

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

BASIL OF CAESAREA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE
UNITY OF THE CHURCH FROM 340-380.

A review of the ways in which Basil of
Caesarea made his contribution to the
unity of the Church in the 4th century.

by

JAMES THOMSON. B.D.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Master
of Theology of St. Andrews University.

June, 1968.



Tu 5577

Declaration.

I hereby declare that this thesis is submitted after work was pursued as a Research Student in St. Mary's College, St. Andrews University, under the supervision of Professor J.H. Baxter. It has been composed by myself and has not been accepted, in part or whole, in fulfilment of the requirements of any other degree or professional qualification.

Signed:

Table of Contents.

	<u>Page.</u>
Acknowledgements	i
Preface	ii
Chapter 1 : A Survey of the Conflict between Arianism and Orthodoxy to the year 360.	1 - 14
" 2 : Basil's Concern for the Church during the Reign of Valens.	15 - 29
" 3 : Basil's Arguments against Eunomius the Strict Arian.	30 - 48
" 4 : Basil's Debate with Eustathius of Sebaste, the Pneumatomachian.	49 - 71
" 5 : Basil's Case against Apollinaris the Younger.	72 - 91
" 6 : Basil seeks to Consolidate Eastern Monasticism.	92 - 123
" 7 : Basil presses for an Alliance between the Eastern and Western Churches.	124 - 149
" 8 : An Assessment and Conclusion.	150 - 171
Appendix - Bibliography.	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

I wish to acknowledge with sincere thanks the valuable assistance I have received from the following:-

Professor J.H. Baxter, St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, who discussed my plans and researches on many occasions, and who gave me an objectivity I might not otherwise have had.

The Staff of St. Andrews University Library and Dr. S. Michie of Trinity College Library, Glasgow, for their invaluable assistance in finding for me all the available books and documents.

The Very Reverend Archimandrite Athanagoras Zakopoulos, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., for his helpful counsel and warm friendship.

Mr. H.B. Campbell, M.A., and Mrs. I.B.E. U'Prichard, M.A., for their assistance with translation.

Miss S. Johnston who typed the whole of this thesis.

Preface.

Patristic study is that branch of theology which deals with the writings of the early Christian Fathers. The term when strictly used, belongs to those teachers who laboured for Jesus Christ and His Church between the first and the eighth centuries. This field of research is manifestly important to both the student of church history and early Christian doctrine, for these were the men who not only defended the faith against heretical intrusion, but also expounded the meaning of Holy Scripture and the implications of the early Christian creeds by relating them to the very best thought of their own day.

Scottish historians and theologians have understandably given more attention to the Reformation period than to the Patristic age. In consequence, Patristics have been more adequately treated by Anglican, Roman Catholic and Orthodox scholars than by their colleagues in this northern realm. Although one may readily appreciate the reasons for the Scottish emphasis, it must be granted that such a course of action has deprived the Scottish theological scene of a most instructive and rewarding field of enquiry.

This fact, of course, has created certain unavoidable difficulties for the patristic research student north of the border. For example, source material is not as easily discovered as in, let us say, Oxford, Cambridge, or at some European Universities. The student at St. Andrews University however, has one distinct advantage over his colleagues at other Scottish Universities - namely, Principal Donaldson's library. Being a keen patristic scholar himself, his

generous gift has proved of immense value to all who have a kindred interest. Another problem, although it does not merely affect Scotland, is that of translation. It is a very great pity that not all of St. Basil's works yet appear in English translation and, furthermore, that certain outstanding contributions to the study of this great churchman still escape the translator's pen. It is hoped that soon this omission will be put right. Meanwhile, the present writer wishes to assume responsibility for those translations which are attributed to him in this text.

The present interest which Scottish Universities are taking in the study of the early Church Fathers is to be warmly welcomed. It is to be hoped that it will go on from strength to strength.

The aim of this thesis is to discover the contribution which Basil of Caesarea made to the unity of the fourth century Church. Although it is freely acknowledged that Basil's true greatness can only become apparent when he is studied in the context of the conflicts of his own age, an attempt is here made, in passing, to indicate some of the ways in which he influenced the later development of the life and thought of the Church. This treatment, it is believed, illustrates that in certain respects Basil was "the light not only of Cappadocia, but also of the world".

CHAPTER ONE

A Survey of the Conflict between Arianism
and Orthodoxy to the year 360.

Before the commencement of the Arian controversy, and as a result of previous theological dispute, the Church had arrived at three conclusions concerning the Person of Christ. They were: (a) A unity of essence exists between the Father and the Son; (b) The Son is eternally generated; (c) A personal distinction, however, must be drawn between the first two Persons of the Trinity.

Suddenly a fresh discord broke out regarding the first two conclusions in the above summary. Our main concern in this chapter will therefore be to define the character and trace the history of this schism to the year 360.

At the time of the outbreak, Arius was a presbyter at Alexandria. We know very little about his life before he set out his errors, and what we do know appears to be most uncertain. Previous to his residence at Alexandria, he had studied under Lucian of Antioch who was a contemporary of Paul of Samosata. Indeed, it was Paul of Samosata who supplied the key to the theological problems facing both of these men. Although they modified his Christology to suit their own needs, he provided the fundamental basis upon which each built his own heterodox teaching.

According to Socrates,¹ the occasion of the outbreak was a doctrinal address given by the Bishop of Alexandria to his presbyters. And this event is generally regarded to have taken place in the year 318.

The Arian controversy centred upon the Eastern half of the Church. The West was not called upon to face the same problems. This was mainly due to the profound influence of its great theologians who had defended formulas which united Christ's divinity with the essence of God the Father.

As a theory, Arianism began by proposing a transcendent monotheism. This means that God is not only absolutely One, but is also absolutely

1. Socrates, Ecclesiastical History, Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library, 1853; pp. 5-6.

simple and isolated from the world of finite things. The real problem arose with regard to the Son. The Church taught that the Son was of the same essence as the ungenerated God. But this teaching forced Arius to conclude that the Father was a composite and divisible being. Therefore, in order to preserve his faith in a transcendent monotheism, he advanced the hypothesis that the Son had a beginning and was therefore a creature; although He was prior and superior to every living thing.² Arius, furthermore, taught that God knew in advance that the Son was going to be morally perfect and accordingly gave Him anticipatively the glory which was later won by His human virtue.

The manifest weakness and folly of this error, which was as much a philosophy as a religion, was that it was based upon the wholly inadequate analogy of human generation. There was nothing wrong with this vehicle of exposition, as long as it was not carried too far or applied too strictly. This is precisely what he did. Transferring the concept of time and sequence, which rules every human generation, to the doctrine of the Godhead, Arius came to the conclusion that the Son was posterior and therefore inferior to the Father. As he says in his "Thalia": "God was not Father eternally; on the contrary, there was a time when God was alone, and was not as yet Father, though later He became Father."³

We should bear in mind, however, that Arius was particularly anxious to resist the teaching of those who held that the Father, Logos (the Son), and the Holy Spirit were three different manifestations of the one God. He was perfectly correct in thinking that the term "begotten" was the safeguard which alone could protect the doctrine of the personal existence

2. See Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History, Bohn's Ecclesiastical History, 1854; pp. 14-31; Athanasius, De Synodis. Trans. H.J. Kidd, Documents Illustrative of History of Church, Vol. 2, 1923; pp. 7-8.

3. Athanasius, Orationes Contra Arianos, Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers (Second Series), Vol. iv; p. 308.

of the Son against Sabellianism. In this respect, the Fathers of the Church fully agreed with him. But strong disagreement appeared as soon as Arius used his analogy to introduce posteriority and inferiority into the relation between Father & Son.⁴

Soon the Emperor Constantine became aware of the dispute. Realising that bitter controversy would adversely affect the unity he was endeavouring to create within the Empire, he decided to bring the matter to an end by summoning all Bishops of the Church to a Council. The place selected, Nicea, was admirably suited for such a purpose. Its situation allowed easy approach by both land and sea. Here in the year 325, some three hundred Bishops assembled to deal with matters pertaining to the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

Three parties may be distinguished within this Council. They were: (a) The Arians, led by Eusebius of Nicomedia. Although they were rather small in number, their zeal and cold logic made them a power to be reckoned with. (b) The Moderates, led by Eusebius of Caesarea. Most of the Bishops supported this cause, either because they were too indifferent to the theological trends of the day to appreciate the issue in hand, or disposed by their conservatism to rest content with the teaching of the Church as it was then given. (c) The Conservatives, led by Alexander of Alexandria. This party, like the Arians, was not numerically strong. It did possess, however, a strength which comes from robust conviction.

After the Council had been formally constituted by the Emperor, the Arians presented a creed which was manifestly fashioned to suit their own theological opinion. It was immediately torn to shreds. Eusebius of

4. "Arianism introduced a mythological element into Christianity, strangely reminiscent of the heroes and demigods of pagan legend." H.R. Mackintosh, The Person of Christ, 1948; p. 178.

Caesarea, respected for age and learning, then came forward with the baptismal creed for his own church. This was "a short and simple document, admirably recommended to conservative feeling by its scriptural language and prudent evasion of the question before the Council."⁵ While the creed itself was most admirable, it did not go far enough. It did not contain, for instance, the term homoousios, which term was regarded as being absolutely necessary to defend the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. Prompted by Hosius of Cordova, Constantine then proposed the insertion of this particular term into the creed of Eusebius. This, and the further decision to thoroughly revise the whole of the Eusebian formula, was quickly agreed to. The result was that four important changes appeared. (a) The term "Word", for instance, was removed in favour of "Son". This alteration certainly improved the Christological content of the creed. It was further strengthened by (b) "only-begotten" being qualified by the words "of the essence of the Father". (c) Our Lord's nature was also guarded by the emphatic assertion "begotten, not made," in reply to Arius, and leading up to "of the same essence as of the Father". (d) The word "incarnate" was then explained by the addition of the words "was made man" in place of Eusebius' less definite statement. In all, the revised creed was considerably stronger than the one first brought forward by Eusebius, especially in the all-important aspect of Christology.

We do not know for certain how long the debates lasted, but when the final moment did arrive, the defeat of Arianism was overwhelming. All the Bishops present, with the exception of two - Secundas and Theonas - signed the formula. Thus the creed issued to the whole Church by this Council, which also carried with it the full blessing of the first

5. H.M. Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, Second Edition, 1900; p. 42.

Christian Emperor, was clearly intended to be a standard of faith, an authoritative exposition of the true faith of the Church.

The term homoousios, used at Nicea to mean "of the same essence", can also mean "of one content". This meaning, which stresses the numerical identity of the Godhead, was used by Athanasius to refute the Arian doctrine which taught that the Son was a subordinate organ of creation.

Athanasius' attack was twofold: (a) He accepted the Arian argument for what it was in itself, and then proceeded to show its utter inadequacy; (b) He insisted upon the witness of Holy Scripture.

Arianism, as we have already noted, defended the concept of God which pictured Him ruling all things in splendid isolation. But this transcendence necessitated someone to mediate His creative energy to the world. Believing that the Son was posterior and inferior to the Almighty, Arius taught that this was the Son's basic role.

(a) Athanasius began his first counter-argument by pointing out that God, the Creator of all things, could not be adequately expounded with human terms. Obvious limitations exist. For instance, man is a creature of the temporal and transient world, but God belongs to all eternity. The Arian argument is therefore wholly inadequate for the task given to it, because it endeavours to set forth the essence of the Godhead in human terms, without even mentioning the obvious restrictions which go with the analogy used.

Having made this point clear, however, Athanasius now begins to turn the tables upon the Arians themselves. It is an axiom of human generation, says Athanasius, that the character of the parent determines the character of the offspring. When applied to the Godhead, we must come to the conclusion that the essence of God determined the essence of the Son.

And if this be the case, the Son is not inferior to the Father. ^{6.}

The Arians charged Christ with being posterior and inferior to God. Athanasius replies: This conclusion is without logical foundation, because - (i) They fail to recognise the limitations of a human analogy; and (ii) When this analogy is taken seriously, when it is used without bias, they refuse to accept the conclusion that may be drawn.

(b) Athanasius also insisted upon the witness of Holy Scripture in his defence of the true faith. We shall take, as an example, one of the passages he used. The Gospel of John records that Jesus once said: "I am in the Father and the Father is in Me". ^{7.} Two points are especially stressed here: (i) "I am in the Father". This part of the text is not to be understood, as the Arians suppose, to mean that the Father and the Son were "decanted" into each other. The Godhead is not to be regarded as existing upon mutual aid, "so that the Father fills the Son's emptiness, and the Son fills the Father's, each of them separately not being full and perfect". Not at all. The whole of the Son's being belongs to the Father, just as the whole of the Father's being belongs to the Son. A union exists between them similar to the union existing between thought and the spoken word, the sun and its radiance, the source and the running stream. (ii) "The Father in Me". This point was developed to further strengthen the unity of substance existing between the Father and the Son.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Godhead is one, Athanasius also insisted upon recognising the distinction which exists between the Father and Son. In one passage, for instance, he writes: "The Father is father

6. Athanasius, Orationes Contra Arianos. Trans. H. Bettenson, The Early Christian Fathers, Oxford University Press; pp. 389-392.

7. John 14.10.

and not also son; the Son is son and not also father; but the nature is one."⁸. This and other passages indicate that Athanasius taught that the unity of the Godhead meant a unity of substance, although this substance expresses itself in a twofold manifestation, that is, Fatherhood and Sonship.

But this outstanding defender of the faith was also responsible for another development. He extended his definition of the divine unity to include not only the Father and the Son, but also the Holy Spirit. His attention had to be given to this doctrinal point because of the "Tropici". This was the title given to a pro-Arian sect who denied the divinity of the third Person of the Trinity. He begins his defence of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit by asking: "Who would dare to say that the Trinity was internally "dissimilar" or "heterogeneous"?" Holy Scripture would refute this evil conclusion. In the Bible, for example, the Spirit is nowhere called the Son of God or the Son's offspring. Rather do we find God's Word talking about the Son as the Father's Son, and the Spirit as the Father's Spirit. If this were not so, the Trinity would indeed be a divisible entity. The evidence of Holy Writ would support the true doctrine of the Church which states: there are three Persons of the Holy Trinity who are One, because they possess a unity of substance."⁹.

Now let us return to the main theme of this chapter. Most of the Bishops, when they had returned from the Council, were agreed that Arius should have been condemned, but some were still rather doubtful concerning the use of the term homoousios. Soon feelings of uncertainty produced further difficulties.

8. Athanasius, Orationes Contra Arianos. Trans. H. Bettenson, The Early Christian Fathers; p. 395.

9. Athanasius, Epistle Adversus Serapionem. Trans. H. Bettenson, The Early Christian Fathers; p. 406.

The first stage, which primarily dealt with persons, lasted from the year 325 until 337. Not long after the Council of Nicea, many Bishops began to feel that the Emperor and the Nicene leaders had treated the Arian a little too harshly. Considerate though this position might have been, it completely overlooked the continuing influence of the heresy. During his exile in Illyricum, Arius made good use of the new opportunities presented to him. Two of the most able Arian leaders of the next generation now came under his influence - they were: Ursacius and Valens. Moreover, during this period the heterodox leaders laboured by intrigue to effect not only their own recall from exile, but also the banishment of their opponents. This manoeuvre was crowned with success in the year 328 when Eusebius of Nicomedia was reinstated to the Church and Eustathius of Antioch was deposed from his episcopal throne. Later, when the Arians had become united with the Meletians, attacks were made against Athanasius, who had recently become the Bishop of Alexandria. Matters really reached a head in 335. In this year, Arius himself was recalled, and a Synod of Tyre deposed the Bishop of Alexandria to Treves. Upon the death of Constantine in 337, Athanasius was allowed to return to his See, but within two years he had been displaced by his rival, namely, the Arian Gregory. Athanasius now withdrew to Rome where he was acquitted of all the charges brought against him.

The second stage of the controversy covers the period of joint rule of Constans and Constantius. The former was responsible for the West and the latter was ruler of the East. Their religious sympathies were similarly divided. While Constans favoured the Nicenes, Constantius was a strong Arian supporter. Indeed, most of, if not all, the authorities agree that the Arian success began and continued on the basis of command

of the Court.^{10.} The Arian policy, no longer willing to act underground, now sought to have the Nicene formula replaced by another declaration which would deliberately leave out the term homoousios. In this respect, they gained the partial support of those in the East who still had misgivings concerning the use of this new watchword. This aim was fully realised at the Council of Dedication in 341. Although the Second Creed of Antioch appeared to be sufficiently orthodox to allow Hilary of Poitiers to accept it, it did omit the crucial term - namely, homoousios.

The importance of this Council warrants a closer examination of its outcome. Four creeds are traditionally associated with it, although only the second can be regarded as the official statement. The members of the Council of Dedication were mostly conservatives who were anxious to settle their differences with the Nicene party. The semi-Arian leaders, however, under the leadership of Eusebius of Constantinople, formed a most compact party.

Their first duty was to frame a reply to the letter from Julius, Bishop of Rome, who had charged them with endeavouring to injure the status of the Council of Nicea. Their reply stated that they had no pro-Arian associations, only a strong desire to preserve the faith which had been "transmitted from the beginning". The real work of creed-making was then begun by the Arians. While they professed to accept the Nicene Creed, they brought forward a formula very like the deceptive profession of Arius; although it began with an absurd protest that they should not be considered his followers, because Bishops would not follow a priest. When this was rejected, the second Creed of Antioch, frequently called the "Lucianic Creed", was proposed and passed. This Creed, as mentioned

10. See H.M. Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism; p. 3.

above, omitted the term homoousios, and, in its anathemas, proscribed the phrases condemned at Nicea, but in such a way as to allow an Arian interpretation. The Lucianic Creed would suggest that a period of fermentation had come about, when the middle parties had not yet positively separated themselves from the heretical core. Indeed, later in the century, it was used as the stepping-stone by which the semi-Arians were able to move over to a more orthodox position. The third Creed was a personal profession of faith by Theophronius of Tyana, who had probably been accused of heresy. The fourth and last Creed was the work of a few Bishops some months later.

At this point Constans was forced to intervene under the pressure of the Western Bishops. He agreed to persuade his brother to call a general Council, in an attempt to arrest the growing rift between the East and the West. The Council met at Sardica around the year 342. After some preliminary discussion, the Eastern Bishops, having found themselves in the minority, withdrew at night. Pausing at Philippopolis, they drew up a statement which proposed that all their opponents should be deposed, and then professed the fourth Creed of Antioch. They, moreover, inserted a new anathema against Marcellus. Now all hope of peace was lost. But the Western Bishops considered all the charges made against the exiled Nicene leaders and acquitted them. Athanasius now returned to Alexandria in triumph to begin what has been called "the golden decade" of his episcopacy. The truce preserved by the might of Constans, however, passed away with his death in 350.

The third stage of the controversy can be divided into two parts:

- (a) 350-356; these years witnessed the re-establishment of Arianism;
- (b) 357-361; now we see the apparent triumph of Arianism, although there were signs of inner disintegration.

We must firstly examine the period during which time Arianism was re-established. The passing of Constans meant that Constantius was the sole ruler. Now he had no one to hinder his pro-Arian sympathies. From now onwards he laboured to bring the West to the point where it would accept his own doctrinal viewpoint. In the year 353, at Arles, the Gallican Bishops were forced to sign a condemnation of Athanasius; and two years later, at Milan, this condemnation was renewed. Only four outstanding champions of the true faith remained - Hilary, Liberius and Hosius in the West, and Athanasius in the East. But each of these were dealt with by the Emperor during the next few years. By the mid-fifties Arianism had begun to divide itself into three main groups - namely the real Arians; the semi-Arians; and the Homoeans.

The second period, covering the years 357-361, witnessed the apparent success of heterodoxy. This is particularly well seen in the year 361, when the strict Arians boldly stated their beliefs in the words of Euxoios ΚΑΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ ἌΝΟΜΟΙΟΣ Τῷ ΠΑΤΡΙ. This step, of course, was prefaced by an open condemnation of the Nicene Creed in the Sirmian manifesto of 357. It also proscribed the terms: οὐσία, ὁμοούσιος, ὁμοιούσιος. Even Hosius of Cordova was compelled to sign this formula, although he would not condemn Athanasius.^{11.}

Around this period, Basil of Ancyra opened communications with the orthodox Bishops of Gaul through Hilary, who was now in exile. Since some kind of union between the Nicenes and semi-Arians now seemed possible, a Council was proposed. Valens, however, seized the opportunity to suggest

11. "The Sirmian manifesto is the turning point of the whole contest ... because the Eusebian coalition fell to pieces the moment Arianism ventured to have a policy of its own." H.M. Gwatkin, Studies in Arianism; p.162.

that it should be held in two different centres. He agreed to preside over the meeting of the Western Bishops, and Acacius was nominated to preside over the Eastern assembly at Seleucia. In order to create some kind of agreement, Valens entered into negotiations with Basil of Ancyra and other important leaders from both East and West. A Creed was then drawn up by Mark of Arethusa which became known as the "Dated Creed". This declaration was mainly Homoean, affirming that the Son "is like the Father who begat Him:" but it also appealed to the Anomoeans in that it condemned the use of the term "ousia". After each section of the Council met, the Western Bishops sternly refused to accept the proposed Creed, while the Eastern Bishops endorsed the Dedication Creed of the Council of Antioch. According to a previous arrangement, each section of the Council was to send representatives to the Emperor to acquaint him of their decisions. When he learned that neither section had accepted the Creed prepared by Mark of Arethusa, he proceeded to enforce it upon them. This, however, was not finally done without some modifications being made to the document itself. Later, at Constantinople, the Homoeans formed a most formidable party which succeeded, as one would expect, in ratifying the "Dated Creed". Now an Homoean victory appeared to be almost certain, but political events soon produced circumstances which were finally to bring about the triumph of the Nicene party.

Meanwhile, a new generation of theologians was beginning to emerge. They were composed of men who held a great respect for both the person and doctrine of Athanasius. One of the most outstanding of them, Basil of Caesarea, had recently accompanied his Bishop, Basil of Ancyra, to the Council of Constantinople. Here he witnessed with his own eyes the political manoeuvres and theological intrigues which had made

"the world groan to find itself Arian". Although his official ecclesiastical position was still a minor one, Basil soon resolved to enter the arena of theological conflict wearing the colours of the orthodox cause. But this matter of his personal involvement in the momentous events of his own day must await the treatment they will receive in the succeeding pages.

CHAPTER TWO.

Basil's Concern for the Church during the Reign of Valens.

In the middle of the fourth century, the East witnessed Arianism fragmenting itself into three distinct parties. They were: (a) The strict Arians. These were under the leadership of Eudoxius of Antioch, his deacon Aetius, and especially Eunomius who was now Bishop of Cyzicus in Mysia. This party differed from their predecessors by being brutally frank rather than subtly evasive. They openly asserted that the Son was of a "different essence" from the Father; that He was even "unlike" the Father and created out of nothing. (b) The semi-Arians. They were represented by Basil of Ancyra and Gregory of Laodicea. Their opinion was that the Son was not of the same essence, but of "like essence" with the Father. Many indeed belonged to this party who at heart agreed with the Nicene formula but, either because they harboured prejudices against Athanasius or saw in the term "homoousios" an approach to Sabellianism, chose rather to support the via media group. Theology, of course, had not yet fixed the distinction between the two terms "ousia" and "hypostasis". The term "homoousios", therefore, could easily be confused with a unity of Persons. (c) The Homoeans, with Acacius at their head, professed the Son to be "like" the Father.

At the Second Great Synod of Sirmium in 357, the strict Arians succeeded in having their own theological viewpoint endorsed. Owing to this undisguised Anomoean declaration, Basil of Ancyra gathered a Council in his own episcopal city which very quickly issued a synodal letter condemning it. Two points now emerge of considerable importance: (a) Both Athanasius and Hilary expressed their full approval of Basil's action and declared attitude. (b) Constantius was now won over to the semi-Arian position and, accordingly, proceeded to exile both Aetius and Eunomius. Circumstances now appeared to favour a closer association

being established between the semi-Arian and Nicene parties. To this end, they persuaded Constantius to call a general Council. Realising that an alliance between these two parties might very well come about, the Anomoeans succeeded in arranging for the Council to meet at two centres. The Western Bishops were to meet at Ariminum and the Eastern Bishops were to assemble at Seleucia. They also had prepared a preliminary formula as a basis for discussion and possible approval. Its ambiguity, however, indicates that it was primarily aimed at satisfying the demands of both the Emperor and the semi-Arians, without actually harming the Anomoean position. This document was later called the "Dated Creed", so called because of the elaborate dating prefixed to it.

The Council of Ariminum opened in the early summer of 359. The Council of Seleucia began a few months later, in the September of the same year. After due consideration, the Bishops of the West rejected the proposed Creed and thereafter approved the Nicene affirmation. The Eastern Bishops, however, endorsed the Creed of the Dedication Council of Antioch. Thereafter, as had been arranged, each section sent representatives to communicate their decisions to the Emperor. On hearing that neither party had accepted the "Dated Creed", he proceeded to enforce it upon them by a combination of brow-beating and threats, although this was not actually accomplished without a measure of compromise on the part of the Emperor. The outcome was a confusion between semi-Arian and Homoean concepts. Following upon this, the Homoeans, under the leadership of Acacius, made every effort to be fully represented at the Council of Constantinople in 360. It was not surprising, therefore, to discover that Council approving of the "Dated Creed". While an Homoean victory seemed assured, political events, and in particular the death of

Constantius, were soon to give a new twist to the religious set-up of the day.

Constantius was succeeded, as he had intended, by his first cousin, Julian. He was the youngest son of Constantine's half-brother, Julius Constantius. The toleration granted by him upon his succession allowed the exiled Nicene Bishops to return to their Sees. A series of local Councils at Alexandria, in Italy, Gaul and Spain, endorsed the faith of Nicea. Soon, however, Julian introduced measures designed to establish the "Holy Catholic Church of Hellenism" - his new name for paganism. As early as 362, for instance, he issued a series of edicts, directly or indirectly, affecting the Church. He also forced Athanasius to depart from Alexandria to enter upon his fourth exile. Furthermore, his intolerant action at Antioch, where he closed the Cathedral, indicated his rising hostility to the Church. All these repressive measures, however, only served to spur the Church to close her ranks. Julian died on 26th June, 363. The well-known story that he died with the words "Vicisti Galilei" upon his lips, is now regarded as a late embellishment upon a passage in Theodoret.¹

After Julian's premature death, his general Jovinian, who had always been a follower of Christianity, was raised to the throne. He speedily recalled Athanasius. His intention was clearly to remove the ecclesiastical and theological confusion then in existence. To achieve this end, he required Athanasius to put in writing his explanation of the true faith held by the Church concerning the Trinity. Athanasius then summoned a large Synod at Alexandria and issued, at its direction and in its name, a synodal letter in which the Emperor was commended to regard the Nicene faith as the one faith which had always been preached by the Church.

1. See F.L. Cross, Julian the Apostate, Dictionary of the Christian Church, 1957; p. 752.

As a supplement to the Nicene Creed, which was set out in full, a statement was added which indicated the orthodox view of the Holy Spirit. The influence of this letter was soon to be seen. Shortly afterwards, when some parties tried to win his support, Jovinian informed them that he always desired peace in his kingdom and preferred the homoousion doctrine to all others. Upon this, Acacius of Caesarea, who had hitherto been a most ardent Arian, with Meletius of Antioch and twenty-five other Bishops, gathered at the episcopal city of Meletius and issued a solemn declaration accepting the Nicene Creed. But in order to leave some room for theological manoeuvring, they inserted a sentence regarding the homoousion which in effect tried to semi-Arianise it. To the great detriment of the orthodox cause, Jovinian died suddenly, on the 16th February, 364, in the eighth month of his reign.

Both the military and the civil authorities now chose General Valentinian as Emperor. The Empire had been without a leader for only ten days. His investment took place on the 26th February, 364. One month later, he bestowed the title of Augustus upon his younger brother, Valens. Valentinian had already proved himself an earnest orthodox Christian under the rule of Jovinian, by preferring to give up his office and go into prison than to forsake his faith. But his brother was an Arian. While the former showed tolerance toward all, Valens emulated Constantius' bigotry. In June, at Nish, the Empire was apportioned to each. Valentinian took the West, and set up his court at Milan. Valens was assigned the East, and he made Constantinople his capital.

Having briefly set out an historical introduction, let us now examine Basil's concern for the Church during the reign of Valens. The material to hand would suggest that on at least six occasions he implicated himself

in such a way as to preserve the unity of the Church of his day. To put it another way, and by so doing indicate the way in which the word "unity" is here being used, it would seem clear that at critical moments Basil was always guided by his desire to direct all the parts of the Church toward the defence of the faith of Nicea.

(1) When Dianius died in the year 362, the episcopal throne of Caesarea was officially declared vacant. The city then found itself in an uproar because of the pressure created by the warring parties who fought for their own nominees. Indeed, in order to overcome the deadlock created by an evenly balanced contest for the episcopate, Eusebius, a layman of rank and influence, was elevated per saltum. Two problems quickly emerged from the appointment: (a) Eusebius had not yet been baptised; (b) He was theologically unqualified for the position.

While the first difficulty was quickly removed, the second was a more knotty problem. Great care would have to be taken in the appointment of an Archdeacon. After careful consideration, Basil of Caesarea was nominated. But not long afterwards, a strong disagreement broke out between the Archdeacon and his superior. While the actual reason is unknown, it was probably due to a measure of jealousy on the part of Eusebius. At this critical stage, such an event could easily injure the Christian cause in the whole of Cappadocia. Semi-Arianism was always ready to use such a situation to its own benefit. Under these circumstances Basil retired to his monastery in Pontus in order to relieve the situation. This was clearly the action of a man who was willing to overlook even his own feelings for the good of the Church into which he had been ordained.

(2) When Valens had the title of Augustus bestowed upon him by Valentinian in 364, Eusebius quickly realised that his Archdeacon's advice and assistance was now more necessary than ever before. He accordingly

wrote a letter to Basil requesting him to return to the city of Caesarea as speedily as possible, in order to assume again his ecclesiastical responsibilities. Basil agreed, and returned with an honest desire to co-operate with his Archbishop. A brief respite now took place in the Arian storm. Having been completely reconciled to his superior, Basil now began to consolidate his Archiepiscopal power over the various provinces in which the Metropolitan of Caesarea exercised his jurisdiction.²

(3) Around the year 364, both the semi-Arians and the Nicenes suffered great hardships by the measures which Valens imposed upon them. The semi-Arians, with the Emperor's approval, under the presidency of Eleusius of Cyzicus, held a Synod at Lampsacus on the Hellespont. Here they condemned the results of both Ariminum and Constantinople, and reasserted the Dedication Creed of 341. Two years later, they sent representatives to Liberius of Rome, who proved their orthodoxy by having them subscribe to the Nicene Creed. While Basil had not actually attended the Synod of Lampsacus, he had met Eustathius and other Bishops who were making their way to the Synod. It is more than likely that his influence contributed something to the decision arrived at in the city.

Two years later, 366, a deputation was sent to the West comprising of three Bishops with whom Basil was in communication. They were: Eustathius of Sebaste, Silvanus of Tarsus, and Theophilus of Castabala. Again, it can hardly have been without the persuasion of Basil that the deputation went as far as it did in accepting the homoousion. When these Eastern Bishops had returned, another Synod was assembled in 367, at Tyanna in Cappadocia, at which they solemnly delivered the letters and documents they had brought back with them. These were received with considerable joy, and it was then decided to impart their contents to other Eastern Bishops. Yet another

2. See Basil, Epistles, xxviii, xxxiv. Maran suggests that these letters show something of the important character of Basil's work during his presbyterate.

Synod was proposed, this was to be held at Tarsus, at which the faith of Nicea was to be universally accepted. Valens, however, withheld his approval. At this point, thirty-four semi-Arian Bishops assembled themselves at Caria, where they rejected the homoousion and accepted the formula of Antioch. We may thus suggest that the success of Tyanna was partly due to the political skill of Basil, although strong movements still existed which were willing to act in a manner contrary to the general opinion of the Church.

(4) It was around this period that Basil suffered a number of set-backs. The first involved the death of his mother. This painful event drove him to his friend, Eustathius of Samosata, for solace. But trouble was awaiting his return. When he had taken up his duties again, Basil was informed that the Arians had succeeded in placing one of their number in the See of Tarsus. This was a most painful blow for Basil.³ But this was not all. In the middle of the year 370, Eusebius of Caesarea "passed away, having sweetly breathed his last in Basil's arms."

The episcopal throne of Caesarea was again technically vacant. But the man who had actually carried out the duties of the Archbishop, "like a lion-keeper", was still in possession of only an inferior ecclesiastical position. What was he to do under these circumstances? Should he withdraw and perhaps find himself in a position where he would have to support a candidate inferior to himself and of dubious theology? It seems clear that the recent events at Tarsus led Basil to determine, if possible, to secure his own election to the See. This resolution, to resist further Arian advance, appears to govern all that immediately followed. Knowing the weight of Gregory's influence, and being particularly anxious to gain his attendance at Caesarea, he decided upon the following ruse:

3. See Basil, Epistle, xxxiv.

he would write a letter to Gregory telling him that he (Basil) was dangerously ill. This he did. When Gregory received this piece of alarming news, he left immediately to be with his friend at the moment of need. This decision, of course, was anticipated and desired by Basil. But Gregory had not travelled very far when he learned that: (a) Basil was no more ill than usual; (b) Bishops were assembling at the city of Caesarea to appoint a new Archbishop. It was just at this point that Gregory realised the real reason for Basil's disturbing communication. He accordingly returned home and wrote a very sharp note to his friend. ^{4.}

Meanwhile, the Bishops at Caesarea wrote to Gregory the elder requesting his assistance in the choice of Eusebius' successor. He replied that he was unable to attend for reasons of poor health and advanced age, but recommended Basil to them. ^{5.} The possibility still existed, however, that intrigue and party spirit would carry the day against Gregory's nominee. While he probably appeared to the people of Caesarea as a man of saintly life, others were not so favourably disposed toward him. They viewed his stern self-denial and high morality with considerable misgiving. Being aware of this kind of exigency, the two Gregories decided to call upon the assistance of Gregory of Samosata, although he did not actually belong to the presiding Council. He immediately responded to their appeal and undertook the three hundred mile journey to be with them. Gregory of Samosata also succeeded in persuading Gregory the elder to undertake the journey in order to ensure the election of their nominee. These political manoeuvres proved to be successful, for all resistance was overcome and Basil was consecrated the new Archbishop of Caesarea.

4. Gregory Nazianzen, Epistle, xi. Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, (Second Series), Vol. vii; pp. 449-450.
5. Gregory Nazianzen, Epistle, xliiii, N.P.N.F.; p.451.

Reactions, however, quickly followed the appointment. While a word of goodwill was received from Athanasius, the Emperor soon began to impose stricter measures against the Catholics in the Province. Moreover, those Bishops who had been narrowly out-voted, and who had absented themselves from the service of consecration, now decided to withdraw their communion from the new Archbishop. But the most painful and embarrassing incident for Basil was Gregory's (the younger) refusal to support him.

In the face of these difficulties, which could easily have spread and thus adversely affected the Catholic cause in the whole of Cappadocia, Basil of Caesarea proved himself a wise and good churchman. He chose a policy of appeasement which probably saved the day. ^{6.}

(5) The point has now been reached where we have to examine the direct conflict between Basil and Valens. A renewal of persecution was introduced by the Emperor in the year 371 and it continued until 378. We may therefore here observe that Basil's episcopate and the Emperor's measures against the Nicene faith ran concurrently. This persecution had its own character and distinctive scope. It differed from Constantius' oppression in that Valens did not pretend to be a theologian. He did put himself, however, into the hands of Eudoxius, Bishop of Constantinople, and other Arian advisers. In consequence, governmental policy strongly supported a faith which eagerly sought to overthrow the orthodox faith.

Early signs of hostility were soon to be seen in Caesarea. In the year 371, flushed with both military and ecclesiastical success, Valens travelled leisurely toward Syria. Theodoret tells us that he did not wish to molest the Metropolitan of the Cathedral city, lest his firmness of purpose would lead others to resist his wishes. He therefore sent Modestus, the Praetorian Prefect, to prepare the way for him. The

6. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xl.40, N.P.N.F.; p.408.

Prefect's task was to persuade Basil either to enter into communion with Eudoxius or else to expel him from the city. ⁷ But on this occasion, Basil proved to be quite unaccommodating.

The Emperor eventually arrived at the city in January, 372. Knowing about Modestus' failure, he personally approached the Archbishop to see if he would allow his Arian Bishop to join in Holy Communion. On being refused, he decided to bring the matter to a head. The next Sunday, as he was about to enter into the Cathedral, Valens was suddenly astonished by "the thundering roll of the Psalms and the sea of heads of the congregation." ⁸ Recovering quickly, he advanced to make his offering at the alter, but no one came forward to receive it from him. Again he was dumbfounded. Witnessing his embarrassment, Basil then came forward and accepted his offering. Thereafter, the service continued and concluded without further incident.

The next day, however, the Emperor returned to the Cathedral. On this occasion he was received within the sanctuary. A theological discussion then took place. Demosthenes, the chief cook of the royal household who was to be numbered among the retinue, could not withhold himself from making a contribution. Unfortunately, he wrongly inflected his remarks. Basil then mischievously replied: "This is a sign - Demosthenes does not know Greek; he had better attend to his sauce than meddle with divinity." Greatly amused, the Emperor left the Cathedral in a most amiable mood.

Later he made a grant of land to the Archbishop's philanthropic institution. Further attempts were indeed made to secure the banishment of the Metropolitan, but following the illness and then the death of Valens' son, Galates, the Emperor was magnanimous enough to support him. Moreover

7. Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History, Book iv.19; pp. 175-178; and Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii.50, N.P.N.F.; pp. 411-412.

8. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii.52, N.P.N.F.; p. 412.

a cordial understanding grew up between Basil and Modestus. At least six letters were addressed by Basil to him. They are still extant in his correspondence. When the Emperor eventually left the city of Caesarea, Basil still remained the master of the situation. Diplomacy and humour had won the day.⁹.

Elsewhere matters turned out otherwise. This was perhaps due to the fact that other cities did not have the benefit and skill of a Basil of Caesarea. When Valens arrived at Antioch, for instance, a persecution broke out which was to extend over all the East. Meletius was now exiled for the third time. Diodore and Flavian, who were now presbyters, assumed ecclesiastical responsibility. They quickly rallied together the faithful of the city who had refused to communicate with the Arian Bishop, Euzoius. But the Catholics were then driven from their churches and forced to worship in open country or secluded spot. Numbers were also exiled. We note: Pelagius, Bishop of Lacodicea, and Eusebius, Bishop of Samosata, with other Bishops and inferior members of the clergy. Barses, Bishop of Edessa, was also deposed and exiled to the Egyptian frontier. Trouble broke out in the city which necessitated Valens sending Modestus to settle things. He found, however, that the people's tempers were more ready for martyrdom than submission. He therefore allowed them to quieten themselves peacefully, although he arrested eighty priests and commanded them to submit to the new Bishop. When they refused, he transported them to Thrace. But wherever they went, they were received with ovations. In order to control this enthusiasm, Valens ordered that they should be exiled two by two. The order was carried out to the letter.

At Alexandria, in 373, Athanasius was drawing near his last days. Since his return in 366, from his fifth and last exile, he had enjoyed seven

9. Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History, Book iv.19; p.177. See also Gregory Nazianzus, Oration, xliii.54, N.P.N.F.; p.412.

years of peace. But now that his end was near, he thought it prudent to appoint his successor. Five days before he died, he consecrated Peter the new Archbishop of Alexandria. Now the Arians sought to take over the command of the See. They appealed to the Prefect, Palladius, to intervene on their behalf. He firstly surrounded the church of St. Theonas and then allowed it to be desecrated. Fortunately, Peter escaped unharmed. The new Arian Bishop, Lucian, was lead into the city by Euzoius amid shouts of "Welcome, thou Bishop who deniest the Son." Meanwhile, Peter sought refuge in Rome, where he was to play an important part in succeeding events.

(6) We have already noticed that Basil's episcopate was conducted amidst many troubles, both personal and public. One of the most painful was the disagreement which arose between himself and Gregory. The whole matter centred around an Imperial edict. Shortly after Valens had left Caesarea, he issued an edict which divided Cappadocia into two parts. Now this was clearly an administrative measure. The policy of Eastern Emperors had always been aimed at reducing the size of the Provinces, so that the power of their governors would be proportionately reduced. But this new ruling adversely affected Basil's episcopal authority. Since the Sees of Cappadocia coincided with the Provinces, Basil's episcopal power was radically reduced. Moreover, Cappadocia Secunda had Tyana as its chief city. The Bishop of Tyanna was called Anthimus - a most ambitious man. In order to strengthen his hand, Basil now created several new bishoprics. Gregory was now appointed Bishop of Nyssa, a small town situated one hundred miles East of Caesarea. Sasima, lying South of Caesarea, he gave to his uncle. Apart from the fact that this small town was situated at the point

where three important roads met, it was a most wretched place indeed. But if Basil could control this strategic point, it would greatly assist his cause against the usurper. Gregory, however, refused the appointment, but, after further pressure had been put upon him, finally accepted it. Meanwhile Anthimus had garrisoned Sasima with his own men and was willing to defend it at all costs. It was too much to expect Gregory to involve himself in an armed conflict against Anthimus; hence he remained at home in Nazianzus. New and more severe diplomatic measures were brought against Anthimus, without much success. Eventually an agreement was reached, although its exact nature remains unknown. Basil of Caesarea, however, had behaved too badly toward Gregory Nazianzen to justify an easy or speedy reconciliation. Indeed, it was never really healed. Even in his "Panegyric" he raises the painful matter.¹⁰ We cannot pass this unhappy incident without noting that its fundamental cause was Basil's strong desire to preserve the homogeneity of the Church in Cappadocia.

Four months after the death of the Emperor Valens, his former university associate, Basil "joyfully resigned his soul to the care of the angels who carried him away".¹¹ He died on his fiftieth birthday - 1st January, 379.

The evidence adduced in these pages reveal two very important points: (a) Basil had good reason for being concerned for the Church during the reign of Valens. While Arianism appears to be in full flower in the mid-fifties of the fourth century, we have seen that the seeds of disintegration were already beginning to show some sign of growth.

10. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii.59, N.P.N.F.; p.414.

11. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii.79, N.P.N.F.; p.421.

The reigns of both Jovian and Valentinian accelerated this development. Indeed, the Nicene cause might very well have burst out into full bloom a little sooner if Valens had not been appointed ruler of the East. Under these trying circumstances, however, the Providence of God produced the right man at the most appropriate moment. (b) Basil's actions and attitudes were always aimed at the defence of the true faith. As we have seen, even personal friendships and loyalties were sacrificed to achieve this end. We therefore conclude this chapter by concurring with the remarks of Dr. B.J. Kidd: "Seeming failure, misrepresentations, and separation from friends were thus Basil's trials; but they show him to have been among the saints." ¹².

12. B.J. Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D.461, 1922, Vol. 2; p. 266.

CHAPTER THREE

Basil's Arguments against Eunomius the Strict Arian.

Early Arianism, as we have already observed, emphasised more the function of the Son than the nature of the being of God. It insisted upon developing the following thesis: God, the Unbegun, was impassible; the Son, created by the will of the Father, was passible. Therefore, this unique relationship between the Father and the Son, although it did not admit equality of essence, did enable the Son to mediate the Father's creative energy to the world.

Later Arianism, however, reached a different conclusion. It no longer questioned the full divinity of the Son, as did its earlier representative, but firmly held that the Son was not divine at all. This hardening of the theological attitude, of course, took place over a number of years. It will therefore be our intention to examine here this development in relation to the life of Eunomius.

1. Eunomius' Rise to Power:

Eunomius, born at Dacora,¹ appears to have come from an honest and industrious stock. His grandfather, Presius, had been a slave at one period of his life, but had managed to purchase his freedom, as well as a small farm, with his savings. His father was equally hardworking. He supported his family from two main sources - namely, (a) from the produce cultivated on his own land; (b) from money raised by teaching a few neighbours children.

Having inherited the family's independent spirit, it is not surprising to find Eunomius anxious to make his own way in the world. He quickly learned shorthand writing, and then became secretary to one of his kinsmen. Later, his inherent restlessness drove him to the city of Constantinople where he hoped to further his fortunes. When this experiment proved to be disappointing, he returned home to Cappadocia.

1. Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book vii.17; pp. 348-350. We here especially note that, while Philostorgius agrees with Sozomen's opinion, Gregory Nazianzus suggests a place called Oltiseris.

About this time the fame of Aetius, now resident in Alexandria, came to his ears. His theology was principally occupied with refuting the equality of essence and the co-eternality of the Son with the Father. Eunomius now resolved to become his disciple - an ambition he actually accomplished in the year 356.² After two years close association with his master, he then accompanied him to Antioch where they attended an Arian Council summoned by Eudoxius. Through Court favour, Eudoxius had succeeded to the See of that city on the death of Leontius the previous year. The bold front displayed by the strict Arians at this Council, and the favour shown to the open blasphemies of both Aetius and Eunomius (neither of whom hesitated to assert the absolute 'unlikeness' of the Son to the Father), excited the strong reaction of the semi-Arians.

Since the dedication of a new church was about to take place in the city of Ancyra, a Council was summoned at which the recent Anomoean doctrines and their leaders were condemned. A synodical letter was also sent to the Emperor which denounced the open profanities of both of these men.

On hearing of this action, the strict Arians resolved to send a representative to Constantinople to defend their case. Eunomius, who had previously declined to accept Eudoxius' offer to ordain him (his reason for refusal was because he had not finally broken his association with the semi-Arian party), was now ordained a deacon. He was then elected to act as the strict Arians advocate at Constantinople. As he was making his way there, however, he was arrested and banished to Phrygia. Aetius was also banished to Pepuza. Eudoxius prudently retired to his native Armenia. Not long afterwards, Eudoxius succeeded in reinstating himself in the Emperor's favour. Indeed, when Macedonius was deposed by the

2. Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book vi. 27; pp. 293-295. See also Socrates, Ecclesiastical History, Book ii.35; pp. 132-134.

Council of Constantinople in 359, he was chosen as the new Archbishop of the city.

Constantius' abhorrence of Anomoeanism now required the strict Arians to adopt new tactics. For instance, they now felt it necessary to sacrifice Aetius, and also required Eudoxius to be more cautious when making theological pronouncements. These measures proved to be momentarily successful. Later, Eudoxius procured for Eunomius the See of Cyzicus which had become vacant by the deposition of Eleusius.³ Following his superior's advice, Eunomius maintained a discreet silence on all controversial matters. But, since dissimulation was foreign to his nature, he soon began to openly propound his erroneous doctrines. Complaints against his outbursts now came to the ear of Eudoxius, who promised an investigation into the whole matter. But despite this and further attempts to delay official action, he was eventually forced to summon Eunomius to a Council of Bishops at Constantinople. This was not done, however, without Eudoxius informing him of his danger and recommending flight. When Eunomius failed to appear at the Council, he was accordingly condemned and deposed. It was about this time in his career that he finally broke from the party with whom he had been making common cause.⁴ He now became the leader of the faction which was soon to bear his name.

The accession of Julian in 361 allowed Aetius, Eunomius and other banished Bishops to return to their Sees. Both Aetius and Eunomius settled in Constantinople where they continued to spread their evil teaching. They continued the propagation of their heresy during the reigns of both Julian and Jovian. In time, however, Eunomianism began to decline. This was mainly due to a number of reasons - for example,

3. Socrates, Ecclesiastical History, Book iv.7; pp. 216-218.

4. Socrates, Ecclesiastical History, Book iv.13; pp. 227-228.

(a) Internal faction; ⁵. (b) The refutation of their heresy by such men as Basil of Caesarea and Gregory Nazianzus; (c) Consequent official condemnation. Eunomius was finally allowed to return to Dacora where he died in extreme old age soon after the year 392.

Eunomius' main aim was to develop Arianism as a doctrinal system. To this end, in the year 361-362, he wrote a work called "Apologeticus". It was a short treatise, comprising of twenty-eight chapters, in which he argued that the only true title for the essence of God was "Ungeneratedness". It was this short document that occasioned Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind and Apollinaris of Laodicea to write against him.

Before we proceed to examine Basil's arguments in some detail, two significant points call for attention: (A) We must investigate the authenticity of this treatise. Three Fathers of the Church - Gregory Nazianzus, ⁶. Jerome ⁷ and Theodoret ⁸. - testify that Basil of Caesarea did indeed write against Eunomius, but they failed to indicate the number of books involved in his refutation. In time, two opinions became established. The first accepted all five books as genuine. This assessment rested upon three witnesses - namely, (a) The edict of Justinian against the Three Chapters; (b) The Council of Seville; (c) The Council of Florence. The second school of thought was not so confident. Maran and Bohringer rejected books four and five on account of their style and absence from some manuscripts.

Didymus the Blind has been suggested by some scholars as the real author of these two books. This opinion would appear to be well founded.

5. Socrates, Ecclesiastical History, Book v.24; pp. 296-297.

6. See Gregory Nazianzus, Oration, xliii.67, N.P.N.F.; pp. 415-416.

7. See Jerome, Lives of Illustrious Men, 116, N.P.N.F.; p.382.

8. See Theodoret, Dialogues, ii, N.P.N.F.; p.207.

In his treatise "De Trinitate", for instance, Didymus frequently refers to his other work called - "First Word". For a long time his work was thought to be lost. This book, possibly the same as the two books "De Dogmatibus et Contra Arianos", mention by Jerome in his "De Viris Illustribus" 109, would seem to be identical with the two books attached to Basil's treatise called "Adversus Eunomium". Notwithstanding the fact that Basilian authorship has been associated with these two books from as early as the fifth century, they most certainly do not belong to him. Two reasons support this claim - namely, (a) They possess a number of features in common with Didymus' "De Trinitate" and "De Spiritu Sancto"; (b) Their text fits the fourteen allusions in the "De Trinitate". There is also good reason for assuming that in his "De Spiritu Sancto" 32, Didymus has the same work in mind when he spoke of a "Dogmatum volumen" as one of his previous writings. This evidence leads us to the conclusion that only the first three books of Basil's earliest dogmatic writings can be accepted as having come from his pen. (B) We must also set out the aim lying behind Basil's counter-arguments. Eunomius regarded his "Apologeticus" as a defence of the "simpler creed which is common to all Christians." In his "Adversus Eunomium", however, Basil is chiefly concerned with countering the outright Arian exposition which Eunomius attached to his statement of faith soon after its publication. No sooner had he issued his theologically innocent creed, than he was interpreting it in terms which ran contrary to the faith of the Church. In the first three books of his treatise therefore, the Archbishop of Caesarea takes the Arian Eunomius to task not so much for his proposed creed, as for the Arian commentary attached to it.

2. Basil's Refutation of Eunomianism:

Basil of Caesarea's arguments against the Bishop of Cyzicus cannot easily be outlined in detail. Indeed, this treatise, so talented in argument and extensive in knowledge, is worthy of a thesis all to itself. We shall therefore set out our treatment of his arguments under the following headings:-

(A) Book 1 : Basil Refutes Eunomius' Argument that the Essence of God consists in His Innascibility, and that for this reason the Word cannot be the true Son of God.

Basil of Caesarea begins his monograph by pointing out that if everyone accepted the Gospel as it is contained in both Holy Writ and Holy Tradition, there would be no real need for him to set out this refutation of impious teaching. Since the enemies of truth have indeed arisen, who, "by the use of considerable guile, reject the divinity of the only-begotten Son", he must now take this opportunity of criticising what is being taught by them, so that the faithful may be guided aright.

Two instances of heretical teaching are now given. Aetius the Syrian taught that the only-begotten Son was dissimilar in essence to the Father. This theological opinion manifestly differs from what is taught in the Church. Eunomius, however, went even further than his teacher. Having accepted and logically completed this doctrine, he proceeded to publish it and thereby became its champion.

Basil's refutation begins in earnest when he sets out Eunomius' statement of faith: "We believe in one God, Father Almighty, of Whom are all things; and in one only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, through Whom are all things; and in one Holy Spirit, the Comforter." 9.

9. Basil, Adversus Eunomium, Edited by J. Garnier, Vol. 1 (Paris, 1839) Book 1. 4; p.299.

As it stands, the creed of Eunomius unambiguously states that the Son, the Word, is God, and therefore is of one substance with the Father. Eunomius' dogmatic system, however, presented the Church with clear proof that this was not his sincere belief. Eunomianism taught that the Son is a creature, and therefore not God at all, but only a demigod. It reasoned as follows: Since the essence of God consists in His Innascibility, the very idea of "begotten" surely implies posteriority, inferiority and unlikeness.

Not so, says the Archbishop of Caesarea. Eunomius is endeavouring to make the impossible, possible. If he could actually prove that God was created either by Himself or by another, he would certainly be entitled to adhere to his present position. But no one, neither within or outside the discipline of the Church, could reasonably defend this viewpoint. Aristotle tells us, he goes on to say, that the ungeneratedness of deity is neither created by himself or by another. Therefore, the idea of sequence which lies inherent within Eunomius' argument is an invalid assumption. Both the Church and Aristotle teach that God is neither self-generated or created by another. He must therefore have existed from all eternity.

The reason for this Arian teaching is quite clear - namely, in order to reveal Eunomius' own concept of the Son's relationship with the Father. Eunomius teaches that the Son is posterior to the Father, just as that which is created comes into existence by the will of its creator. He thus perpetuates the evil teaching of both Arius and Aetius.¹⁰

The word "Unbegotten", which Eunomius and his followers use so extensively, is now examined by the Archbishop of Caesarea. Although he recognises it as a most convenient word to use, he rejects it for two

10. Basil, Adversus Eunomium, Book i. 5; pp. 301-305.

sound reasons: (a) It is nowhere used in Scripture; (b) It has a very close association with the Arian heresy. Since this word has introduced so much confusion and untruth into the Church's concept of God, it would be more profitable to adopt the term "Father" when considering the Nature and Person of God. Three reasons justify this substitution: (a) It is a word used in Holy Scripture; (b) It implies all that is meant by the word "Unbegotten"; (c) It also suggests the idea of Son.

Eunomius insists that the word is absolutely necessary since it states the actual nature of God - that is, He is unbegotten, simple and incommunicable. ^{11.}

Basil rejoins, the word "Unbegotten", like so many other useful and admirable words, is wholly incapable of completely expressing the Divine essence. Even collectively this group of concepts only gives us a poor insight into who and what God actually is. Only one noun exists which adequately describes the being of God - namely, the word "essence" (ousia). Basil now claims that, while he is ready to accept that the essence of God is "unbegotten", he would strongly resist Eunomius' assertion that "essence" and "unbegotten" are to be regarded as words identical in meaning. To put the matter another way, Basil would agree that the essence of God is innascible, but he would roundly reject the unwarranted inference that God's essence is innascibility. ^{12.}

But Eunomius then replies, God's essence is ungenerated; He cannot be anything else since He is simple, undivided and unbegotten. ^{13.}

At this point Basil remonstrates: "What pride! Does he imagine that he has discovered the very essence of God most high?" He then proceeds to enquire into the real source of Eunomius' unique knowledge. It was

11. Basil, Adversus Eunomium, Book i. 7; pp. 307-309.

12. Basil, Adversus Eunomium, Book i. 8-10; pp. 309-315.

13. Basil, Adversus Eunomium, Book i. 11; pp. 315-316.

certainly not from the common notion which all men share. That, says the Archbishop of Caesarea, only suggests to us that God exists; it fails to give us a clue as to what He is. Did it then come from the teaching of the Holy Spirit? This is possible. Eunomius, however, fails to indicate where his sources are to be found. We cannot therefore examine them for ourselves. Is it possible that he gained his knowledge from a study of Holy Scripture? Basil doubts this, because he is of the opinion that the evidence from both Testaments clearly proves that holy men very quickly realised that matters pertaining to the nature of God were beyond their full understanding. And yet, having failed to discover his special source of information, Eunomius confidently and authoritatively speaks about God's name and essence. One of two conclusions can only be reached - either Eunomius had a special source of information which he does not wish to divulge, in which case he should be ashamed, or else he is merely expounding his own heretical theories. ^{14.}

The Basilian understanding of the word "Unbegotten" is now set out. For him, "unbegotten" means having no external origin. Eunomius uses the term to establish the contrast between the Father and the Son. God, says the strict Arian, being ingenerate, could never admit of generation. This declaration can be understood in two ways: (a) It may mean that the ingenerate nature cannot be subject to generation; or (b) It may also mean that the ingenerate nature cannot generate. Eunomius, Basil thinks, accepts the second of these two meanings, although he gains considerable support from people who imagine that he holds the former interpretation. Eunomianism therefore, requiring this kind of duplicity in order to exist, is worthy only of the strongest of criticisms. ^{15.}

14. Basil, Adversus Eunomium, Book 1. 13; pp. 318-319.

15. Basil, Adversus Eunomius, Book 1. 16; pp. 322-323.

The argument adumbrated above permits the following summary:

Basil rejected Eunomius' subordinationism because: (a) His theological presupposition - namely, that the essence of God consists in His Innascibility - is philosophically and dogmatically unwarranted; and (b) His terminology - namely, "Unbegotten" - is also rejected because it is a non-Scriptural, restricted and negative concept.

(B) Book 2 : Basil Counters Eunomius by Defending the Nicene Doctrine which States that the Word is Consubstantial with the Father.

The Book opens with Eunomius making the following sweeping assertion:

"The consensus of opinion is that the only-begotten Son is generated and therefore a creation. It also maintains a diversity between names and essence." 16.

Basil proceeds to investigate the validity of this staggering claim:

(a) Investigating the witness of Holy Scripture.

Since the Arian's use of Scripture was wide and various, Basil chooses to expound certain examples. One such text appears to be St. Peter's words: "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." 17. It is possible, Basil asserts, that Eunomius would have us believe that this text teaches that the Son is begotten of God, and therefore posterior and inferior to Him. So that he may be refuted, attention must now be given to the early Creation account.

The Book of Genesis does indeed tell us that God "created the heaven and the earth", 18. but it nowhere mentions His creation of the only-begotten Son. If Eunomius' blasphemy is correct, Holy Scripture would surely make mention of it? Since no passage in God's Word refers to the generation of the Son, Eunomius is guilty of a great evil in that he

16. Basil, Adversus Eunomius, Book ii. 1; p.337.

17. Acts 2.36.

18. Genesis 1.1.

has called the Creator of all things the Begetter of the only-begotten Son. Thus, when Eunomius speaks about "the consensus of opinion", he is not merely endeavouring to give some encouragement to his followers, but involving other perfectly orthodox people in the scandal of his injurious teaching.

The words of St. Peter do not speak about the eternal hypostasis of the only-begotten Son, nor about the essence of the Logos of God, but about the self-emptying of the Son. The text cannot therefore be expounded in a dogmatic, but in a traditional and devotional manner. To be sure, Eunomius understands the words of the apostle Peter to refer to the generation of the Son, but St. Peter himself uses them to indicate the human aspect of our Lord. The words, "God hath made that same Jesus ... both Lord and Christ," refer primarily to our Lord's human dignity and not to His essence. Eunomius' exposition of this text is therefore completely erroneous because he reads into it ideas and concepts which are entirely foreign to its textual situation. ¹⁹.

The Archbishop of Caesarea now looks at: (b) The conclusion arrived at if we apply the principle that there is a diversity between names and essence.

He begins by saying that St. Peter and St. Paul, as well as other people, may very well describe an object in many different ways, but they do not thereby change the essence of the object in question. For instance, people are the same. What distinguishes one individual from another are the special characteristics and idiosyncrasies attached to each person. Therefore, the appellations accorded to the Son by St. Peter are significant not for His essence, but for His human attributes. When we refer to the apostle Peter, to choose only one of Basil's numerous

19. Basil, Adversus Eunomius, Book ii. 2-3; pp. 337-339.

illustrations, we refer to his human character and not to his human generation. To be sure, the nature of St. Peter and any of the other Apostles may differ considerably, but they all possess in common the basic element of humanity, and therefore are of the same essence.

Eunomius' assertion that the words of St. Peter - "Lord and Christ" - refer to the Son's essence is completely and entirely wrong. He arrives at this misleading conclusion simply because he wrongly assumes that names and things are identical. Such is not the case. Basil is of the opinion that things do not follow their names, but names follow things. If Eunomius' supposition were correct, we could justly infer that every saint in the Church is identical and equal with God - that is, of the same essence as God. This kind of argument, of course, is manifest madness - like all of Eunomius' theorising.²⁰

The argument continues to go forward apace. Our next pause is at the point where Basil expounds his understanding of Eunomius' proposition (c) "The essence of the Son is generated by the Father before all things."

In effect, Basil points out, Eunomius is saying: When the Son was created by God, He either existed or He did not. If we say He did not exist before His generation, we cannot contest his position. Since we hold that the Son existed from all eternity, however, it is our opinion that this doctrine is not only blasphemous, but also absurd, because that which exists requires no origin.

Eunomius' problem is that he uses a sensuous analogy to develop his concept of the hypostasis of the only-begotten Son. He claims that because the Son has come into existence, He did not therefore exist before His generation. Thus, in a clever way, he theorises about the generatedness of the only-begotten Son.

20. Basil, Adversus Eunomius, Book ii. 4; pp. 339-341.

The most effective way by which to counter this argument is to examine the affirmation of Holy Scripture. St. John in his Gospel says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."²¹ These words surely rule out the idea of a transcendental and a non-transcendental existence. Moreover, it makes foolish the idea that a beginning has something prior to it. That which exists does not refer to non-existence but to existence. If St. John's "beginning" (arche) alludes to something else - for example, the beginning of wisdom, or the beginning of a moral life, or even to the beginning of the creation of all things - then we must exclude any interpretation inferring generation, because "beginning" would then mean the absolute principle or the highest nature.

St. John furthermore deals with the word "was" (ἦν) which means the supreme authority. If the expression alludes to a temporal existence then it is used in the same sense as - "there was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job"²². and "the earth was without form and void."²³. The meaning of "was" is simply this - namely, that which was and is, the Omnipotent. ὤν and ἦν are identical, as well as eternal and timeless, that is, they have no relation to temporality.²⁴.

Having had yet another of his evil attacks repulsed, Enomius goes on to explain that (d) He was ready to bestow great dignity upon the Son as the supreme Creator. It was not his intention to maintain that the essence of the Son was the same as the things created out of nothing. His desire was rather to grant to the Son the honour and distinction which a Creator rightly has over his own creation.

21. John 1.1.

22. Job 1.1.

23. Genesis 1.2.

24. Basil, Adversus Eunomius, Book ii. 14; pp. 351-353. This last sentence reads: Ὅτιον γὰρ τὸ ὤν, τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ ἦν, αἰδίον ὁμοίως καὶ ἄχρονον.

Basil, however, immediately rejects this concession because he believed that it only led to confusion and contradiction. He then asks: If God, the Unbegotten, differs from things begotten, and all begotten things have the same hypostasis, what alternative have we to a natural conjunction of all such things? Just as unbegottenness effects a distinction between the natures, so also the equality of condition brings them together. Eunomianism says that the Son and all things created by Him are of the non-existent, and thus far make those natures common, and yet they proceed to deny that they have given to the Son a nature of the non-existent. It would appear that Eunomius is here acting as the Lord Himself, for he has ascribed to the Son whatever rank and dignity he chooses to bestow upon Him. If this is his attitude, let him tell us what difference of substance he thinks the only-begotten Son, the Creator of all things, has from the things He created? The artist surpasses his own creation, but he is yet consubstantial with it. Eunomius explains the title "only-begotten" to mean that the Son alone was created by the Father, and was therefore made His perfect servant. Now surely, Basil rejoins, if the Son's glory resides only in the fact that He is an exact and obedient servant, He differs very little from other ministering spirits who perform their work without blame? This picture of God the Father being dependent upon a supreme servant to perform His work is manifestly most unworthy to the Almighty. Furthermore, if the only-begotten Son is only a creature, then mankind is still without a revelation of God. Eunomius, by alienating the only-begotten Son from the Father, thus deprives us of the knowledge of the love of God which has been made through Jesus Christ.^{25.}

"Without doubt," says Dr. J.A. Dorner, "Eunomius was quite right in maintaining that if God in Himself is merely the one simple Being, which,

25. Basil, Adversus Eunomius, Book ii. 19; pp. 359-361.

being absolutely without distinctions, stands related solely to itself, there is no place for distinctions in God, and therefore none for the Son. But that is a mere tautological proposition, and the answer is simply, - Such an idea of God is incogitable and false, appropriate to Deism and Judaism, but not to Christianity." 26.

(C) Book 3 : Basil Contests Eunomius' Arguments by Defending the Nicene Doctrine which States that the Holy Spirit is Consubstantial with the Father.

Dr. Hermann Dorries, in his monograph called "De Spiritu Sancto", rightly remarks: "It may surprise one to notice how much Basil ignores, but it is also enlightening to see where he attacks." 27. It is certainly true that the Archbishop of Caesarea does not attempt to answer every statement made by Eunomius in his "Apologeticus", but he does say sufficient to illustrate that he here further develops Athanasius' basic ideas.

A start is made with Eunomius defending the position which holds that "the Fathers teach that the Holy Spirit is the third Person of the Godhead in nature, dignity and order." He reasons as follows: The Paraclete is third in dignity and order, therefore we must also regard Him as being third in nature. That which comes first in order cannot be second according to nature; and neither can the first by nature occupy the second or third place in the order. If the Holy Spirit is the third in order, He cannot be the first according to nature, for the first is God the Father.

Asks Basil: "What is the need for Eunomius calling the Paraclete the third Person in nature, dignity and order?" Holy Tradition certainly teaches that the Holy Spirit is the second Person after the Son in dignity and order, but nowhere, neither in Holy Scripture or according to sincere

26. J.A. Dorner, The Person of Christ, Vol. 11, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh 1862) p. 267.

27. H. Dorries, De Spiritu Sancto, Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Gottingen. Philol - histor. Kl., 111. F, 39) Gottingen, 1956, p. 11.

deduction, can we conclude that the Spirit is the third Person in essence. As the Son is second in dignity because He came from the Father; and second in order because the Father is His beginning and cause; so also is the Holy Spirit and the third Person of the Godhead because He proceeds to the Father through the Son. The Holy Spirit is not second in nature and essence, because the essence of both the Son and Spirit is one. Thus the Holy Spirit, although second Person to the Son in dignity and order, has identity of essence with the only-begotten Son.

This, moreover, is the witness of Scripture. Take, for instance, the following words of St. John: "God is Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." ²⁸. If, according to this text, we pray to God in the Spirit, that to which we pray and that in which we revere it cannot be the same. Besides, God, the "unbegotten", is the One from whom everything emanates; the Son is the Person through whom everything exists, and the Holy Spirit is the third Person of the Trinity. He exists by the law of the Father and through the work of the Son. He is therefore honoured as the first and greatest creature of the Begotten, and is replete with sanctifying and teaching power. As the Father and the Son are holy in nature, so also is the Paraclete - He is our Source of Sanctification. ²⁹.

Eunomius then goes on to affirm that the Holy Spirit, being of a similar creation to the Son, lacks God's divine nature and creative power.

Basil, in order to defend the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father, then cites a number of Scriptural passages. We note: St. Paul's words - "In whom all the building fitly framed together

28. John 4.24.

29. Basil, *Adversus Eunomium*, Book iii. 1-3; pp. 385-390.

groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit;" ³⁰. and "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you;" ³¹. and finally the words of the apostle John - "And he that keepeth His commandments dwelleth in Him, and He in him. And hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us." ³².

The Archbishop of Caesarea now goes on to make the following three points: (a) If God dwells within us through the Holy Spirit, is it not impious to assert that the same Spirit does not share God's essence? (b) If we call those who lead the life of perfection, divine- and that perfection comes through the operation of the Paraclete - is it not absurd then to say that the Power which deifies does not share the divine essence of God the Father? (c) Holy Writ command us to baptise in "The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." ³³. Baptism, therefore, is not administered in the name of any other creature, but only in the name of the God whose divine nature is complete in the Trinity. Anything else outside this teaching and practice must be rejected. Thus for Basil of Caesarea, the Paraclete is the hallowing and not the hallowed power in Christianity. Therefore to place Him among the creatures, as Eunomius endeavours to do, is grossly impious and worthy of the strongest condemnation. ³⁴.

"Adversus Eunomium" is the treatise with which Basil entered the field of contemporary doctrinal dispute. He there resolutely sets his face

30. Ephesians 2.21-22.

31. 1 Cor. 3.16.

32. 1 John 3.24.

33. Matthew 28.19.

34. Basil, Adversus Eunomium, Book iii. 5-6; pp. 392-394.

against Eunomius' thesis which seeks to deduce the position of the Son and the Holy Spirit from Their nature. In the process of his argument against the Arian's subordination of the Holy Spirit, Basil employs at least three basic arguments: (a) The names and works accredited to the Paraclete in Holy Scripture all prove that He shares the same essence as the Father and the Son. (b) The tradition of the Church is to baptise only in "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Chost." This practice, based upon the evidence of Scripture, proves that the Church has always regarded the Paraclete as having equal dignity with the Father and the Son. (c) In all this, however, the definite limits of human knowledge must also be freely acknowledged. Beyond this point faith reigns supreme.

CHAPTER FOUR

Basil's Debate with Eustathius of Sebaste,
the Pneumatomachian.

When Basil was made responsible for the See of Caesarea, he was called upon to defend the true faith against the schismatic Eustathius of Sebaste. This debate was a particularly painful one for both of them, because strong theological opinions had now marred their previous friendship.

Although time and space do not allow us to examine this association in anything like the detail it could demand of us, we feel the following remarks are necessary for a proper understanding of the chapter.

1. The Reasons for Eustathius' Rejection of the Orthodox Position.

Especially in his earlier years, Eustathius of Sebaste interested himself in the organisation of the monastic movement in certain provinces of Asia Minor. Indeed, it was he who introduced it into Cappadocia and Pontus. When Basil visited the monastic settlements in Syria and Egypt in the year 357, he was profoundly impressed by their example. On his return, Eustathius is said to have considerably assisted him in the establishment of his Rule. A close bond of friendship was thus established between them. But some years later, when Eustathius had accepted Homoeanism, this close association rapidly deteriorated until finally it no longer existed. Basil, in two letters,¹ gives his own reason for it. From now onwards Eustathius, soon to become the acknowledged leader of Macedonianism in Asia Minor, became one of the foremost opponents of the orthodox faith.

The fundamental reason for Eustathius' fight against the orthodox faith was because he opposed the full deity of the Spirit. He subordinated the Holy Spirit to the Son in exactly the same way as Arius and Eunomius had made the Son posterior to the Father. In effect, he became a member of the faction known as the "Macedonians" or the "Pneumatomachians". Their history really begins with the triumph of Homoeanism at

1. See Basil, Epistles, ccxiii, ccxxvi. Gwatkin makes the following helpful suggestion - Eustathius' drift toward Subordinationism began from a neutral position in the year 364 and ended with him becoming its champion in 377. H.M. Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, Cambridge, 1911; p. 277.

Constantinople in 360. Soon afterwards, Macedonius became increasingly prominent with his teaching that the Holy Spirit was only a ministering spirit who did not differ from angels except in degree.² Soon several other semi-Arians, among whom we note Eleusius of Cyzicus and Eustathius of Sebaste, joined with him. We cannot really tell for certain how far Macedonius, after whom the party was named, professed their doctrine, but some association does seem apparent.³ In later years they were condemned by Damasus (374), and their teaching was repeatedly attacked by the three Cappadocians. Macedonianism reached its full development in the year 380. At that time, it contained a more conservative section which, while rejecting the divinity of the Holy Spirit, accepted the consubstantiality of the Son, and also a radical party, which repudiated the consubstantiality of both the Son and the Holy Spirit. The faction finally disappeared during the reign of Theodosius.

2. Basil's Reply to Eustathius as set out in his "De Spiritu Sancto".

In a recent noteworthy essay,⁴ Dr. H. Dorries contends that much of the contents of Basil's treatise "De Spiritu Sancto" is based upon a discussion between these two men in 372. A most careful and delicate examination of the evidence then follows. Since his findings are of the utmost importance for us, we shall now set out his main arguments.

Having presented the disputant's seventeen objections to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Dr. Dorries then suggests that it fits rather neatly

2. Athanasius, Tomus ad Antiochenos, Sections 5-7. Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers (Second Series), Vol. iv; pp. 484-485.
3. See F.L. Cross, Pneumatomachi, in Dictionary of the Christian Church, 1957; p. 1086.
4. H. Dorries, De Spiritu Sancto, Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philol-histor. Kl., lll. F., 39). Göttingen, 1956; pp. 81-90.

into the framework of Basil's monograph. If it were otherwise, of course, we would gather that Basil was examining his opponent's work and extracting those statements offensive to his own beliefs. In "De Spiritu Sancto", however, the opponent voices his misgivings and objections to specific remarks of the author, which he could not have previously known. This point suggests two conclusions: Firstly, we may assume that Basil made these objections as a stylistic device to enliven his own exposition. This suggestion must be rejected on the grounds that both the conviction and personal manner in which the objections are made, suggest a theological commitment which the Metropolitan of Caesarea could not possibly have supported. Moreover, all the arguments are subjected to an examination by the author which not only answers their contents, but also meets the form and even the tone with which they are put forward. For these reasons, we must reject the conclusion that Basil used these objections as a stylistic device in order to give some sharpness to his treatment of the subject. Secondly, we may also conclude that a genuine dispute preceded this treatise. Such an opinion certainly allows the adversary to voice his doubts and misgivings in detail, so that he can test the real strength of the author's arguments against him, and, further, permit the author to explain his own opinion in the most appropriate and orderly manner possible. This opinion is further supported by the fact that in ancient times, such an important discussion would require the presence of shorthand writers. These would record the discussion in detail. Assuming this point to be the correct one, we may conclude that Basil had his own copy of these shorthand notes and would use them when writing his treatise.

So far, however, the disputant has not actually been identified. In this respect, two pieces of evidence prove most helpful. Aetius' name, mentioned near the beginning, indicates that this doctrine had some association with him. Moreover, Basil repeatedly exhibits the Arian consequences of his disputant's arguments. These two factors force us to conclude that the Bishop of Caesarea's disputant belonged to some Arian group; possibly he was a Pneumatomachian. Among the list of names of Pneumatomachians who fit the clues presented in "De Spiritu Sancto", Eustathius of Sebaste appears to be the most likely. As Dr. Dorries says: "Mentioned or not, Basil is confronting him in his mind, and nothing is nearer the truth than the assumption that he was the adversary in the dispute with Basil."

Our knowledge of Eustathius of Sebaste confirms this conclusion. After Nicopolis, he made every effort to isolate himself from any possible meetings. But before that, Basil had visited his controversial and erstwhile friend in his diocese, and there a lengthy theological discussion took place. In view of the fact that some of the decisions now reached appear both in "De Spiritu Sancto" and the "Tome of Nicopolis", we cannot do anything else but conclude that the proceedings had been taken down in shorthand.

Our verification of Basil's disputant may be still further supported by considering how he characterises himself in the monograph. We note:

(a) Throughout the treatise the disputant endeavours to be honest to himself. Although on a few occasions he does try to adopt an approach alien on his own way of thinking, he generally remains throughout the conversation consistently negative. (b) The middle path aimed at with one of his interjections is most typical, since he wishes to accord as

much as possible to the Holy Spirit without actually admitting His divinity. (c) He has close and strong ties with the Bible, and his references to ecclesiastical edicts or their absence, is worthy of notice. (d) We gain the impression that the opponent, having had to repeatedly give way already, decides to forego further discussion with Basil.

None of these traits contradicts any part of our knowledge of Eustathius of Sebaste, and no other person in Basil of Caesarea's environment fits better. If our identification of Basil's disputant is correct, it must be of great value to hear him speak for himself. Thus far, Eustathius is only known to us through his sparse and polemic works and descriptions of others. His signature under confessions he did not write, and the very uncertain part he played in the original framing of Basil's Short Rules, do not lift him out of the silence surrounding him. Only now, if our assumption is correct, can we hear his voice again.

Dr. Dorries continues his investigation by examining the manner in which Basil of Caesarea deals with his opponent and his circle. His reproaches are certainly strong enough. The "unjustly famous gnosis" the "new" or "strange" wisdom (C.xvii.4) is "wisdom of the world", which attacks faith and the wholesome teaching with "Sophism" (C.xi.27) and "Enticing speeches", etc. Yet basically, it is not a rational interest which is being pursued, and this irrationality makes the discussion more difficult. Clearly, anger and passion cloud the thoughts of Eustathius of Sebaste.

Basil's opponent and his circle, moreover, are evidently more at home in their insistence upon Holy Writ. Repeatedly they demand proof from the Bible, and are more intent on giving precedence to Scripture than to apostolic tradition or the attestation of the Fathers. Although the

witness of the Bible appears to be a hopeful way of convincing Eustathius and his circle of their errors, Basil is not actually able to bring this about.

A cross-checking of this theory is offered through an examination of the document which can be traced back to the dispute at Sebaste, that is, the "Tome of Nicopolis". If we assume that the protocol of Sebaste found its way into both "De Spiritu Sancto" and the "Tome of Nicopolis", there should really be similarities between them. Bearing in mind the different purposes for which each document was written, we do find a degree of agreement which would support the present theory. It especially merits attention that the common factors are most apparent where both, "De Spiritu Sancto" and the "Tome of Nicopolis", coincide in the same rejection of the opponent's statements and concepts; whereas the treatise, in its own teaching and content, shows a much wider and richer range.

In the light of all this evidence, Dr. Dorries rightly concludes that we can no longer doubt that the work emanating from an inward rejection of the Pneumatomachian theories, goes back to a conversation held between Basil of Caesarea and his opponent in the treatise "De Spiritu Sancto", that is, Eustathius of Sebaste.

This monograph in which Basil masterfully deals with the divinity of the Holy Spirit, was written in the year 375. Amphilocius, the first cousin of Gregory Nazianzen and the spiritual brother of the Bishop of Caesarea, had on the previous year paid the first of his annual visits to that city. While he was there, he urged the Bishop to clear up all doubt regarding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Basil complied and, having completed his work, dedicated it to Amphilocius.⁵ Six years later, Ambrose used this work as a source for his own work on the subject. In this way, many of Basil's ideas quickly reached the West.

5. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C.1, N.P.N.F.; p.2.

In view of the great weight of evidence which Dr. Dorries has brought forward to support his theory that chapters 10-27 of "De Spiritu Sancto" are mainly based upon the proceedings of the theological conference between Basil of Caesarea and Eustathius of Sebaste, we shall endeavour, in our adumbration of the conflict, to allow each man to speak for himself.

A study of these seventeen chapters reveals that Basil was called upon to counter at least ten objections to the orthodox belief that the Son and the Holy Spirit were consubstantial with the Father.

Eustathius begins by asking, "Is it not permissible for the Holy Spirit to be ranked with the Father and the Son, on account of the difference of His nature and the inferiority of His dignity?"

Basil immediately counters by quoting the words of our Lord in which He gave His own disciples the task of world mission in the names of the three divine Persons. He then goes on to say - if our Lord did not here hesitate to bring together the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, it follows that Eustathius' argument and practice openly withstands the command of our Lord. Moreover, if Eustathius should deny that this verse reveals a fellowship between the divine Persons, let him tell us what other or more intimate association exists?

Basil now moves on to his second attack. Our Lord, he says, has given His Church the task of defending the true faith. Among the many basic truths which orthodoxy holds as essential to saving faith, is the belief that the Holy Spirit is to be ranked with the Father, through the Son. This truth is made especially clear in baptism, which is a Sacrament performed in the name of the Trinity. Therefore, Eustathius' position forces us to deny both the Scriptural formula and the practice of the Church. 6.

6. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C.10-11, N.P.N.F.; pp. 16-18.

Eustathius then points out that frequently Holy Scripture omits the name of both the Father and the Holy Spirit when speaking about baptism.

True though this may be, Basil says, we must be careful not to jump to wrong conclusions. The naming of Christ, in his opinion, is the confession of the whole Godhead; because it reveals "the love of God who gave, the obedience of the Son who received, and the power of the Holy Spirit who endues". Although Holy Scripture may sometimes speak of the Holy Spirit alone in connection with baptism, we must not assume that the Sacrament is valid only when the one name is invoked. Basil insists that regeneration involves the following pattern - "first comes the confession, introducing us to salvation, and baptism follows, setting the seal upon our assent." In other words, baptism is established through faith, and faith is perfected through baptism. To profane the baptismal formula, as does Eustathius with his teaching that the Holy Spirit is not of the same essence as the Father and Son, is to detract from God's Word and justly to incur His wrath. ⁷.

Basil's adversary jumps to his own defence with the remark - "other creatures mentioned with the Father and the Son are not always glorified with them".

Despite the fact that this point hardly justifies comment, Basil nevertheless gives some attention to it. If man, the sinner, is to be made free and called the son of God, it can only be accomplished by one who has acquired a real relationship with God and with man. A distinction is then drawn between the Spirit, the Lord of Life, and the angels who are God's faithful witnesses of truth. Paul is not alone in calling upon these heavenly observers to behold all that is being accomplished in the name of Christ. On the Last Day, these faithful

7. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C.12, N.P.N.F.; p.18.

witnesses will be called upon to support each man's claim for Christ's word of praise. But the Holy Spirit is not to be regarded in this way. He, unlike those ministering angels, is assigned an equality with the Father. Therefore, while Eustathius may be correct in raising this point, he has no evidence to support his inference that the Holy Spirit is only like the angels of heaven. On the contrary, because the Holy Spirit is of the same essence as both the Father and the Son, the same reverence and glory must be given to Him as is accorded to the remaining two Persons of the Trinity. ⁸.

Eustathius is not easily shaken or distracted. He again attacks Basil - what about baptism into other than the Father, Son and Holy Spirit? Are they similarly glorified?

Reference is here being made to St. Paul's words which talk about baptism "into Moses in the cloud and in the sea". ⁹. Basil's answer is that faith in the Spirit is the same as faith in the Father and the Son. The same can also be said about baptism. The passage to which Eustathius is referring must be interpreted typologically. Basil insists that the Old Testament reference must also be treated as such. Moses did not know Christ or his baptism. We are therefore required to interpret this passage in the light of that fact, that is anticipatory. And this is only another way of saying that the reference is a "type" of the true baptism in Christ.

Does this mean, Eustathius enquires, that because these people were only typically baptised into Moses, the grace of baptism was proportionately smaller than baptism into the three Persons of the Godhead? The assumption is rejected outright by the Bishop of Caesarea. If he were to

8. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 13, N.P.N.F.; p. 18-19.

9. I Cor. 10.2.

accept this conclusion, it would mean that the love of God in Christ, the efficacious sacrifice of our Lord upon the Cross, and the Resurrection, would all be reduced in significance simply because it had been prefigured in the Old Testament. If Eustathius will examine this passage of Scripture, without bias, he will quickly see the great difference between Christian baptism and "baptism into Moses". This kind of specious argument reveals that Eustathius does not see the wisdom of God through the ages. God deemed it necessary, Basil reminds his opponent, to "use this gentle treatment" which gradually accustoms us to see first the meaning of the "type", before we graduate to the "wisdom hidden in mystery".¹⁰

The contest continues: Do we give to the water into which we are baptised the same honour and glory as we grant to the Father and the Son?

The purpose of God's dispensation of grace, says Basil, is to recall man to fellowship with Himself. But so that this can be accomplished, the imitation of Christ is necessary. This truth is both symbolically expressed and fully actualised in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. In the rite two points are particularly stressed - Firstly, it is necessary that the continuity of the old life be severed once and for all. This takes place in the "new birth". Without this radical re-orientation of a man's life, the second stage cannot even begin. Secondly, in baptism we signify the renewal of our life by the Spirit of God. Therefore, the grace that is present within the Sacrament does not depend upon the water used, but upon the presence of the Holy Spirit. And this is the divine Person whom Eustathius wishes to subordinate to a lesser being!

One exception exists to what has already been said - that is, martyrdom. Basil is of the opinion that martyrs need "none of the outward

10. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 14, N.P.N.F.; pp. 19-21.

signs of water for their salvation, because they were baptised in their own blood." 11.

Eustathius now asks the Bishop of Caesarea to comment on the question which appears to lie at the very heart of the whole controversy - is the Holy Spirit inseparable and wholly incapable of being parted from the Father and the Son?

In reply to this important query, evidence is brought forward from Holy Scripture. Basing his argument upon the words of St. Paul - "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit" 12. - he proceeds as follows: Let us first think about the creation of all things. The Father is the original cause of all things that are made; the Son is the creative cause, and the Holy Spirit is the perfecting cause. But, having said this, no one should imagine that there were either three original hypostases or an imperfection within the operation of the Godhead. Basil would seem to be saying here, that while there was a unity within the Godhead, expressed in the desire to create, there was also a diversity of operation. To put it in the same terms as the text with which Basil began this exposition: A diversity of creative operation (hypostases) exists within the Godhead, but there is the same unifying urge (ousia) to create. In this way, he labours to make clear the ideas regarding his dictum: "one essence in three hypostases."

Having established this broad principle, he now turns to Holy Scripture in order to support the proposition that, while the Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and Son, He has a different mode of operation. In the Old Testament, Basil cites the words of the Seraphim in Isaiah 6 - "Holy, Holy, Holy" - and asks, if they had not been

11. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 15, N.P.N.F.; pp. 21-23.

12. 1. Cor. 12.4.

taught by the Spirit how would the angels know when to praise the Creator of all things? He, therefore, holds that all the angels and multitude of the heaven praise God through the assistance of the Spirit.

It is also his opinion that the New Testament produces the same evidence. The life and teaching of Jesus Christ and the ordering of the Church are also claimed to have been made effective through the Holy Spirit. Thus the Spirit was the perfecting principle in all these things.

But the final, and Basil regards it to be the greatest, proof of the consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Father and Son, lies in the fact of the Christian growing more and more into the likeness of Christ. This experience is clearly attributable to the perfecting Spirit. And on this point he concludes his treatment of Eustathius' most searching enquiry. ^{13.}

Another crucial question is asked by Eustathius of Sebaste: Should the Holy Spirit be numbered with the Father and the Son?

At this point, Eustathius introduces a piece of Aristotelian philosophy which is known under the title - "The Doctrine of Predicables". ^{14.}

Basil immediately asserts that he anticipates some difficulty in applying this theory to the three Persons of the Trinity. But the question has been asked, therefore he must endeavour to answer it.

He begins by stating his understanding of the theory - it holds that while some nouns are common, others are specific. For example: the word human is more specific than animal, and the word man is much more specific than human, etc. But, he continues, does this mean the division of the common into its subordinate parts? If so, the theory cannot really be

13. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 16, N.P.N.F.; pp. 23-26.

14. This theory offers a set of distinctions by which general names are classified by the class to which they belong. The five classes are: a genus, a species, a differentia, a proprium, and an accidens.

regarded as a valuable tool for expounding the true nature of the Godhead. To suggest that the God of the universe is divided into several subordinate parts, is unmitigated blasphemy. Moreover, accepting that this understanding of the theory is correct, it can be used against Eustathius himself. If, as Basil has already proposed, this theory means that the common term is to be divided into its subordinate parts, Eustathius' theological position is greatly endangered. Put it this way: The subordinate parts must surely possess the essential quality of the common term. When applied to the three Persons of the Trinity, it means that the Holy Spirit, whom Eustathius wishes to subordinate to the Father and Son, is of the same essence as Father and Son. Basil has no argument with his disputant on this point, although he is sure this is not really what he wishes to say.

A closer examination of this subordinationist's position now takes place. Eustathius claims that "connumeration" is appropriate to subjects of equal dignity, and "subnumeration" to those which vary in inferiority. In other words, Basil remarks, he is now saying that subnumeration introduces inferiority. But what about two coins which have the same value, which of them is to be subnumerated to the other? If they are taken separately, they are regarded as having an equality of value, but if they are considered together, we make their value one by numbering them one with another. Does Eustathius therefore mean that both the Son and the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit alone, is to be subnumerated to the Father? The former thesis manifestly introduces the impious doctrine of strict Arianism, which Basil has already refuted elsewhere. If, however, he applies this speculation to the Holy Spirit alone, he must bear in mind that the Holy Spirit is always related to the Son in exactly the same way

as the Son is associated with the Father. At the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, for example, we are baptised into "the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost". These words clearly reveal a unity of essence within the Godhead. When this co-ordination exists, what really is the point of talking about "connumeration" and "subnumeration"? What object, animate or inanimate, has ever lost its own essence by being numbered? Surely the case is this - while we may use numeration to facilitate our descriptive and perceptive powers, the essence of the object in question remains unaffected. It does not follow that, because we have designed the concept of numerality for our own convenience, we have thereby altered the nature of the thing being discussed. Therefore, if no other object admits subnumeration, how can Eustathius honestly apply it to the Spirit? The theory does a great injustice to both the words of our Lord and the theology of the Church. When Christ delivered the baptismal formula, He did not introduce thereby the inferiority implied by the theory of 'subnumeration'.

Basil of Caesarea's concept of the relationship within the Godhead may be expressed thus: "one essence in three hypostasis". But this does not mean that he wishes to imply a plurality of Gods. As in a work of art the likeness of the subject depends upon the form given, so is it with the orthodox concept of the Trinity - the community of the Godhead rests upon the communion of the Godhead.

This argument closes with the charge: "they who support their subnumeration by talking of first and second and third ought to be informed that into the undefiled theology of Christians they are importing the polytheism of heathen error." ¹⁵.

15. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 17-18, N.P.N.F.; pp. 26-30.

Basil's disputant retorts: But surely our glory of the Holy Spirit does not require us to include it specifically in our doxologies?

The defender of orthodoxy calls attention to the magnitude of the Spirit's operations. An examination of this point will clearly show that the titles accorded to Him are derived from His natural and close relationship with the Father and the Son.^{16.} Therefore all that belongs to the Father and the Son, eternal consubstantiality, also belongs to the Holy Spirit. His intimate association with the Son, for example, may be put this way: through Him, our Lord worked miracles, forgave sins and created the bond of fellowship between God and man. Since this evidence shows that the Spirit is not inferior to the Father or the Son, we ought also to accord to the third Person of the Trinity the same glory as we offer to the other two Persons of the blessed Godhead.^{17.}

Eustathius asks: Is not the Spirit a free agent?

Basil now begins to despair at the "terrible insensibility and pitiable audacity" of his opponent. Eustathius is obviously insulting the doctrines pertaining to the divine Nature by his strict application of human analogies. This question presupposes that if a negative reply is given, a state of bondage, slavery, can then be deduced. But slavery and poverty are entirely due to man's inhumanity to man. When they do not exist, freedom abounds. But man, within that free condition, is still utterly dependant upon God, his Maker and Preserver. To conclude from this that the Spirit is also similarly dependant is utter nonsense. Holy Scripture fails to support this hypothesis.^{18.} Therefore, how can

16. See John 4.24; John 14.16; etc.

17. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 19, N.P.N.F.; pp. 30-32.

18. See 1 Thess. 3.12-13. Basil suggests that the Holy Spirit is the subject of this benediction. Also refer to 2 Cor. 3.17.

Eustathius, who regards the Bible as the inspired Wisdom of God, use the language of one who insults and belittles it? All men ought to give to the Spirit the glory of which He is worthy. 19.

The disputant finally asks: How is it that Scripture nowhere describes the Spirit as glorified together with the Father and the Son, but carefully avoids the use of the expression "with the Spirit", while it everywhere prefers to ascribe glory "in Him" as being the more suitable phrase?

The words "in" or "by", Basil reminds him, does not imply a lower dignity than the word "with". On the contrary, rightly understood it leads to the highest possible meaning. It would seem to Basil that the following doxology comes naturally to the lips of Eustathius: "To Thee, O Father, be honour and glory, through Thy only-begotten Son, 'by' or 'in' the Holy Ghost." But if Eustathius insists upon Basil conforming to the words of Holy Writ, then let him cite his Biblical authority for this doxology. He cannot, for Scripture nowhere brings these clauses together in an ascription of glory and praise. If, however, he makes a concession for this point, he ought also to make an allowance for Basil's doxology.

It now remains for the Metropolitan of Caesarea to trace the origin of the word "with"; to show what force it has, and to underline the fact that its use is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture. His argument proceeds as follows: The general beliefs and practices of the Church come from two main sources - namely, (a) From written teaching; (b) From the tradition of the Apostles. Each of these two departments carries the same authority for the Bishop of Caesarea. If therefore we endeavour to minimise those customs which have no written authority, on the ground that

19. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 20-24, N.P.N.F.; pp. 32-36.

they possess less significance, we would unintentionally deal a severe body-blow to the Gospel. For instance, consider the serious harm that would be inflicted upon the Holy Gospel if we did not sign with the sign of the cross when communicating with those who belong to the Church, or did not face toward the East at prayer, or offer the words of invocation at the displaying of the wine and bread at the Eucharist. These ancient and revered practices come not from Holy Scripture, but from the "unwritten teachings"²⁰ of the Apostles. Moreover, on the same basis, we bless the water of baptism and the oil of chrism.²¹ Where does the practice of a three fold immersion come from? They come from these "unpublished and secret teachings". But why should they be secret? For the simple reason that the Fathers of the Church learned from bitter experience that the dignity of the mysteries are best preserved in silence. What the mind does not know or the eye see, the lips will not repeat. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that a great distinction

20. For a fuller treatment see Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta's monograph: The Unwritten and Secret Apostolic Traditions in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea. S.J.T. (Occasional Paper No. 13) Oliver and Boyd 1965. pp. 39-59.

21. Immediately after Baptism, an Orthodox child is "chrismated" or "confirmed". The priest now anoints various parts of the child's body, marking them with the sign of the cross: first the forehead, then the eyes, nostrils, mouth and ears, the breast, the hands and the feet. As he marks each, he says: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit". Now the child, who has already been incorporated into Christ at Baptism, receives the gift of the Spirit, thereby allowing him to become a full member of the Church.

they possess less significance, we would unintentionally deal a severe body-blow to the Gospel. For instance, consider the serious harm that would be inflicted upon the Holy Gospel if we did not sign with the sign of the cross when communicating with those who belong to the Church, or did not face toward the East at prayer, or offer the words of invocation at the displaying of the wine and bread at the Eucharist. These ancient and revered practices come not from Holy Scripture, but from the "unwritten teachings"²⁰ of the Apostles. Moreover, on the same basis, we bless the water of baptism and the oil of chrism.²¹ Where does the practice of a three fold immersion come from? They come from these "unpublished and secret teachings". But why should they be secret? For the simple reason that the Fathers of the Church learned from bitter experience that the dignity of the mysteries are best preserved in silence. What the mind does not know or the eye see, the lips will not repeat. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that a great distinction

20. For a fuller treatment see Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta's monograph: The Unwritten and Secret Apostolic Traditions in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea. S.J.T. (Occasional Paper No. 13) Oliver and Boyd 1965. pp. 39-59.

21. Immediately after Baptism, an Orthodox child is "chrismated" or "confirmed". The priest now anoints various parts of the child's body, marking them with the sign of the cross: first the forehead, then the eyes, nostrils, mouth and ears, the breast, the hands and the feet. As he marks each, he says: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit". Now the child, who has already been incorporated into Christ at Baptism, receives the gift of the Spirit, thereby allowing him to become a full member of the Church.

exists between "Dogma" and "Kerygma".^{22.} Put simply, the former is kept in silence; the latter is proclaimed to the world.

Basil now concludes, having enumerated other practices held dear to the Church and for which there is no written authority, by asking what is the written source for the confession of faith in Father, Son and Holy Spirit? He replies that if it be granted that we were baptised into the name of the three Persons of the Trinity, so also we must confess our belief in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Consistency is the least that we can offer to our God and fellow-men. Furthermore, if Eustathius rejects the Basilian doxology on the ground that it lacks written authority, let him give the written evidence for the confession of faith which he would substitute, as also for the practices of the Church which have been enumerated in this chapter. Since he is unable to supply this evidence, let him remain silent and return to the true faith of the Fathers.^{23.}

Before we conclude this examination, a few words must be said about:

(a) Basil's main contribution to the defence of the consubstantiality of the Son and Holy Spirit; and (b) What factors contributed to the settlement of the Council of Constantinople in 381.

22. Dr. Amand de Mendieta closely examines the Basilian use of these two terms in an essay called: The Pair Kerygma and Dogma in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea. It is to be found in the J.T.S. April, 1965, pp. 129-142. The following is the main argument, as the words are used in "De Spiritu Sancto". Basil was in the habit of reserving "Kerygma" for the public teaching of the Church. In this treatise, and in some letters, he uses the word to cover those doctrines and customs which are publicly proclaimed and practiced. He applies kerygma to the Nicene symbol (homousios), but not to the divine Monarchy. The word "Dogma", on the other hand, is reserved for the initiated Christian. But two distinctions must here be made: (a) The term is used as being almost synonymous with the whole structure of liturgical and sacramental life. (b) It is also used to indicate the theological significance of the Church's liturgical prayers and customs. The formulation of these distinctions is suggested by the author to be based upon Basil's own experience.

23. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, C. 25-27, N.P.N.F.; pp. 36-43.

(a) Basil's main contribution may be said to centre around one profound idea which he succeeded to impress for ever upon Christian theology - namely, there is a tremendous difference between a unity which is real and one that is only numerical. If monotheism merely means that God is one in number, then little is to be gained in its defence. Basil argued, however, that God is one in simpliciter. He refuses to apply the idea of number to the Deity, for this implies a limitation which does not actually exist. It is his candid opinion that the one essence of God is expressed in three modes of operation, that is, in three hypostasis. If one says that it is foolish to make this assertion, Basil replies that it is equally foolish to say, as did Arius and Eunomius, that God is one in number. On this basis he could say: "Thus there is both acknowledgement of the hypostasis and the true dogma of the Monarchy is not lost".

Basil's invaluable contribution to the defence of the orthodox faith was quickly recognised. In the year 376, the Bishop of Iconium, Amphilocius, presided at a Synod where the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity was laid down exactly as Basil had propounded it in this treatise. Indeed, this very work was at that time formally sanctioned and confirmed by a Synod in Cappadocia.

(b) The final settlement of this question in 381 was not achieved without further work being done by the two Gregories and Epiphanius.

Gregory Nazianzen was satisfied in his thinking with the Johannine statement that the Spirit "proceeds" from the Father. He, however, failed to indicate what he regarded this oblique word to mean.

It was Gregory of Nyssa who was to provide a definite statement. He taught that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son. It is now a very short step to the idea of the twofold procession of the

Spirit. He regards the three Persons of the Trinity to be distinguishable by Their origin: the Father being cause ($\tau\omicron \alpha\lambda\tau\iota\omicron\nu$) and the other two caused ($\tau\omicron \alpha\lambda\tau\iota\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$). A further step had now to be taken. From this it could be concluded that the Son was directly produced by the Father, and the Spirit proceeded from Him through the Son. In this way, Gregory of Nyssa preserves the unique relation of both Son and Holy Spirit to the Father. From now onwards the regular teaching of the Eastern Church is that the procession of the Spirit is "out of" the Father and "through" the Son.

Epiphanius took a further step forward by omitting the crucial preposition "through". It was his opinion that the Spirit is "not begotten, not created, not fellow-brother nor brother to the Father but out of the same substance of the Father and the Son". While it is true that shades of this concept had already appeared in both Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea, it was Epiphanius who gave it a logical form.

The climax of all these developments took place at the Council of Constantinople in 381. It was at this point that the Church formally declared its belief in the consubstantiality of both the Son and the Holy Ghost. The Constantinopolitan Creed shows an improvement upon the Nicene, both in its omission of the anathema at the conclusion, and in its addition of the articles concerning the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the way of salvation. This Creed, the Constantinopolitan, maintained itself for a time alongside the Nicene, but after the Council of Chalcedon in 451, where it was formally adopted for the first time, it gradually displaced the earlier statement of faith.

The Latin Church adopted and improved the Nicene symbol from the Greek, but admitted, in the article on the Holy Spirit, the further addition of the well-known "Filioque", which was first inserted at the Council of Toledo in 580, and subsequently gave rise to many bitter disputes between the two main branches of the Church.

CHAPTER FIVE

Basil's Case against Apollinaris the Younger.

As a result of the Arian controversy, the Church was able to pronounce a clearly defined concept of the Trinity at the Council of Constantinople in 381. Basing itself upon the irrefragable evidence of the Christian experience, the Council posited one Supreme Being who eternally existed and who manifested Himself in three modes of existence - namely, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Moreover, the Council was careful to note that, while these three modes of existence were capable of being distinguished both in human thought and experience, when taken together, they formed One Godhead. We may therefore conclude that, to date, the Church had especially given her attention to resolving problems concerned with the nature and essence of the Trinity.

Other movements must also be noted. In this connection, we must pause to examine the emphasis of both the Alexandrian and the Antiochian schools of theology. The former, with its characteristic speculative and mystical turn, favoured such a close connection between the humanity and divinity of Christ that it was in danger of mixing the one with the other. The latter school, in which the sober intellect prevailed, inclined to the opposite extreme with its abstract separation of the two natures. Thus, in both cases, the mystery of the Incarnation was either weakened or altered.

In opposition to both of these extremes, the Church now had to assert the personal unity and distinction of the two natures of Christ with equal zeal and precision. This she did through the Christological controversies which agitated the Church for more than two hundred years. Throughout this period, five controversies may be specifically named: Apollinarianism; Nestorianism; Eutychianism; Monophysitism; and Monothelitism. The task of this chapter, however, is merely to restrict our attention to the first of these five heresies - namely, Apollinarianism.

In the treatment that follows, we shall be examining Apollinaris' rise to notoriety from the point of view of another outstanding contemporary theologian - Basil of Caesarea. Apollinaris' father, after whom he was named, was born at Alexandria. After leaving his native town, he settled at Berytus as a schoolmaster, and thereafter moved up the coast of Syria to Laodicea. Here he was married; ordained a priest; and begot his famous son about the same time as Constantine issued his Edict of Milan - that is, in the year 313. Sozomen records an interesting incident which took place in Apollinaris' early years.¹ When Apollinaris the younger was about twenty years of age, he went with his father to lectures given by Epiphanius. During the course of these lectures Epiphanius recited a hymn in honour of Bacchus. This incident soon came to the ears of Theodotus, Bishop of Laodicea, who decided that, although laymen might attend such performances without harm, it was intolerable that the clergy should do so. Apollinaris, of course, had already been admitted to the order of Readers. Both father and son were then suspended from communion until after a period of penance.

This story is important for two reasons: (a) It furnishes us with a clue to the date of Apollinaris' birth;² and (b) It illustrates the broad basis on which, under his father's care, the young cleric was being educated. Apollinaris was again excommunicated by another Bishop in 346, but for a reason entirely praiseworthy to his orthodoxy. Athanasius, as he made his way back to Alexandria from exile in the West, paused for a

1. Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Bagster, 1846; Book vi. 25; pp. 287-290.

2. Theodotus died in 335. Since he must have restored the penitents before his death, the event could not have happened before 333. Readers were usually young men of not less than eighteen years of age. We therefore conclude that Apollinaris was born between 312 and 315. This conclusion accords well with other indications of his age.

brief rest at Laodicea. The Bishop of the city, George by name, was a staunch Arian. No communion could possibly be held between them. Apollinaris, however, who had by this time been made a priest, received Athanasius to communion and was excommunicated by his Bishop in consequence. Notwithstanding many petitions, Bishop George never actually readmitted him. This meeting is important in so far as it initiated a lifelong friendship which was of the greatest importance to the future heresiarch. We know of no other occasion on which the two actually met,^{3.} but there is clear evidence of an intimacy and of a regularity of correspondence between them.^{4.}

Until Bishop George's removal from the throne of Laodicea in 360, we hear nothing of Apollinaris. He did, however, continue his championship of the Nicene cause. We do know that Athanasius sent him a copy of his letter to Epictetus, Bishop of Corinth, in which a variety of rather speculative opinions about the Person of Christ were refuted. Dr. Raven dates this incident around the year 360.^{5.} Apollinaris appears to have been consecrated Bishop about this time, and we justly presume for the orthodox congregation of his native city, for he is called Bishop in the record of his sending formal representatives to the Council of Alexandria in 362. To this same period must be assigned the four famous and highly controversial letters in which Basil of Caesarea asked, and Apollinaris

3. Dr. Raven notes that Draseke, on the evidence of the Pseudo-Justin *Λόγος Παρηνετικός*, which he regards as having been written by Apollinaris, assumes that he visited Alexandria frequently. See C.E. Raven, Apollinarianism, Cambridge, 1923; p. 130, n.4.
4. Sozomen preserves for us Apollinaris' account of the summons to Athanasius by Alexander on his deathbed. This intimate detail certainly implies close acquaintance. See Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book 11.17; Bagster, 1846; pp. 70-72.
5. Dr. Raven sets out a number of good reasons for dating the "Ad Epictetum", one of a group of three letters, and this particular incident to about the year 360. See, C.E. Raven, Apollinarianism; pp. 103-109.

provided, advice concerning the doctrine of the Trinity. The last of the four letters was certainly written in 362.⁶

Around this period, Apollinaris and his father became involved in one of the most outstanding literary exploits ever undertaken. Julian, the Emperor, had recently issued a rescript forbidding Christians to teach the classics. He regarded it as monstrous for teachers to think one thing and to teach another. Therefore, he decreed that in the future the teaching of the pagan classics, which still continued to supply the material for an ordinary liberal education, was to be restricted only to those who were willing to believe the religious truths they contained. Thus, for the Emperor, the classics were not merely to be used as illustrations of literary and logical method, but also as vehicles of instruction about the gods. Christian parents were therefore put in the unenviable position of having to choose either to send their children to pagan schoolmasters, or to withhold them from school altogether.

Since Apollinaris and his father were both Christians and men who were willing to face this new challenge, they set about producing a collection of textbooks of which the form was classical but the substance Christian. Between them they turned the Pentateuch and the early historical narratives of the Old Testament into heroic verse. The Gospels and the Epistles of the New Testament they produced in the form of Platonic dialogues. In this way they enabled the Christian teacher to conform to the royal decree and still present the truths of Christianity. When Julian perished in the Persian campaign in 363, of course, these Christian grammars and epics lost their special utility.

6. Dr. Prestige examines the text of each of the four letters and comes to the conclusion that internal evidence supports their authenticity. See his St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea, S.P.C.K. 1956; pp. 1-37.

Jovian was now elected the new Emperor. Part of his brief eight months reign was spent in the city of Antioch, which lay about forty miles from Laodicea. It seems more than likely that the bulk of the material which Apollinaris issued in order to circumvent Julian's edict was produced as material for lectures at Antioch. Certainly, he was so employed later, for Jerome, who attended his classes there in the year 373, 7. tells us that his commentaries were set out very briefly - "resembling headings for a speech still to be expanded, rather than completed exposition". The close proximity of these two cities was probably also the reason for Apollinaris addressing to the Emperor an intensely religious confession of faith. Indeed, if the author himself was actually present at Antioch and gave a copy to Athanasius, and he carelessly filed it among his other papers, it would explain how the letter of Apollinaris to Jovian came to be associated with the name of the Bishop of Alexandria. This suggestive hypothesis of Dr. Prestige would certainly solve this problem, and also supply a good reason for Apollinarians circulating their heretical documents in the names of such respectable people as : Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Julian of Rome. 8. Be that as it may, both historians and theologians must be eternally grateful for the success of this document, for without it later generations would not possess even a brief example of Apollinaris' work.

We must now especially give our attention to Basil of Caesarea, because he was quickly involved in the controversy which took place as soon as Apollinaris' heretical teaching became known.

7. "At Antioch I frequently listened to Apollinaris of Laodicea, and attended his lectures." Jerome, Epistle, lxxxiv, N.P.N.F. (Second Series), Vol. vi; p. 176.

8. G.L. Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, S.P.C.K., 1958; p. 97.

In a letter addressed to Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, Basil acknowledges that he was being charged with holding heretical views. It would appear that the Sebastenes, after a search in some unusual quarter, had discovered a document which gave them grounds for believing that the Metropolitan of Caesarea was guilty of the same doctrinal error as Apollinaris. Some of the offensive phrases are quoted - for example, "What the Father is firstly, the Son is secondly, and the Spirit is thirdly ... And, so express the ineffable with greater point, the Father is the Son in a paternal sense, and the Son is the Father in a filial sense, and so in the case of the Spirit, in so far as the Trinity is one God." ⁹. Apollinarianism taught, of course, that, while the Son may possess perfect divinity, He lacks complete manhood. Since this conclusion may be drawn from the above quotations, it could be very serious for the Metropolitan if they were proved to have come from his lips and pen.

Soon others were voicing the same criticisms. The Archbishop seems to have been aware of this development. In a letter of the same year, 373, addressed to Olympus, he again expresses his distress at the way in which things were moving against him. For instance, he tells of a letter which had been sent to Dazinas, and which he himself had read, in which he was unworthily insulted. Moreover, the letter went on to say that evidence was forthcoming which would conclusively prove the case. At this point, Basil admits that he had indeed corresponded with Apollinaris, but, since this had taken place a good number of years ago, he was sure this was not the real basis of the charge. ¹⁰.

9. Basil, Epistle, cxxix, N.P.N.F.; pp. 197-198.

10. Basil, Epistle, cxxxi, N.P.N.F.; pp. 199.

As time passed, the rumours gradually took more solid form. Two years later, in a letter against Eustathius of Sebaste, we again discover Basil setting out the accusation as he then knew it.^{11.} Now, all his suspicions had been confirmed. The case against him was simply this: Apollinaris had been charged with holding and promoting heretical opinions. Twenty years earlier, Basil had written a letter to him. It seems that the Sebastenes had discovered this document, and had immediately come to the conclusion that Basil was Apollinaris' accomplice. The Archbishop now defendshimself by raising a number of legal points: (a) The Sebastenes and their followers would have to produce more evidence to prove that he was the actual author of the letter in their possession; (b) They would also have to prove that it was properly dated; (c) Their charge rested upon only one document, and that a very old one. It is his own opinion that the matter has been raised for political reasons. He is convinced that the letter in question has been devised by Euzoius as a pretext to explain the Arian reaction to a creed which he had proposed to them.^{12.} Since Euzoius was on very friendly terms with the Emperor, this stratagen was not impossible.

This evidence indicates that, while every effort was made to implicate Basil of Caesarea in the scandal of heresy, he rightly asked for more proof being produced by his accusers.^{13.}

11. Basil, Epistle, ccxxiii, N.P.N.F.; pp. 262-265.

12. The phrase 'present authorities' usually means the reigning Emperor, as in Epistle lxvi. Here, however, the Benedictine note has no hesitation in asserting that reference is being made to the Arian Euzoius. See also Epistle ccxxvi. 3.

13. See Epistle, ccxxiv. 2, N.P.N.F.; pp. 265-267.

Apollinaris' passage into positive heresy did not occur until he was over sixty years of age. Until that date, he had retained his reputation as a loyal supporter of the Church. Both his writing and lecturing defended the true faith. Indeed, in the year 373, Jerome attended his lectures on the Bible. Questions of doctrine, however, must have already interested him. For instance, he was deeply engrossed not only in the Arian controversy, but also in the efforts of the Nicenes to consolidate their party. It is therefore likely that the subject of Christology was now attracting his attention. Although his earliest writing on the subject falls outside this period, it does indicate that he was familiar with the subject and had already formed some preliminary opinions. It is worthy of notice that, up to this time, Apollinaris had made no intervention whatsoever in the affairs which concerned the See of Antioch.

This sad situation had originally begun with the deposition of Bishop Eusebius in the year 328. Because his immediate successors were suspected of holding heretical views, a small group, under the leadership of Paulinus, refused to recognise them. Twenty years later, Constantius convoked a Synod in Antioch with the intention of appointing a new Bishop. The choice fell upon Meletius. Although he had hitherto been associated with the semi-Arians, he now declared himself in favour of the Nicene formula. This action created considerable hostility. Indeed, a few weeks later, Meletius was deposed and replaced by Euzoius. The Church quickly repudiated the new Arian Bishop, but unfortunately split among themselves. The majority remained faithful to Meletius, but the older and more conservative Eustathians proceeded to elect Paulinus as counter-Bishop. Thus, two rival Bishops asserted independent grounds for representing the lawful succession from Eustathius. While Athanasius

and the West strongly supported Paulinus, Basil and the East endeavoured to induce the See of Rome to recognise Meletius. Around the year 375, we suddenly hear of yet another Bishop, Vitalis, whom Epiphanius unsuccessfully tried to reconcile with Paulinus. It is not surprising, therefore, that a few years later, Jerome wrote to Rome asking for an apostolic decision to be taken so that he may know with whom he ought to hold communion. Although the exact sequence of events is now difficult to disentangle, indeed it might be almost impossible, it would seem beyond any doubt that Apollinaris now broke with the Church; won over Vitalis to his own heterodox view of the Incarnation; and consecrated him as the schismatical Bishop of Antioch. This schism in fact lasted until the year 414, when Bishop Alexander succeeded in reconciling the old orthodox remnant with the successors of Meletius.

Rumours had meanwhile circulated around the East, to the effect that extremely unsound Christological opinions were gaining popularity there. Epiphanius actually attacked them in 374. A short time later, while visiting Antioch, he found things very much more serious than he had expected. Vitalis was actively engaged in spreading his own erroneous Christological opinions, and had rejected every entreaty to abandon his new theology. Later, and worst of all, it came out that the real author of these heterodox views was none other than the venerated Apollinaris. Epiphanius, who does not frequently betray kindness for those whom he considers to be holding heretical views, was profoundly shocked. He wrote to Apollinaris with deep feeling and unhappiness. He could not bring himself to believe the accusation, and suggested that his disciples were either misrepresenting him or else had wholly misunderstood the real meaning of his writings. Although Epiphanius immediately reacted in

this way, he later had to accept the fact that the respected Apollinaris had indeed forsaken the orthodox faith.

Little is known about Apollinaris' later life. He was condemned at Rome and Antioch. The Council of Constantinople in 381 also added its weight to these resolutions. Thereafter, Apollinaris, with the assistance of Vitalis, organised their faction with more thoroughness. Like Arius before them, they prepared party-songs which could be sung by their supporters wherever they went. Apollinaris then wrote a particularly painstaking treatise in vindication of his new Christology. Unfortunately, the contents of this document is now only known to us through the quotations made from it by Gregory of Nyssa. This erstwhile defender of the Nicene faith, died a heretic in the year 390.

Before we begin our investigation of Apollinaris' Christology, two points must be kept in mind: (a) As stated above, we no longer possess the treatise in which Apollinaris embodied his final views on the Person of Christ; (b) As may be expected, his critics read into his words much more than he had originally intended. Because of this, he has been unjustly charged with theories which he himself never manufactured. Nevertheless, sufficient does remain to show with some certainty just what he taught and how far these intentions carried him away from the mainstream of orthodox conviction.

Until the beginning of the present century, historians of the early Church regarded Arianism and the doctrine of the mutability of Christ, as the main point of Apollinaris' attack.¹⁴ But in 1901, G. Voisin¹⁵ came forward with a new and more adequate theory - namely, that the

14. For example, Dorner, Person of Christ, Edinburgh, 1862, Vol. 11; pp. 352-399; Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, Second Edition; pp. 250-254

15. G. Voisin, L'Apollinarisme: Etude historique litteraire et dogmatique sur le debut des Controverses Christologiques, 1901.

Antiochian school of theology was the real object of his severe criticisms. This theory has commended itself so much to Dr. Raven that he says of it: "It is an illuminating and incontrovertible discovery." ¹⁶. No doubt, like Basil of Caesarea, Apollinaris felt that Arianism had spent its force, and that the real danger to the future of the Church now came from heterodox opinions within her ranks.

Apollinarius set out his doctrine of the Incarnation as a defender of the Greek rather than the Syrian school of thought. His main aim was to repudiate the teaching of Paul of Samosata. In this respect, he was the partner of Athanasius, although he and the Cappadocians centred their attention upon Eunomius.

Dr. Raven is of the opinion that Apollinaris' criticisms of Diodore and the Antiochians was consistently the same. As an illustration, he quotes his first letter to Dionysius. Apollinaris there says: "These slaves of Paul of Samosata say that the element of heaven, which they acknowledge to be God, is totally distinct from the man from earth: they call the one uncreate, the other created ... in either case they act impiously, whether in worshipping what they call slave and creature, or in not worshipping Him who redeemed us by His own blood ... I hear they speak of two natures, although John clearly shows that the Lord is one when he said 'The Word became flesh'." ¹⁷. Many other passages could be quoted to prove his fear of the outcome of this kind of dualism. ¹⁸.

16. C.E.R. Raven, Apollinarianism, Cambridge; 1923; p. 178.

17. See C.E.R. Raven, Apollinarianism; pp. 179-180.

18. See his "Anacephalaeosis", 1,21, 29; and "Apodeixis". Illustrative quotations are to be found in Dr. Raven's book. See p. 180.

From what has just been said, it seems quite clear that Apollinaris regarded the Antiochian school as being the virtual destroyers of the orthodox doctrine which held, and still holds, that union between God and man can be accomplished only through Jesus Christ. Like Athanasius before him, he believed that there should be no belittling whatsoever of the conviction which states - that only through the Incarnation of deity can man be brought into a meaningful and lasting at-one-ment with his Maker.

It was certainly easy enough for Apollinaris to criticise Paul of Samosata and others. The real difficulty arose when theologians, beginning from the premise that God and man were opposites, endeavoured to define how reconciliation was to be finally effected between them. Having rejected the dualism which was inherent in the theology of Paul of Samosata and others, he now fashioned a theory which was intended to avoid this error.

Apollinaris' theory was based upon a psychology peculiar to himself. Mankind, he held, is endowed with three elements in his nature. Firstly, and lowest of all, we have the body (soma), the material structure through which the invisible self is expressed. Frequently the term flesh (sarx) is also applied to this material aspect of man. Secondly, we have the lower soul (psyche). Although this element is higher than the body, it is still earthly. When the term flesh (sarx) is used of the living, material body, the lower soul (psyche) is usually contrasted with it. Thirdly, and highest of all, comes the heavenly element. St. Paul calls this the spirit (pneuma), but Apollinaris regularly identifies it with the mind (nous). He regards this quality to belong to all men by nature, and not merely the element with which special people are endowed - for example, the prophets and the saints.

When Apollinaris applied this threefold understanding of man's nature to the Person of Christ, he came to a number of interesting conclusions. While he certainly attributed a human body and soul to Jesus Christ, he did not grant Him a human reason (nous). In its place, he substituted the Logos, that is, the divine Reason or Wisdom. He arrived at this conclusion because he regarded the human mind to imply a self-determining subject. This really meant that the mind of man motivated his passive flesh.¹⁹

Therefore, when the Church taught that Jesus Christ was both completely human and perfectly divine, Apollinaris was driven to the conclusion, according to his own theory, that the two self-determining impulses resident within the Person of Christ would strive against each other. In consequence, perfection or sinlessness would be wholly unattainable.

Apollinaris insisted upon defending the sinlessness of Jesus Christ. As far as he was concerned, the orthodox teaching of the Church regarding Christ led to a dualism no more acceptable than Paul of Samosata's. This is the basic point of his heresy, and his own statements leave us in no doubt whatsoever that he both realised and intended this mutilation to orthodox truth.

Let us now take another look at the position in which Basil of Caesarea found himself in the middle years of the second half of the fourth century. We have already noticed that around 373, strong efforts were being made to implicate him in heresy. By the year 375, the charge against him was this - that twenty years earlier he had corresponded with Apollinaris. Since there had been no alteration in the situation, we must keep in mind that he was still being accused of being Apollinaris'

19. The letter to his pupil, 'Ad Julian', is the most important source for a knowledge of his psychology.

accomplice.

In his letter to Patrophilius, the Bishop of Aigai, the Archbishop of Caesarea clearly states that his previous association with Apollinaris never assumed the character which would allow the present charge to stand unchallenged. Indeed, he now specifically denies having learned from or taught anything to Apollinaris, and goes on to say that even he has some accusations to lay at his door. ²⁰.

Writing to the Western Bishops in 377, Basil openly condemns Apollinaris for not drawing his theological arguments from Holy Scripture, but from human reason. The Metropolitan, moreover, points out that he has caused great confusion among the brethren concerning the doctrine of the Incarnation by directing attention toward his own works. The letter ends with Basil appealing to the West to send representatives to the East so that some peace may come to that Church. ²¹.

An interesting insight is given in a letter which Basil sent to three exiled Bishops - Eulogius, Alexander and Harpocraton. These Bishops appear to have "refused to keep silence concerning the mischief which they are causing." In order to guide both their thoughts and actions, Basil now indicates his own experience with Apollinaris. He firstly says that Apollinaris has distressed him, because at first he appeared to be on the side of the orthodox cause. He is also further grieved by his theology - "Are not his discourses about God full of impious doctrines?" and "Does he not confuse the doctrine of the Incarnation?" He therefore appeals to these three Bishops to try and bring Apollinaris back to the true faith by boldly putting before him the doctrines of orthodoxy, so

20. Basil, Epistle, ccxliv, N.P.N.F.; pp. 285-289.

21. Basil, Epistle, cclxiii, N.P.N.F.; pp. 301-303.

that he and his disciples, presumably including themselves, might repent of their error and return to God. ^{22.}

It is actually only in two letters that Basil gives us a fleeting indication of the ways in which he might have developed his argument against Apollinaris. Let us quickly look at them.

In the first letter, addressed to the Sozopolitans, he says that he knows that there are some "who are trying to destroy the saving Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ". He counters: Surely, the God who has helped His chosen people, first through the Patriarchs, and then through the Law, and finally through Jesus Christ, would never allow His promises to fail. If, as Apollinarianism taught, our Lord's sojourn upon the earth was not indicative of complete manhood, then Christ our Redeemer has died in vain and, as St. Paul said, "we are of all men most miserable". Basil, in effect, is arguing thus: If effective at-one-ment is to be established between God and man, then God must be perfectly represented to man (Christ's divinity) and man must be fully represented before God (Christ's humanity). ^{23.}

This exposition of the work of Christ is a little more thoroughly worked out in the second letter to which we must give our attention.

This missive, sent to Urbicius, especially notes that he was facing the same problems as the Sozopolitans - namely, that God in Christ did not assume, through Holy Mary, the nature of Adam, but was changed into a material nature.

Basil argues: let us take their own statement as it stands. If they say that God changed, this means that He was altered from what He had hitherto been. This surely is manifest blasphemy. Holy Scripture has

22. Basil, Epistle, cclxv, N.P.N.F.; pp. 303-305.

23. Basil, Epistle, cclxi, N.P.N.F.; pp. 299-301.

declared of Him: "I am the Lord, I change not." Moreover, in order to allow mankind to have fellowship with God, they too have to be changed. If, as this error teaches, God was changed at the Incarnation, He would thereafter possess a being wholly incapable of returning to its prior divinity. Therefore, on the basis of their own statement, mankind's hope of redemption is in vain. Apollinarianism unashamedly teaches that at the Incarnation God was changed into an ordinary and temporal man.

The letter then concludes with Basil advising Urbicius to "abstain from communion with Heretics", and it also encourages him to take steps to see that "these errors may receive ecclesiastical correction." 24.

The evidence adduced from these letters may not be as dogmatically satisfactory as on other occasions - for example, his arguments against Eunomius and Eustathius of Sebaste. Three points emerge, however, which deserve special note.

Firstly, Basil clearly rejected the charge that he had Apollinarian leanings. For instance, he specifically states in his letter to Patrophilius: "I have never learnt anything from, nor taught anything to this man whose guilt is laid at my door." 25.

Secondly, the Metropolitan of Caesarea laboured hard to maintain the discipline of the Church. Apollinarian factions were making a mockery of Church unity. Take, for instance, the case of the three Bishops who welcomed into the Church "those who endeavoured to introduce innovations in opposition to the apostolic doctrines." Basil roundly scolds them for this action. He reminds them that they do not stand alone, that they, as much as he or any other person or church, form an integral part of the Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. In accordance with this honour and

24. Basil, Epistle, cclxii, N.P.N.F.; p. 301.

25. Basil, Epistle, ccxliv.3, N.P.N.F.; pp. 285-289.

responsibility, therefore, they ought to have acted in a way that preserved the unity of the Church. ^{26.}

Lastly, Basil did suggest some counter-arguments to the doctrine of Apollinaris. To be sure, they were not as numerous or weighty as those brought against strict Arianism and Macedonianism, but they do indicate a way in which the error was to be resisted.

These three points certainly indicate a person who was not merely interested in countering heresy, but also one who was anxious to preserve the unity of the Church in the mid-seventies of the fourth century.

Opposition to Apollinarianism, of course, obliged other churchmen to consider the problems connected with an orthodox Christology. We may select, as helpful examples, the two Gregories, Amphilocius and Epiphanius.

Gregory Nazianzen taught that when the Logos became flesh, He mingled Himself with an intelligent soul, "purifying like with like". ^{27.} Therefore, in all points, except sin, He was made man. In this unity, created by their commingling, "God became man and man became God." ^{28.} We may therefore conclude that, for Gregory Nazianzen, Jesus Christ was man's Redeemer because divinity and manhood are substantially united in the God-Man.

Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, treated our Lord's human experiences much more realistically than did Gregory Nazianzen. Leaning heavily upon both Origen and the Antiochian school, he taught that the Godhead entered into and controlled Christ's manhood. Christ was treated

26. Basil, Epistle, cclxv. 2, 4, N.P.N.F.; p. 289.

27. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xxxviii. 13, N.P.N.F.; p. 349.

28. Gregory Nazianzen, Epistle, coi, N.P.N.F.; p. 439-440.

as the man who alone was controlled by divinity. According to one passage, at the Incarnation the Holy Spirit prepared the body and soul of Jesus so that it might be a worthy receptacle for His divinity. Having been thus prepared, the heavenly Son then "mingled Himself"²⁹ to become the God-Man. Gregory of Nyssa then proceeded to assert that the sufferings of Christ belonged to the human and not the divine element in the God-Man. Although Gregory would here appear to be emphasising the separation of the two natures of Christ, he did insist that the union created at the Incarnation was designed to be eternal.

The outstanding features of the Christologies of some of the leading contemporary teachers may be summarised under the three following heads: (1) Most of them agreed that Christ possessed two natures; (2) Most of them regarded His humanity to be complete and unutilated; (3) Nearly all were in agreement that at the Incarnation neither of the natures was changed into the other. For example, Epiphanius taught that Christ had a human mind which was distinct from His divinity. This, he explained, brought about Christ's physical limitations. Amphilocius also believed that Christ's divinity was consubstantial with the Father and His humanity was consubstantial with humanity. But, and here is the interesting point, he taught that the two natures of Christ coalesced into one prosopon.

29. ἀνάκρασις was Gregory of Nyssa's favourite term for 'mingling'. In its use, he regarded the Logos as active and flesh as the passive elements in the structure of the God-Man.

This brief resume of some of the Christological thinking of these four churchmen, to which we must also add our findings regarding Basil's contribution, clearly supports the late Professor Schaff's estimation: "That the two Gregories, Basil, and Epiphanius combated the Apollinarian error, but with a certain embarrassment, attacking it rather from behind and from the flank, than from the front, and unprepared to answer duly its main point, that two integral persons cannot form one person. The later orthodox doctrine surmounted this difficulty by teaching the impersonality of the human nature of Christ, and by making the personality of Christ to reside wholly in the Logos." ³⁰.

30. P. Schaff, History of the Christian Church, 1886, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Vol. III; p. 713.

CHAPTER SIX

Basil Seeks to Consolidate Eastern
Monasticism.

In order rightly to appreciate the efforts of Basil of Caesarea to strengthen Eastern Monasticism, we shall divide the present chapter into three distinct parts. Firstly, we shall deal with the beginnings and the early form of asceticism. We shall then give our attention to Basil's association with and contribution towards Eastern Monachism. Finally, we shall examine his influence upon later monastic life in both the East and the West. In this way, we hope to emphasise our belief that the Metropolitan of Caesarea was one of the most significant link-men between early asceticism and later cenobitism.

1. The Beginnings and the Early Form of Asceticism:

Asceticism, both the precursor and the necessary prerequisite of monasticism, appeared very early in the history of the Church. Disciples of Christ have always existed who have regarded the exercise of great restraint and stern renunciation as the only ways by which one can mature in the Christian experience. In pursuit of this ideal, however, Christian ascetics did not at first withdraw themselves from the world. They led their lives of self-discipline in private; keeping fasts, abstaining from marriage, and giving themselves to prayer and good works at home.

Circumstances then began to alter this pattern of behaviour. For instance, owing to the stress of the Decian persecution in the year 250, many Christians in Egypt fled to the desert in order to escape the oppressive measures against them. Here the practice of severe bodily hardship as a religious discipline continued. Over the next few years, the number of Christian refugees who sought the solitude of the desert rapidly increased. Indeed, one ancient source tells us about the abbot Arsenius who strongly disapproved of this invasion because it had deprived

him of his solitude.¹ Eventually, as we shall soon see, this amorphous collection of ascetics proved to be the ground from which sprang an early form of monasticism. Later, when monasticism proper had established itself in both the East and the West, this earnest desire for Christian growth by way of the life of discipline became the bulwark of the Church. Even today, particularly in the Greek and the Roman communions, Monachism still remains the most productive institution of priests, missionaries and saints.

Asceticism is by no means only to be found in the Christian Church. It is not a peculiarly Christian phenomenon. It is also to be observed in other religions, both before and after the life of Christ, especially in the East. We may cite the following examples: the Vedas, portions of which may be dated fifteen centuries before Christ; the Laws of Menu, which were completed six or seven centuries before our era; and numerous other sacred books belonging to the Indian religion, all of which enjoin by precept and example a complete seclusion from the world and an entire abstraction of thought, in order that full communion with the deities may be achieved.

This ascetic spirit is also to be found in Greek heathenism. Although it is less serious and certainly free from the doctrine of absorption, it created its own kind of monastic society. The Platonic view of matter and body, to quote one example, not only lies at the heart of Gnostic and Manichaeian asceticism, but it also contributed much to the ethics of Origen and the Alexandrian school.

This evidence calls for the following question being asked:

1. Pelagius the Deacon, Verba Seniorum, trans. from H. Waddell's The Desert Fathers; p. 82.

"Were these earlier expressions of this phenomenon the source or only a copy of Christian asceticism?" In reply, attention must especially be drawn to the fact that two kinds of asceticism may be distinguished. The first, Gnostic and dualistic, certainly finds its source in heathenism. The second, Christian, discovers its motivation in the challenging life and teaching of our Lord. Although similarity of form is to be observed, the former type was wholly antagonistic and irreconcilable in both spirit and principle to the latter.

The early forms of asceticism may be set out under the following pattern -

Firstly, we have the hermits. A good deal of discussion has taken place regarding which monk came first to live in the desert. Some people, tracing the beginnings of this movement further back than is here admitted, suggest either the prophet Elias or John the Baptist. Others propose that, on the evidence of the witness of Amathas and Macarius, Paul of Thebes was the first to enter upon this lonely and difficult road. Since Jerome's "Life" of Paul of Thebes is not a reliable authority,² we must treat this account in an appropriate manner. Clearly, this is a question upon which no final answer can yet be given. These "athletes of God" were not content with a mere partial or temporary retirement from the common life, they insisted upon complete seclusion, even from their fellow ascetics. Their clothing was a hair shirt and a wild beast's skin; their food was bread and salt; their dwelling was found in a hut or cave or even on top of a stone pillar; their occupation was prayer and conflict with the satanic powers revealed to them. This mode of life came to perfection in the East, but it was far too extravagant and impractical for the cooler and more arduous West.

2. See W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great, Cambridge, 1913; p. 30.

Secondly, we have the semi-eremitical way of life. Under this heading we must carefully look at St. Anthony's contribution to the movement. When St. Anthony became a monk in the year 270, he followed the example of other contemporary ascetics and settled near a town.³ Fifteen years later, however, he withdrew to the desert at Pispis, near the Nile, where he lived the anchorite life for the next twenty years. During the persecution of the Church by Maximin, he left his place of retreat and organised the monastic life on a site near the Red Sea. This monastery was named after its founder. The organisation introduced by St. Anthony was not very thorough, but he did lead the movement a significant step forward. For instance, while some of the monks chose to continue to live their lives in complete seclusion, others lived in small groups of two or three. On both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, however, all assembled together in the church for worship. During the remaining five days of the week the monks conducted their own devotions in private. This observance of the Sabbath as well as the Lord's Day was quite common throughout Egypt and the East. Furthermore, we must pause to note that there was no rule of life; no authority, except that of superior age or experience. We may therefore conclude that St. Anthony created a religious community which was fundamentally held together by bonds similar to those of a family.

Lastly, let us now examine cenobitism, or the monastic life of St. Pachomius the Copt. About the year 320 he began his monastery at Tabennisi near Dendera in the Thebaid, which lay on the right bank of the Nile. Eventually he established eight additional foundations for men and two for women, numbering about seven thousand in all, over whom he presided

3. Both W.C. Lowther Clarke - St. Basil the Great, p.30 - and C. Butler - Benedictine Monachism, p. 12 - claim that St. Anthony was the "Father of the Christian monks".

as Abbot General. St. Pachomius' significant contribution was not only that he housed the monks together, but that he created a genuine fellowship. He sought, for instance, to create an association in labour as well as in prayer. In the Antonian type of asceticism, work was only for occupation or penance; in Tabennisi it was more a way of life. In order to achieve this end, he sought only a moderate level of obligatory observance of the Rule from all. But he left it open to each, and even encouraged each, to go further in his austerities. At one time, although dinner was served at noon, there were also meals served each hour of the day for those who wished to prolong their fast. Moreover, the Eucharist was regularly administered by clergy who, however, were not of the Order.

Despite the manifest differences between the two types of Egyptian monasticism, the character which permeated both was the same - that is, they both had a strongly marked individualism. St. Pachomius, however, "drew up the first Rule providing for a government in the spirit of community, uniformity, poverty, obedience and discretion. Thus he became the founder of cenobitism, the form of monastic life which was destined to spread through the whole world and survive to our times." ⁴.

The monastic stream, which had found its source in the deserts of Egypt, divided itself into two parts. The first, in the East, quickly covered everything and then slowly lost itself. The other reached the West and, by a thousand different channels, eventually covered the entire world. Our next task must therefore be an examination of monasticism in the West.

Eastern monasticism was at its height when Athanasius first became connected with it. In the year 333, as an ascetic, he visited St. Pachomius' foundation at Tabennisi. On the occasion of St. Anthony's

4. J. Quasten, Patrology, 1963, Vol. III, p. 154.

first return in 338, he visited the Archbishop of Alexandria to offer him his personal congratulations for having safely returned to his See from exile in Trier. But the monastic life was properly introduced into the West only in 339, when Athanasius visited Rome accompanied by two Eastern monks.⁵ At first, their presence only excited disgust and contempt, but soon admiration and imitation replaced these first reactions. This favourable reception of monasticism was later strengthened by two other visits of Athanasius to Rome, and especially by his biography of St. Anthony, which quickly acquired the authority of a monastic gospel. Many thereafter went to Egypt and Palestine to devote themselves there to the new mode of life. Indeed, it was for the sake of monks like these that Jerome afterwards translated the Rule of St. Pachomius into Latin. Others founded religious houses near Rome or on the ruins of ancient temples. From this centre, Western monasticism gradually spread, first over the whole of Italy and later throughout Europe.

As has been suggested before, monasticism in the West differed from the type found in the East. Owing to climate, and we may also add the inherent character of the European, monasticism in the Occident assumed a much milder form than in the Orient, although it still retained considerable variety. Exclusive contemplation, one of the main features of the semi-eremitical way of life, was exchanged for a life of labour and contemplation. This emphasis was not new. The monastic institutions of St. Pachomius had previously adopted this practice. Monks still lived in the West, however, who regarded labour as being the enemy and not the friend of real contemplation - for example, Martin of Tours.

5. See W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great, p. 147.

2. Basil's Association with and Contribution towards Eastern Monachism:

The Metropolitan of Caesarea's connection with monasticism began around the year 358, when he journeyed to Egypt by way of Syria to see for himself the ascetic and cenobitic establishments there. After a brief halt at Alexandria, probably owing to illness, he then travelled through "the rest of Egypt". He then moved on to Palestine and Mesopotamia, and finally returned home. In his Epistle 223 he tells us of the great impression which these settlements made upon him. Indeed, he even went as far as to say: "And I prayed that I, too, as far as in me lay, might imitate them."

An interesting speculation arises with regard to his journey home. Owing to the mountains ranging between the Euphrates and Cappadocia, we are required to assume that Basil journeyed home during the summer months of the year 358. If this were not the case, he would have been unable to travel along the impassable roads. He was therefore in a position to pass through such places as Samosata and Melitene. If, as seems very likely, he did choose this route, it is most fascinating to picture him visiting the Coptic-speaking monks who lived in monasteries nearby; calling in at Edessa, the historic centre of the Syriac-speaking Church; and passing through Samosata, where the foundations of his friendship with Eusebius of Samosata were possibly first laid.

Now that Basil had returned home from his tour of the monastic settlements in the East, he was anxious to implement his resolution as quickly as possible. The genius and originality of his mind, of course, could not be expected to express itself in the establishment of a form of ascetic life which reproduced what he had seen in Egypt and elsewhere. He now set out upon the enterprise by first calling upon Gregory to join with him. This action was taken in order to fulfil a promise made during student days.

Tiberina was first considered as a possible locality for their retreat, but the charm of a spot near Annesi in Pontus led Basil to propose it as an alternative site. Friendly criticism of the rival locations now appear in their correspondence with each other. Eventually Basil insisted upon his choice being accepted. This was not readily adopted by Gregory because it would require him to leave his aged parents to look after themselves. In order to overcome this problem, he proposed that half of the year should be spent at Tiberina and the remainder at Basil's retreat on the Iris. Gregory was piqued when his friend refused to accept his suggestion. In consequence, he only paid brief visits to his friend.^{6.} We may assume that it was about this time that Basil renounced his possessions.^{7.} Since evidence exists that he enjoyed the income of at least part of his estate during his lifetime, we conclude that on this occasion he probably sold only his personal belongings and gave the proceeds to the poor.^{8.} It would also seem likely that he dedicated the income from his share in the family property to God and spent it as necessity demanded.^{9.}

Basil's personality has been so deeply impressed upon later monasticism that we naturally think of him as the pioneer of the movement in Asia Minor. Strictly speaking, such is not the case. Communications between the different part of the Roman Empire were fairly easily

6. Gregory Nazianzen, Epistles, i,ii,iv,v,vi; Basil, Epistle, xiv.

7. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii. 60; Basil, Epistle, ccxxiii.

8. ibid. ibid. ; Basil, Epistles, xxxv, ccxxiii.

9. Basil, Epistle, xxxvii. This letter informs us that he retained certain rights in a property made over to his foster-brother by his parents.

maintained. The great ascetic movement in Egypt and Syria must therefore have had some kind of echo in areas beyond the Taurus before Basil retired to Pontus. Gregory tells us that Basil had difficulty in choosing to live either the life of a solitary or to live the life of a celibate in the world, devoted to prayer and active benevolence.^{10.} The ascetic ideal was indeed in existence in this part of the world; Basil's task was to organise it in such a fashion as to make it suitable for the needs of the people and country.

To this point we must also add the contribution of Eustathius of Sebaste. He had already founded monasteries in Pontus and, probably on the basis of his experience and advice, Basil had visited Egypt and Syria. Evidence clearly suggests that Basil owed much to his early teacher.^{11.} Indeed, as Lowther Clarke says: "If the Basilian Rules could be ascribed to Eustathius without manifest absurdity, it seems probable that their ideas were to a large extent those of the Bishop of Sebaste."^{12.}

The spot which Basil chose for his monastic settlement stood on the banks of the river Iris. Annesi, where his mother and sister were also living in seclusion, was on the opposite bank of the river. The area stood close to the city of Neo-Caesarea, and was under the ecclesiastical authority of Ibora. Referring to Basil's description of the place,^{13.} Sir. W.M. Ramsay says: "It can hardly refer to any other part of the

10. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii. 62.

11. Basil, Epistle, ccxxiii.5. He writes: "How often did you visit me in my monastery on the Iris? How many days did we spend in the opposite village, at my mother's, living as friend with friend, and discoursing night and day." An intimate association such as this must have been mutually beneficial.

12. W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great, p. 47.

13. Basil, Epistle, xiv, N.P.N.F.; pp. 124-125.

river than the rocky glen below Turkhal." ¹⁴. On modern maps this spot is marked about thirty miles south-east of Amasia.

How long did Basil reside in Pontus? W.K. Lowther Clarke suggests the following outline. Evidence does not allow us to assume that he spent all the time between the years 358 and 370 at his monastic settlement. In the year 360 he went to the Council of Constantinople after which he returned to Caesarea. In 362 he was present at the deathbed of Dianius, Bishop of Caesarea. ¹⁵. He, moreover, appears to have had a good deal to do with the election of Eusebius and was himself ordained priest about this time. ¹⁶. Basil's innate ability and rapid popularity with the faithful of the city soon roused the jealousy of Eusebius. Indeed, the situation grew so tense that there was serious possibility of a schism developing. Thereafter, with Gregory's advice and encouragement, they both set out for Pontus. This incident took place around 362-363. Later, in 365, Valens' threat upon the church of Caesarea forced Basil back to the trouble spot. The task of directing the practical activities of the church at Caesarea occupied his remaining years.

Our conclusion, in the light of the above evidence, must be as follows: Basil's residence in his Pontus retreat may be divided into two parts - (a) The first, lasting over one year (358-359), ended with his departure to Constantinople; (b) The second (362-365) began with his retreat from Caesarea to avoid a strife with Eusebius and ended with his return at the time of Valens' visit. But this division certainly does

14. Sir W.M. Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, (Supplementary Papers for the Royal Geographical Society, Vol. iv) 1890; p. 327.

15. Basil, Epistle, li, N.P.N.F.; pp. 154-155.

16. W.C. Lowther Clarke agrees with Schafer in dating the ordination in the year 362. Maran and others put the event in 364, but this view has not found much support. See W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great; p. 52.

not exclude the possibility of several brief visits between 360 and 362, and after 365. It is, moreover, quite reasonable to assume that during the first period, Basil was occupied with the organisation of his monastery, and that the widespread propaganda, about to be mentioned, took place within the span of the second period.

The next question we must seek to answer is: "What were the distinctive marks of the Basilian cenobia at this time?" Our attention will especially be given to two letters which provide us with the relevant information.

The first was addressed to Gregory in the year 358 or 359.¹⁷ It may be described as Basil's first sketch of the cenobitic life. He was of the opinion that there is only one way to escape from the daily round of life which weighs down the soul, and that is separation from the world. This involved, of course, not merely bodily separation, but also the severance of the soul's sympathy with the body. In order to achieve this end, a monk must seek the solitude of a monastery, such as Basil offered at Annesi. Here the day was begun with prayer and hymn-singing. It was then occupied with labour, seasoned throughout with devotion. The chief method of learning the duties of a monk was the study of Holy Scripture, and the imitation of the examples found there. Restraint in conversation was also of the utmost importance, and the cultivation of a "middle tone of voice" absolutely necessary. Outward appearance was required to correspond with the inner humility of the soul. The main aim of dress was to provide the wearer with sufficient warmth; a girdle was recommended to be worn, but bright colours or soft material were to be avoided at all costs. Shoes were to be cheap and serviceable. Regarding food, Basil

17. Basil, Epistle, ii, N.P.N.F.; pp. 110-112.

says that if a man was in good health, bread and water and vegetables were sufficient. Grace should be said before and after eating. Regular hours for meals was advised. Sleep was to be light and deliberately broken for meditation. Especially at midnight was the monk's soul alone with God, and wrapt in earnest prayer.

If this letter reveals to us the ideals which animated Basil in his early life at Annesi, the next letter shows the cenobia at a more developed stage. It would appear that some monks had written to him regarding doubtful points in the ascetic life. He writes this brief tract in reply, in which he claims that his instructions are founded upon a study of Holy Scripture, and announces his intention of leaving behind him advice to assist future students. 18.

This letter recommends that silence was to be observed as far as possible. Strangers who enter the monastery were not to speak to monks without the approval of the overseers. Wine and flesh must be avoided. Whatever the Christian possesses was given to him to be used and not hoarded up; he must take care of everything as the Lord's property. He must never grumble at the shortage of food or excess of labour. The voice should be properly modulated and the eye held under strict control. Everyone was also recommended to remain at his appointed task. If a monk offended another, he was to be admonished, and if he then failed to make amends, he had to be brought before the Superior. If he continued in his offending attitude, he was then to be cut off, as a limb from the body.

The similarity between these two letters and Basil's Rules are very close, as we shall soon see. If the Rules are to be compared with his earlier letter, and the rest of the Basil - Gregory correspondence, it

18. Basil, Epistle, xxii, N.P.N.F.; pp. 127-129.

will immediately be seen that they were all prepared in a spirit of moderation. Quite clearly, Basil did not recommend the average monk to imitate the privations of his own life.^{19.} Here Basil follows the example of St. Pachomius, but also anticipates the moderation of St. Benedict. All three tempered the severity of their original ideals when legislating for their disciples.

Although Basil and Gregory were obviously busy with the claims of devotion and manual labour, they were also able to accomplish some important literary work. They compiled both the "Philocalia", comprising of selected passages from Origen, and some Rules for the monastic life. They also, according to Sozomen, Socrates and Rufinus, dealt with matters lying outside their own monastery. They, moreover, divided the country between them in order to give as much attention as possible to each of the areas. Basil was responsible for the neighbourhood of Pontus. Here he founded numerous monasteries, and by his teaching and example persuaded them to hold similar views to himself.^{20.} Rufinus also tells us that Basil visited the cities and rural districts of Pontus, stirring them up to put away worldly things, to build monasteries and to furnish recruits for these religious establishments.^{21.} This activity, for one reason or another, stirred up some opposition, especially among the citizens of Neo-Caesarea.^{22.}

The final period of Basil's career may be treated in a very brief way. This is because we have already examined it in a previous chapter.

19. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii. 61, N.P.N.F.; p. 415.

20. Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book vi. 17; pp. 274-275.

21. See Rufinus, Ecclesiastical History, Book ii.9.

22. Basil, Epistle, ccvii.2, N.P.N.F.; pp. 245-248.

The most outstanding event demanding mention was his humane action during the famine of the year 368. During this time, he did all he could to relieve the distress that befell the people for whom he was responsible. He even sold his own possessions and bought provisions with the proceeds.²³ He also made eloquent appeals to the wealthy citizens to follow his example.

In the year 370, after the death of Eusebius, Basil was finally elected the Archbishop of Caesarea. Now that he was responsible for the See of that great city, he was able to exercise his profound influence in a full and effective way. This momentous work, however, was cut short by his untimely death, at the age of fifty, on the 1st January, 379.

Before we specifically state the way in which Basil of Caesarea consolidated Eastern monasticism, a word or two requires to be said about the authenticity of the material from which we are about to extract our evidence.

"Few literary works of antiquity have more external attestation than Basil's 'Ascetica.'" ²⁴. Six witnesses may be called forward to support the authenticity of our material:-

Firstly, in his letter 22, Basil makes reference to a writing, which he intends to leave behind him, which deals with questions raised by certain monks concerning the ascetic life. The manner in which this document is described suits either the "Morals" or the "Regulae Fusius Tractatae". The "Regulae Brevius Tractatae" must be excluded since it was not based upon Holy Scripture, as Basil said this reminder would be.

23. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii. 35, N.P.N.F.; p. 407.

24. W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great; p. 64.

Secondly, Gregory Nazianzen, in his letter 6, recalls the "written Rules and Canons" over which he and Basil had collaborated. He, moreover, praises Basil's ascetic advice; ^{25.} also his care of the converts, and the "written regulations" by which he subdued every sense and regulated every member. ^{26.}

Thirdly, writing in the year 392, Jerome states that Basil composed a work on asceticism. ^{27.}

Fourthly, Rufinus, who had been Jerome's companion, returned to Italy from the East in 397 and translated Basil's work into Latin for Urseius, Abbot of Pinetum. The work referred to by both Jerome and Rufinus is both the "Regulae Fusius Tractatae" and the "Regulae Brevius Tractatae". Rufinus abbreviated and adapted these two works into one composite document.

Fifthly, some years later Cassian wrote: "Basil and Jerome the former of whom, when the brethren asked about various rules and questions, replied in language which was not only eloquent but rich in testimonies from Holy Scripture." ^{28.}

Lastly, Sozomen also mentions the existence of an ascetic work with Basil's signature upon it. We also have the witness of Justinian, Benedict and Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople in the latter half of the ninth century.

But what is the witness of internal evidence? Necessity demands that we observe the following:-

25. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii. 62, N.P.N.F.; p. 415.

26. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii. 62, N.P.N.F.; p. 415.

27. Jerome, Lives of Illustrious Men, 116, N.P.N.F., (Second Series) Vol. 111; p. 382.

28. W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great; p. 65 and Appendix B.

Basil's "Regulae Fusius Tractatae", consisting of fifty-five chapters mostly concerns itself with monastic problems. The writer nearly always supports his recommendations with proof-texts from Scripture.²⁹ More relevant to our discussion is the fact that we now discover a piece of evidence which strongly indicates that the "Regulae Fusius Tractatae" post-dated the "Regulae Brevius Tractatae". On three occasions Basil refuses to discuss the questions raised; this is because his answers had already been given in his "Shorter Rules".³⁰ We may therefore assume that this document was already in circulation and accessible to Basil's readers. Add to this the further point that both the style and contents of the material is thoroughly consistent with the evidence expected of a genuine work. We are accordingly forced to come to the conclusion that the trustworthiness of Basil's "Regulae Fusius Tractatae" is overwhelmingly proved.

But what can be said concerning his "Shorter Rules"? Notwithstanding the fact that a large number of the questions in this work have nothing whatever to do with the ascetic life, and also that the last twenty-seven Rules are absent in some manuscripts, Basilian authorship is generally accorded to it. Why should this be? As in the case of the previous work, so here - the style is so thoroughly Basilian that no doubts can possibly be raised concerning its genuineness.

We may therefore proceed with our investigation knowing that, in spite of some textual difficulties and the possibility of editorial revision, the body of material from which we shall educe our evidence is regarded as generally belonging to Basil of Caesarea.

29. The passages which fail to provide Scriptural proof-texts are as follows: Fusius 13, 26, 27, 38, 39, 49, 51, 53, 54.

30. These passages are: B.74 = F.7; B.103 = F.27; B.220 = F.33.

A detailed study of Basil's Rules will clearly prove the point that he did make his own unique contribution to Eastern monasticism. After painstaking work, Dr. Lowther Clarke was able to write: "Later legislators may have raised or lowered his standards, or expressed with definiteness ideas that are only implicit in his writings, but all the guiding principles of later developments are present in Basil, at least in germ." 31

The method which we shall adopt in the presentation of evidence, determined by reason of limited space and time, will be to accept the fourfold division of the subject as presented by Dr. Lowther Clarke, and then support these claims with references from both the "Longer" and "Shorter Rules". In this way, we shall be able to survey speedily but thoroughly a very wide field of research. The four heads, under which we shall encapsulate our material, may be set out as follows:-

- A. Basil's new organisational emphasis.
- B. Basil's moderation regarding austerities and enthusiasm.
- C. Basil's reasons for claiming the superiority of cenobitism.
- D. Basil's methods of bringing monasticism into the service of the Church.

(A). Basil's New Organisational Emphasis.

The ascetic way of life was already firmly entrenched in Cappadocia and Pontus before Basil sought to make his mark upon the movement. At this early period of his life it had assumed the two typical forms - namely, the eremitic and the semi-eremitic ways of life. No doubt, the former gradually developed into the latter. Thus when Basil returned from his tour of Eastern monasteries in the year 358, he found, settled on his own native heath, a movement which encouraged a number of ascetics to live in

31. W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great; p. 114.

close proximity to each other and to render voluntary deference to a senior. In addition to this, there was also the later development of the traditional ascetic life in the world. They pledged themselves both to virginity and to good works in the service of the Church. But these ties could be broken at any time. While one person might feel himself bound to his promise of virginity, he was not thereby bound to continue his association with his fellow-ascetics in one particular house. Nothing whatever prevented him from moving to another house if and when he desired to do so. We may therefore safely conclude that the theory and practice of asceticism at the time was wholly unorganised.

Basil's task was clearly to organise this movement, to provide it with institutions which suited the needs of both the country and the people. This he certainly did. Lowther Clarke remarks: "We may sum up Basil's gift to Cappadocia by saying that he brought to spirit of Anthony and the forms devised by Pachomius, fused into an harmonious whole by their passage through a brilliant Greek mind".³²

When Basil visited the ascetics in the East, he probably halted for a time at both Nitria and Tabennisi. Here he witnessed for himself the working of the two different types of monasticism. After careful consideration, he chose the Pachomian system as a model for his own institution, although not without significant alterations. On his return to Cappadocia, he was able to use the increasing enthusiasm for the ascetic life to create new monasteries, as well as to modify the character of the existing institutions.

Three outstanding features of the Basilian organisation must now be adumbrated. Firstly, one of Basil's chief aims was to institute convents

32. W.C. Lowther Clarke, The Ascetic Works of St. Basil, Cambridge, 1925; p. 44.

of moderate size. Under the Pachomian order, of course, a large number of monks were gathered together under one roof. This made the superintendence of the monastery a most difficult task. Basil's intention, however, allowed the Superior to discharge his duties toward both the monastery and the individual monk with greater ease. The approximate size of these institutions has long caused debate. In one passage in his "Regulae Fusius Tractatae" we read about "one lamp" and "one fire" sufficing the whole brotherhood.³³ This reference, frequently cited to support the claim that Basil created a system of very small monasteries, would suggest to us that they were probably large enough to house about thirty or even forty monks. Basil, moreover, advised the amalgamation of these small religious communities in order to make a strong economic unit. His Rules certainly picture a busy, self-centred community, large enough to meet its own needs, and requiring a large number of officers.

Secondly, the female contribution to monasticism was not overlooked. No doubt, the example and influence of Macrina helped to predispose Basil to foster this aspect. But he also recognised that great care would have to be taken in their case, if the movement was to be kept free from scandal. This influence was further supported by the tremendous impression made upon him by the Pachomian communities. We cannot be surprised therefore to find in his Rules a strong effort being made to bring about a greater liaison between male and female ascetics. His chief point of emphasis was mutual service. He recognised that women could make as great a contribution to the common life as men.³⁴ On the basis of this belief, he introduced a system of double monasteries, in which the abbot and the

33. Basil, Fusius, 35.

34. Compare Basil's Brevius 112 with Brevius 108-111.

abbess worked in close connection with each other. While the abbot ruled over the whole religious establishment, his authority over the women was exercised through the abbess.

Lastly, Basil recommended that the small monasteries should join together into a federation. This association, however, could create certain peculiar difficulties by forcing a Superior to divide his loyalty. Measures were accordingly recommended to reduce this danger to the minimum. For example, Superiors were to meet periodically to discuss any "untoward happenings and difficult moral problems." ³⁵. We also note that Basil ruled that a new Superior was to be chosen by the Superiors of a neighbouring monastery, although the local monks must test and approve the choice. ³⁶. But, unlike the Pachomian order, he did not include either the general chapter or the Superior-General; the latter office being wholly unnecessary during his own life-time.

This survey clearly indicates that, while Basil took over the general framework of the Pachomian organisation, he altered it by modifying the system of discipline and leaving more scope for the voluntary actions of the individual.

(B). Basil's Moderation Regarding Austerities and Enthusiasm:

Each of these points calls for special treatment. Let us now concentrate upon the first - Austerities: Basil's Rules make it perfectly clear that whenever a candidate applied for admission into the monastery, his character was firstly examined carefully and, having been found

35. Basil, Fusius, 35, 54.

36. Basil, Fusius, 43.

acceptable, he was then instructed to part with his private property.^{37.} Insistence upon this point can be explained by noting that Basil regarded goods to be a distraction from the service of God.^{38.} Since both the postulant and his property were about to be consecrated to the Lord, neither could be treated carelessly. If the candidate had the necessary experience, he was permitted personally to distribute his property; if not, assistance from trustworthy friends was sought.^{39.} All this, however, was the ideal. Evidence supports the claim that in practice it was interpreted with greater freedom. Basil's own renunciation, for instance, was only partial. He enjoyed the income of at least part of his estate during his lifetime.^{40.} Furthermore, in his "Epistle" 284 he writes to the assessor of taxes suggesting that monks, who have "neither money to spend nor bodily service to render in the interests of the common good," should be exempted from taxes. This appeal clearly implies that monks were not absolutely forbidden to keep some private property. We may be sure that monks did retain some of their worldly goods, although it was generally spent on the poor.

The same tone of moderation may be found with regard to the question of prayer. While Basil recognised that every moment of every day was suitable for prayer, no monk was to be allowed to shirk labour under the pretext of devotion. The following is an outline of the daily scheme of prayer. "To begin with dawn, so that the first movements of the soul and mind may be directed to God." At the third hour the brethren, who had already dispersed to attend to their various tasks, were summoned together

37. Basil, Brevius, 85.

38. Basil, Brevius, 92.

39. Basil, Fusius, 9.

40. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliiii.60; Basil, Epistles, xxxv, ccxxiii.

for worship. The apostles' time of prayer, the ninth hour, then followed. At the close of the day the monks gathered to thank God for the mercies of the day and to seek pardon. As evening advanced they were required to seek God's mercy throughout the midnight watches and to repeat Psalm 90. The example of Paul and Silas and the teaching of Psalm 118 gave Scriptural authority for Basil recommending prayer at midnight. Again, on the basis of the same Psalm, the monks were required to rise for prayer before dawn. The monks were not allowed to neglect any of these periods of prayer, for the ever-varying course of psalmody and prayer "helps to destroy evil desires and keep the attention alert." ⁴¹.

As a young man, Basil practised great austerities. His ill-health was largely due to his zeal in this respect. But in his Rules we discover a strong reaction to his earlier point of view. Something of his leniency may further be seen in his attitude to meals. According to one passage, the mid-day meal (τὸ ἀριστον) was the only one served during the day, because lateness meant the monk would go hungry until the next day. ⁴² Elsewhere, however, supper (τὸ δεῖπνον) is mentioned in addition to the other meal. ⁴³ This slight discrepancy may be explained by assuming the evening meal to be so modest that it in no way made up for the loss of the mid-day meal. A fixed order for meal times was recommended. One monk was to be responsible for the seating arrangements. ⁴⁴ A book was to be read to the assembled monks, and they were expected to think more on what they heard than what they ate. ⁴⁵ Food was to be simple, cheap and easily prepared. For this reason, bread and fish became a

41. Basil, Fusius, 37.

42. Basil, Brevius, 136.

43. Basil, Fusius, 21.

44. Basil, Fusius, 21.

45. Basil, Brevius, 180.

common diet in early monasteries. If, however, a monk was employed with heavy manual work, he was permitted to apply either for more or a better quality of food. The authorities, of course, held the power to grant or refuse his request. Temperateness thus characterises Basil's instructions regarding austerities.

Now let us explore his opinions regarding the other point -

Enthusiasm: By the third century enthusiasm had died down among the rank and file of the Church. But it did continue to survive among the ascetics who lived the virgin life, and especially in martyrs and confessors. The literature of this particular movement abounds with tales of miracles, clairvoyance, spiritual healings, visions, and conflicts with demons. To the third century ascetic, these were the evident signs of the Spirit's indwelling. Not so for Basil of Caesarea. He regarded the gifts of the Spirit as bestowing moral and spiritual power rather than the ability to see or do unusual things. This point can be noted in the last section of his "Regulae Fusius Tractatae", which deals with the question of doctors and medicine. Here he vindicates their right to a place in the economy of the monastery.⁴⁶ We note, however, that while he never attacks the concept of the miraculous, he does reveal a remarkable ability to discriminate between primary and secondary elements in religion. This thoroughly Greek sense of proportion was undoubtedly due both to his innate common sense and good education. In one particular respect, Basil did set out to introduce a new idea, which moderated certain aspects of the monastic order. Indeed, it was through his influence that it gained a permanent foothold in Eastern monasticism. Recognising the ever-recurring truth that official rank in no way prepares a man for his religious duties,

46. Basil, Fusius, 55.

he proposed that a special charisma was necessary for the real cure of souls. When dealing with the matter of confession, for instance, he points out that, just as a patient reveals his ailments only to a trained medical practitioner, so also the penitent should confess his sins to those who know how to heal a sin-sick soul.⁴⁷ True spiritual preception is a gift of the Spirit.

These examples, found in the above two sections, clearly illustrate that a general standard of moderate asceticism was prescribed for all monks. His Rules were obviously written in order to prevent the monk from making the same mistakes as he had made with regard to the practice of severe asceticism. He was also anxious to recognise special spiritual charisma.

(C). Basil's Reasons for Claiming the Superiority of Cenobitism:

We have already observed that the Pachomian monasteries were cenobitic only in outward appearance, their essence was still individualistic. Basil of Caesarea, however, introduced cenobitism in reality. What were the reasons which led him to make this noteworthy contribution? Two fundamental beliefs may be observed: Firstly, man is a social creature. "Who does not know," writes Basil, "that man is a tame and sociable animal, and not a solitary and fierce one. Nothing is so characteristic of our nature as to associate with one another."⁴⁸ Secondly, the call of God. For Basil this is the supremely important point. Whenever God calls a man to "start on the God-ward way", everything else, even love of parents, must be renounced. Spiritual retirement is essential, but this will be found impossible apart from physical retirement. Without this physical retreat, for example, the sights and sounds of the world will undoubtedly

47. Basil, Fusius, 26.

48. Basil, Fusius, 3.

distract one from prayer. Again, one cannot escape the fact that insufficient leisure is available in the world to sustain meaningful devotion. Moreover, one's association with sinners in the world injures the soul. Their company lowers the standard of life, and makes one complacent with one's own moderate attainment of virtue.^{49.}

These two basic assumptions forced Basil of Caesarea to choose a middle way between the solitary and the community life, combining the excellence of both.^{50.} Monasticism was indeed fortunate that he decided in this way because the outcome was cenobitism properly so called.

(D). Basil's Methods of Bringing Monasticism into the Service of the Church:

Under this heading, we are required to note first that Basil's Rules everywhere avoids the word "Bishop". Probably this was due to the uncertainty of Church affairs at the time. But the Rules do recognise, albeit half-heartedly, the right of one who virtually holds the office of Bishop; he was to be consulted on matters pertaining to the cloister.^{51.} Indeed, such a person exercised authority over monasteries covering a wide area. Basil, moreover, furthered this policy of bringing the monk into closer relation with the episcopate by establishing his cenobia in towns rather than deserts.^{52.} Thus the monk was no longer to flee from his fellow-men, he was now required to remain in their midst and set an example of how the Christian life was to be lived.

49. Basil, Fusius, 6.

50. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration, xliii. 62, N.P.N.F.; p. 415.

51. Basil, Fusius, 15; Brevius, 187. The authority of a Bishop would seem to be implied in these passages.

52. W.C. Lowther Clarke, St. Basil the Great; p. 121, n.1. The author remarks that in spite of Fusius 6, which orders a remote situation for the monasteries, the above conclusion may be considered correct. Reference should be made to Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book vi. 17; pp. 274-275.

Basil's cenobia also served a useful purpose by providing education for children of both sexes. The fundamental aim of these educational institutions, of course, was entirely different from what was to be found in secular schools. They were mainly concerned with preparing the children for the monastic life which, it was hoped, they would choose as their own career. But no pressure was ever exercised upon them to reach this decision. Since this was the case, it is a safe assumption that many returned to the secular life after a training at the convent school. As may be expected, the curriculum was very one-sided. Scripture was the main subject of instruction. It was given so that the pupils could learn about "noble deeds and not myths". Clearly, if these monastery schools were staffed with men who possessed the same or similar mental powers as Basil, it was not surprising that parents were anxious to leave their children there to be educated. ⁵³.

The above illustrate some of the chief ways in which Basil sought to bring monasticism into the service of the Church, but, in so doing, we cannot overlook the point that these measures sometimes resulted in benefit being brought to the State. Fourth century monasticism thus emerges the friend and not the foe of the legislature.

3. Basil's Influence upon Later Monastic Life in both the East and the West:

This subject is so vast that a thesis could very well be written upon it. We shall resist the natural temptation to spread ourselves. Our aim will merely be to relate a few facts concerning the influence which Basil of Caesarea had upon certain later monastic leaders.

53. Basil, Fusius, 15, 16.

The East: Cenobitism made most progress, as we would expect, in those churches which were under the influence of Caesarea, especially Pontus and Lesser Armenia. This influence gradually spread to Palestine as more and more pilgrims visited the Holy Places there. By the sixth century, Palestine had become as significant a monastic centre as had been Egypt in the earlier days of the movement. We must note, however, that at this time both forms of monasticism flourished happily together on the same soil.

In time, Constantinople became the hub of Greek monasticism. This was to have important consequences for the future of the movement. The influence of the Byzantine Emperors brought about a waning of the cenobitic ideal. This was due to their zeal for centralisation. This affected monasteries in so far as now they became subject to Bishops, and through them to the State. Unorganised asceticism, however, was allowed to flourish because it was regarded by the authorities to be of less importance than the cenobia. In consequence, the anchorite ideal gained a firm footing within monasteries, and then became regarded as the higher mode of life.

The continuing influence of the State upon the internal affairs of monasticism eventually created a desire, on the part of some monasteries, to dispense with the control of the diocesan Bishop and come directly under the control of the Patriarch. Germanus encouraged this new emphasis. When this had become established, the cenobitism then in vogue bore little resemblance with the system as outlined by Basil of Caesarea.

All was not lost. We must now look at the work of Theodore of Studium, one of the greatest figures in the history of Greek-speaking monasticism, apart from Basil of Caesarea.

About the year 463 Studius, an ex-consul, founded a church at Constantinople which was named after him. Although it was not originally intended for the use of the "Akoimetai" (the Sleepless Ones) they quickly occupied the sanctuary. The chief characteristic of this order, founded by Alexander, was the maintenance of an unceasing round of prayer and praise. While this monastery rapidly rose to fame, toward the end of the eighth century it had fallen from its previous position. By that time its numbers had been reduced to ten. At this critical hour, Theodore came forward to revive and reorganise it. Born of a noble family in the year 379, he had renounced the world together with other members of his family, and had received his early training in asceticism from his uncle, the abbot of Saccudio. Having formed a very high opinion of his nephew, Paul promoted him abbot in his own place. Since Theodore would have nothing to do with this arrangement, the two ruled for a period as joint abbots, first at Saccudio and then at Studium.

The main inspiration of Theodore came from a study of the monastic fathers, and especially the works of Basil of Caesarea. At Studium he revived the common life, and insisted on the carrying out of the obligations of the brotherhood even to the minutest detail. The abbot's power was also increased, and lesser officials were introduced who were obliged to report to him on everything. Moreover, constant instruction of the brethren in the principles of asceticism and their application to the community life were established. Furthermore, provisions were made for the education and care of the sick and also philanthropic work by the monks were undertaken.

The reformed and reorganised monastery of Studium now became a centre from which influences poured fourth to all parts of the Greek world. Numerous parts of Theodore's Rules were adopted on Mount Athos, which in its own turn became the heart of later monasticism. The monastery of Kiev also drew its inspiration from Studium, and through that convent in South Russia, Theodore had some part in the writing of the later ecclesiastical history of Russia.

The later period of Constantinopolitan monasticism is therefore marked by a strong revival of Basilian ideas. While Basil only adumbrated principles essential to the cenobitic life, Theodore thoroughly worked them into a practical system which has had a lasting influence upon Eastern monachism. Theodore of Studium may therefore justly be called the true legislator of Greek cenobitism.

The West: The question of Basil's monastic influence upon the West is no less important than his effect upon the East, but we shall be able to confine ourselves to narrower limits. There will be no need for us to extend our enquiry beyond St. Benedict of Nursia, because any influence that Basil's Rules may have had on the later Western Church has been wholly accomplished through the Benedictine Rule.

Since we have already examined the influence of Athanasius, Rufinus and Jerome we shall now pass on to a study of Cassian.

Cassian was undoubtedly the most important figure in Western monasticism before St. Benedict. Following his travels in the East, he returned to Gaul and founded a monastery at Marseilles in the year 410. Probably he was the first really to appreciate the difference between the physical constitution of the Eastern and the Western monk. Indeed, at the end of the preface to his Institutes, he intimates his intention of

introducing more lenient measures for the Western monk.⁵⁴ Although Cassian had undoubtedly studied Basil's ascetic writings, he appears to have owed very little to the thinking of the Archbishop of Caesarea.

The person who really adapted monasticism to Western needs was St. Benedict of Nursia. He was born in the year 480, the son of a noble family, Rome was chosen as the city to give him his education. But in the year 500 he left it disgusted and determined to become a monk. He is said to have spent three years of complete solitude in a cave, after which he emerged to organise his followers into a monastery. Soon, so great was the following, it became necessary to found other monasteries in the neighbourhood. Benedict later returned to Monte Cassino, where he presided over the convent most closely associated with his name.

The movement at this period badly needed a new impulse. Eclecticism had succeeded only in creating a general feeling of discouragement. To meet this need Benedict composed his famous Rule. In it he aimed at enforcing a moderate rule of life upon all monks. Its leading features were: the insistence upon the common life; the elimination of individual austerities; the requiring of manual work and the study of Scripture; the careful regulation of the continual round of devotion in which the community was involved; the forbidding of a monk to leave the monastery where he had been professed; and the definition of the abbot's position and powers. Unlike Basil's Rules, the abbot was to be elected by the monks, and he had to consult with them. A noteworthy change now appears - the Rule was to guide him instead of, as hitherto, his own discretion. While Benedict legislated only for cenobitics, he also recognised the existence of the other ideal.

54. Cassian, Institutes, Preface, N.P.N.F. (Second Series)
Vol. xi; pp. 199-200.

The question of the literary sources of the Benedictine Rule have been fully examined and presented by Dom Butler in his Book "Benedictine Monachism". His findings are: In a number of places St. Benedict has borrowed from St. Basil's Rules, but regarding details Cassian was by far his most important authority. Cassian, of course, was much nearer his own day, and had also written especially for Western monasticism. He did recommend, however, that his monks should study not only the books of the Bible, but also the writings of the Catholic Fathers, Cassian's Conferences and Institutes, and "the Rule of our holy father Basil". Basil is, indeed, the only Father expressly mentioned by St. Benedict - a point which surely indicates deep respect. It is therefore not unexpected that in an article on the Basilian monks, Dom Butler was able to write: "St. Benedict owed more of the ground-ideas of his Rule to St. Basil than to any other monastic legislator." 55.

In the light of the above assessment, and to it we may also add our own findings regarding the ways in which St. Basil successfully consolidated Eastern monasticism, we can understand why history has accorded to this pioneer of the common life, the title - "Father of Oriental Monasticism."

55. Encyclopedia Britannica, Basilian Monks, Eleventh Edition, 1910-1911; p. 470.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Basil Presses for an Alliance between the
Eastern and Western Churches. 1.

Among the numerous elements of confusion which were at work in the 4th century Church, the Meletian schism at Antioch deserves careful examination. Two reasons may be brought forward to explain our special interest in this particularly distressing ecclesiastical event: (a) It was itself closely connected with the Arian controversy; (b) Basil of Caesarea became involved in it. So that we may satisfactorily underline the main aim of this chapter, and also deal with other relevant points which emerge, we shall divide this chapter into sections, of which the following is the first:-

1. The Events which brought about and aggravated the Antiochene Schism:

In order to quickly trace the history of this schism, we must go back to the year 328 when Eusebius of Antioch, a most staunch Nicene, was deposed and banished. His successors, Euphonius and Flacillus, were suspected of heresy. In consequence, a small group, under the leadership of Paulinus, refused to recognise them. ^{2.}

Later, around the year 360, the Emperor Constantius assembled a Synod at Antioch with the view to appointing a new Bishop to that city. The choice fell upon Meletius, who had hitherto partly associated himself with the semi-Arians. After his promotion, however, he immediately declared himself in favour of the Nicene faith. On account of this declaration, a

1. The histories consulted in preparation for this chapter were: B.J. Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D. 461, Vol. 11 (Oxford 1922), pp. 261-265; L. Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, Vol. 11 (London, Reprinted 1957), pp. 317-332; T.G. Jalland, The Church and Papacy, An Historical Study, (London 1944) pp. 240-244; Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, Basile de Cesaree et Damase de Rome: Les causes de l'echec de leurs negociations, Biblical and Patristic Studies, (Herder), pp. 122-166; E. Schwartz, Über die Sammlung des Cod. Veronenis LX, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1936, pp. 1-23.
2. Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History, Book i.22; pp. 59-60.

few weeks later, he was again deposed and replaced by Euzoius, ³. The Catholics quickly repudiated the new Bishop, but unfortunately split among themselves. While the majority remained faithful to Meletius, the older and more orthodox party, hitherto known as the Eustathians, elected Paulinus as counter-Bishop. ⁴.

The basic doctrinal difference between these two orthodox parties consisted in this: The Eustathians stressed the ὑποστάσις in the divine Trinity, and the Meletians acknowledged only the three πρόσωπα. In other words, the former laid emphasis upon the triplicity of the divine essence, the latter on its unity.

When Paulinus returned from exile under the protection of Gratian, Meletius proposed that they should unite their flocks, and that whichever Bishop survived the other, he should superintend the church alone. Paulinus declined to accept this proposal because canon law prevented him from taking as a colleague one who had been ordained by the Arians. Meletius was then given the cathedral church, which had been in the hands of Euzoius.

Meanwhile, Lucifer of Cagliari, who strongly opposed the mild treatment offered to returning Arians, arrived at Antioch and proceeded to consecrate Paulinus as Bishop. Athanasius, the great Nicene champion, was at this time forced to choose between Paulinus and Meletius. On hearing that the latter had entered into relations with the Homoeans, he chose Paulinus.

The ecclesiastical situation at Antioch had now reached an impossible position. Three Bishops were now responsible for the See of Antioch: Euzoius, who was recognised by the Arians; Paulinus, accepted by Athanasius, the West and Egypt; and Meletius, acknowledged by the orthodox

3. Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book iv. 28; p.199.

4. Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History, Book v. 12; p.225.

East.

Matters appeared to be momentarily relieved with the death of Euzoius in 378. Now, if at any time, the local clergy possessed a favourable opportunity for healing the schism. In accordance with this high aim, they undertook to advance no claim upon the bishopric after the death of either Meletius or Paulinus. When Meletius did die in the year 381, however, the delegates refused to accept Paulinus on the grounds that it would not be good ecclesiastical policy to grant a seeming victory to the West. Flavian was therefore chosen and promoted. Paulinus himself died about seven years later. Prior to his decease, however, he had consecrated Evagrius to succeed him, but the schism continued. Now the West and Egypt recognised Evagrius, and the East generally accepted Flavian.

Despite the many later attempts of the Church to heal the breach, the schism continued until the year 414, when Bishop Alexander succeeded in reconciling the old orthodox remnant with the successors of Meletius. The two parties eventually celebrated their union with a splendid festival, after which they proceeded to the church to offer God their heartfelt thanks for his gracious blessing.

Having indicated the salient features in the history of the Antiochene Schism, and before we go on to study the four negotiations between Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome, a few words must be said about:-

2. Basil's Chief Ecclesiastical Aims and the Reason why he Chose them:

When Basil had assumed the full responsibility of his episcopal seat, a number of fundamental aims undoubtedly came to his mind. Some may be

5. Theodoret, Ecclesiastical History, Book v.23; pp. 229-231.

guessed at, and others can be seen in his vast correspondence. Two especially important objectives call for note: (a) Basil eagerly worked for the union of the Eastern churches in the Nicene faith. When we refer to his enormous correspondence, we find repeated appeals being made for a union under the Nicene symbol. One example may be given. In his letter to the "Presbyters of Tarsus" (113), Basil describes the condition in the Eastern Church in the year 372 as being rather like "an old coat, which is always torn and can never be restored to its original strength." He therefore goes on to suggest to these brethren that it would be advantageous if those parts "hitherto severed should be united" under the symbol of Nicea.⁶ This insight enables us to see that from the very beginning of his episcopate, Basil was anxious to effect a union in the Nicene faith and brotherly love of all the churches in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire. This aim also appears to have included the church of Alexandria, which was solidly anchored in the true faith.⁷ Basil was convinced that such a confederation would eliminate all trace of virulent Arianism, and also greatly help to suppress the most dangerous heresies then in circulation. (b) Basil was particularly anxious to clear up the confusion which existed in the church at Antioch. As far as he was concerned, only one solution was possible; namely, all must recognise, and especially Rome and Alexandria, his own superior ecclesiastic, Meletius. This belief forced him to take the initiative. First he endeavoured to present his case to Athanasius, the friend and ally of Damasus, and after his death, with Damasus himself, and the Bishops of the West. Tireless patience characterises these negotiations, as we shall soon see.

6. Basil, Epistles, cxiv, cciii, cciv.

7. Basil, Epistle, lxvi.

The reason why Basil chose these fundamental aims may be seen by a consideration of the condition under which the orthodox block of the Eastern Church was labouring. Briefly put, we may outline it as follows: the Emperor deliberately manipulated his very considerable authority and influence to promote the cause of heresy. In consequence, orthodox Bishops of the East were completely powerless, by themselves, to put an end to this inextricable situation. No one, neither Meletius or Basil, possessed sufficient and undisputed power in the East to make a unanimous decision hold good.

Therefore, failing to discover a possible solution in the Orient, Basil of Caesarea then turned to the West for help. What he really desired of Damasus, of course, was a deputation of Western Bishops, supplied with adequate powers, to be sent from Rome to the East, and especially to Antioch, to examine the peculiar problems there, and if possible to make on the spot decisions so that theological peace may be restored to that area. As will soon become apparent, Damasus always refused for various reasons, and under several pretexts, to grant Basil's request.

Accepting the fourfold division indicated by H. Lietzmann, we shall now adumbrate:-

3. The Essential Features of the Negotiations between Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome:

Basil's first attempt to secure the assistance of the West involved him writing a series of letters to Athanasius. His approach was based upon three very important factors (a) Athanasius was on the best of terms with Damasus of Rome; (b) He was also recognised in both the East and the West as being the champion of the doctrine of consubstantiality; (c) Close relations had existed for some time between the Sees of Rome and Alexandria

Addressing Athanasius in the most favourable of terms, Basil requests him to crown his life's work by now labouring for the peace and unity of the whole Church. We note, as an example of his effort, that in 'Epistle' 69 he especially urges Athanasius to support his appeal to Damasus for effective assistance; to also give letters of recommendation to "Dorotheus the deacon, of the Church under the right honourable Bishop Meletius;" and, further, that Rome "should drive away the heresy of Marcellus, as greivous and injurious and opposed to sound faith." This flattering reference to Meletius, however, was sufficient to put the aged Bishop of Alexandria off from helping Basil. His opinion was that Paulinus was the only legitimate Bishop of Antioch. We are not surprised therefore to learn that Dorotheus received neither the letters of recommendation nor assistance on his journey to Rome.

Without becoming too depressed about this treatment of his envoy, Basil wrote several more letters to Athanasius, but he continued to remain quite silent. We must therefore conclude that, despite Basil's earnest appeals, the Bishop of Alexandria, mainly because of Basil's favourable reference to Meletius, was unwilling to reappraise his association with Paulinus and Marcellus. On account of this, Basil suffered his first setback.

Basil's next attempt to secure the aid of Rome and the West involved the Milanese deacon, Sabinus. This negotiation developed as follows: On receiving a copy of the Roman synodical letter of 372, the Bishop of Caesarea was encouraged to begin again. This time he wrote to Meletius suggesting that he should make a direct approach to the Roman See. ^{8.}

8. Basil, Epistle, lxxxix, N.P.N.F.; pp. 175-176.

Meletius, who was then in exile, wrote, in the name of thirty-two Bishops, a letter which was addressed not Damasus, but to the Bishops of Italy and Gaul. This letter, retained in Basil's correspondence,⁹ clearly indicated the distress of the Oriental churches and asked for a considerable number of Western Bishops to be sent as speedily as possible to the East. They were to be charged with the task of: (a) Silencing the quarrels which divided the men who professed the same doctrine; (b) Make every effort to unite them under the "creed drawn up by our fathers at Nicea". This letter together with others addressed to outstanding Western Bishops, were taken by Sabinus on his way home, probably around Easter 373. In the Spring of the same year - either on the 2nd or 3rd of May - Athanasius died. Prior to that event, the Bishop of Alexandria had consecrated Peter his successor. Peter now found his position quite impossible to bear and accordingly fled to Rome. Damasus then appointed him his advisor with special responsibility for Oriental affairs. This arrangement was to have a significant effect upon the Church by reason of his aversion toward Meletius and his defiance of Basil of Caesarea.

In the same year, a priest of Antioch, Evagrius, expressed a desire to return to his own native heath. He was therefore chosen as a messenger from the Romans. His was the task of returning to Basil the bundle of letters which he had, some months earlier, given to Sabinus. This action clearly indicated that Damasus regarded Basil's suggestion as wholly unacceptable. Evagrius, under the direction of the Bishop of Rome, also presented a confession of faith, drawn up at Rome, to which Basil had to add his signature without being able to alter a single word in it.¹⁰

9. Basil, Epistle, xcii, N.P.N.F.: pp. 177-179.

10. While the letter itself has not survived, its contents can be inferred from Basil's Epistle, clvi. In his Epistle, cxl.2 he insists that the Nicene symbol alone is sufficient.

This formula was then to be returned to Rome by a delegation composed of representatives of the churches of the East. This was manifestly a case of adding insult to injury! At Antioch, Evagrius refused ecclesiastical communion to Dorotheus, Basil's envoy and one of Meletius' deacons. In a letter addressed to the Roman messenger, Basil refused to comply with the demands of Damasus.¹¹ And so ended the second attempt to negotiate with Rome and the West.

Basil of Caesarea's third endeavour to bring about a successful negotiation with Damasus, involved Dorotheus and Sanctissimus visiting Rome. Events developed as follows:-

In the year 374, at the suggestion of Eusebius of Samosata, Sanctissimus was sent to Armenia Minor and Syria in order to collect signatures to the proposed petition to the Westerns.¹² Basil eagerly supported the venture. As soon as the task was completed, Sanctissimus was joined by Dorotheus, who had now been promoted to the priesthood. Armed with the formula brought by Evagrius to Basil the previous year; the signatures to it since collected by Sanctissimus; and two important letters; the two representatives left for Italy. The first was a general letter addressed "To the Westerns";¹³ the second, a personal communication from Basil, was specifically directed "To the Bishops of Gaul and Italy".¹⁴ In the second letter (243), Basil again described to them, in a most moving fashion, the distress of the churches of the East. He then asked them to

11. Basil, Epistle, clvi, N.P.N.F.; pp. 210-211.

12. Basil, Epistles, cxx, cxxi, cxxxii, ccliii-cclvi.

13. Basil, Epistle, ccxlii, N.P.N.F.; pp. 282-283.

14. Basil, Epistle, ccxliii, N.P.N.F.; pp. 283-285.

try and bring this painful matter before the attention of the Emperor, Gratian, or, if this could not be accomplished, to send to the East delegates capable of realising the situation and of bringing a remedy to it. Dorotheus and Sanctissimus appear to have gone straight to Rome. On their arrival, Damasus convoked a Council, the third of the Roman Synods of his day, which met in the Autumn of the same year. Dorotheus later brought back a not very friendly reply from Damasus, of which the essential part has been preserved for us in the fragment "Ea Gratia". This reply condemned clearly enough the erroneous teaching of Arius, Marcellus, Apollinaris, and Macedonius. But regarding the request for help, there are only a few words affirming that they were already preoccupied with the question. The letter also dropped a hint about irregular ordinations, intended, no doubt, to keep Meletius at bay; and gave fresh assurances of sympathy, but nothing more. On the other hand, Damasus now develops the theme of the unity of the divine ousia; indicates the distinction he would make regarding the concept of the three "persons" in the Trinity; and defends the full humanity of the Son of God and the divinity of the Holy Spirit. We pause here to note that the expression "three hypostases", which Meletius had hitherto employed, was intentionally avoided.¹⁵ It was now quite clear that Damasus and the Western block regarded Meletius and his supporters, including Basil, as perverters of theological truth, and this attitude largely rested upon the doctrine of the three hypostases. For these reasons, Basil's renewed efforts to negotiate with Damasus and the West came to nothing.

15. B.J. Kidd cites Damasus, Epistle, ii, Fr.i (P.L. xiii. 350 sqq.). See also E. Schwartz, Über die Sammlung des Cod. Veronensis LX, 2; pp. 20-21.

The fourth and last effort to gain the assistance of Rome and the West went like this: In the year 375, Vitalis, who had recently been consecrated Bishop of the Apollinarist community at Antioch, visited Rome and returned with a letter from Damasus. This missive intimated that Damasus now considered Vitalis as orthodox and recommended him to Paulinus. Shortly afterwards, however, the Pope received further information regarding the Apollinarist doctrine. These new revelations required Damasus to act quickly. He therefore sent a second letter to Paulinus in which he enjoined him to exact from Vitalis a profession of faith which was to be clearly anti-Apollinaristic. This letter, "Per Filium", also stated that Paulinus was the only orthodox Bishop in Antioch who would receive the recognition of Rome.^{16.} In the eyes of Basil, this was disastrous. Confusion was now worse confounded!

At length, in the Spring of 376, Dorotheus and Sanctissimus started for Rome on the fourth and last mission, carrying with them a collective letter from the Bishops of the East "To the Westerns". In this letter, the prelates clearly say that it was not the Arians who now troubled the Church, but Eustathius, the "prime leader of the heresy of the Pneumatomachi", Apollinaris, and also Paulinus, "who is showing an inclination for the doctrines of Marcellus".^{17.} Since delay was exceedingly dangerous, the Eastern Bishops advised the Westerns to "take due heed", and grant communion only to those who are clear of such innovations. The envoys were received at the fourth Roman Synod under Damasus. Peter of Alexandria, who was still in exile, was present. Two fragments of the Synodical Letter are still extant: "Illud Sane Miramur"

16. See E. Giles, Documents Illustrating Papal Authority, (S.P.C.K.) 1952; p. 133.

17. Basil, Epistle, cclxvi, N.P.N.F.; pp. 301-303.

and "Non Nobis Quidquam".^{18.} Damasus and the Western Bishops here set out a detailed refutation of Apollinarianism, and also repudiated the erroneous teaching of the Pneumatomachi and of Marcellus. It was at this Council that Dorotheus, as he later reported, was shocked to hear Basil's friends, Meletius of Antioch and Eusebius of Samosata, spoken of as "Ariomaniacs" in the presence of Damasus and Peter, neither of whom raised one word of protest.^{19.} Deep despondency now settled upon the Bishop of Caesarea. "I seem to be deprived by my sins of all success in my undertakings", he writes in the year, 377.^{20.}

The long series of negotiations therefore concluded in a most unsatisfactory way. Resenting the authoritative approach of Basil's latest letter addressed "To the Westerns" (263), Damasus appears to have abandoned the churches arising from the great metropolis of Antioch to their own pitiable fate. We can also gather that the Bishop of Rome did not in the least approve of Basil, Meletius, Eusebius of Samosata or their colleagues discussing these significant ecclesiastical happenings on the basis of equality. The lack of real respect and filial devotion with regard to the Apostolic Seat, which characterises all of the Basil's letters, and especially the last one, also explains the reason for Damasus' firm reply.

The above survey of the negotiations between Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome clearly reveal strong undercurrents at work. Our study of this subject would not be complete without a closer examination of these particular tensions which appear to have doomed the whole affair from the

18. See E. Schwartz, Über die Sammlung des Cod. Veronenis LX, 3,4,; pp. 21-23.

19. Basil, Epistle, cclxvi, N.P.N.F.; pp. 305-306.

20. Basil, Epistle, cclxvi.2, N.P.N.F.; pp. 305-306.

very beginning. We shall, therefore, now give some space for a consideration of:-

4. Suggested Causes of the Setback to the Negotiations between Basil and Damasus.

Our main interest here will be to disentangle some of the apparent reasons for the failure of both the Eastern and Western Churches to bring about an effective solution to the problem of Antioch. The points which we shall raise fall into two categories. Let us now look at them in turn.

(A) The secondary reasons for the failure:

This survey must commence with an examination of the influence which geography had upon the negotiations. Considerable distance separated Caesarea, lying in the heart of Cappadocia, from Rome. Basil frequently alludes to this problem in his correspondence. Take, as an example, his letter addressed "To the Presbyter, Dorotheus" (215). He says: "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." While we can immediately appreciate the difficulties created by bad road conditions in winter, Basil now mentions another which would, with equal seriousness, adversely affect communications with the West. The existence of these two problems, not to mention any other at the moment, must have seriously hampered the free flow of letters which was part and parcel of the negotiations.

Another point which must be taken into consideration is the problem of linguistics. Relations between the Oriental and Occidental Churches became much more difficult when, after the complete Latinization of the Roman Church in the middle of the 3rd century, the two great halves of Christendom found they were no longer speaking the same language. It was

only the exceptional Greek who learned Latin as a literary language; and only the unusual Latin who gave serious study to Greek. This produced a linguistic barrier which was to increase in size with the passage of the years. Indeed, this problem explains the birth and continuance of grave theological misunderstandings between the East and West. More will be said later on this point.

Different theological aims between the two main branches of the Church is a further aspect worthy of notice. The Eastern churches were much more interested in the free elaboration of dogmatic speculation than the West. This emphasis produced arguments which were full of subtle distinctions. The West, on the other hand, gave more attention to moral and human problems, as well as their practical solution. In consequence, the West regarded the finely woven theologies of the East to be mere vain intellectual exercises which were both useless and difficult to understand. This Western emphasis is well illustrated in their attitude to the Nicene Creed. They regarded adherence to this symbol as being absolutely necessary to the preservation of true faith. The real danger of this pragmatic attitude, of course, lies in the fact that soon its acceptance becomes the only possible expression of orthodoxy. Many battles were indeed fought around these conflicting theological viewpoints.

The last point calling for attention under this heading concerns the similarity of temperament between Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome. Both men were imperious and determined to follow their own policy without qualification. Both of them, for example, were faithful to their allies. Damasus of Rome loyally supported Athanasius, Peter and Paulinus of Antioch. Basil, on the other hand, maintained his alliance with Meletius of Antioch and Eusebius of Samosata, and resolutely refused to recognise Paulinus as

the rightful Bishop of Antioch. Furthermore, while Damasus was set upon the programme of submitting the members of the Church in the East to the spiritual lordship of Rome, Basil obstinately laboured to impose upon the Pope of Rome his own solution to the schism at Antioch, his "theology of hypostases", and his list of proscriptions. These two representatives, equally imperious and unaccommodating, were not made to come to agreement. This is a point upon which more will be said later.

(B) Primary causes for the setback:

The four points to which we shall now turn our attention require much closer scrutiny than was given to the secondary points treated above. Their importance obviously demand it. Here we shall deal with matters of theology, ecclesiastical policy and personality. As we develop each point in turn, however, one conviction is kept firmly in mind - namely, that Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome failed to produce effective measures with regard to the church of Antioch, because of their divergent concept of the nature and constitution of the universal Church.

(i) The conflict which resulted from the use of different terminology with regard to the Trinity:

It is a well known fact that the divergent points of emphasis between the Eastern and the Western concepts of the Trinity, centred less upon the content of belief than around the different terminology employed. This point was used by the West to harden its attitude toward the East. Up to the time of Damasus' letter, known to us in the fragment "Ea gratia", the Roman Church had remained faithful in her correspondence with the East, to the formula attributed to Tertullian: namely, "una substantia, tres personae". But in this letter of 374, the term substantia was intentionally replaced by the Greek term οὐσία, and literally translated as such.

Moreover, neither "Illud Sane Miramur" or "Non Nobis Quidquam" contained any recognition, even implicit, of the theory or terminology of the three hypostases, τρῆς ὑποστάσεις.^{21.} This doctrine and terminology belonged to the homoiousians; that is, to Basil of Ancyra, Cyril of Jerusalem and Meletius of Antioch. Basil of Caesarea, however, with other Cappadocians, adopted and later developed this idea into a sound logical system.^{22.}

In practical terms this meant that as long as Damasus was subject to the influence of his Eastern adviser, Peter of Alexandria, who rejected the liberalism of his predecessor which was manifestly revealed at the Council of Alexandria in 362,^{23.} he would refuse to tolerate this concept. His outright rejection, of course, was based upon identification of the Greek term ὑπόστασις with the Latin term *substantia*, which always meant the unity of the divine essence. It is not surprising, therefore, that the West looked upon Meletius of Antioch and all his adherents, and this included Basil of Caesarea, as disguised Arians. For this reason, Damasus of Rome imposed upon Basil and his colleagues a formula of faith to which they had to attach their names, without even having an opportunity to discuss the terms employed. To put the matter another way, Rome and the

21. See E. Schwartz, Über die Sammlung des Cod. Veronensis LX, 2,3,4,; pp. 20-23.

22. See G.L. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought (S.P.C.K.) 1964; p.242; and J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, (Third Edition); pp. 263-269. While the doctrine of the Cappadocians was the same as that held by Athanasius, from whom they learned it, they stressed a different point. Since their main battle was against the strict Arians, they insisted upon the objective triplicity of the Godhead as the basis of their attack. From this point they advanced to the conclusion that because the three hypostasis were equal, they must constitute a single and identical ousia.

23. See J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, pp. 253-254; and J. Quasten, Patrology, Vol. III, 1963; p. 228. The decision of the Synod of Alexandria to formally recognise the concept of either one 'hypostasis' or three 'hypostasis' in God, led to endless misunderstanding and controversy. As far as Athanasius was concerned, 'hypostasis' and 'ousia' meant simply 'being'. See his Ad Afros, 4.

West adopted this stern measure because they regarded the logical conclusion of Basil's doctrine of "one essence in three hypostasis" to be Arian, tritheistic or polytheistic.

Another point, however, contributed toward the Western aversion to Basil and his supporters. This matter concerned Meletius of Antioch. Before he became, from the Western point of view, the anti-canonical Bishop of Antioch, he had had strong Arian associations. Regardless of his later confession of the true faith, Rome still regarded him with great suspicion.

These two points, namely, Meletius' previous Arian association and the doctrine of the three hypostasis, which Basil expounded with passionate conviction, fortified the spirit of distrust which the West harboured for the East.

Let us now look at the Eastern point of view. The Oriental Bishops who formed themselves around Meletius and Basil made every effort to profess the orthodox faith in matters concerning the Trinity. They found no difficulty in using the term homoousion to mean the perfect equality of the Son with the Father. While they did emphasise the concept of the three hypostasis, they made every effort to express the unity of essence in the Trinity.

On the other hand, the Oriental Bishops had already avowed to seek the destruction of Marcellus of Ancyra, who had professed a theology which was unquestionably Sabellian. When the Western Church recognised him at the Council of Sardica in 343, all the Eastern Bishops, including Basil of Caesarea, could not help suspecting Damasus, Peter and Paulinus of collusion with one of the enemies of the true faith.

The fact that the West tolerated a person whose theology was, in the eyes of the Eastern Bishops, completely Sabellian - it sought to suppress the real distinction between the three divine Hypostasis - further poisoned the atmosphere of negotiation. .

Although the immediate objective which Basil of Caesarea had in mind was not realised, we must not jump to the conclusion that all was lost. The Roman document called "The Tome of Damasus" seems to suggest that some little progress had indeed been made. It is most probable that these bans were issued by Damasus in response to Basil's Epistle 263, and that it is actually the Synodical letter of a Council held in 377 or 378.

Some salient features are: With regard to doctrinal matters, this Council arrived at decisions which entirely conformed with the desires of the Archbishop of Caesarea. Moreover, the controversial subject regarding the primacy of Rome was discretely left alone. This was primarily a document which was prepared in order to express the Roman disapproval of heresy. While it did not contain any censure against Eustathius of Sabaste, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Marcellus of Ancyra or Paulinus of Antioch, it did openly condemn Arius, Sabellius, Eunomius and the Macedonians. Thus, some good did come out of these negotiations, although it may not have entirely complied with the wishes of either Basil of Caesarea or Damasus of Rome.

- (ii) The discord which arose out of the direct confrontation of the two major ecclesiastical power-groups in the 4th century:

Enough has already been said in the earlier part of this study to show that two very influential pressure-groups were at work in the 4th century. Our task must now be to look at them a little more closely.

We have, first of all, the party which represented the West and Egypt; created by an alliance between the Seats of Rome and Alexandria. This union can be traced back to earlier days. Athanasius, the champion of the Nicene formula, had always found great support and indefatigable friendship in Julius of Rome (337-352). He had provided shelter for the Bishop of Alexandria after his escape from that city in 339. Such friendship, of course, naturally brought the two men and their respective Sees closer together. Before he had succumbed to the pressure of the Emperor to support the condemnation of Athanasius, Liberius, (352-366), Julius' successor, had loyally defended both the cause and person of Athanasius. He was succeeded by Damasus (366-384), who quickly re-established the relationships of friendship and co-operation with the aged Athanasius, who, since 366, was living in peace at Alexandria. This party, headed by the Sees of Rome and Alexandria, resolutely defended the Nicene Creed.

The second power-group represented the East, and Antioch was its ecclesiastical centre. Owing to internal theological division, the West regarded this party as being virtually *persona non grata*. We can appreciate this attitude by recalling that up to the death of the Emperor Valens in 378, the majority of the Eastern episcopacy had accepted the Homoean confession of faith imposed upon them by Constantius in 359. But a very different reaction is felt when we remember that, although this may be true, there were still a great number of Bishops in the East who either remained loyal to orthodoxy or were desirous of being more closely associated with this confession of faith. This group, committed homoiousions, had Meletius of Antioch as its hierarchical chief, and Basil of Caesarea as its theological leader. Indeed, it was the Bishop

of Caesarea who succeeded in integrating this party with the Nicenes of the East.

The frustrating negotiations between Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome represented therefore the confrontation of almost all the Eastern Meletian episcopacy with the churches of the West and Egypt. The conflict between these two parties, already intense during the year 370-379, became increasingly acute until the Council of Chalcedon (451). This date marks the conclusion of the political-ecclesiastical power of Egypt in the affairs of the imperial Church.

The reasons outlined above clearly explain why the confrontation of these two major power-groups in the 4th century Church brought almost certain discord into the negotiations between their respective leaders.

(iii) The further irritation created by the clash of two inflexible personalities:

Since we have already said one or two words on this subject, we shall here confine our attention to an examination of the point as it concerns Marcellus of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste.

Marcellus, the strong supporter of the homoousion at Nicea, became increasingly suspect of heresy from the year 330 onwards. This man, who became more and more an embarrassment to the illustrious Bishop of Alexandria, was quickly singled out by the Oriental episcopacy as the main object of their heretical charges. He was one of the real causes of strife between the Eastern and Western Churches. Although his theology was certainly Modalistic, Western respect for him would not allow them to investigate his writings with anything like an open mind. In consequence, he was recognised on more than one occasion as orthodox. For example, a Roman Council, held in the year 341, under the presidency of Pope Julius,

awarded him a certificate of orthodoxy. Two years later, at the Synod of Sardica, the Fathers of the West again pronounced him loyal to the true faith. Indeed, when he died in the year 374, at the ripe old age of ninety, he was still in ecclesiastical communion with Rome and Alexandria.

The East, and especially Basil of Caesarea, thundered against both the doctrine and person of this man. In his letter addressed "To Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria" (69), the Bishop of Caesarea remarks: "A point that is also insisted upon by some of those in these parts, very necessarily, as is plain even to myself, is that they (the Romans) should drive away the heresy of Marcellus, as gr̄evous and injurious and opposed to sound faith." ²⁴.

Despite these pressing appeals to condemn Marcellus, the West merely censured the Sabellian doctrine attributed to him. On no occasion did it reverse this decision and criticise Marcellus himself. It is quite clear that this was due to the West recalling his earlier support of Athanasius and the Nicene cause.

Now let us consider Eustathius of Sebaste. In his letter 263, addressed "To the Westerns", this is to say, to Damasus, Basil demanded of the Pope an explicit condemnation of the person of the Bishop of Sebaste. He bluntly states: "As it is from the West that he derives his power to injure the churches, and uses the authority given him by you to the overthrow of the many, it is necessary that his correction should come from the same quarter, and that a letter be sent to the churches stating on what terms he was received, and in what manner he has changed his conduct and nullified the favour given him by the Fathers at that time". Basil's honest opinion therefore was that the West was to blame for the misdeeds

24. See also Basil, Epistles, cxxv, ccvii, cclxiii.

of Eustathius who had now become his own personal enemy. This letter clearly illustrates the nature of the correspondence toward the end of the negotiations. The Bishop of Caesarea was manifestly exasperated. He accordingly takes great pains to unambiguously state his case, and, on occasions, to inform Damasus what he had to do in order to clear up the situation. ²⁵.

These bitter and painful questions of personalities (Basil against Damasus; Damasus and Peter against Basil, Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata; Meletius of Antioch against Paulinus of Antioch, to mention only a few names) continued to set the East against the West. Without the slightest doubt, these personal rivalries and dissensions constitutes one of the essential reasons why the Metropolitan of Caesarea failed to bring peace and unity to the Oriental Church.

(iv) The clash of opinion between the two leaders in matters of ecclesiology:

The subject we are about to develop may not actually appear very clearly in the texts which we have to hand, but it still exists, for all that. Even a cursory examination of the material reveals an obvious undercurrent in matters pertaining to the government of the Church. The disagreement and its consequences may be seen in the following way. Both Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome made sincere efforts to establish peace and unity between the two halves of the Church. But in their efforts to reach the common goal, both of them acted in such a way as to create mutual irritation. The fundamental reason for this was that each allowed

25. Another example of Basil giving advice to Damasus occurs toward the end of the letter. Basil says: "Of these things I implore you to take due heed. This will be the case if you will consent to write to all the churches of the East that those who have perverted these doctrines are in communion with you, if they amend; but that if they contentiously determine to abide in their innovations, you are separated from them... Delay is dangerous, for the mischief they have caused has taken root." Epistle, cclxiii; N.P.N.F.; pp. 301-303.

himself to be guided by his own personal idea of the nature and unity of the Catholic Church. Because these concepts differed on essential points, the negotiations, as we have already noticed, progressively deteriorated.

Basil based his political programme upon ecclesiological presuppositions which were not acceptable to the West in general, or to Rome in particular. They were judged to be out-dated and, therefore, wholly inadequate to meet the exigencies of the day. The Basilian concept of the Church was basically the primitive notion. He laid more stress upon the pneumatic than the institutional aspect. He accordingly regarded faith, charity and brotherly love of all the orthodox Bishops to be more important than the government of the Church by one Bishop who was superior to his colleagues. We may safely say that Basil regarded the two hallmarks of ecclesiastical unity to be orthodoxy and brotherly love.

This basic idea appears again and again in his voluminous correspondence, as one would expect. For him, the Church is one society bound together by mutual love; that is, a fraternity, ἀδελφοτης. This belief is particularly well illustrated in his letter "To the Presbyters of Tarsus" (113). He writes: "We live in days when the overthrow of the churches seems imminent; of this I have long been cognisant. There is no edification of the Church; no correction of error; no sympathy for the weak; no single defence of sound brethren; no remedy is found either to heal the disease which has already seized us, or as a preventive against that which we expect. Altogether the state of the Church is like an old coat, which is always being torn and can never be restored to its original strength ... Union would be effected if we were willing to accommodate ourselves to the weaker, where we can do so

without injury to souls." 26.

Since this was the case, Basil of Caesarea refused to take into account the authoritarian decision of Damasus with regard to Antioch; that is, the decision which confirmed the recognition of Paulinus as the legitimate Bishop of that influential metropolis. In addition to this, and for exactly the same reason, he strongly refused to sign the formula of faith, drawn up in Rome and delivered for his signature by Evagrius. He resented being treated as a person whose faith was suspected, and from whom a signature was to be obtained without an opportunity being given to examine the terms employed within it. This piece of unjustified Roman superiority must surely have greatly offended the Bishop of Caesarea, as well as the other Eastern Bishops.

It is also most significant that throughout the whole period of these painful negotiations, all the official letters which Basil sent to the West were addressed either to the assembly of "Western Bishops" or to the 'Bishops of Gaul and Italy'. Only one letter is addressed to Damasus in person; that is letter number 70, which he drew up at the beginning of his episcopacy, in the autumn of the year 371. This letter, full of polite and respectful phrases, clearly is typical of the kind of letter one Bishop would send to another. There is no sign whatsoever that the writer was the faithful and obedient son of the Church of Rome.

26. Father Congar, in his book 'Divided Christendom', asserts that "from the first, Eastern ecclesiological thought envisaged the divine realities at the heart of the mystery of the Church rather than its earthly aspect and human implications ... The relatively feeble development of ecclesiology by the Greek Fathers has often been remarked, the fact being that their emphasis was rather of Christology and still more Pneumatology; seeing the Church in Christ and in the Holy Spirit rather than in its ecclesiological being as such."

Quoted by V. Lossky in The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church; pp. 174-175.

This evidence would lead us to the conclusion, which accords with our understanding of Basil's ecclesiological viewpoint, that he did not wish to deal exclusively with Damasus of Rome, but with the greatest possible number of Western Bishops, or at least with the Synod which met each year under the presidency of the Bishop of Rome.

At this point, let us examine the Western opinion. It would be most unfair to affirm that at this date - the end of the 4th century - the Roman Church demanded of Basil and the East a recognition of her pre-eminence. This claim was not actually formulated until the year 382; that is to say, three or four years after the death of the Metropolitan of Caesarea. Indeed, when this theory was first propounded, it was not done so by Damasus, but by Pope Leo the Great. But it would be natural for the Roman Church to hope to receive from the East some implied recognition of her uniqueness.²⁷ This, however, was not forthcoming from Basil. His letters and conduct, both lacking deference and obedience to the Roman Primacy, must have gravely offended the holder of the Apostolic Seat. It must also have shocked many of the Westerns, among whom we must note Jerome, who confessed and defended the Roman supremacy. Jerome, in fact, accused Basil of pride. Elsewhere he even goes as far as to affirm that there existed only three orthodox Bishops in the time of Epiphanius; these were Athanasius of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis and Paulinus of

27. The Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. 1, (1911); p. 172 says "The pontificate of Damasus (366-384) has more than once mentioned in the preceding pages as the period of the first definite self-expression of the papacy."

Antioch. ^{28.} All other Eastern Bishops, he confidently asserted, were Arians. This rash accusation certainly suggests a very strong Western reaction to the ecclesiastical diplomacy of the East.

The evidence which we have adumbrated above points to the fact that Basil's ecclesiastical programme, although it was primarily conceived to meet the peculiar difficulties of the Eastern Church at the time of his episcopate, would have greatly strengthened the Church of that and succeeding ages. But almost as soon as it was conceived it was doomed to failure. Two fundamental reasons may be advanced to explain this: (a) The theological climate of the day was wholly unfavourable to such a scheme; and (b) The inflexible attitude of both Basil and Damasus in ecclesiological matters. ~~X~~ As we have already seen, these two factors stifled all progress toward the peace and unity of the Catholic Church.

We cannot conclude (this chapter), however, without remarking upon the tireless patience of the Metropolitan of Caesarea. Having decided upon his course of action, he steadfastly set his face to carry it out as quickly as possible. But the Bishop of Rome, the leader of the Western block, determined otherwise. Clearly, the two basic features of the Basilian concept of ecclesiastical unity - orthodoxy and brotherly love - were absent from the 4th century Catholic Church. On the other hand, Damasus refused to have any significant dealings with the East because of their alleged unorthodoxy. Quite obviously, Basil was unable to realise his earnest desire by reason of Western intransigence. Under these circumstances, therefore, the outcome of the negotiations between Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome is not unexpected.

28. Jerome, To Pammachius against John of Jerusalem 4. Having previously addressed Epiphanius as "our Father in God", he goes on to say: "At the time when the whole East (except our Fathers in God, Athanasius and Paulinus) was overrun by the Arian and Eunomian heresies ..."

CHAPTER EIGHT .

An Assessment - Conclusion.

We have been dealing thus far with some of the most outstanding events in the episcopate of Basil of Caesarea. The collecting of information relevant to these points has enabled us to arrive at certain firm conclusions. In this present chapter we shall bring together all our findings and then attempt an assessment of the thesis we set out to examine.

One particularly important aspect of Basil's life still requires some attention - namely, his early years. Although his youth obviously prevented him from becoming involved in the lively theological debates of the age, his family and the education he received both fashioned the mind that was later to give its undoubted ability in the defence of the orthodox faith.

1. Basil's Early Years:

Basil of Caesarea was not a convert to the Christian faith, but the product of Christian upbringing. He was the son of a lawyer who had acquired for himself a high reputation in Pontus and the neighbouring districts.

Some controversy has arisen with regard to the date of Basil's birth. Most scholars are agreed that it must have taken place between 329-330. Two cities have been named as his birthplace - Caesarea in Cappadocia and Neocaesarea in Pontus. Some uncertainty must indeed exist on this particular point since no clarifying statement can be found anywhere to help us. Gregory Nazianzus, however, does speak of Basil as a Cappadocian like himself. This reference is generally accepted as the main ground for associating Basil's birthplace with Cappadocia.

Basil was a member of a family of ten children. The eldest, Macrina, was named after her grandmother. One of his brothers appears to have died in infancy, for on the occasion of the death of his father four sons and five daughters were left to share the considerable fortune he had left them. Two sons became Bishops, one of Nyssa, and the other of Sebaste. Naucratius, Basil's immediate junior, died in early manhood; round about the time of Basil's ordination as a Reader.

The place most closely connected with his early years is neither Caesarea nor Neocaesarea, but a small village in Pontus called Annesi. Here Basil was brought up by his saintly grandmother, Macrina. In this neighbourhood his family possessed considerable property. Indeed, here his mother founded a church in honour of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste.

Basil's schooldays were spent in the company of another pupil who was later to become one of "The Three Cappadocians" - namely, Gregory Nazianzus. Later, he continued his studies at the new capital of Constantinople. Here he studied rhetoric and philosophy and proved himself an outstanding pupil.

In the year 351 he proceeded to the university of Athens. His studious way ill-fitted him for the boisterous habits of the undergraduates. Fortunately, he was saved from the worst consequences by Gregory Nazianzus who had preceded him there, and through whom he later secured a certain amount of popularity. Another distinguished student at this time was a member of the Imperial household. His name was Julian. He became known to both Gregory and Basil, but he already showed antipathy toward the Christian faith.

At university, Gregory and Basil became known for three things: (a) Their diligence and success in study; (b) Their highly principled and devout lives; (c) Their loyalty to each other. Around this period Basil entered upon an exceedingly brief correspondence with Apollinaris. The letter in question was written "from laymen to laymen". Later, as we have had cause to note, this missive was used by Basil's opponents to accuse him of fostering heretical associations.

Basil left university in the year 356. Gregory remained some time longer to pursue an academic career. Possessing a more practical turn of mind, Basil settled down to an active life in Caesarea. For a time he was satisfied to accept the admiration and flattery accorded to such an outstanding son of the town as himself. But he was finally jolted out of his self-satisfaction by his sister, Macrina. To her he owed his conversion to what was then regarded as the main expression of the religious life - namely, to the life of a monk. This new resolution led him to receive Baptism and later to become Ordained a Reader of the Church. What followed need not be pursued since we have already dealt with it in some detail.

Basil's early years reveal three significant factors which were to play a most important role in his later work for the Church:

(A) He was a member of a Christian family.

Basil was born into the bosom of a wealthy and pious family, whose ancestors had distinguished themselves as martyrs. The seeds of piety were planted in Basil by the influence of

three women - namely, (a) Macrina, his grandmother; (b) Emmelia, his mother; (c) Macrina, his eldest sister. The other members of the family were equally religious, as we have had reason to note. It is therefore quite clear that the religious influence of this family had a lasting effect upon all the family.

(B) He was born into a Church which had received official blessing.

Basil's birth took place at approximately the same time as the transference of the chief seat of power from Rome in the West to Constantinople in the East. Sixteen years earlier, Constantine had issued his Edict of Milan which marked the end of pagan Rome and inaugurated the Christian Empire. Christianity was now no longer the outlawed religion, but the preferred faith of the Emperor. Moreover, five years earlier, the first great Council of Nicea had given official expression to the fundamental faiths of the Church. This shift of interest, and its eventual return, certainly allowed Basil of Caesarea to become involved in certain ecclesiastical matters of the first magnitude.

(C) He enjoyed a liberal education.

Basil's liberal education began with his father, who was a rhetorician; continued with his study of rhetoric and philosophy at Constantinople; and crowned with a successful academic career at the university of Athens. The fruits of these years of learning are quickly recognised in his writings. Basil's training therefore was not isolated from the mainstream of contemporary thought and life, but intimately involved in

it. Although Athens may have contributed something to the apostasy of Julian, it provided Basil with a solid foundation upon which he was able to build his own understanding of the living faith.

2. Assessment:

Now that we have gathered together all the facts relevant to our study, our next duty must be to extract (although not by force) those features which indicate the personal and ecclesiastical qualities of the Archbishop of Caesarea.

(A) Basil of Caesarea Possessed both Political Skill and Moral Integrity:

Ecclesiastical History is full of people who possess either the one or the other gift, but few indeed are the number who have them compounded together in their own person. Basil of Caesarea, we believe, is an example of one of those exceptional persons.

At moments of crisis, Basil was always guided by his strong desire to direct all parts of the Church toward the unity he believed could be established by a recognition and acceptance of the Nicene formula. This fact, moreover, is evidenced both when he was an Archdeacon and an Archbishop.

Basil's churchmanship, or moral integrity, or both, are made clear in the following cases - (a) The decisions of the Synod of Lampsacus in 364 and the Council of Tyanna in 367; (b) His departure to Pontus, accompanied by Gregory, when Archbishop Eusebius' jealousy had created an ecclesiastical situation in Caesarea which could have resulted in further Arian advance; (c) Basil's ready acceptance of Eusebius'

request to return to the episcopal city to assist him to resist further Arian aggression; (d) His earnest desire, on the death of Archbishop Eusebius to secure the episcopal throne for himself. This aim and the manner by which he achieved it have come in for some criticism, but it would seem to us that they were both conditioned by the Arian success at Tarsus.

Two further examples deserve a fuller comment than given to those above. (a) When the Province of Cappadocia was divided into two parts, Basil regarded this as an open attack upon his own episcopal power. Such was not the case, but, because the State and Synodal boundaries coincided, it was a justifiable conclusion. Thereafter, hostility broke out between Basil and the ambitious Anthimus. The immediate counter-measures of the Archbishop of Caesarea were singularly unsuccessful; indeed, they only gained Gregory's lasting disapproval. Eventually, however, after more pressure had been brought to bear upon Anthimus, the matter was resolved, although we do not know how it was actually achieved.

(b) Being anxious to heal the schism at Antioch, Basil wrote to the West asking for assistance with the matter. At first he wrote to Athanasius, but, because of his flattering reference to Meletius, the Archbishop of Alexandria did nothing. He then approached Sabinus to do something about the matter. Basil then sought the assistance of Meletius, Bishop of Antioch. He suggested to him that he should make a direct approach to the Roman See. But owing to the fact that he was now in exile, Meletius wrote a letter, in the name of thirty-two Bishops, and addressed it to the "Bishops of

Gaul and Italy". This missive, still retained in Basil's correspondence, clearly pointed out the great distress of the Oriental Church at what had taken place at Antioch, and requested that a deputation should be sent to that city with powers to unite all parties under the "creed drawn up by our fathers at Nicea". This letter, together with others addressed to outstanding Western Bishops, were taken by Sabinus to the West in 373. Some months later, Evagrius, a priest of Antioch, returned home. Basil was then handed the letters which he had, some months earlier, given to Sabinus. The Western representative was further instructed to present to Basil a confession of faith, prepared in Rome, which he had to sign without delay or alteration. This action certainly reveals the West's attitude to Basil's concern for Church unity. They were clearly unwilling to negotiate with someone who was regarded a schismatic, or even a heretic. This set-back was followed by two further attempts to secure the West's assistance, but each effort proved to be unsuccessful. Indeed, the long series of appeals ended with Basil being plunged into deep despondency.

Although further evidence could be adduced to support this point, we believe sufficient has been said to indicate the moral integrity and political skill of Basil of Caesarea.

(B) Basil of Caesarea's Positive Defence of the Symbol of Nicea:

The new orthodoxy of the Archbishop of Caesarea must be viewed in the light of the two following facts: (a) We must relate it to the divisions of the Arian party in the

the middle of the 4th century; and (b) We must also note that Basil's two fellow-Cappadocians and Epiphanius further developed his dogmatic emphasis.

Basil grew up with the semi-Arians, was Origenistic in sympathy, and fiercely opposed to Sabellianism. But he did feel the strong influence of Athanasius and recognised the Nicene Creed as an authoritative declaration of the Church's doctrinal position. He therefore began by energetically labouring to heal the division between the semi-Arians and the Nicenes. With this end in view, he sought both to interpret the Creed of Nicea and the word "hypostasis" in such a way as to make it acceptable to the semi-Arians, without actually offending Athanasius and his associates. The formula he used was - "one essence in three hypostasis". This vehicle of exposition enabled him to emphasise both the oneness of nature and the distinction of Persons in the Godhead as it had never been done before. Hitherto, the words "ousia" and "hypostasis" were used to mean the same thing. This practice, for instance, existed in the West from the time the Nicene Creed was formed right up to the end of Basil's episcopate. Indeed, this was one of the major reasons for the strong disagreement between Basil and Damasus. According to Athanasius and the West, the three Persons of the Godhead were the same Being living in a threefold relationship. Following the example of the later Platonists, Basil sought to distinguish between these two words. He took "ousia" to mean the common nature shared by the Godhead, and the word "hypostasis" he used to indicate the three distinct

Persons of the Godhead. Therefore, for Basil of Caesarea, the formula "one essence in three hypostasis" expounded his belief that a common essence was shared by the three individual Persons of the Trinity. The real cutting-edge of this expositional tool may be seen by referring to - "Adversus Eunomium" (Book ii.4), "De Spiritu Sancto" (Chapters 17 and 18), and his "Epistles" (xxxviii, ccxxxvi). Although the difference in emphasis between the East and the West was quite sharp on this point, each in their own way endeavoured to preserve the unity of the Godhead. We may summarise the distinction thus: While the Nicenes defended the numerical unity of the Godhead, the Easterns stressed its triplicity.

The lasting effect of this new and positive defence of the Nicene formula may be seen by an examination of the development of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed.

The Creed issued in 325 by the Council of Nicea reveals no special interest in the Holy Spirit. Attention was mainly centred upon the Son and His relationship to the Father. The Arians treated the Paraclete as they did the Son - they recognised Him as a creature having a different dignity, order, and nature from both God and man. While others continued to regard the Son as being consubstantial with the Father, they persisted in thinking of the Spirit as a creature posterior and inferior to God. It was against these Pneumatomachians that Basil of Caesarea wrote his treatise "De Spiritu Sancto". Indeed, Basil's valuable defence of the orthodox faith was very quickly recognised. In the

year 376, Amphilocius, the Bishop of Iconium, presided at a Synod where the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity was set out exactly as Basil had propounded it in his "De Spiritu Sancto". The final settlement of this question, however, was not achieved in 381 without further work being done by the two Gregories and Epiphanius. Thereafter, the consubstantiality of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit was generally accepted by the Church.

Our present Nicene Creed is not identical with the original Creed of 325. It was once thought that this was due to the fact that it had been revised by the Council of Constantinople in 381. It was for this reason called the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. The authorities connecting it with Constantinople date from the year 449-450. If this tradition is accepted, it is very possible that Cyril of Jerusalem or Nectarius brought it before the Council as a profession of faith. Other grounds exist, however, for disassociating it from Constantinople. Its appearance in Epiphanius' "Ancoratus" would be a most helpful piece of evidence, if only there were no reasons for assuming that the Nicene and not the Constantinopolitan Creed originally stood in the text. Notwithstanding all these problems, it does seem likely that our Nicene Creed ultimately derives from the Baptismal Creed of Jerusalem.

The difference between the Constantinopolitan and Nicene Creed may be adumbrated thus: (a) The second section on the Person of Christ is very much longer; (b) The Nicene phrase "from the substance of the Father" is omitted; (c) It

contains an extended statement on the status and work of the Holy Spirit; (d) It contains assertions of belief in the Church, Baptism, the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Life; (e) It contains no anathemas.

From what has just been said, we may conclude that the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed represents more closely the position of Basil of Caesarea than the one held by Athanasius and his associates. Its theological comprehensiveness and attitude of tolerance certainly made it more suitable for general liturgical use; indeed, these two qualities eventually brought about its general acceptance. By the 6th century the whole of the East chose it in preference to the original Creed of 325, and the West followed that example not long afterwards. In both parts of the Empire, however, it continued to be called the "Nicene Creed" - a practice which continues to this day.

Our survey of this major Basilian contribution to the unity of the Church has made the following two points especially clear - (a) Basil's new orthodoxy was not established without hostility and personal sacrifice; (b) It also required later development. However, the fact that he actually pioneered this new and positive defence of orthodoxy during his episcopate, is a point we consider to be of supreme importance.

(C) Basil of Caesarea's Practical Measures to Consolidate the Church:

Two contributory features now require to be examined separately. They are:-

(a) Basil's efforts to strengthen Monasticism.

Basil of Caesarea's connection with monasticism may be said to have begun around the year 358, when he journeyed to Egypt to see for himself the ascetic and cenobitic establishments there. Having been profoundly impressed with what he had seen, he returned home determined to mould his institutions in such a way as to make them suitable to the needs and people of his own country. The implementation of this desire, however, did not require him to start from scratch. Eustathius of Sebaste had already established monasteries in Pontus and, on the basis of his superior experience, had advised Basil to visit Egypt and Syria. Pontus, like Egypt and Syria, supported both the ascetic and cenobitic ways of life. This at first created a problem for Basil, but, according to Gregory Nazianzen (Oration, xliii.62) "he brought them together and united them". The site finally chosen by Basil and Gregory for their monastic settlement stood on the banks of the river Iris, and was called Annesi. It was contiguous to the city of Neo-Caesarea, and was under the ecclesiastical authority of Ibora.

As we would expect, Basil's ideas regarding the cenobitic life reveal some slight change with the passage of years. When we compare his first sketch of the cenobitic life

(Epistle ii) with a later letter dealing with the subject (Epistle xxii), we can see that certain institutional problems did indeed arise, but these difficulties were soon resolved by the Archbishop. On the other hand, when we compare these two letters with Basil's Rules, it will immediately be seen that all were written in a spirit of moderation. Clearly, Basil did not recommend the average monk to follow his own example. Like Pachomius before him and Benedict after him, Basil sought to temper his own original ideals when legislating for his associates.

Basil of Caesarea's attempts to strengthen monasticism express themselves in three noteworthy ways:-

Firstly, he sought to give a new organisational emphasis to the movement. This, of course, involved him in departing from the practice which had been instituted by Pachomius. Under the Pachomian order, a large number of monks lived together under the same roof - an arrangement which undoubtedly created certain peculiar problems. Anxious to reduce these to a minimum, Basil created a system of small monasteries; each probably housed no more than thirty or forty monks at one time. Superintendence of each monastery was therefore more efficiently carried out than under Pachomius' scheme. It also allowed him to systematise the female contribution being made to the movement. On the basis of his belief that women could make as great a contribution to the common life as men, Basil introduced a system of double monasteries, in which the abbot and abbess worked in close connection with each other. Realising that the

movement had to be kept free from scandal, Basil resolved that, while the abbot ruled over the whole religious establishment, the abbess was responsible for the nuns. Basil, moreover, recommended that the small monasteries should join together in a federation. This meant, for instance, that Superiors met together periodically in order to discuss common problems and to reach united solutions. This arrangement also allowed a new Superior to be appointed by a neighbouring monastery, although this was never done without the approval of the local monastery being expressed. In these and other ways, Basil sought to modify the Pachomian system of discipline in order to give more scope for voluntary action.

Secondly, Basil stressed the vocational aspect of monasticism. The Pachomian monasteries, as we have already noticed, were cenobitic only in outward appearance; they continued to be strongly individualistic. Cenobitism, properly so called, was introduced by Basil of Caesarea. His Rule was based upon two fundamental points - (i) Man is a social creature; (ii) God calls certain people to this way of life. For Basil, the second point was more important than the first. Indeed, without it there could have been no monastic movement at all. God's call to live the common life has priority over all others - this is one of the basic truths of the Basilian order; or for that matter, any other monastic order. In obedience to this call, men and women of both the Roman Church and Orthodoxy still seek self-fulfilment in the cenobitic way of life.

Thirdly, the Archbishop of Caesarea also made an educational emphasis. This was one of the ways in which he brought monasticism into the service of the Church. Basil's cenobia served a most useful purpose by providing education for children of both sexes. The main intention of these institutions was to prepare children for the monastic life which, it was hoped, they would later choose as their own career. But no pressure whatsoever was brought to bear upon the children to reach this decision. We may safely assume that, while many returned to the secular life after their training at the convent school, not a few remained to continue their education and search for God. This, and the fact that the teachers themselves were men and women well versed in Scripture, must have greatly strengthened orthodoxy's fight against Arianism. Doctrinal error fears the knowledgeable and articulate Christian, and this is precisely what the Basilian school was producing during the tempestuous years of Basil's episcopate.

No. (b) Basil laboured to implement his own ecclesiological programme.

Basil's (of Caesarea's) failure to effect an alliance with Damasus of Rome may be explained by referring to the profound divergence in ecclesiological policy which existed between them. It must be immediately admitted, however, that this conclusion does not readily appear in the texts which we have preserved for us, but it is a belief which we hope to expound in what follows.

No one would gainsay that both Basil and Damasus made every sincere effort to establish a unity between the two halves of 4th century Christendom. But the ecclesiastical situation in each of the two sections differed widely. The East was clearly divided between the Nicenes, the Arians, and other new heresies - for example, Apollinarianism, Macedonianism, etc. This created a disunity against which Basil was always writing - see his Epistles cxiii, cclxiii, cclxv. On the other hand, the West did not have to face these particular problems, although it did have its own peculiar difficulties. In their efforts to reach a common goal, and thereby solve their own respective perplexities, Basil and Damasus acted in ways which brought them in opposition to each other.

Basil's negotiations with Damasus failed because the Pope and the West rejected Basil's ecclesiastical programme and ecclesiastical politics. Basil's policy stressed three main points: (i) He insisted upon the acceptance of the spirit and letter of the symbol of Nicea; but, in addition to this, he also included a clause which defended the doctrine which stated that the Holy Spirit was consubstantial with the Father and the Son. (ii) In order to make this dogmatic unity really effective, however, he further stressed the need for the Church to foster a sincere Christian charity between all her Bishops. (iii) He negotiated with the West on the basis of the parity of all Bishops.

The West, on the other hand, was very conscious of the primacy of the Roman Church over all other churches. Damasus therefore made efforts to solve the Eastern problem in a monarchical and authoritarian fashion. Although it must be granted that the pre-eminence of the Roman Church was not officially formulated until the year 382, Damasus at the time hoped that Basil would grant to the See of Rome the recognition and respect already given to it by almost all the churches in the West.

Illustrations of these divergent ecclesiological policies are not numerous, but those we do possess are worthy of mention. For instance, Basil refused to sign the formula of faith prepared in Rome and delivered for his signature by Evagrius; he also rejected Damasus' solution to the problem at Antioch - namely, to recognise Paulinus as the only legitimate Bishop; moreover, and most significantly, in all his painful and frustrating dealings with Damasus, the Archbishop of Caesarea always addressed the assembly of Western Bishops and not Damasus himself. This is clear proof that Basil wished to negotiate with the Synod which met each year and Damasus, rather than with the Pope himself. The one letter which may be excluded from this rule - Epistle lxx - was written at the beginning of Basil's episcopate. An examination of its contents indicates that, while its tone accords with the new relationship existing between them, it nowhere suggests that Basil regarded the See of Rome as having a primacy over all other Sees. Thus,

in his dealings with Damasus and the West, Basil treats the Bishop of Rome with respect and veneration, but also as a colleague.

Damasus' imperial attitude toward Basil of Caesarea becomes apparent when we recall the confession of faith he sent via Evagrius which Basil had to sign without delay or alteration. This suggests that Damasus regarded Basil as at least a schismatic, if not actually a heretic. It is also to be observed in the peremptory tone of his letters. Imagine the pain inflicted upon Basil's intellectual liberty by reading the following from Damasus' "Ea Gratia":

"Here, then beloved brethren is our faith; whoever follows it is in communion with us. A body of diverse colours disfigures the members. We grant our communion to those who approve, on all points, our judgment. God forbid that we should tinge the pure faith with diverse colours. In addition to this, we warn you to take care that the canonical rule is not neglected in the consecration of Bishops and in the ordinations of clerics, and that one does not easily grant communion to those who have violated it. By so acting, one could incite other people to sin. This then is the judgment of which we notify you." This wound was further irritated in his "Non Nobis Quidquam", where he refused to give any help to the distressed Orientals. We are therefore not surprised at Basil's bitter complaints of Damasus' haughty pride and cold indifference to the needs of the Eastern Church - see Epistles ccxv, ccxxix. Thus in his

dealings with Basil of Caesarea, Damasus does not alter his ecclesiastical policy by one jot or tittle.

The contrast between these two ecclesiological programmes may be set out thus - Basil and the East conducted their negotiations with the West on the basis of a parity of all Bishops; Damasus and the West recognised and insisted that Basil and the East should accept the pre-eminence of the Roman Church - that is, the ecclesiastical policy which is summed up in the Latin phrase: "Primus inter Pares."

We believe that the negotiations between Basil of Caesarea and Damasus of Rome were unfruitful because of this fundamental divergence in ecclesiological emphasis. It must also have played its part in aggravating the theological and political set-up of the day. But worst of all, it explains the inflexible attitude which the two Bishops finally adopted against each other. To be sure, all was not lost. The "Tome of Damasus" does indicate a measure of success, but this was nothing in comparison with what could have been achieved had Basil and Damasus exercised some personal restraint, and used their undoubted political skill to achieve the peace and unity of the Church. And yet, having said all that, we cannot but admire the tireless patience which Basil exercised in his dealings with Damasus nor feel sad at the way in which they were concluded.

3. Conclusion:

The cardinal issues raised and developed in the

foregoing assessment permit us to come to the following conclusions:-

(i) Although the early years of Basil's life actually lie outside our field of research, certain points must be kept in mind because of their significant contribution to his later life and thought. Basil was born into a Christian home; brought up in a Church which had received the official blessing of the Emperor; and received the best liberal education then available. These three points undoubtedly prepared him for the tasks in which he was later to become involved.

(ii) Basil's contribution to the unity of the faith of the Church is both clear and considerable. Realising the need and the profit of closing the ranks of the Church, Basil first turned his energies toward bringing the Eastern semi-Arians and Nicenes closer together. Since the real problem between these two parties concerned the relationship which the Son and the Holy Spirit had with the Father, Basil proposed his formula - "one essence in three hypostasis". This new dogmatic emphasis certainly aroused considerable misunderstanding and hostility, particularly from the West, and it also required him to make a number of personal sacrifices. Its final acceptance by the Council of Constantinople in 381, however, did not come about without the further work of the two Gregories and Epiphanius. Notwithstanding this latter point, the fact that Basil virtually pioneered this new and positive defence of orthodoxy during his episcopate, is a matter of supreme importance.

(iii) Basil's practical measures to strengthen the Church are particularly well seen in two areas. The first concerns Monasticism. Here he laboured to modify the Pachomian Rule in such a way as to give more scope for voluntary action; to more adequately recognise both the societary and the devotional needs of the ascetics; and to establish an educational system which benefited both the monastery and society at large. The second area deals with Basil's negotiations with Damasus of Rome. The real problem centred around a divergent ecclesiological programme. Basil approached the West on the basis of his own belief in the parity of all Bishops. The West, even at this comparatively early date, insisted upon the Archbishop of Caesarea recognising the primacy of the See of Rome. Since these points were mutually unacceptable, confusion and hostility ensued. Some little progress was indeed achieved, but this was nothing when we compare it with what could have taken place. If Basil and Damasus had exercised restraint and constructive political ability, the Church would certainly have gained more than she did from their respective episcopates. One word more must be said regarding Basil of Caesarea. We cannot but note and admire his tireless patience throughout his dealings with Damasus and the West. In this respect he is an example worthy of emulation.

These, then, are the issues which must be kept in mind when we come to evaluate "St. Basil's contribution to the unity of the Church from 340-380".

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Histories of the Church.

- L. Duchesne, "Early History of the Church"; London, 1957.
- C.J. Hefele, "A History of the Councils of the Church",
English Translation; Edinburgh, 1876.
- B.J. Kidd, "A History of the Church to A.D. 461", Vol. 11;
Oxford, 1922.
- P. Schaff, "History of the Christian Church", Vol. 111;
New York, 1886.

Ancient Sources.

- Athanasius, "Select Writings and Letters", Nicene and
Post Nicene Fathers; Oxford, 1892.
- Basil, "Letters and Select Works", Nicene and Post Nicene
Fathers; Oxford, 1895.
- Basil, "Adversus Eunomium", J. Garnier, Tome 1; Paris, 1839.
- Jerome and Gennadius, "Lives of Illustrious Men", Nicene and
Post Nicene Fathers; Oxford, 1892.
- Gregory Nazianzen, "Select Orations and Letters", Nicene
and Post Nicene Fathers; Oxford, 1894.
- Socrates, "Ecclesiastical History", Bohn's Ecclesiastical
Library; London, 1853.
- Sozomen, "Ecclesiastical History", English Translation;
London, 1846.
- Theodoret, "History of the Church", Bohn's Ecclesiastical
Library; London, 1854.
- Theodoret, "Dialogues", Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers;
Oxford, 1892.

Special Studies.

- C. Butler, "Benedictine Monachism"; Longmans Green, 1919.
- W.C. Lowther Clarke, "St. Basil the Great"; Cambridge, 1913
- W.C. Lowther Clarke, "The Ascetic Works of St. Basil";
Cambridge, 1925.
- H. Dorries, "De Spiritu Sancto", Der Beitrag des Basilius
zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas.
(Adhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften
in Gottingen. Phil. - Hist. Kl., 111. F., 39);
Gottingen, Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956.
- J.A. Dorner, "The Person of Christ", Vol. 11; Edinburgh, 1862
- H.M. Gwatkin, "Studies of Arianism", Second Edition;
Cambridge, 1900.
- T.G. Jalland, "The Church and Papacy", An Historical Study;
London, 1944.
- J.N.D. Kelly, "Early Christian Doctrines", Third Edition;
London, 1965.
- V. Lossky, "The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church";
1957.
- H.R. Mackintosh, "The Person of Jesus Christ",
International Theological Library;
Edinburgh, 1948.
- E. Amand de Mendieta, "Basile de Caesarea et Damase de Rome",
Biblical and Patristic Studies;
Herder, 1963.
- G.L. Prestige, "St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of
Laodicea"; London, 1956.
- G.L. Prestige, "Fathers and Heretics"; S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Sir W.M. Ramsay, "Historical Geograph of Asia Minor";
(Supplementary Papers for Royal
Geographical Society), 1890.
- C.E. Raven, "Apollinarianism"; Cambridge, 1923.
- E. Schwartz, "Uber die Sammlung des Cod. Veronenis LX",
Zeitschrift fur die Neutestamentliche
Wissenschaft, 35; 1936.
- J. Quasteen, "Patrology", Vol. 111; Spectrum Publishers, 1963
- H. Waddell, "The Desert Fathers", The Fontana Library;
London and Glasgow, 1965.

Pamphlets.

- E. Amnd de Mendieta, "The 'Unwritten' and 'Secret' Apostolic Traditions in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea." Scottish Journal of Theology, Occasional Papers, No. 13; Edinburgh, 1965.
- E. Amnd de Mendieta, "The Pair 'Kerygma' and 'Dogma' in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea". Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XVI; 1965.

Other Sources.

- H. Bettenson, "The Early Christian Fathers"; London, 1963.
- B.J. Kidd, "Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church"; S.P.C.K., 1923.
- J. Stevenson, "A New Eusebius"; S.P.C.K., 1960.
- J. Stevenson, "Creeds, Councils, and Controversies"; S.P.C.K., 1966.