed the acts of the first Council in 381 as a priest, and not as a bishop of Antioch.

17. H.E., v, 23. Theodoret alleges that Flavian was consecrated by Diodore of Tarsus and Acacius of Beroea.

18. Soc., H.E., v, 5; Soz., H.E., vii, 3,11.

19. Serm. cum Presb. fuit ordin., Opp. ed Ben. i,442.

20. Puller (Primitive Saints p. 346 n.3) gives 3 September 381, the traditional date (following Ambros. Gesta Conc. Aquil.1), but Homes-Dudden (Ambrose i. p.201,n.2) gives reasons for abandoning this date: the evident ignorance of the Fathers at Aquileia of the Council of Constantinople of May-July 381 is incomprehensible if the traditional date be right; while the statement in Epistle 13.4 (Ambrose) that the Fathers of Constantinople

were aware (in June) that Maximus the Cynic had appealed to the Council of Aquileia is sheer nonsense if the latter council did not sit until September. Thus, Homes-Dudden abandons the traditional date and places the arrival of the bishops and the preliminary discussions at Aquileia in April 381; the plenary session of the Council and Epp. 9.10 and 11 in May; Ep.12, the arrival of Maximus and the conclusion of the Council in June; and Epp. 13 and 14 in the Autumn.

21. Ep. 12 (Quamlibet)

22. Ep. 13.

23. Greg. Naz., Ep. cxxx.

24. H.E., v, 9.

25. Ibid. Homes-Dudden (Ibid., p.215)calls this reply to Ambrose 'a provokingly clever document' since all the points he had made in his letters were either turned by polite phrases, or met with ripostes.

26. Jerome, Ep. 108.

27. Ruf., Apolog. PG 17.

28. Soz., H.E., vii, 11.

29. Ep. 14.

30. Two eyewitnesses, Libanius (Or. 19-23) and Chrysostom (Hom de statuis), who in Flavian's absence exhorted, comforted and rebuked the city in a series of sermons, recount how the disturbance was occasioned by the imposition of a new tax upon the city which angered the populace so much that they first (unsuccessfully) demanded its reduction, and then marched in protest to Flavian's house. Finding him discreetly absent, they vented their rage upon panel pictures and statues of the imperial family, and had to be dispersed by the toxotai (police). The most serious offenders were tried for treason, condemned and put to death, and the rest of the city awaited action from the Emperor himself. Browning ('The Riot of AD 387 in Antioch', J.R.S. xlii) believes that the riots may have been led by a claque connected with the theatre, a not uncommon practice of those times. John's dramatic account of Flavian's interview with Theodosius is printed in Stevenson, Ibid., pp.237-8.

31. John had been ordained by Meletius just before the Council of Constantinople in 381, and was made presbyter by Flavian in 386 (Pallad., Vita Johannis, 42). He had been taught by Libanius of Antioch who held a very high opinion of him and who, when asked at his deathbed in 395 which of his pupils he thought worthiest to succeed him, replied: 'John, if the Christians had not stolen him from us'. (Soz., H.E., viii, 2). During his monastic period John had benefitted greatly by his association with Basil; and he was also helped in his interpretation of Scripture by Diodore of Tarsus.

32. Hom.xi in Epist. ad Ephes. Quoted by Puller, Ibid., p. 261.

33. Puller (Ibid., p.263)believes this date is too early: a) Socrates (H.E., v,15) and Sozomen (H.E., vii,15) imply that Paulinus died when Theodosius celebrated his victory over Maximus in June 389. b)But the same historians also say that Evagrius did not long survive his consecration. Now, Evagrius was still alive when the Council of Capua was held in the winter of 391-392, and Puller points out that the two historians are not always accurate chronologically; thus, it is possible Paulinus did not die until 390 or 391.

There is no proof he was ever canonised as a saint; and his name does not appear in the Roman Martyrology.

34. Theodoret (H.E., v, 23), Socrates (H.E., v, 15) and Sozomen (H.E., vii, 15)do not mention the irregularity of the consecration, but merely speak of the election of Evagrius after Paulinus' death. But there is no reason to doubt the substantial truth of Theodoret's statement. Ambrose (Ep. 56,5) implies that the consecration of Evagrius was in some way uncanonical.

35. Theod., H.E., v, 23.

36. Ep. 56 (according to Puller's interpretation, Ibid., p.264.)

37. We are ill-informed about this sequence of events: it

is Theodoret who gives most information (H.E.v.23) and even this is merely a general outline confused by chronological inconsistencies. An allusion to the tyranny of Maximus places Theodosius' intervention after the Emperor's victory over the usurper i.e. Summer 388. The next attempt to call Flavian and Evagrius, which took place 'a long time afterwards', refers to Theodoret's stay in Rome during the period June to August of 389. There is also a possible reference to the reunion at the Council of Capua in 391.

38. Ambrose, Ep. 54, written to Theophilus of Alexandria. In another letter (56) Ambrose comments bitterly: 'Because of these two (Flavian and Evagrius), all the universe is troubled, yet they have no compassion for our pain... Because they do not care about the peace of Christ, the world is prey to a lamentable discord'. It must have seemed to many of the Western divines that each of the two rivals relied more on the weakness of his opponent's case than on the soundness of his own.

39. The date of this Council is difficult to pinpoint, but generally Tillemont's dating (based on Ambrose Ep.54) is accepted.

40. Ep. 54 to Theophilus.

41. The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch. ed. Brooks 1903. pp. 223-224.

42. Soc., H.E., v, 15; Soz.,H.E., viii, 3.

43. H.E., v, 23.

44. Soz., H.E., vii, 15; Soc., H.E., v, 15.

45. Letters of Severus, pp. 302-304.

46. Soz., H.E., viii, 3.

47. Cyril Alex., Ep. 56.

48. Pallad., Dial., 144; Soz., H.E., viii, 24.

49. H.E., v, 35.

50. Ep. 83.

51. Dial. 143.

52. Soz., H.E., viii, 24.

53. Innoc., Ep. 19,21; Soz., H.E., viii, 24-27.

54. Theod., H.E., vi, 5.

55. H.E., v, 35.

56. Innoc., Ep. 19,20; Theod., H.E., iii, 2.

NOTES: CONCLUSION

1. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p.302.

2. De Engastrimytho, 63, 4.

3. P.G., 18, 685 C, 693; 18, 681 C.

4. P.G., 23, 1560.

5. Theod., Dial., i; P.G., 83, 100A.

6. Theod., Ibid., i.

7. Theod., Ibid., iii.

8. Dorner's remark, quoted in Sellers, Eustathius of Antioch, p.117.

9. Kelly, Ibid., p.342

ARIAN BISHOPS

PAULINUS OF TYRE 330

EULALIUS 331

EUPHRONIUS 331 - 332

FLACCILLUS 332 - 342

STEPHEN 342 - 344

LEONTIUS 344 - 357

EUDOXIUS 358 - 360

EUZOIUS 360 - 376

DOROTHEUS 376 - 381

COMPARATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF RELEVANT BASILIAN EPISTLES

Ep.	Till.	Ben.	Loofs.	Cav.
57	370	371	-	370
66	371	371	371	371
67	371	371	371	371
68	-	371	-	-
69	371	371	371	371
70	371	371	371	371
89	372	372	372	372
90	372	372	372	372
91	-	372	-	-
92	372	372	372	372
99	372	372	372	-
125	-	373	-	-
129	373	373	375	376
133	-	373	-	-
138	373	373	373	374
140	373	373	-	-
156	373	373	373	374
214	375	375	375	375
215	373	375	375	375
216	375	375	375	375
223	-	375	-	-
239	376	376	376	376
243	373	376	376	375
258	377	377	-	376
266	378	377	377/8	378

Adapted from Cavallera, Le Schisme d' Antioche,p.188.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

G. BARDY, 'Le Concile d'Antioche (379)', Revue Bénédictine xlv, Maredsous, 1933, pp. 196 - 213.

G. BARDY, 'Lucien d'Antioche,' Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, Vol. ix, Paris, 1926, cols. 1024 - 31.

G. BARDY, Recherches sur Lucien d'Antioche et son école, Paris, 1936.

P. BATTIFOL, Le Siege Apostolique, Paris, 1924.

N. H. BAYNES, Byzantine Studies and other essays, London,1955.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER, The Meaning of the Homoousios in the Constantinople Creed, Cambridge, 1901.

R. BROWNING, 'The Riot of A D 387 in Antioch', Journal of Roman Studies xlii, London, 1952.

A. E. BURN, The Council of Nicaea, London, 1925.

F. CAVALLERA, Le Schisme d'Antioche, Paris, 1905.

V. C. de CLERCQ, Ossius of Cordova: A contribution to the history of the period (The Catholic University of America: Studies in Christian Antiquity No. 13), Washington D.C., 1954.

R. DEVRÉESSE, Le Patriarcat d'Antioche, Paris, 1945.
Dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie ecclesiastiques, Paris, 1924.

G. DOWNEY, Antioch in the age of Theodosius the Great, University of Oklahoma Press, 1962.

L. DUCHESNE, Early History of the Christian Church, Vol.II, Eng.Tr. by C. Jenkins, London, 1912.
Encyclopaedia Britannica, Chicago, 1973.

E. FLEURY, Saint Grégoire de Naziance et son temps, Paris, 1930.

S. L. GREENSLADE, Schism in the Early Church, 2nd ed.,London,1964.

H. M. GWATKIN, Studies of Arianism, 2nd ed., London, 1900.

J. HEFELE, A History of the Councils of the Church, (2 Vols), Eng.Tr. by H. N. Oxenham, Edinburgh, 1876.

H. HESS, The Canons of the Council of Sardica, Oxford, 1958.

F. HOMES-DUDDEN, The Life and Times of St. Ambrose, (2 Vols), Oxford, 1935.

A. H. M. JONES, The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Cambridge, 1971.

W. J. JURGENS, 'A Letter of Meletius of Antioch,' Harvard Theological Review 53, Cambridge, Mass., 1960, pp.251-260.

J. N. D. KELLY, Early Christian Creeds, 2nd ed., London, 1952.

J. N. D. KELLY, Early Christian Doctrines, 3rd ed., London, 1965.

B. J. KIDD, A History of the Church to A D 461, Vol.II, Oxford,1922.

N. Q. KING, The Emperor Theodosius, London, 1961.

K. S. LATOURETTE, A History of the Expansion of Christianity,Vol.I, New York, 1937.

J. M. LEROUX, 'Acace, évêque de Césarée de Palestine (341-365),' Studia Patristica Vol.VIII, (Texte und Untersuchungen z. Gesch. der altchristlichen Literatur Bd 93), Berlin, 1966.

R. MACMULLEN, Constantine, London, 1970.

F. MILLAR, 'Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian,' Journal of Roman Studies lxi, 1971, pp.1-17.

J. M. NEALE, A History of the Holy Eastern Churches: The Patriarchate of Antioch, Rivingstone, 1873.

H. NORDBERG, Athanasius and the Emperor, Helsinki, 1963.

G. L. PRESTIGE, Fathers and Heretics, London, 1940.

G. L. PRESTIGE, God in Patristic Thought, London, 1936.

G. L. PRESTIGE, St. Basil the Great and Apollinarius of Laodicea, London, 1956.

F. W. PULLER, The Primitive Saints, 3rd ed., London 1900.

M. RICHARD, 'Saint Basile et la mission du diacre Sabinus', Analecta Bollandiana, pp. 178-202, 1949.

R. V. SELLERS, Eustathius of Antioch, Cambridge, 1927.

J. H. SMITH, Constantine the Great, London, 1971.

J. STEVENSON, Creeds, Councils and Controversies, London,1966.
Theodosian Code, The, Tr. C. Pharr, Princeton, 1952.

E. A. THOMPSON, The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus, Cambridge, 1947.

H. WACE and W. C. PIERCEY, A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature, London, 1911.

D. S. WALLACE-HADRILL, Eusebius of Caesarea, London, 1960.

M. WILES, 'In Defence of Arius,' Journal of Theological Studies NS xiii, 1962.

PRIMARY SOURCES

P.G. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus,Series graeca

P.L. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus,Series latina.

ALEXANDER Alexandrinus, Epistola ad Alexandrum,PG.18,547-72

AMBROSIUS, Epistulae, P.L. 16.

ATHANASIUS (S). Apologia contra Arianos, P.G. 25, 239-410.

De Decretis Nicaenae synodi, P.G. 25, 415-76.

De sententia Dionysii, P.G.25, 479-522.

Apologia pro fuga sua, P.G. 25, 643-80.

De Synodis, P.G. 25,-681.- 794.

Historia arianorum, P.G. 25, 691-796.

Tomus ad Antiochenos, P.G. 26, 795-810.

BASIL, St., Bishop of Caesarea, Epistulae (P.G.32), tr.by P. Schaff and H. Wace, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second series, Vol.VIII. De Spiritu Sancto, P.G. 32.

CODEX THEODOSIANUS See Theodosian Code.

DAMASUS (S.), Epistulae et decreta, P.L. 13.

EPIPHANIUS(S), Panarium seu adversus Haereses, P.G. 42.

EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, Historia ecclesiastica, P.G. 20,45-906.

Vita Constantini, P.G.20.

Adversus Marcellum, P.G.24

GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS (S.) Orat., P.G. 36.

Carmina, P.G. 37.

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS (S.) De Vita S. Macrinae sororis suae, P.G.46,973.

HIERONYMUS (S.) Epistulae, P.L.22.

HILARIUS, De Synodis, P.L.10, 479.

IOANNIS CHRYSOSTOMI (S) In S. Eustathium Antiochenum, P.G.50,597-606.

In S. Meletium, P.G. 50, 513-20.

INNOCENTIUS I, Epistulae, P.L.20.

JULIAN, Works, Vol.II, Loeb series.

ORIGEN, De oratione libellus, P.G.11, 415-562.

In Epist. ad Hebraeos, P.G. 14, 1307-10.

PALLADIUS, Dialogus historicus, P.G. 67, 5-82.

PHILOSTORGIUS, Epitome Historiae Ecclesiasticae, P.G. 65.

RUFINUS, Historia Ecclesiastica, P.L. 21.

SOCRATES, Historia Ecclesiastica, P.G. 67.

SOZOMENUS, Id., Ibid.

TERTULLIAN, Adversus Praxeam, P.L. 2, 153.

Adversus Valentinianos, P.L.2, 523.

THEODORETUS, Historia Ecclesiastica, P.G.82.