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Introduction

The present study was meant to be a simple doctoral thesis in classical philology – simple in a sense that I intended to analyse literary genres of Gregory of Nyssa’s writings. The study was to be technical, not controversial. I started with the most “obvious” – the dialogue *De anima et resurrectione*. I thought it was clear that it is a philosophical dialogue that followed a model of Plato’s *Phaedo*. At the very beginning of my research, I was intrigued by two problems: first, why Gregory wrote *De anima et resurrectione* in a form of a dialogue – the only dialogue in his entire literary legacy; second, why he chose Macrina for an interlocutor. Of course, I could understand she was intended as a reminiscence of Diotyma, but what puzzled me was the question: Why Gregory wrote a dialogue with Macrina and not with his great, saint brother Basil?

Although I decided to focus on *De anima et resurrectione* I started to analyse *Vita sanctae Macrinae* as a point of reference. I was struck by the incoherencies in those writings, especially regarding Macrina herself: a simple ascetic brought up on the Holy Scripture in *Vita sanctae Macrinae* and a philosopher of the highest Ancient level in *De anima et resurrectione*. So, I looked for other sources to check which version was “the correct one”. To my greatest surprise, I discovered that apart from the writings of Gregory of Nyssa and one epitaph by Gregory of Nazianzus there is literally no mention on Macrina in any other source. When I started to read studies on Macrina I noticed the second remarkable fact: the only two authors who wrote about Macrina (Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus), passed over a very important person, an initiator of ascetic/monastic life in Pontus and Basil’s inspirer – Eustathius of Sebastea. In Gregory of Nyssa’s version, Macrina appears in Basil’s life at the moments that according to his own testimony were marked by the influence of Eustathius. At this point of my research I was already convinced that Macrina was a literary construct aimed at “covering” Eustathius and protect Basil from accusation of having been inspired by a heretic – as according to all studies Eustathius was a Pneumatomachian condemned by the Council of Constantinople (381). More or less at that time I wrote the article *Macrina the Younger – the invented*
saint, published in “Studia Pelplińskie” 52 (2018), 323-343. It has become a basis for Part I. Macrina the Younger of the present study. Later on, I discovered that the reason for inventing Macrina might have been different – she was to constitute a model of asceticism alternative to the one practiced by Eustathius and Basil.

Methodology

I found myself at the crossroads: I needed to choose whether I wanted to focus on the literary form of Gregory’s writings and look for literary models of the figure of Macrina or whether I would dig deeper into history including research on Eustathius of Sebastea. Prof. Ewa Wipszycka-Bravo agreed to supervise my thesis, so I recognized I had the best and unique opportunity to make a research on history under her supervision. Also my theological background turned out to be very useful when I was analysing the theological ideas of Eustathius of Sebastea and Basil the Great. Therefore, my study is presented as interdisciplinary, drawing upon the disciplines of classical philology, history and theology.

State of research

According to the recent studies on early monasticism and asceticism Macrina the Younger was one of the most important persons of 4th century Christianity in Pontus. Scholars treat Vita Sanctae Macrinae written by her brother Gregory of Nyssa as a source of information about her character and achievements. A.M. Silvas begins a book about Macrina with the following statement: “The holy woman known in Christian tradition as Saint Macrina the Younger (327-379) was the descendant of resolutely Christian forbears, the first-born among some famous siblings, and the leader of a family outstanding for its contribution to Christian history, piety, and culture.”\(^1\) Further, “Macrina became a spiritual mother and teacher to her own mother, Emmelia, and to each of her four brothers”\(^2\) (including Basil the Great). She is considered also “the guide and teacher of the virgins she directed in her

\(^1\) A.M. Silvas, Macrina the Younger. Philosopher of God, Turnhout 2008, 1.
\(^2\) A.M. Silvas, Macrina the Younger. Philosopher of God, 2.
monastery,”3 “a pioneering monastic founder.”4 S. Elm stressed in her study about feminine asceticism in Late Antiquity: “Because of her significantly earlier experience and her uninterrupted presence, Macrina may well have been the dominant figure at Annesi; her share in developing what is known as Basilian monasticism ought not to be underrated.”5

The first part of my research (Macrina the Younger) questions the very bases of above-quoted theses. *Vita Sanctae Macrinae* has important features of hagiography and as such cannot be treated as reliable source describing real persons and events. Although it can contain a lot of true information, its aim was not to report history, but to exhort readers to live virtuously. The status of *Vita Sanctae Macrinae* as hagiography undermines not only commonly accepted facts of Macrina’s biography, but a lot of results of studies on Basil, including the most famous: *Basil of Caesarea* by Philip Rousseau and *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great* by Anna-Maria Silvas. Although they all were very useful to me I had to treat them with due caution and I found myself questioning a lot of them in large measure. The expert on Basil that “defended himself” to the end was Jean Gribomont.

The studies that helped me at the beginning of my research were studies in literature, especially thorough and innovative analyses by Hippolyte Delehaye, Averil Cameron and Timothy Barnes. In order to prove a fictional character of *Vita Sanctae Macrinae* I compared it with the first hagiography of non-martyr, namely *Vita Antonii* by Athanasius of Alexandria. Here, I based mostly on the results of research of Ewa Wipszycka-Bravo and David Brakke.

There are hardly any studies on Eustathius of Sebastea. He appears in many studies about Basil the Great but as far as I know there is only one monograph dedicated to Eustathius himself – *Eustathius of Sebaste* by William A. Jurgens. The publication is a part of the doctoral dissertation by Jurgens – unfortunately published only partially and extremely difficult to access. What is worse, the Biblioteca Gregoriana refuses any access to the entire text of his doctoral thesis.

---

The findings of Jurgens are well based on sources and at some point still valid. But, in the case of Eustathius (as well as a lot of personages of the 4th century) there are more hypotheses and presumptions than proofs and evidences. That is why my dating of Eustathius’ life differs significantly from the one of Jurgens.

I regard as the best study of Eustathius’ asceticism the book by Tomislav Zdenko Tenšek, *L’ascetismo nel Concilio di Gangra. Eustazio di Sebaste nell’ambiente asetico siriaco dell’Asia Minore nel IV° secolo. Excerpta ex dissertatione ad Doctoratum in Facultateae Theologiae Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae*, Romae 1991. Recently, Federico Fatti wrote some articles on Eustathius; his research is deeply rooted in the sources, providing brilliant and innovative ideas. Even if I disagree with some of them, they were stimulating and significant point of reference for my own findings.

It is difficult for me to list all studies that played an important role during my long-lasting process of writing, especially that my study regards so many different subjects including the way bishops were elected and ordained. A reader can find references to them in the footnotes. Here, I would like to mention two more authors: Raymond van Dam and Thomas A. Kopecék whose remarks about social structure of Cappadocia were of great value to me.

Last but not least, the sources. The present study is based on sources. My starting point was to analyze *De anima et resurrectione* and *Vita sanctae Macrinae*. I quote a lot both in original and translation. I am convinced that it is pointless to summarize a source, it is better to quote it – not only to help a reader, but to help me myself. I prefer to quote several times even the same text. It happened many times that only after I looked at the same text hundreds of times, I noticed a word or an expression that turned out to be crucial in understanding some important events. I can evoke the problem of Dianius as an example. It took me a lot of time to realize that Dianius from Letter 51 by Basil could have not been Dianius bishop of Caesarea, but the enlightenment came when I was reading the very letter by Basil for the nth time. When I face incoherencies, I dig into the sources, not into the secondary literature. Sources cause problems and they can solve it.
Part I. Macrina the Younger

Chapter I. Writings about Macrina the Younger

Macrina the Younger can be found in four Ancient writings: *Vita Sanctae Macrinae*, Letter 19, dialogue *De anima et resurrectione* by Gregory of Nyssa and epitaph 120 by Gregory of Nazianzus. In order to assess the information they contain it is necessary, above all, to establish their literary genre, because depending on it we can treat the events they describe as facts or not.

1. *Vita Sanctae Macrinae* by Gregory of Nyssa

*Vita Sanctae Macrinae* is the most extensive Ancient writing about Macrina. It has been translated many times and widely studied; lately, it aroused special interest of researchers of early Christian spirituality and feminist theologians looking for meaningful feminine characters in Antiquity.

The question about the literary genre of *Vita Sanctae Macrinae* is absolutely crucial, nevertheless it is often omitted or treated as minor or secondary. But, depending on the answer the events and persons described in the writing can be considered real or fictitious.

I am convinced that *Vita Sanctae Macrinae* is neither a philosophical biography as Maraval wanted, nor a family chronicle, as Silvas called it, but it is a hagiography. Although Barnes thinks that “hagiography was never a literary genre in the strict definition of that term,” it has its characteristic features. What makes hagiography distinct from history is, according to H. Delehaye, the religious character of the writing and the purpose of edification. At the beginning of *Vita

---


Gregory declares that the benefit (κέρδος) brought by the history of good things (τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἱστορίαν) is that the life of the one who had raised herself to the highest summit of human virtue (πρὸς τὸν ἀκρότατον τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀφετής ὄρον) would not pass unprofitable (ἀνωφελής). The profit of the story of virtue is, of course, spiritual and it does not need real events or even real persons to be attained. We can see the same purpose also in the 2nd century influential Martyrium Polycarpi, belonging to the so-called Smyrnene hagiography. The explicit aim of this writing is that “we may become Polycarp’s followers” (Ἰνὰ μιμηταί καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ γενώμεθα) and that its readers “glorify the Lord” (Ἰνὰ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δοξάζωσιν τὸν κύριον). That purpose is from the very beginning a characteristic feature of Christian hagiography.

Vita Sanctae Macrinae was not the first hagiography of an ascetic and non-martyr. The first was Vita Antonii by Athanasius of Alexandria and Gregory of Nazianzus testifies that it was known among Cappadocians. Similarity between those two writings is striking. It consists even in the literary form: both lives are letters or rather they pretend to be the letters written as a reply to specific persons who asked the author to describe a life of the saint. One of the initial statements of Vita Antonii reads as follows:

ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπητήσατε καὶ παρ’ ἐμοῦ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ μακαρίου Ἀντωνίου, μαθεῖν θέλοντες πῶς τε ἢξετο τῆς ἀσκήσεως, καὶ τις ἤν πρὸ ταύτης, καὶ ὅποιον ἐσχα τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἄγιον Αντωνίου μοι περιποιηθῆναι ἐπιτῆ που ἵνα μιμηταί καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ γενώμεθα, καὶ ἐσπαίνατε ἐκεῖνοι δοξάζωσιν τὸν κύριον.

Now, you have also asked me for an account of the life of the blessed Antony; you would like to learn how he came to practice asceticism, what he was previous to this, what his death was like, and whether

11 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita Sanctae Macrinae 1, GNO 8/1, 371.
14 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 21 (In laudem Athanasii), 5, SC 270, 118.
everything said about him is true.
You have in mind to model your lives after his life of zeal. I am very happy to accede to your request.  

From the heading of this work, you might think that it is a letter, but it has extended itself into a rather lengthy monograph. My excuse is that you ordered me to write on a subject that goes beyond the scope of a letter. [...] You suggested that a history of her good deeds ought to be written because you thought such a life should not be lost sight of in time and, that having raised herself to the highest peak of human virtue through philosophy, she should not be passed over in silence and her life rendered ineffective. Accordingly, I thought it right to obey you and to write her life story as briefly as I could in an artless and simple narrative.  

Both prologues have some things in common: they claim to be an answer for somebody else’s initiative and they both set the same target: the edification of the

---

16 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctæ Macrinae* 1, GNO 8/1, 370-371; transl. V. Woods Callahan, 163-164.
readers. The purpose of edification and religious character are features that differentiate hagiography from other literary genres. Philosophical biography is aimed to show the views of the philosopher, hagiography is aimed to show a model to be imitated. 17 “Antony is therefore not a philosopher to learn from, but a model to imitate.” 18 Such a purpose determines which facts from the life of a saint are selected and how they are showed to the readers. The described persons and events do not have to and have no ambition to be authentic, but they must be hortatory, aiming to exhort the readers.

In order to make their accounts more reliable the authors of both lives stress that they were eyewitnesses of what they are writing about. Athansius says that he is writing down his own memories:

Εβουλόμην γὰρ ὑμῖν, δεξάμενος ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν, μεταπέμψασθαι τινας τῶν μοναχῶν, τῶν μάλιστα πυκνότερον εἰωθότων πρὸς αὐτὸν παραγίνεσθαι. Τάχα τι πλέον μαθών πληρέστερον ὑμῖν ἑπιστείλω. ἑπειδή δὲ γὰρ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν πλώμων συνέκλειε καὶ ὁ γραμματοφόρος ἐσπευδέν, διὰ τοῦτο ἀπέρ αὐτός τε γινώσκω (πολλάκις γὰρ αὐτὸν ἑωρακα), καὶ ἀ μαθείν ἡδυνῆθην παρὰ τοῦ ἀκολουθήσαντος αὐτῷ χρόνον οὔκ ὀλίγον καὶ ἐπιχέαντος ὕδωρ κατά χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, γράφω τῇ εὐλαβείᾳ ὑμῶν ἑσποῦδας.

Well, when I received your letter I wanted to send for some of the monks, especially those who used to associate with him most closely. Thus I might have learned additional details and sent you a fuller account. But the sailing season is about over and the postman is growing impatient; therefore, I make haste to write to Your Reverence what I myself know—for I have seen him often—and whatever I was able to learn from him who was his companion over a long period and poured water on his hands. 19

Gregory of Nyssa stresses his kinship with the described person that legitimizes his story:

Τὸ δὲ διήγημα ἡμῖν οὖν ἐξ ἀκοῆς ἐτέρων διηγημάτων τὸ πιστὸν εἶχεν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῆς πείρας διδάσκαλος ἦν, ταῦτα δι’ ἀκριβείας ἐπεξείμη ὁ λόγος, εἰς οὖδὲν ἀκοὴν ἀλλοτρίαν ἐπιμαρτυρόμενος· οὐδὲ γὰρ ξένη τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἢ μνημονευθείσα παρθένος, ὡς ἀνάγκην εἶναι δι’ ἐτέρων γινώσκειν τὰ κατ’ ἐκείνην θαύματα, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν ἡμῶν γονέων, ὡσπερ τὶς ἀπαρχῆς καρπῶν πρώτη τῆς μητρός νηύους ἀναβλαστήσασα.

We did not have to rely on hearsay since experience was our teacher, and the details of our story did not depend on the testimony of others. The maiden we spoke of was no stranger to my family so that I did not have to learn the wondrous facts about her from others; we were born of the same parents, she being, as it were, an offering of first fruits, the earliest flowering of our mother’s womb.20

There were some attempts of questioning the authorship of Vita Antonii by Athanasius,21 but apart from internal evidences there are external ones that confirm Athanasius’ authorship – when Athanasius was still alive he was regarded as an author.22 I assume that Athanasius was an author of Vita Antonii and that he created a literary fiction in this writing. D. Brakke noticed “the paucity of evidence for actual contact between Athanasius and the historical Antony”23 and E. Wipszycka questions the probability that Athanasius knew Coptic and it was the only language he could use to talk with Antony or with the witnesses of his life.24 Gregory of Nyssa himself confessed that he did not see his sister for many years25 and he knew

---

20 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 1, GNO 8/1, 371, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 163.
23 D. Brakke, Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism, 205-207.
24 E. Wipszycka, Second Gift of the Nile, 49.
25 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 15, GNO 8/1, 387.
her miracles only from the accounts of others.\textsuperscript{26} The emphasis present in both writings that the author was an eyewitness of the saint’s life is obviously a literary topos and has little to do with reality.

\textit{Vita Sanctae Macrinae} clearly follows the model of the saint established by \textit{Vita Antonii}. Gregory’s Macrina in many details mimics the characteristics and behaviour of Athanasius’ Antony. Both Antony and Macrina were born to Christian families, were raised on the Bible, isolated from the influence of culture and Pagan habits. The description of Antony’s childhood reads as follows:

```
 ANTÓNIOU GÉNOS MÉN ᾍΓΥΠΤΙΟΣ, EÚGENOY ÓH GYNOÉW KAI PEIROUSIÁN AUTÁRKH KEKTEIMÉNWON. XHRIΣTIANOYN ÓH AUTÔWN ÓNTWON XHRIΣTIANIKÓS ÓNÝHGETO KAI AUTÔS. KAI PAIDÍON MÉN ÓN, ÉTROFETO PÅRA TÔI GYNOÉSI, PLEÓN AUTÔWN KAI TOU ÓIKOU MÝDÉN ÉTERON GINÝSKWON. ÉPETIDH ÓH KAI AVXÈΣAS ÉGÉNETO PAÏS KAI PROÖKOPOTE TÍ ÍLUKIA, GYRAMATA MÉN MAÞEÍN ÓUK ÓNÝSCHETO, BOULÓMENOS ÓKTOZ ÓIÑAI KAI TÍS PRÓS TOÚS PAÍDAS SYNHthèIAS. TÍN ÓH ÉPIBØMIAΝ PÁSAXN ÓIÞE, KATA TÓ GYRAMMÉNÓN, ÓWS ÆPŁÀSTOS OÍKEÍN EN TÍ ÓIKIA AUTÔÚ.
```

Antony was an Egyptian by birth. His parents were of good stock and well-to-do; and because they were Christians he himself was brought up a Christian. As a child he lived with his parents, knowing nothing but them and his home; and when he grew to be a boy and was advancing in age, he did not take to schooling,\textsuperscript{27} desiring to shun even the companionship of other children: his one desire was, as the Scripture States concerning Jacob, to lead a simple life at home.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{26} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 30-31, GNO 8/1, 404-406; \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 36-38, GNO 8/1, 410-413.

\textsuperscript{27} D. Brakke, \textit{Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism}, 255: “Thus, the young man’s failure to learn letters γράμματα does not represent his total illiteracy, but his unwillingness to receive the secondary education from a grammaticos;” E. Wipszycka, \textit{Second Gift of the Nile}, 51: “The word γράμματα may refer not only to ‘letters’, but also, in the metaphorical sense, ‘literature’, or ‘education’ (imparted in the form characteristic of the ancient Greek model of education, where the study of literature was fundamentally important).”

\textsuperscript{28} Athanasius, \textit{Vita Antonii} 1, SC 400, 130; transl. R.T. Meyer, 18.
Similarly, Macrina described by Gregory of Nyssa was brought up by Christian parents, she was taught only the Bible absolutely isolated from other people:

Her mother was eager to have the child given instruction, but not in the secular curriculum, which meant, for the most part, teaching the youngsters through poetry. For she thought that it was shameful and altogether unfitting to teach the soft and pliable nature either the passionate themes of tragedy (which are based on the stories of women and give the poets their ideas and plots), or the unseemly antics of comedy, or the shameful activities of the immoral characters in the Iliad, defiling the child’s nature with the undignified tales about women. Instead of this, whatever of inspired Scripture was adaptable to the early years, this was the child’s subject matter, especially the Wisdom of Solomon and beyond this whatever leads us to a moral life. She was especially well versed in the Psalms, going through each part of the Psalter at the proper time; when she got up or did her daily tasks or rested,

Ἡν δὲ τῇ μητρὶ σπουδὴ παιδεύσαι μὲν τὴν παιὰ, μὴ μέντοι τὴν ἐξωθὲν ταύτην καὶ ἐγκύκλιον παιδευσιν, ἦν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων αἱ πρῶται τῶν παιδευομένων ἡλικίαι διδάσκονται. Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ὡτε καὶ παντάπασιν ἀπρεπές ἡ τὰ τραγικὰ πάθη, ὡσα ἐκ γυναικῶν τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἐδωκεν, ἡ τὰς κομικὰς ἀσχημοσύνας ἢ τῶν κατὰ τὸ Ἡλιον κακόν τὰς αἰτίας ἀπαλήν καὶ εὐπλαστὸν φύσιν διδάσκεον, καταμολυνομένην τρόπον τινὰ τοῖς ἀσεμνοτέροις περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν δυνήμασιν. Ἀλλὰ ὡσα τῆς θεοπνεύσου γραφῆς εὐληπτότερα ταῖς πρῶταις ἡλικίαις δοκεῖ, ταῦτα ἢν τῇ παιδὶ τὰ μαθήματα καὶ μάλιστα ἢ τοῦ Σολομῶντος Σοφία καὶ ταύτης πλέον ὡσα πρὸς τὸν ἡθικὸν ἐφεσί τινον ἠγνόη καῳροὶ ἰδίοις ἐκαστὸν μέρος τῆς ψαλμοδίας διεξούσα τῆς της κοινης διανισταμένη καὶ τῶν σπουδαίων ἀπτομένη τε καὶ
Such a description of childhood is strictly connected with the purpose of the writings. Athanasius calls Antony “taught by God” (θεοδίδακτος)\textsuperscript{30} not by people.\textsuperscript{31} But, his letters demonstrate that he must have read with understanding the writings by Origen and Gnostics.\textsuperscript{32} Apparently, Antony not only could read and write, but he was quite well educated.\textsuperscript{33} Macrina in the dialogue \textit{De anima and resurrectione} not only mentions philosophers by name,\textsuperscript{34} but engages in a discussion with Gregory on the highest scientific level (in the Ancient sense) using dialectic and rhetoric. So, isolation from culture is nothing more than a literary topos.

It is worth noticing that – as E. Wipszycka stated – “people of Late Antiquity were not as obsessively preoccupied with the individual paths of religious experience as we are. The model path of salvation and its biblical justification were more important than the accidental (and thus unimportant) impulses resulting from the vicissitudes of individual lives.\textsuperscript{35} That is why there is not a single hint of development in the descriptions of the saints: according to the hagiographies both Antony and Macrina were saint from the earliest childhood, because they should be the models to be followed. Those accounts are not descriptions of real youth of little Antony or little Macrina. Both saints lived very simple lives from early

\textsuperscript{29} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 2, GNO 8/1, 373-374; transl. V. Woods Callahan, 165.
\textsuperscript{30} Athanasius, \textit{Vita Antonii} 66, SC 400, 308.
\textsuperscript{31} The importance of this expression has been stressed by Y. de Andia, \textit{Antoine le Grand Théodidacte}, in: \textit{Mystiques d’Orient de d’Occident}, Begrolles-en-Mauges 1994, 41-56 and E. Wipszycka, \textit{Second Gift of the Nile}, 58.
\textsuperscript{34} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{De anima et resurrectione}, GNO 3/3, 8 and 33-34.
\textsuperscript{35} E. Wipszycka, \textit{Second Gift of the Nile}, 70.
childhood. Antony wanted to lead a simple life at home (ὡς ἄπλαστος). D. Brakke explains: “Lack of education signifies a certain disposition: it denotes seclusion, in contrast to companionship and being ‘natural’ or ‘unformed’ (ἀπλαστος) in contrast to the artificiality produced by socialization into leamed culture. Virtue, Antony claims in chapter 20, is the preservation of the soul in its ‘natural’ condition; here Antony remains in an ‘unformed’ state of innate wisdom, unsullied by the ambiguities and conventions of human discourse.”

Both Antony and Macrina undergo a conversion and start a new life in poverty, though they used to live virtuously since they were children.

Antony:

Ὡς δὲ, πάλιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ Κυριακόν, ἦκουσεν ἐν τῷ Ἑυαγγελίῳ τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος, Ἔχε βιώσας περὶ τῆς αὐριον, οὐκ ἀνασχόμενος ἐτέ μένειν, ἔξελθὼν διέδωκε κάκεινα τοῖς μετρίοις. Τὴν δὲ ἀδελφὴν παραθέμενος γνωρίμιοις καὶ πισταὶς παρθένοις, δοῦσ’ τε αὐτὴν εἰς παρθένιαν ἀνατρέψθαι, αὐτὸς πρὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἐσχόλαζε λοιπὸν τῇ ἀσκήσει, προσέχων ἐαυτῷ καὶ καρτερικῶς ἐαυτὸν ἄγων.

Macrina:

Ἠπειδὴ γὰρ πάσης ὑλῳδεστέρας ἐξης ὑπόθεσις ἦδη αὐτοῖς περικέκποτο, πείθη τὴν μητέρα καταλιπούσαν τὸν ἐν ἑστε βιών καὶ τὴν κομπωδεστέραν διαγωγήν καὶ τὰς ἐκ τῶν ὑποχειρών

But once again as he entered the church, he heard the Lord saying in the Gospel: Be not solicitous for the morrow. He could not bear to wait longer, but went out and distributed those things also to the poor. His sister he placed with known and trusted virgins, giving her to the nuns 17 to be brought up. Then he himself devoted all his time to ascetic living, intent on himself and living a life of self-denial, near his own house.57

When there was no longer any necessity for them to continue their rather worldly way of life, Macrina persuaded her mother to give up her customary mode of living and her

Those descriptions should not be trusted. ‘The rules of ancient biographical literature gave the authors much liberty in conjuring up the details of people’s lives as long as their writing did not violate the sense of probability: the emphasis on accuracy, so characteristic of twentieth-century biographers, was entirely foreign to the ancient way of describing the life of a person. The expectation which they had to meet was to offer a coherent portrayal – plausible, but not necessarily faithful through and through. It is worth realising at this point that descriptions of conversion in Christian literature before Athanasius were few and far between. The best-known example (and also the most detailed) is the story of Justin Martyr, who described his conversion in such a way that we would be hard pressed to believe its authenticity. We may learn from it what a philosopher’s conversion was supposed to have looked like, but we are left in the dark as to the question of how Justin actually converted to Christianity.’

E. Wipszycka quotes other examples of nearly identical conversions in the lives of Cyriakus and Hypatius, she also points out significant variances in the three accounts on the conversion of Simeon the Stylite as a proof that they must have been a literary construct not a description of real events.

The characteristic feature of the saints is peace and total absence of corporal sensations. In the case of Antony, the state of his soul was pure, for it was neither contracted by grief, nor

38 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 7, GNO 8/1, 377-378; transl. V. Woods Callahan, 168.
39 E. Wipszycka, Second Gift of the Nile, 163-164.
40 E. Wipszycka, Second Gift of the Nile, 64-67.
καθάπερ γὰρ αἱ διὰ θανάτου τῶν σωμάτων ἐκλυθείσαι φυχαὶ καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον τοῦτον μεριμνῶν συνεκλύονται, οὕτως κεχωρίστο αὐτῶν ἡ ζωὴ καὶ ἀπώκυστο πάσης βιωτικῆς ματαιώτητος καὶ πρὸς μίμησιν τῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων διαγωγῆς ἐρωτημένο. Ἡν οἷς γὰρ οὐ θυμός, οὐ φθόνος, οὐ μίσος, οὐχ ὑπεροφία, οὐκ ἀλλο τὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἐνεωρᾶτο, ἢ τε τῶν ματαιῶν ἐπιθυμία, τιμῆς τε καὶ δόξης καὶ τύρφου καὶ ὑπερηφανίας καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων, ἐκβεβλητο· τρυφῇ δὲ ἦν ἡ
dissipated by pleasure nor pervaded by jollity or dejection. He was not embarrassed when he saw the crowd, nor was he elated at seeing so many there to receive him. No, he had himself completely under control—a man guided by reason and stable in his character. [...] He induced many to take up the monastic life. And so now monasteries also sprang up in the mountains and the desert was populated with monks who left their own people and registered themselves for citizenship in Heaven.41

ἐγκράτεια καὶ δόξα τὸ μὴ γινώσκεσθαι, πλούτος δὲ ἡ ἀκτιμοσύνη καὶ τὸ πᾶσαν τὴν ὑλικὴν περιουσίαν οἶόν τις κόσμον τῶν σωμάτων ἀποτινάζοντας.

It is an ideal that can be aspired to, but unattainable on earth. Both authors of the Lives were aware of its unattainableness, so Athanasius calls the way of Antony’s living a heavenly state (ἡ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς πολιτείαν) and Gregory compares the lifestyle of Macrina to angels (πρὸς μιμησιν τῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων διαγωγῆς). Bartelink analysed the biblical references in Vita Antonii (more than 200) proving that the ideal personified by Antony had its deep biblical roots.

D. Brakke noticed the resemblance between the behaviour of young Antony and the lifestyle of young Mary as Athanasius described it in his first Letter to Virgins 12-14 (paragraph numbers according to Brakke). Antony repeats the behaviour that Athanasius admired in Mary: staying at home, being obedient to his parents, spending his time on prayer, attending church, listening to the Holy Scripture, eating simple food in moderate amounts, doing good deeds secretly. Macrina presents similar behaviour.

The descriptions of the last days, death and funeral of Antony and Macrina are similar. In both cases they are long, detailed, and contain speeches of the heroes, kind of testaments for their companions, called farewell speeches. Festugière analysed the last prayer of Macrina from Vita sanctae Macrinae and stated that it was a noble literary composition that had nothing to do with historical probability. Both Antony and Macrina had no fear of death, they are dying cheerful, full of joy at the thought of meeting God; both leave some instructions regarding their funerals that should be modest. In both cases the attention is focused on keepsakes that are given by the saints to the closest persons: bishop Athanasius received one sheepskin and

42 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 11, GNO 8/1, 382; transl. V. Woods Callahan, 170-171.
the cloak on which Antony used to lie, bishop Serapion received the other sheepskin, and other brothers kept the hair shirt;48 Macrina left her iron cross to Vetiana and her iron ring to Gregory.49 Antony distributed all his belongings as it “was fitting for a holy man, a monk and a martyr who shied away from everything that would have bound him to the world;”50 Macrina as well had only a dress, a covering of her head and sandals.51

In order to achieve its intended purpose (which is edification of the readers) hagiography used fictional elements from the very beginning of the genre. Regarding Antony we can examine some events described in *Vita Antonii* and some of them are obviously fictitious. T.D. Barnes calls *Vita Antonii* a fictitious hagiography and an imaginative composition.52 Heussi thinks that the entire episode from *Vita Antonii* 46, where Antony comes to Alexandria to support persecuted Christians, is fake.53 Wipszycka believes that Antony could have been in Alexandria, but she considers the ban on letting ascetics into a court anachronistic as ascetics were not a separate, distinctive group at that time.54 She also thinks it was impossible that Antony served Christians who worked in mines/quarry (μέταλλα) as there were no such μέταλλα near Alexandria: “Athanasius knew full well that there were no *metalla* near Alexandria where Antony could have found Christian exiles. This, however, did not matter to him. Athanasius was not intent on providing a minutely accurate rendering of Antony’s biography in accordance with literary principles, nor was he obliged to do so. In describing the new model of sanctity, one which was supposed to replace that of a martyr, he tried to demonstrate that the saint visited all places where he could find martyrs and confessors: while they were being taken to trial, during interrogations, and in the places where they were eventually exiled or martyred.”55

---

48 Athanasius, *Vita Antonii* 91, SC 400, 370.
49 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 30, GNO 8/1, 404.
50 E. Wipszycka, *Second Gift of the Nile*, 97.
51 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 29, GNO 8/1, 403.
54 E. Wipszycka, *Second Gift of the Nile*, 75-76.
55 E. Wipszycka, *Second Gift of the Nile*, 75.
Athanasius intentionally described the exchange of letters between Antony and Constantine at variance with the reality. Antony receives a letter from Constantine and his sons, and replies with reluctance advising them how to hold power:

The fame of Antony reached even to emperors; for when Constantine Augustus and his sons Constantius Augustus and Constans Augustus heard about these things, they wrote to him as to a father and begged him to write back. [...] And he wrote back, commending them for worshipping Christ, and giving them salutary advice not to think highly of the things of this world, but rather to bear in mind the judgment to come; and to know that Christ alone is the true and eternal King. He begged them to show themselves humane and to have a regard for justice and for the poor. And they were glad to receive his answer.\(^{56}\)

According to E. Wipszycka, “the data provided in VA 81, which could make it possible to date the event, are considerably flawed. According to the VA, the letter was written by three *augusti*: Constantine, Constantius and Constans, but the latter two were elevated to the rank of *augustus* only after their acclamation (9 September 337) following the death of their father Constantine (before that they had been caesars). It is also striking to note that two other figures are not mentioned in the account, even though they might have deserved notice. The first of these is

---

Constantine’s eldest son, Constantine II, who died in the civil war which he began in order to defeat Constans. The other missing figure is Dalmatius, murdered in 337 (with the consent of Constantius, if not at his instigation). Both these men were subject to a certain kind of damnatio memoriae. The fact that the VA mistook caesars for Augusti can be easily explained by stating that Athanasius, who wrote the work many years after Constantine’s death, attributed to the emperors the rank to which they were subsequently elevated. We can be sure of one thing at least: Athanasius did not have the text of the said letter, for surely he would have found the names of all those rulers placed in the beginning of the document together with the titles which they had at the time when the letter was written (as was customary for all documents and letters issued by all members of the imperial college).”

There is the testimony of Sozomen who presented a different version of the event:

The people of Alexandria loudly complained of the exile of Athanasius, and offered up supplications for his return; and Antony, the celebrated monk, wrote frequently to the emperor to entreat him to attach no credit to the insinuations of the Melitians, but to reject their accusations as calumnies; yet the emperor was not convinced by these arguments, and wrote to the Alexandrians, accusing them of folly and of disorderly conduct. He commanded the clergy and the holy virgins to remain quiet, and declared that he would not change his mind nor recall Athanasius, whom, he said, he regarded as an exciter of sedition, justly

57 E. Wipszycka, Second Gift of the Nile, 79-80.
condemned by the judgment of the Church. He replied to Antony, by stating that he ought not to overlook the decree of the Synod; for even if some few of the bishops, he said, were actuated by ill-will or the desire to oblige others, it scarcely seems credible that so many prudent and excellent bishops could have been impelled by such motives; and, he added, that Athanasius was contumelious and arrogant, and the cause of dissension and sedition.⁵⁸

Again, according to the analysis by E. Wipszycka, “In Sozomenus’s account the historical context of the letter is presented in a particularly precise manner. Chapter 31 of the second book of his Ecclesiastical History implies that it was Antony who petitioned the emperor in defence of Athanasius and that the letter of Constantine was the emperor’s response to the letter of Antony. It appears from Sozomenus’s writing that the event took place between 335 (when Athanasius was deposed at the Council of Tyre) and 337 (the year of Constantine’s death). I see no reason to doubt the veracity of Sozomenus’s account. In his letter, Constantine demonstrates the attitude known to us from other sources. His attitude towards Athanasius is also thoroughly documented in other sources, as are the arguments used by the emperor to explain why he refuses to change his mind on the matter. It would be difficult to explain why Sozomenus (or someone before him) should have invented correspondence content which would show the emperor in an unfavourable light: after all, the latter refused to listen to the suggestions of two magnificent saints, a fact which would compromise the reputation of any ruler in the eyes of contemporaries, i.e. the people living in the mid-fifth century, when

---

⁵⁸ Sozomen, HE II 31, 2-3, GCS 50, 96, transl. NPNF II 2, 280.
Sozomenus wrote his History. This version of events would not have been useful for praising the virtues of the saint either: to this end, one would rather expect stories of successful interventions.”

The scholars have no doubts that the version of Sozomen is right. The case was very well known so it is difficult to assume that Athanasius wanted to falsify the history. Athanasius did not describe what happened, but what should have happened. And it is not a surprise, if we remember the purpose of hagiography: “the primary social function of the Athanasian Antony is to inspire imitation.”

“hagiographical work may be historical, but it is not necessary. It can don all literary genres suitable for glorifying the saints from official relation modified for usage of the faithful to the exuberant poetical work, with no reference to the reality.”

Gregory of Nazianzus testifies that in the times when Vita Antonii was written such understanding of hagiographies was obvious:

ἐκεῖνος Ἄντωνιον τοῦ θείου βίον συνέγραφε, τοῦ μοναδικοῦ βίου νομοθεσίαν, ἐν πλάσματι διηγήσεως.

[Athanasius] himself wrote the life of the divine Antony, and set forth, in the form of a narrative, the laws of the monastic life.

D. Brakke claims straight out that Athanasius created in Vita Antonii a ‘narrative world’, an ‘alternative reality’ that was intended to give a certain message, clear and comprehensible for the readers. The very existing of Antony is confirmed by other sources (Sozomen, Rufinus, Jerome). Nevertheless, already in the first hagiography describing the life of non-martyr real elements intertwine with the fictitious ones invented in order to accomplish the mission of the writing which was to hearten the readers not to inform them about the vicissitudes of saint’s life.

In the case of Macrina none of the sources she appears in was aimed to refer real events, so even her very existence is not confirmed. Some scholars already
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59 E. Wipszycka, Second Gift of the Nile, 80-81.
63 H. Delehaye, Les légendes hagiographiques, 2.
64 Gregory of Nazianzus, Orationes 21 (In laudem Athanasii), 5, SC 270, 118, transl. NPNF II 7, 270.
noticed that what Gregory of Nyssa wrote about Macrina has a characteristics of literary construction. S. Elm pointed out that the description of Macrina’s earliest years is “stylized and subject to rhetorical conventions.”66 P. Maraval claimed that Gregory knew how to distort the reality in order to make his story more reliable.67 G. Luck suggested that he used the technique of a novelist to dramatize a very real event,68 and that description of the Macrina’s community in Annisa is very rhetorical.69 A. Cameron went even farther: “Though the temptation to read the Life of Macrina as a real portrait has been strong, especially among those interested in women in Late Antiquity, for Gregory, the figure of Macrina is a literary trope.”70

2. Letter 19 by Gregory of Nyssa

Letter 19 has a strange title:

Πρὸς τινὰ Ἰωάννην περὶ τινῶν ὑποθέσεων καὶ περὶ τῆς διαγωγῆς καὶ καταστάσεως τῆς τοιαύτης ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Μακρίνης.

To a certain John on certain subjects, especially on the way of life and the character of his sister Macrina.71

“The certain John” must have been a symbolic person and not a real one. Addressing the letter “to the certain John” proves in my opinion that the writing was not to be a personal letter, but was thought by Gregory as a circular. Silvas rightly points out the formal style of the letter: Gregory most often uses the plural of modesty of himself and only occasionally slips into the singular. She claims that “he clearly intended this letter as a kind of bulletin of his affairs to someone well

66 S. Elm, Virgins of God, 47.
placed in church affairs, meant to correct any misinformation.”

The second purpose of the writing was to introduce Macrina to the common consciousness.

Scholars have had trouble with the pronoun τοιούτος used in the title in relation to Macrina. It can mean “such wise”, but its first meaning is “such as this” and according to Liddell & Scott it can also refer to what goes before. G. Pasquali commented it shortly: “non intellego”; R. Crisculo translated it into Italian with the word “tal”; P. Maraval into French with “célèbre”; and A.M. Silvas just omitted it in her translation into English explaining: “the τοιοῦτος does not make much sense.” However, I can see a reason for its use.

It is impossible to date Gregory’s writings with absolute certainty as there are no external evidence to confirm the dating, but it is possible that all four writings about Macrina (including epitaph 120 by Gregory of Nazianzus) were written more or less at the same time. It is possible that *De anima et resurrectione* was the first writing about Macrina at all, and letter 19 was a kind of explanation who was Gregory’s interlocutor. Indeed, in one of the manuscripts (F) the dialogue precedes Letter 19.

It is important to realise that before *De anima et resurrectione* and letter 19 were written nobody had ever mentioned Macrina – neither Gregory of Nyssa himself, nor Basil, nor Gregory of Nazianzus. *De anima et resurrectione* is probably the first writing about Macrina, so the pronoun “such” in the advertising letter 19 specifies the person, referring to what goes before (*De anima et resurrectione*). *Vita sanctae Macrina* could have been written as the last one.

But, Letter 19 is not a documentation as Silvas wanted. Below, I will analyse in detail biographical “information” it contains, here I just want to define the general character of the writing. Letter 19 is a masterpiece of rhetoric. It begins with an extensive comparison of a writer to a painter. Gregory himself is a painter who

---

73 GNO 8/2, 62.
77 GNO 8/2, 62.
paints Macrina’s life with the words (ἡ διὰ τοῦ λόγου γραφή)\(^79\) but the painting is so grossly unreal that it even does not pretend to be a portrayal of a real person. The “description” of Macrina consists mostly of quotations from the Bible and epithets that in the Bible refer to God:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Ὡς μὴν ἀδελφὴ τοῦ βίου διδάσκαλος,} \\
\text{ἡ μετὰ τὴν μητέρα μήτηρ, τοσαύτην} \\
\text{ἐξουσα τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεόν παροικίαν} \\
\text{ὁμοίως πύργον ἡμῖν ἵσχυς εἶναι καὶ} \\
\text{ὁπλον εὐδοκίας, καθὼς φησιν ἡ} \\
\text{γραφή, καὶ πόλιν περιοχῆς καὶ πάν} \\
\text{ἀσφαλείας ὅνομα διὰ τὴν προσούσαν} \\
\text{ἐκ τοῦ βίου αὐτῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν} \\
\text{παροικίαν. ὥστε ὅ τι τὸν Πόντου τὰ} \\
\text{ἐσχατα, τοῦ βίου τῶν ἀνθρώπων} \\
\text{ἐαυτὴν ἐξοικίσασα: ὥστε ἢν περὶ} \\
\text{αὐτὴν παραθέναιν πολὺς, ἀς αὐτῇ διὰ} \\
\text{τῶν πνευματικῶν ὑδίων γεννήσασα} \\
\text{kai eis teleiōsouin dia pásēs} \\
\text{ἐπιμελείας προάγουσα, tīn tōn} \\
\text{ἀγγέλων ἐμμείτο ζωὴν ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ} \\
\text{τὸ σῶματι. ὥστε ἢν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτῇ} \\
\text{νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦ} \\
\text{ἐνεργός ἐν τοῖς τοῦ φωτὸς ἔργοις} \\
\text{ἐκδικνυτο καὶ ἡμέρα τὴν νυκτερινὴν} \\
\text{ἡσυχίαν τῷ ἀπαράχῳ τῆς ζωῆς} \\
\text{ὑπεκρίνετο: φωνῆν ἢν αὐτῇ διὰ} \\
\text{παντὸς τοῦ χρόνου τὸ οἴκημα νυκτὸς} \\
\text{καὶ eis teleiōsouin dia pásēs} \\
\text{ἐπιμελείας προάγουσα, tīn tōn} \\
\text{ἀγγέλων ἐμμείτο ζωὴν ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ} \\
\text{τὸ σῶματι. ὥστε ἢν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτῇ} \\
\text{νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦ} \\
\text{ἐνεργός ἐν τοῖς τοῦ φωτὸς ἔργοις} \\
\text{ἐκδικνυτο καὶ ἡμέρα τὴν νυκτερινὴν} \\
\text{ἡσυχίαν τῷ ἀπαράχῳ τῆς ζωῆς} \\
\text{ὑπεκρίνετο: φωνῆν ἢν αὐτῇ διὰ} \\
\text{παντὸς τοῦ χρόνου τὸ οἴκημα νυκτὸς} \\
\end{align*}\]

We had a sister who was for us a teacher of how to live, a mother in place of our mother. Such was her freedom towards God that she was for us a strong tower (Ps 60.4) and a shield of favour (Ps 5.13) as the Scripture says, and a fortified city (Ps 30.22, 59.11) and a name of utter assurance, through her freedom towards God that came of her way of life. She dwelt in a remote part of Pontus, having exiled herself from the life of human beings. Gathered around her was a great choir of virgins whom she had brought forth by her spiritual labourpains (1 Cor 4.15, Gal 4.19) and guided towards perfection through her consummate care, while she herself imitated the life of angels in a human body. With her there was no distinction between night and day. Rather, the night showed itself active with the deeds of light (Rom 12.12-13, Eph 5.8) and day imitated the tranquillity of night through serenity of life. The

\(^{79}\) Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Epistulae} 19, 3; GNO 8/2, 63.
καὶ ἡμέρας ταῖς ψαλμοδίαις

Moreover, Macrina is described as devoid of any corporal sensation; she knew no distinction between night and day, she lived the life that we expect after resurrection (καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ὑποστεύομεν). Gregory finished the portrayal with the meaningful rhetorical question: “How anyone could present to the eyes the reality that transcends any verbal description? (καὶ πῶς ἀν τις ὑπ’ οἷς ἀγάγοι πράγμα ὑπερβαίνον τὴν διὰ τῶν λόγων γραφήν).”

The following description of Gregory’s arrival to his sister is similarly rhetorical and could have not been applied to a real person. Especially in the mouth of a Christian comparing somebody to a source of water (τινα κρήνην) and calling her “the entire good/every good” (πᾶν ἀγαθόν) must have sounded as a blasphemy if the expressions concerned a real human being.

Well then, after I left your region, I had halted among the Cappadocians, when unexpectedly I received some disturbing news of her. There was a ten days’ journey between us, so I covered the whole distance as quickly as possible and at last reached Pontus where I saw her and she saw me. But it was the same as a traveller at noon whose body is exhausted from the sun. He runs up to a spring, but alas, before he has touched the water, before he has cooled his tongue, all at once the stream dries up before his eyes and he finds the water turned to dust. So it was

80 Gregory of Nyssa, Epistulae 19, 6-8, GNO 8/2, 64-65, transl. A.M. Silvas, 176-177.
81 Gregory of Nyssa, Epistulae 19, 9, GNO 8/2, 65.
with me. At the tenth year I saw her whom I so longed to see, who was for me in place of a mother and a teacher and every good, but before I could satisfy my longing, on the third day I buried her and returned on my way. Such was my first visit to my fatherland after my return journey from Antioch.82

Those who treat Letter 19 as a documentation become puzzled reading about ten years of separation while in Vita sanctae Macrinae Gregory tells about almost eight years.83 I maintain that both documents were not aimed to report the history.

3. De anima et resurrectione by Gregory of Nyssa

Although a lot of prominent scholars claimed that De anima et resurrectione is a record of a real conversation between Gregory of Nyssa and Macrina,84 it is impossible for many reasons, for many other – improbable. First of all, the dialogue occupies 123 pages in GNO edition – it is physically impossible to read or deliver it in one afternoon as Vita sanctae Macrinae suggests it was.85 It is significant that even the mention of a conversation in Vita sanctae Macrinae is contradictory to the dialogue itself: in the Life it is Macrina who asks questions while in De anima et resurrectione Gregory asks questions and Macrina answers.

83 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 17, GNO 8/1, 389.
85 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 17-18, GNO 8/1, 389-391.
On the other hand, a dialogue means not only conversation between two people but has been for ages an acknowledged literary genre. A special type of that genre is a philosophical dialogue, associated above all with Plato. It is difficult, if not impossible, to harmonise Plato’s Socrates with the one we know from other sources (Xenophon, Aristophanes), so it is generally assumed that Plato transmitted his own ideas through the personage of Socrates. And the same happened in the literary construction by Gregory of Nyssa, written in accordance with the canons of the genre – a philosophical dialogue. Therefore, I have no doubts that Macrina serves here as “a mouthpiece for Gregory’s theology” and the dialogue is not a record of a real conversation. As Cameron stated: “Gregory’s use of the dialogue form in On the Soul is clearly a deliberate literary choice, carefully adopting a Platonic model.”

Cameron’s statement is confirmed by the formal aspect of the dialogue. K. Jażdżewska has recently proved that the philosophical dialogue associated with Plato did not have indicators of the speakers. There are “specific groups of texts, ranging from documentary to paraliterary, in which indications of speakers are routinely given. These include reports of real proceedings, the Acta Alexandrinorum, the acts of Christian martyrs and – here our evidence is more limited – accounts of Church congregations, in particular of debates concerning orthodoxy and heresy. The discussed texts follow, with various degrees of exactitude, the documentary as-if-verbatim format.” If De anima et resurrectione had been or had pretended to be a real conversation between Gregory and Macrina, it would have had indicators of the speakers characteristic for documentary. But, the dialogue De anima et resurrectione in the GNO edition has no indicators of the

---
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speakers. And in the PG edition the indicators of the speakers do not come from the manuscripts, but according to the editor were added by Zacharias Hasselmann.\textsuperscript{93}

It is worth stressing that at the time when Gregory was writing, a dialogue as a literary genre already had a long and respectable tradition in Christian literature, starting with apologetic dialogues (Ariston of Pella, Justin and Minutius Felix) to the dialogues which Hoffman called dogmatic-polemic and philosophical\textsuperscript{94} (Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and above all Methodius of Olympus). The purpose of those writings was apologetic and polemic; none of them was intended to record a real conversation but to convince a sophisticated, well-educated reader that Christianity is a true and best philosophy. \textit{De anima et resurrectione} has the same polemical aim: to defend Gregory’s own concepts on the soul, resurrection and apokatastasis. We can, of course, ask why he chose his sister as a “mouthpiece”, but that is a subject for independent research and actually has been already widely discussed.\textsuperscript{95}

4. Epitaphium 120 by Gregory of Nazianzus

The fourth and last Ancient writing about Macrina is an epitaph by Gregory of Nazianzus. It suggests that Macrina had been hidden and unknown before \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} made her famous. The epitaph reads as follow:

\begin{align*}
\text{Παρθένον αἰγαλήτοσαν ἔχω κόνις, εἶ & Me, the dust, I hold the radiant virgin,} \\
\text{τιν’ ἀκούεις} & \text{if you hear about certain} \\
\text{Μακρίναν, Ἐμμελίου πρωτότοκον} & \text{Macrina - the first-born of great} \\
\text{μεγάλης} & \text{Emmelia,} \\
\text{ἡ πάντων ἀνθρώπων λάθεν ὀμμάτα,} & \text{who hid herself from the eyes of men,} \\
\text{νῦν δ’ ἐνί πάντων} & \text{yet now she is on}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{In opusculum sequens monitum}, PG 46, page without number before col. 11. \\
\textsuperscript{94} M. Hoffmann, \textit{Der dialog}, 57-159. \\
γλώσση καὶ πάντων φέρτερον εὐχος ἔχει.

every tongue and she has achieved better fame.96

The epitaph, which is obvious, must had been written after Macrina’s death. The poetry as such could, of course, refer to real persons and historical events, but it is not necessary for its literary construction. Even the “information” that she led her life hidden from the eyes of all men is contradictory to *Vita sanctae Macrinae* that states that during her life there were noble women who joined the community moved by Macrina’s fame,97 also a soldier came with his family to see the “school of virtue” (τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς φροντιστήριον).98

The above-quoted epitaph is a proof that Gregory of Nazianzus was involved in the process of inventing Macrina. The reasons of his involvement will become clear after the life of Eustathius and relationship between Eustathius and Basil has been exposed.

**Chapter II. Contradictions in the writings about Macrina and other sources**

Incoherencies and contradictions in the very writings about Macrina and between those writings and other sources are the most important evidence that none of the Macrina writings describes the real history; moreover, none of them pretended to do so. I will list here only some of the most important contradictions, but there are a lot more contradicting details.

1. **Two Macrinas**

The most conspicuous incoherence we face while thinking about Macrina is a huge difference between two Macrinas: one from *Vita sanctae Macrinae* and the other from *De anima et resurrectione*. In *Vita sanctae Macrinae* Macrina was educated by her Christian parents and from the very beginning she read only Bible; also when she grew up she and her companions cared only about divine things and unceasing

---

97 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 28-29, GNO 8/1, 402.
98 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 36, GNO 8/1, 410.
prayer.\textsuperscript{99} Meanwhile, in \textit{De anima et resurrectione} Macrina not only names Pagan philosophers,\textsuperscript{100} but she leads the discussion on the highest scientific level – scientific of course in the Ancient meaning; so, it is a philosophical discussion full of dialectic and rhetoric. If we treated both writings as describing historical person, we would have to admit that Macrina was schizophrenic or that there were two different Macrinas. And yet, Macrina was not schizophrenic nor Gregory was intellectually disabled, but Macrina constitutes in both writings a deliberate and elaborate literary construct. In \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} she is a model of a saint ascetic, simple and focused on virtuous life. In the dialogue she is a philosopher, teacher and authority on elevated philosophical and theological topics.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \underline{Basil’s conversion}
\end{enumerate}

The biggest amount of incoherencies concerns the conversion of Basil, namely his decision to start leading ascetic life. It was a crucial moment of his career as the Ancients attached a lot of significance to the master-pupil relationship. According to \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae}, when Basil returned to Annisa after his studies (in Athens?), he was proud and haughty because of his rhetorical skills. Then, Macrina “persuaded him to strive after philosophy” (κἀκεῖνον πρὸς τὸν τῆς φιλοσοφίας σκοπὸν ἐπεσπάσατο):

\begin{quote}
Καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ κατὰ τὰς ἀδελφὰς πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν ἐκάστη μετ’ εὐσχημοσύνης ἢ μήτηρ ψυχομήσατο, ἐπάνεισιν ἐν τούτῳ τῶν παιδευτηρίων πολλῷ χρόνῳ προασκήθεις τοῖς λόγοις ὁ πολὺς Βασίλειος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῆς προειρηκένης.
Λαβοῦσα τοῖνυν αὐτὸν ύπερφυώς ἐπηρμένον τῷ περὶ τοὺς λόγους φρονήματι καὶ πάντα περιφρονούντα
\end{quote}

After the mother had skillfully arranged what seemed best for each of Macrina’s sisters, her brother, the distinguished Basil, came home from school where he had had practice in rhetoric for a long time. He was excessively puffed up by his rhetorical abilities and disdainful of all great reputations, and considered himself better than the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{99} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 11, GNO 8/1, 382.
\textsuperscript{100} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{De anima et resurrectione}, GNO 3/3, 8 and 33-34.
\end{flushleft}
leading men in the district, but Macrina took him over and lured him so quickly to the goal of philosophy that he withdrew from the worldly show and began to look down upon acclaim through oratory and went over to this life full of labors for one’s own hand to perform, providing for himself, through his complete poverty, a mode of living that would, without impediment, lead to virtue.  

Basil himself left us two different (not exclusive) stories about his own conversion. In Letter 1 addressed to Eustathius the philosopher, identified by Gribomont with Eustathius of Sebastea, Basil confessed that he had quit his studies in Athens when he had heard about his philosophy (κατέλιπον τὰς Ἀθηνας κατὰ φήμην τῆς σῆς φιλοσοφίας). Letter 1 was written most probably in 357. In Letter 223 written in 375 and addressed to the very same Eustathius of Sebastea Basil passed over his role as an inspirer of his asceticism and wrote: “I woke up like from the deep sleep” (ὥσπερ ἐξ ὑπνοῦ βαθέως διαναστάς). It was the time when Basil and Eustathius were in a sharp conflict, but even here where the figure of other inspirer would be very useful for Basil, he does not refer to Macrina.

These are not the only versions of Basil’s conversion that can be found in Ancient literature. Rufinus wrote that it was Gregory of Nazianzus who literally forced Basil to lead a monastic life (ad monasterium manu injecta perduceret). Kardong thinks that Rufinus apparently disliked Basil and wanted to discredit him with such malice.  

103 Basil the Great, Epistulae 1, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, 3.  
105 Rufinus of Aquileia, HE II 9, PL 21, 518B.
inversion of roles. But, N. McLynn points out that Rufinus wrote his version a decade after Gregory of Nazianzus’ death and he was influenced by the literary construct of the friendship created by the latter: “The texts in which Gregory presents the details of his friendship with Basil need to be understood against the background of the 380s, and in relation to Gregory’s position in Cappadocia after his return from Constantinople. After the humiliating loss of his position in the capital, he faced the very difficult task of constructing a commensurate (or at least compensating) authority at home, independently of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Various strategic can be detected in the works he produced in this period; but of all these, his appropriation of Basil was arguably the most successful. Barely a decade after Gregory’s death Rufinus, who translated works by both men, could claim that it was Gregory who had led Basil from the rhetorical schools to the ascetic life and that he had lived with him for thirteen years (improving on reality by a factor of roughly ten).” In reality, we know from letters by both Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus that it was Basil who was persuading his friend to lead an ascetic life (Letters 2 and 14 by Basil). Gregory of Nazianzus promised to come to Basil, who was staying near the Iris river, but found various excuses in order not to (Letter 1 by Gregory of Nazianzus).

3. Circumstances of the last meeting of Gregory and Macrina

All three writings about Macrina by Gregory of Nyssa describe the last meeting of the siblings. In each of them the author himself gives a different reason why he decided to visit his sister. In De anima et resurrectione he comes to Macrina in order to share a mourning for Basil and he does it hurriedly (κατὰ σπουδὴν):

            Επειδὴ τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου βίου πρός Θεὸν μετέστη ὁ πολὺς ἐν ἀγίοις Ἡσαύλειος, καὶ κοινὴ πένθους ἀφορμή ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις ἐγένετο, περιήν δὲ ἐτι

When Basil, the great saint, had passed over to God from the life of men, he gave the churches a common cause for grief. As our sister and teacher still remained in

in haste to share with her the sad news concerning our brother.\textsuperscript{108}

In \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} he just wanted to visit her and it was nine months after Basil' death:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ἐνατὸς ἦν μετὰ τὸ πάθος τούτῳ μὴν ἢ μικρὸν ύπέρ τούτῳ καὶ σύνοδος ἐπισκόπων κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχου πόλιν ἡθοοίζετο, ἣς καὶ ἡμείς μετέσχομεν. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ πάλιν [387] πρὸς τὴν έαντοῦ ἕκαστος ἀπελύθημεν, πρὶν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν παρελθεῖν, ἐνθύμιον ἐμοὶ τῷ Γρηγορίῳ γίνεται πρὸς αὐτὴν διαβήναι.}
\end{quote}

About nine months after this disaster, there was a synod of bishops in the city of Antioch, in which I participated. And when each of us was leaving to return to his own diocese before the year was out, I, Gregory, thought often of visiting Macrina.\textsuperscript{109}

According to \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae}, during the journey he had a vision which he interpreted as a harbinger of disaster and only after that he learned that Macrina was ill:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ὁδοῦ διανύσας μιὰς ἡμέρας ἀπείχον ὅδον, ὡς τε ἡμῖν ἐξ ἐνυπνίῳ φανεῖσα φοβερὰς ἐποιεὶ τάς ἐλπίδας τοῦ μέλλοντος. Ἐδόκουν γὰρ λείπανα μαρτύρων διὰ χειρὸς φέρειν, εἶναι δὲ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν αὐγήν oία ἐκ καθαροῦ γίνεται κατόπτροι, ὅταν πρὸς τὸν ἡλιοῦ τεθή ἀντιπρόσωπον, ὡστε μοι τᾶς ὑπέρ τῆς μαρμάρου τῆς λαμπηδόνος ἀμβλύνεσθαι. Καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μοι νυκτὸς}
\end{quote}

When I had almost finished the journey and was about one day away from my destination, a vision, appearing in my sleep, aroused fearful forebodings about the future. I seemed to be carrying the relics of martyrs in my hand and a light seemed to come from them, as happens when the sun is reflected on a bright mirror so that the eye is dazzled by the brilliance of the beam. That same

\textsuperscript{108} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{De anima et resurrectione}, GNO 3/3, 1, transl. C.P. Roth, 27.

\textsuperscript{109} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 15, GNO 8/1, 386-387, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 173.
By contrast, in Letter 19 he said that while he was in Cappadocia he was alarmed by some rumours about her and that is why he decided to go to Pontus.

Επειδή τοινυν ἐπέστην παρ᾽ ὑμῶν τοῖς Καππαδόκαις, εὐθὺς τις ἡμᾶς ἀκοῇ περὶ αὐτῆς διετάραξε· δέκα δὲ ἦν ἡμερῶν ἡ διὰ τοῦ μέσου ὀδὸς, καὶ ταύτην πάσαν διὰ τῆς ἐνδεχομένης

Well then, after I left your region, I had halted among the Cappadocians, when unexpectedly I received some disturbing news of her. There was a ten days’ journey between us, so I covered the whole distance as quickly

ἐπείξεως διανύσας γίνομαι κατὰ τὸν Πόντον καὶ εἶδον καὶ ὤφθην.

as possible and at last reached Pontus where I saw her and she saw me.\textsuperscript{111}

Those differences are understandable if we remember a different genre and different purpose of each of the writings. In \textit{De anima et resurrectione} the death of Basil serves as a pretext for discussion about death, resurrection and soul’s immortality. In the \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} Gregory “just felt like visiting Macrina (ἐνθύμιον ἐμοὶ τῷ Γρηγορίῳ γίνεται πρὸς αὐτὴν διαβήναι),” which was to stress his close relationship with his sister and make credible his story about her. In Letter 19, Gregory justifies himself why he had left his own diocese endangered by many heresies (Cappadocia) and went on a journey to home (Pontus).

Further, Gregory himself gives us different information on the time that passed from his previous meeting with Macrina. In \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} he counted the years and the result was almost eight (τὸ διάστημα ὁκτὼ μικρὸν δεῖν παραμετρούμενον ἐτεις),\textsuperscript{112} by contrast, in Letter 19 he affirms that he saw his beloved sister for the first time in ten years (ἐνιαυτῷ δεκάτῳ).\textsuperscript{113}

Also the period from the death of Basil to Gregory’s visit to Macrina is different in every writing. In \textit{De anima et resurrectione} he went to Macrina soon after Basil died as he wanted to inform her as soon as possible about the misfortune (ἐγὼ μὲν ἦειν κατὰ σπουδήν κοινωνήσων ἐκεῖνη τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ συμφοράς).\textsuperscript{114} Meanwhile in \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} Gregory decided to visit Macrina nine months after Basil’s death.\textsuperscript{115} He even had enough time to go to the council of Antioch that was not mentioned either in \textit{De anima et resurrectione} or in Letter 19.

Gregory obviously did not pay attention to chronological details as none of the writings was intended to present authentic events.

\textsuperscript{111} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Epistulae} 19, 10, GNO 8/2, 65, transl. A.M. Silvas, 88.
\textsuperscript{112} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 15, GNO 8/1, 387.
\textsuperscript{113} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Epistulae} 19, 10, GNO 8/2, 65.
\textsuperscript{114} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{De anima et resurrectione}, GNO 3/3, 1.
\textsuperscript{115} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 15, GNO 8/1, 386.
4. Number of siblings

In one and the same writing, namely *Vita sanctae Macrinae*, Gregory seems to give two versions of the number of Emmelia’s children. First, he says that the mother had four sons and five daughters (τεσσάρων γὰρ ἦν υἱῶν μήτηρ καὶ πέντε θυγατέρων), but when Emmelia is praying on the deathbed, she speaks about Macrina and Peter in such a way that a lot of scholars understand as if there were ten children:

Σοί, κύριε, καὶ ἀπάρχημαι καὶ ἀποδεκατῶ τὸν καρπὸν τῶν ωδίνων. Ἄπαρχη μοι ἦ πρωτότοκος αὐτή καὶ ἐπιδέκατος ὑπός, ἡ τελευταία ωδίς. Σοὶ δὲ ἀφιέρωται παρὰ τοῦ νόμου ἀμφότερα καὶ σὰ ἐστιν ἀναθήματα. Οὕκουν ἐλθοὶ ὁ ἄγιασμός ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν μου ταύτην καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον τούτο.

To you, O Lord, I offer the first and tenth fruit of my pains. The first fruit, my eldest daughter here, and this my tenth, my last-born son. Both have been dedicated to you by law and are your votive offerings. May sanctification, therefore, come to this first and tenth.

Drawing the conclusion that Emmelia must have had ten children, but one of them died in infancy, seems unjustified to me. Both expressions used here in relation to children (ἀπαρχὴ and ἐπιδέκατον) constitute in the Bible technical terms meaning the offering for God. However, I would stress that even the number of nine children is rather symbolic (nine fruits of the Holy Spirit from Ga 5, 22-23) as there are no external testimonies to confirm it. Gregory of Nazianzus said only that all of the children of Emmelia and Basil led virtuous life, though some of them were priests, some virgins and some were married.

---

116 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 5, GNO 8/1, 376.
120 Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio 43 (In laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi)*, 9, SC 384, 134.
Incoherencies and contradictions in the very writings about Macrina and between those writings and other sources are substantial and significant. They are not an effect of a slip-up or a moment of inattention. Gregory of Nyssa juggles the events in order to achieve his goals. None of the writings about Macrina had as its aim to report historical events; they are full of literary topoi, rhetoric, quotations from the Bible. All four sources about Macrina were written according to the rules of literary genres that do not have as a scope to report history, but have other aims such as edification, polemics and honouring somebody. Even if they contain some information that seems historical, they are often incoherent and contradictory. On the other hand, there are no external sources that confirm Macrina’s achievements. Macrina described by Gregory of Nyssa is obviously a literary construct.

Chapter III. Writings that do not mention Macrina

If Macrina really had been a pioneering monastic founder she should have appeared in the specific places in the specific writings, but she actually did not. I will point out at least the most obvious sources in which Macrina is absent, though she should have been present, if she had been the inspirer and the prominent representative of ascetic and monastic life in Pontus.

1. Basil the Great

Many scholars have been wondering why Basil never mentioned his sister Macrina not only in his ascetic writings, but also in any of his letters. Basil did not say a word about Macrina in his Letter 1 describing his conversion, although according to *Vita sanctae Macrinae* it was Macrina who inspired him to the ascetic lifestyle.

---


122 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 6, GNO 8/1, 377.
In Letter 207 written in 375/376 he complains that there are very few women who lead an ascetic life in Pontus – “among us” refers either to the entire dioceses of Pontus or to the province of Pontus Polemoniacus as the letter is addressed to the clergy of Neocaesarea:

Εἰ δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες εὐαγγελικῶς ζῆν προελόμεναι παρθενίαν μὲν γάμου προτιμῶσαι, δουλαγωγοῦσαι δὲ τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός καὶ ἐν πένθει ζῶσαι τῷ μακαριζομένῳ, μακάριαι τῆς προαιρεσίας, ὅπου ἄν ὤσι τῆς γῆς. Παρὰ δὲ ἡμῶν μικρὰ ταύτα στοιχειομένων ἔτι καὶ εἰσαγομένων πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν.

If women also choose to live according to the Gospel, and prefer virginity to marriage, by enslaving the arrogance of the flesh, and by living in a sorrow which is deemed blessed, they are blessed in their choice wherever they are in the world. But among us these instances are few, because mankind is still learning and being introduced to piety.

He did not mention Macrina here though according to Vita sanctae Macrinae Macrina should have been the leader of a group of women in Pontus for approximately 20 years. Basil passed Macrina over in Letter 223 written at the same time (375) to Eustathius of Sebastea alluding to many visits of Eustathius to the place near the river Iris, where Basil stayed with his brother Gregory.

Finally, Basil did not address to Macrina even a single one of his more than 300 letters, 13 of which were addressed directly to women and some concerned women.

If anybody suspects that Basil was a misogynist and that was a reason he did not say anything about his sister, I reply in advance: it is not true. In Letter 223 Basil confesses that he received the faith from his mother and grandmother:

'Αλλ' ἦν ἐκ παιδὸς ἔλαβον ἐννοιαν περὶ Θεοῦ παρὰ τῆς μακαρίας μητρὸς μου καὶ τῆς μᾶμμης Μακρινῆς, ταύτην αὐξηθείσαν ἔσχον ἐν ἐμαυτῷ· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα ἔξ

Nay, the conception of God which I received in childhood from my blessed mother and my grandmother Macrina, this, developed, have I held within me; for I did not change from one opinion

to another with the maturity of reason, but I perfected the principles handed down to me by them. For just as the seed, in developing, becomes.\textsuperscript{124} Basil emphasised their role in his life by belittling achievements of his father and grandfather. On the contrary, Gregory of Nazianzus said that Basil was taught by his father:

\textit{Τὰ μὲν δὴ πρώτα τῆς ἡλικίας ύπὸ τῶν μεγάλων πατρί, ὃν κοινὸν παιδευτὴν ἄρετής ὁ Πόντος τηνικάυτα προψάλλετο, σπαργανοῦται καὶ διαπλάττεται πλάσιν τῆν ἀρίστην τε καὶ καθαρωτάτην, ἐν μὲν ἄρετῃ καὶ τῆς νυκτερινῆς ἀντίθετον.}

In his earliest years he was swathed and fashioned, in that best and purest fashioning which the Divine David speaks of as proceeding day by day, in contrast with that of the night, under his great father, acknowledged in those days by Pontus, as its common teacher of virtue.\textsuperscript{125}

The difference between those two accounts arise from two different attitudes to the family. Gregory of Nazianzus thought that the main obligation of a son is to be obedient to his father as he himself was. Basil was eager to abandon his family for the sake of asceticism.\textsuperscript{126} He refers to his mother and grandmother as it allows him to claim that he stands in the line of tradition that comes from Gregory Thaumaturgus. He regards his faith reliable because it was handed down to him by his grandmother:

\textit{Πίστεως δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας τίς ἀν καὶ γένοιτο ἐναργεστέρα ἀπόδειξις ἢ ὅτι τραφέντες ἡμεῖς ύπὸ τῆθη μακαρία γυναικὶ παρὴ ὑμῶν ὀρμημένη;} And what indeed could be a clearer proof of our faith than that we were brought up by our grandmother, a blessed woman who came from amongst you? I mean the illustrious Macrina, by whom we were taught the

\textit{Μακρίναν λέγω τήν περιβόητον,}

\textit{Πίστεως δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας τίς ἀν καὶ γένοιτο ἐναργεστέρα ἀπόδειξις ἢ ὅτι τραφέντες ἡμεῖς ύπὸ τῆθη μακαρία γυναικὶ παρὴ ὑμῶν ὀρμημένη;} And what indeed could be a clearer proof of our faith than that we were brought up by our grandmother, a blessed woman who came from amongst you? I mean the illustrious Macrina, by whom we were taught the

\textit{Μακρίναν λέγω τήν περιβόητον,}

\textsuperscript{125} Gregory of Nazianzus, \textit{Oratio} 43, 12, SC 384, 140, transl. NPNF II 7, 399.
\textsuperscript{126} See Part IV. Epilogue of the present study.
2. Gregory of Nazianzus

I find it puzzling that in his Epitaph 54 on Emmelia among the children of Emmelia Gregory of Nazianzus favoured the wife of a priest (Theosebia) over the leader of asceticism in Pontus (Macrina):

Ἐμμέλιον τεθνήκε, τίς ἐφρασεν; ἢ γε τοσούτων
καὶ τοῖς τεκέων δῶκε φάσος βιότω, νίεας
ἡ δὲ θυνατρας ὠμόζυγας αἰζυγέας τε,
ἐὐπαίς καὶ πολύτας ἢδὲ μόνη μερότων.
τρεῖς μὲν τίροι ἱερῆς ἀγακλέες, ἢ δ’ ἱερής
σύζυγος, οἱ δὲ πέλας ὡς στρατός εὐαγέων.

Emmelia is dead! Who would have thought it, she who gave to life the light of so many and such children, both sons and daughters married and unmarried? She alone among mortals had both good children and many children. Three of her sons were illustrious priests, and one daughter the companion of a priest, and the rest were like an army of saints.¹²⁸

Even if we wanted to understand ἡ ἱερής σύζυγος not as a wife, but as a companion, who could be a sister as well, it would be rather Theosebia, honoured in Epitaph 123 and called there the child of the famous Emmelia and the wife of the great Gregory:

Καὶ σὺ, Θεοσσέβιον, κλεινὴς τέκος
Ἐμμελίοιο,

And you, Theosebia, child of noble Emmelia, and in truth the

In Letter 197 Gregory of Nazianzus calls Theosebia “the most beautiful and glorious among all the beauty of the Brethren” (Θεοσεβίαν, τὴν ἐν τοιούτῳ κάλλει τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐνθεσπεστάτην καὶ διαφανεστάτην) and “truly sacred, truly consort of a priest, and of equal honour and worthy of the Great Sacraments” (Θεοσεβίαν, τὴν ὄντως ἵεραν καὶ ἱερέως σύζυγον καὶ ὀμότιμον καὶ τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀξίαν). 130 So, it is difficult to resolve whether she was a wife called sister because of her faith or she was a companion in ascetic life (σύζυγος). 131 Anyway, Gregory of Nazianzus did write a consolation letter to Gregory of Nyssa after Theosebia (no matter, sister or wife) died, 132 but he did not write any in connection with Macrina’s passing away. There is another consolation letter of him addressed to Gregory of Nyssa on the occasion of Basil’s death, in which he justifies himself that he had not come to Basil’s funeral due to “the serious and dangerous illness.” 133 If soon after that Macrina, sister of Gregory of Nyssa and Basil, died (according to Vita sanctae Macrinae 134), we could have expected similar letter. Unless Gregory of Nazianzus suddenly recovered and attended her funeral; but that would have been stressed in Vita sanctae Macrinae, since Gregory named among the

---

130 Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistulae 197, 5-6, GCS 53, 143, transl. NPNF II 7, 462.
131 J. Daniélou (Le mariage de Grégoire de Nysse et la chronologie de sa vie, “Revue des études augustinianennes” 2 (1956), 71-78) thought there were two Theosebias, both married to Gregories: one daughter of Emmelia, sister of Gregory of Nyssa and Basil, married to certain Gregory, and another one, wife of Gregory of Nyssa. S. Elm (Virgins of God, 157, footnote 64) claims that there might have been only one Theosebia, sister of Gregory of Nyssa and Basil, and σύζυγος may mean here associate or collaborator; the same argument was repeated by Silvas, Macrina the Younger. Philosopher of God, 7, footnote 25.
132 Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistulae 197, 5-6, GCS 53, 143, PG 37, 321-324.
133 Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistulae 76, GCS 53, 65.
134 Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 14-15, GNO 8/1, 385-387.
participants of the funeral an unknown bishop Araxios,\footnote{Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 33, GNO 8/1, 407.} he surely would have mentioned his famous friend, if he had been present.

\section{Historiae Ecclesiasticae}

Macrina does not appear in any Ancient source describing the Church history of that period. Certainly, Ancient historians focused on relationships between the Church and the state, doctrinal disputes and bishops, but they also said something about the monastic life. Rufinus said that Basil was the founder of monasticism in Pontus\footnote{Rufinus of Aquileia, \textit{HE} II 9, PL 21, 518C.} and had two brothers: Gregory of Nyssa and Peter,\footnote{Rufinus of Aquileia, \textit{HE} II 9, PL 21, 520C.} failing to mention their saint sister. It is not weird that he did not name Macrina as he generally did not mention women unless they were martyrs or members of the ruling family.

Sozomen was especially fond of histories of the ascetics; he not only mentions some saint/ascetic women by names but also describes their holy lives: Eusebia, a deaconess (\textit{HE} IX 2), a holy virgin Matrona (\textit{HE} VII 21), a widow Olympias (VIII 9), the zealous women Nicarete (\textit{HE} VIII 23). Socrates Scholasticus was less focused on asceticism, but he dedicated the entire chapter of his history to Hypatia, the philosopher (\textit{HE} VII 15). And in none of that texts there is any mention of Macrina, alleged inspirer and leader of monastic life in Pontus according to \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae}.

Macrina should have been evoked at least twice in the \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica} by Sozomen. When describing the beginnings of monasticism in Pontus and the vicinities he points to Eustathius of Sebastae as an initiator:

\begin{quote}
'Αρμενίως δὲ καὶ Παφλαγόσι καὶ τοῖς πρὸς τῷ Πόντῳ οἰκούσι λέγεται Εὐστάθιος ὁ τῆν ἐν Σεβαστείᾳ τῆς Ἀρμενίας ἐκκλησίαν ἑπιτροπεύσας μοναχικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀρξαι, καὶ τῆς
\end{quote}

It is said that Eustathius, who governed the church of Sebaste in Armenia, founded a society of monks in Armenia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus, and became the author of a zealous discipline, both as to what meats were...
to be partaken of or to be avoided, what garments were to be worn, and what customs and exact course of conduct were to be adopted. Some assert that he was the author of the ascetic treatises commonly attributed to Basil of Cappadocia.\footnote{Sozomen, HE III 14, 31, GCS 50, 123, transl. NPNF II 2, 293.}

According to Sozomen it was Basil who continued Eustathius’ work in Pontus:

\[ \text{καὶ Βασίλειος μὲν τὰς πρὸς τῷ Πόντῳ περιοῦν πόλεις συνοικίας τε μοναχῶν πολλὰς ἐκεῖσε κατεστήσατο καὶ τὰ πλῆθη διδάσκων ομοίως αὐτῷ φρονεῖν ἐπείθε.} \]

According to Socrates Scholasticus, the founder of monasticism in Pontus was Basil.\footnote{Sozomen, HE VI 17, 4, GCS 50, 258, transl. NPNF II 2, 356.} He mentioned by name two brothers of Basil: Gregory of Nyssa and Peter, adding that only Peter followed Basil in monastic lifestyle\footnote{Socrates Scholasticus, HE IV 26, 12, GCS NF 1, 261.} — again, no mention about Macrina.

The cities in the neighborhood of Pontus fell to the lot of Basil; and here he founded numerous monasteries, and, by teaching the people, he persuaded them to hold like views with himself.\footnote{Socrates Scholasticus, HE IV 26, 26, GCS NF 1, 262.}

The complete absence of Macrina in the \textit{Historiae Ecclesiasticae} written in the 5th century seems to confirm that she obviously was not the founder and leader of asceticism or monasticism in Pontus. The founder and inspirer of monasticism in Pontus was Eustathius of Sebastea. He became also an inspiration for Basil to start leading ascetic life.
Part II. Eustathius of Sebastea

Chapter I. Sources

1. Eustathius of Sebastea and Eustathius the Philosopher

No writings by Eustathius of Sebastea have preserved unless Eustathius of Sebastea is regarded as the author of the letter by Eustathius the Philosopher to the emperor Julian. According to F. Fatti Eustatius of Sebastea and Eustatius the Philosopher described by Eunapius in the VI book of the *Lives of Philosophers and Sophists* are one and the same person. The letter reads as follows:

What an advantage it was for me that the token came late! For instead of riding, in fear and trembling, in the public carriage and, in encounters with drunken mule-drivers and mules made restive, as Homer says, from idleness and overfeeding, having to endure clouds of dust and a strange dialect and the cracking of whips, it was my lot to travel at leisure by a road arched over with trees and well-shaded, a road that had numerous springs and resting-places suitable to the summer season for a traveler who seeks relief from his weariness on the way; and where I always found a good place to stop, airy and shaded

İουλιανῷ Εὐστάθιῳ φιλόσοφῳ. Ὡς ἄνησε γε τὸ σύνθημα ἡμίν μελλήσαν- ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ τρέμειν καὶ δεδιέναι, φερόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς δημοσίας ἀπίνης καὶ περιπίπτοντα κραίπαλισιν ὄρεωκόμοις καὶ ἡμίόνοις ἀκοστώσαις καθ’ Ὄμηρον δι’ ἀργίαν τε καὶ πλησμονῆν, καὶ ἀνέχεσθαι κοινορτοῦ καὶ ὑρωκῆς ἀλλοκότοι καὶ ψόφου μαστίγων, βαδίζειν ἐπὶ σχολῆς περιέστη μοι δι’ ὁδοῦ συνηρεφούς καὶ ἐπισκίου, πολλὰς μὲν κρίνας, πολλὰς δὲ ἔχοις καταγωγᾶς ἐπιτηδείους τῇ ὀρᾷ μεταξὺ τὸν πόλον διαναπαύοντι, ἕνα ἄν μοι φανείη κατάλυσις εὐτυνοὺς τε καὶ ἀμφιλαφής ύπὸ πλατάνοις ἢ κυπαρίσιοι τισὶ τὸν Φαίδρον ἐν λαφής

ὑπὸ πλατάνοις ἢ κυπαρίττοις τοῖς τὸν
Φαίδρον ἐν χερσίν ἔχοντι τὸν
Μυροινούσιον ἢ ἔτερον τινα τῶν
Πλάτωνος λόγων. Ταῦτα τοι, ὦ πάντα
θεία και ιερά κεφαλή, ἀπολαύων τῆς
ἐλευθέρας ὁδοιπορίας, ἀτοπον
ὑπέλαβον τὸ μή καὶ τούτο κοινώσασθαι
σοι καὶ ἀποσημήναι.

Actually, it is not the correspondence between Julian and Eustathius the Philosopher that can refute, I think, the hypothesis of Fatti. The letter published among Julian’s letters contains no information about Eustathius himself, whoever he was. Even the fact that he refers to Plato and Homer by names proves nothing as it was a frequent custom also among Christians (e.g. Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus). I am convinced that we cannot identify two Eustathius because of other reasons.

First, Fatti bases his thesis and detailed dating on the Eunapius’ Lives of Sophists. He seems to forget that his story about Eustathius the Philosopher was constructed – let me quote here N.D. Lewis’ words about the “fictive construction of Sosipatra” – “within the specific genre of late antique philosophical bioi” and “the nature of the texts themselves invites caution.”144 The scope of Lives of Sophists was to juxtapose Pagan saints to the Christian ones; it is not a historiography, but as E. Wipszycka stated, it was written “in a hagiographic style.”145

Second, Fatti thinks that Eustathius the Philosopher disappeared around 335 and that Eustathius of Sebastea appeared in a public life just before the Council of Gangra which he dates to 343.146 However, it is not true that “di Eustazio filosofo, dopo la sua «diparita» (μετὰ τὴν ἀποχώρησιν Εὐσταθίου),147 non sappiamo più

146 F. Fatti, Eustazio di Sebaste, Eustazio filosofo, 448.
147 Eunapius, Vitae sophistarum VI 9, 1.
nulla.”¹⁴⁸ Fatti himself notes that Eustathius the Philosopher “è ancora vivo nel 358, quando prende parte all’ambasciata inviata da Costanzo II presso il re di Persia Sapore II.”¹⁴⁹ Although Eunapius is far from describing the events in the chronologic order and he often mixes facts it seems that it was regarding this embassy that he writes:

In this similar crisis all men were so held captive and enchanted by Eustathius, that they did not hesitate to commend a man of the Hellenic faith to the ears of the emperor; although the earlier emperors had been accustomed to elect for embassies men who had won distinction in the army, or military prefects, or men who were next in rank to these and had been selected for office. But at that time, at the imperious call of necessity, Eustathius was sought out and admitted by general consent to be the most prudent of all men.¹⁵⁰

In the very same 358 Eustathius of Sebastea was sent by bishops gathered in Ancyra as one of four deputies to Constantius who at that time was in Sirmium.¹⁵¹ The concept of Fatti is that before 343 Eustathius the Philosopher converted to Christianity and became Eustathius of Sebastea. But in 358 there are still two Eustathiuses: one of them was sent by Christian emperor to Persia despite of his Hellenic faith and the second one was a Christian bishop.

¹⁵⁰ Eunapius, *Vitae sophistarum* VI 5, 3-4, transl. E. Wilmer Cave Wright, 395.
¹⁵¹ Sozomen, HE IV 13, 5, GCS 50, 156.
On the other hand, it is difficult for me to imagine that Eunapius could have chosen for an example of a Pagan saint a person who converted to Christianity.

“Eunapius’ two works – the History as well as the Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists – were written from a strongly Pagan point of view. As a committed Pagan Eunapius is much more one-sided and polemical than Ammianus.”\textsuperscript{152}

2. Sources and chronology

So, apparently no writings by Eustathius of Sebastea have preserved. The main sources for the life of Eustathius of Sebastea are four Ecclesiastical Histories – by Sozomen, Socrates Scholasticus, Theodoret and Philostorgius – and the letters of Basil the Great. Out of four Ecclesiastical Histories it is Sozomen who left the most detailed information on Eustathius. It is generally assumed that he wrote his Ecclesiastical History after and on the basis of the one by Socrates Scholasticus, but “not only does Sozomen introduce more details about episodes and characters dealt with by Socrates, he also includes a category of material found only in an abbreviated form in Socrates’ history. This is descriptions of the lives and virtues of various sorts of Christians: monks, holy men, martyrs as well as bishops.”\textsuperscript{153} That is why it is no surprise that Sozomen will be the most important source of information about Eustathius’ life.

The historians who wrote in the first half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century significantly differ in their attitude towards Eustathius. It is understandable, because “although the Church historians had many sources in common and at least to some extent knew each other, there are remarkable differences in their selection and use of sources. This is highly influenced by their respective ideas on Church history and Church politics.”\textsuperscript{154} For Sozomen Eustathius occupies the exceptional position in the history of the Ancient monasticism. He considers him as a father of Anatolian asceticism.\textsuperscript{155} For Socrates Eustathius is definitely a heretic.

\textsuperscript{155} F. Fatti, \textit{Eustazio di Sebasto, Eustazio filosofo}, 443.
There are some mentions about Eustathius of Sebastea in Philostorgius, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus and Epiphanius of Salamis. All of them need to be treated with caution. Even *Historia Arianorum* by Athanasius is a polemical not historical writing. It seems that Athanasius was not very interested in details and considered Eustathius of Sebastea as heretic although in the circumstances when he mentions him he was not accused of heresy but of disciplinary issues.

In the Ancient sources there are four main accounts about the career of Eustathius of Sebastea. Two of them (by Socrates Scholasticus HE II 43 and Sozomen HE IV 24) are the list of charges brought against Eustathius during the Council of Constantinople in 360, the third one comes from the letter 263 by Basil the Great and the forth is a parallel account from the letter 244 – both written by Basil during the conflict between Basil and Eustathius. Although all four lists were not to be an objective description of Eustathius’ life, they contain some important information about him. The circumstances of all three lists are important to understand why they differ among them. The two by historians refer to the events that were brought as charges for the deposition of Eustathius in 360. Basil on the other hand wanted to list changes in Eustathius’ confessions.

There are serious problems with the chronology of the described events. The most discussed is the problem with dating the Council of Gangra that I will describe below. Here I only want to mention that according to most popular interpretation Socrates states that the Council of Gangra took place after the Council of Constantinople (360) while Sozomen places it in the early 340s. Usually, scholars deal with the incoherencies by choosing one of the reports and discrediting the other on the basis of some more or less rational reasons. But, they presume that the charges listed by Sozomen are put in chronological order. However, it is not so obvious and not even necessary for his narration as he did not have intention to present events one by one in chronological order, the list could have been random or put by importance of the charges. There are evidences of such an attitude in

---

156 See Appendix II. Sources on Eustathius of Sebastea.
other charges described by Sozomen. He lists following reasons for deposing Silvanus during the same Council of Constantinople (360):

καθετίλον δὲ Σιλβανὸν ὡς ἀρχηγὸν γενόμενον ἀπονοίας τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν τε Σελευκείᾳ καὶ Κωνσταντινουπόλει καὶ Θεόφιλον προστήσαντα τῆς ἐν Κασταβάλως ἐκκλησίας, Ἐλευθερουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα πρότερον παρὰ τῶν ἐπισκόπων Παλαιστίνης καὶ ἐπομοσαμένον παρὰ γνώμην ἐτέραν μὴ υπεισιέναι ἐπισκοπῆν.

The reason they assigned for the deposition of Silvanus was, that he had constituted himself the leader of a foolish party in Seleucia and Constantinople; he had, besides, constituted Theophilus as president of the church of Castabala, who had been previously ordained bishop of Eleutheropolis by the bishops of Palestine, and who had promised upon oath that he would never accept any other bishopric without their permission.157

It is no doubt that the accusation of being “the leader of a foolish party in Seleucia and Constantinople” refers to two councils: Seleucia (359) and Constantinople (359/360). Tarsus is located more than 900 km away from Constantinople, but near Seleucia. Silvanus must have ordained Theophilus before the Council of Seleucia or between the two councils. The charge listed as the second one apparently occurred first in the chronological order.

The second evidence is a list of charges against Cyril of Jerusalem:

Κύριλλον τὸν Ἱεροσολύμων καθετίλον ὡς Εὐσταθίω καὶ Ἐλπιδίῳ κεκοινωνικότα, ἐναντία σπουδάσασι τοῖς ἐν Μελιτηνῇ συνελθοῦσι, μεθ’ ὧν καὶ αὐτῶς συνεληλύθησε, καὶ ὡς μετὰ τὴν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ καθαίρεσιν κοινωνίας

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, was deposed as he stayed in communion with Eustathius and Elpidius, in defiance of those assembled in Melitina, among whom was Cyril himself; and because after his deposition in Palestine he had established contact with Basil and

157 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 13, GCS 50, 181, transl. NPNF II 2, 321.
George, bishop of Laodicea. When Cyril was first installed in the bishopric of Jerusalem, he had a dispute with Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea, concerning his rights as a Metropolitan, which he claimed on the ground of his bishopric being an apostolic see. This dispute excited feelings of enmity between the two bishops, and they mutually accused each other of unsoundness of doctrine concerning the Godhead. In fact, they had both been suspected previously; the one, that is, Acacius, of favoring the heresy of Arians; and the other, of siding with those who maintain that the Son is in substance like unto the Father.

Acacius being thus inimically disposed towards Cyril, and finding himself supported by the bishops of the province, who were of the same sentiments as himself, contrived to depose Cyril under the following pretext. Jerusalem and the neighboring country was at one time visited with a famine, and the poor appealed in great multitudes to Cyril, as their bishop, for necessary food. As he had no money to

158 The last part of the sentence in NPNF has been translated as follows: „and because he had also received Basil and George, bishop of Laodicea, into communion after their deposition in Palestine.” Although grammatically possible (the Greek text does not specify whose deposition it was), we know nothing about any deposition of Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea in Palestine, but we know that Cyril himself was deposed by Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea. The circumstances of this deposition are described subsequently.
purchase the requisite provisions, he sold for this purpose the veil and sacred ornaments of the church. It is said that a man, having recognized an offering which he had presented at the altar as forming part of the costume of an actress, made it his business to inquire whence it was procured; and ascertained that a merchant had sold it to the actress, and that the bishop had sold it to the merchant. It was under this pretext that Acacius deposed Cyril.\textsuperscript{159}

The date of Cyril’s deposition is not known precisely, but it is generally agreed that he was deposed “in 357 or thereabouts.”\textsuperscript{160} And the Council of Melitene took place most probably in 358.\textsuperscript{161} So the first charge (“he was associated with Eustathius and Elpidius, although they had opposed those assembled in Melitina, among whom was Cyril himself” – presumably 358) refers to the event chronologically subsequent to the second (“after his deposition in Palestine he established contact with Basil and George, bishop of Laodicea” – presumably 357). And it is absolutely obvious that the explanation which follows both charges refers to the events that had occurred before the deposition (before 357). It is not impossible that Cyril took part in the Council of Melitene (358) after he had been deposed (357) as we know from Theodoret that despite his previous deposition he attended the Council of Seleucia (359):

Cyrillus passed by Antioch, which he had found without a pastor, and came to Tarsus, where he dwelt with the excellent Silvanus, then bishop of that see. No sooner did Acacius become aware of this than he wrote to Silvanus and informed him of the deposition of Cyrillus.

Silvanus however, both out of regard for Cyrillus, and not without suspicion of his people, who greatly enjoyed the stranger’s teaching, refused to prohibit him from taking a part in the ministrations of the church. When however they had arrived at Seleucia, Cyrillus joined with the party of Basilius and Eustathius and Silvanus and the rest in the council. But when Acacius joined the assembled bishops, who numbered one hundred and fifty, he refused to be associated in their counsels before Cyrillus, as one stripped of his bishopric, had been put out from among them.162

Both Socrates and Sozomen wanted to refer the reasons why Eustathius had been deposed by the Council of Constantinople (360) and they could have listed them from the most important to less relevant or vice versa. In the case of Socrates,

---

his list of charges against Eustathius is much shorter. Actually, it consists of two charges: that he had been deposed by his own father and he had been condemned by the Council of Gangra. So, in that case the problem of chronology is much less important. On the other hand, Basil should be more eager to stick to the chronological order as he presents (alleged) changes in Eustathius’ confessions. Although, with such a goal he could have omitted or misinterpreted some events.

Chapter II. The life of Eustathius of Sebastea

1. Eustathius’ father and homeland

Both Socrates Scholasticus and Sozomen confirm that Eustathius’ father was called Eulalius and was bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia: ὑπὸ Εὐλαλίου τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς καὶ ἑπισκόπου Καισαρείας τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἤδη πρῶτερον καθήκητο.163 Εὐλάλιος ὁ πατήρ καὶ τῶν εὐχῶν ἀφώρισεν, ἑπίσκοπος ὄν τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἐκκλησίας Καισαρείας.164 In 1703 Tillemont stated that there was no place in the hierarchy of Caesarea for any bishop named Eulalius and that Eustathius’ father was from Antioch.165 Following F. Loofs a lot scholars claim that Eulalius was bishop of Sebastea.166 It is true that we know the name of Eulalius from the lists of bishops who took part in the Council of Nicaea (325) as bishop of Sebastea in Armenia Minor.167 However, Eulalius seems to have been a very popular name at that time. Gregory of Nazianzus even had a nephew by the name of Eulalius.168 The same or another Eulalius became bishop of Nazianzus in 383.169

163 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 1, GCS NF 1, 180.
164 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180.
165 I.S. Tillemont, Mémoires pour servir a l’histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles, vol. 9, Paris 1703, 79.
168 Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistulae 15, GCS 53, 17.
169 Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistulae 182, GCS 53, 131.
According to Theodoret, a Eulalius was bishop of Antioch.\textsuperscript{170} Hilary lists Eulalius, bishop of Amasea, among the bishops who undersigned a decree at the Council of Serdica (343).\textsuperscript{171} Sozomen speaks about Eulalius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus around 379.\textsuperscript{172} Socrates Scholasticus lists two other Eulaliuses (except for the one from Sebastea) among the participants in the Council of Nicaea (325): Eulalius of Iconium, and among the bishops from Bithynia ἕωλάλιος χωρεπίσκοπος,\textsuperscript{173} which means “country—bishop appointed to superintend churches at a distance from the city where the bishop resided.”\textsuperscript{174} And Bithynia also had its own Caesarea.

But, Eustathius came from Caesarea in Cappadocia and his father was bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. The conclusive evidence is based on Basil’s accounts. In the letter 263 Basil states that Eustathius returned from Alexandria to his hometown (ἐις τὴν ἐαυτοῦ) and was ordained by Hermogenes:

επειδή ἐπανήλθεν εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ, τῷ μακαρωτάτῳ ἐπισκόπῳ
Εἰμιογένει τῷ Καισαρείᾳ κρίνοντι αὐτόν ἐπὶ τῇ κακοδοξίᾳ ὁμολογίαν ἔδωκε πίστεως ὑγιούς. Καὶ οὕτω τὴν χειροτονίαν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ δεξάμενος
Εὐστάθιῳ...

In two letters Basil says that Eustathius was ordained by Hermogenes, bishop of Caesarea, then went to Constantinople and returned to his homeland: ἐπὶ τῆς πατρίδος,\textsuperscript{176} εἰς τὴν πατρίδα.\textsuperscript{177} In both letters ἡ πατρίς means Cappadocia. The textual analysis of Basil’s writings confirms that understanding. Except for two quotations from the Bible, references to paradise/heaven and four cases where the meaning of ἡ πατρίς is uncertain, Basil always and with no exception attributes ἡ

\textsuperscript{170} Theodoret, HE V 40, 5; GCS 44, 348.
\textsuperscript{171} Hilary, Collectanea antiariana parisina, CSEL 65, 74.
\textsuperscript{172} Sozomen, HE VII 2, 6; GCS 50, 303.
\textsuperscript{173} Socrates Scholasticus, HE I 13; GCS NF 1, 49-50.
\textsuperscript{176} Basil, Letter 263, 3, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 3, 123.
\textsuperscript{177} Basil, Letter 244, 9, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 3, 82.
πατρίς (in singular with the article) to Cappadocia and never to any other country/homeland of anybody. Twenty-six times it is ἡ πατρίς itself with the article and no possessive and sixteen times ἡ πατρίς ἡμῶν/ἑαυτῶν (with the article and the possessive). As Y. Courtonne explains the custom of avoiding proper names and replacing them with a periphrasis is one of the characteristics of the rhetoric of that era.

Jurgens tried to connect those reports with the theory of Tillemont reaching rather weird concept: “Probably Eustathius was born at Caesarea; for Basil refers to Caesarea as Eustathius’ «own country». And while it is dangerous to urge half of an admittedly erroneous proposition in favor of any theory which is expected to be taken seriously, Socrates and Sozomen, as we have just pointed out, do say that Eustathius’ father Eulalius was bishop of Caesarea. If we amend the thought of their remark to indicate that he was, while not bishop of Caesarea, yet of Caesarea in the sense that it was his native place, we have testimony which may assist in urging Caesarea as Eustathius’ birthplace.”

Tillemont stated “il ne se trouve aucun évêque de Cesarée de se nom”, but he was convinced that such a bishop must have lived “jusques après le Concile de Nicée” only because he believed that Eustathius was disciple of Arius in Alexandria. But, as I will show below, there are no reliable sources to confirm the latter thesis. If we remove that premise, nothing will force us to maintain that Eulalius was bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia in the early 330s. Actually, we do not know a lot about bishops of Caesarea in Cappadocia until Eusebius, the predecessor of Basil, who died in 370. According to the preserved lists of bishops Leontius took part in the Council of Nicaea (325) as bishop of Caesarea, Sozomen names Dianius as bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia among the participants in the Council

---

180 W.A. Jurgens, Eustathius of Sebaste, 16.
of Antioch (341). According to many scholars the very same Dianius is mentioned by Basil in Letter 51 as the one who signed the formula of faith approved at the Council of Constantinople (360):

Περὶ μέντοι τὰ τελευταία τοῦ βίου (οὐ γὰρ ἀποκρύψομαι τάλιθές) ἐλυπήθημεν ἐπ’ αὐτῶ λύπην οὐκ ἀνεκτήν, μετὰ πολλῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι φοβουμένων τὸν Κύριον, ἐπὶ τῇ ὑπογραφῇ τῆς πίστεως, τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ Γεώργιον ἀπὸ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κομισθείσης.

However, at the end of his life (for I will not conceal the truth), I, together with many Godfearing people of our fatherland, suffered intolerable grief on his account, for he subscribed to the creed brought from Constantinople by George and his associates. It is hardly possible that the person mentioned in the letter was bishop of Caesarea before Eusebius, the predecessor of Basil. Basil asks: “Tell me, did I anathematize the most blessed Dianius?” (Ἐγώ δὲ, εἰπέ μοι, τὸν μακαριώτατον Διάνιον ἀνεθημάτισα;). Basil could have not anathematized anyone being a deacon as excommunication was a prerogative of a bishop and the letter indicates that Basil became reconciled with that Dianius before he died so he could not have anathematized him posthumously. Dianius from Letter 51 was someone who signed the confession of faith brought from Constantinople by the associates of George when Basil was already bishop. It is not even certain that Dianius mentioned in Letter 51 was a bishop as Basil applied the term μακαριώτατος to any respectable person as well as to a lay (Eupsychius) and to a woman (Julitta). It is significant that in

183 Sozomen, HE III 5, 10, GCS 50, 107.
184 Hilary, Collectanea antiariana parisina, CSEL 65, 75.
185 R. van Dam, Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia, Philadelphia 2003, 35.
190 Basil, Epistolae 263, 3, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 3, 123.
191 Basil, Homilia in martyrem Julitam, PG 31, 237.
353 Nerses was ordained bishop of Armenia by the bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia and P`awstos Buzandac'i’s (the source written in the 5th century) claims that the bishop’s name was Eusebius not Dianius. \(^{192}\)

Older studies placed Eulalius after Leontius and before Hermogenes, \(^{193}\) but it is hardly possible as according to Basil it was Hermogenes who ordained Eustathius and according to Sozomen and Socrates Eulalius excommunicated him when he was a priest. And we know from Basil that immediately (εὐθύς) after Hermogenes had died Eustathius run to Constantinople to Eusebius of Nicomedia. \(^{194}\) There are two possibilities for locating Eulalius. First (less possible), he could have been bishop of Caesarea after Hermogenes and before Dianius, but it must have been before the Council of Antioch (341) in which Dianius took part as bishop of Caesarea. Second possibility: at some point after 343.

2. Disciple of Arius?

According to Jurgens our first historical contact with Eustathius is in Alexandria, where he was a disciple of Arius. \(^{195}\) Jurgens refers only to the letters of Basil to confirm that Eustathius of Sebastea was a student of Arius. Actually, also Athanasius names Eustathius whom he describes as “Eustathius now in Sebastea” (ETYPEIOUS O YN EN SEBASTEIA) in a group of people who were admitted into the clerical order thanks to their connections with Arius after Eustathius of Antioch had been expelled. Basil the Great also somehow connected Eustathius' ordination with Arius, but even those two seemingly similar versions differ significantly. The version of Athanasius reads as follows:

| ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΗΝ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΙΑΣ, ἈΝΗΡ ὈΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΙΣΤΗΝ ΕΥΣΕΒΗΣ. ΟΥΤΟΣ ἘΠΕΙΔΗ | There was one Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, a Confessor, and sound in the Faith. This man, because he was |

---

\(^{192}\) Fatti is convinced that Letter 51 by Basil concerns Dianius, bishop of Caesarea, so he suggests that the source confused the name, F. Fatti, *Giuliano a Cesarea. La politica ecclesiastica del principe apostata*, Roma 2009, 65, note 69.


very zealous for the truth, and hated the Arian heresy, and would not receive those who adopted its tenets, is falsely accused before the Emperor Constantine, and a charge invented against him, that he had insulted his mother. And immediately he is driven into banishment, and a great number of Presbyters and Deacons with him. And immediately after the banishment of the Bishop, those whom he would not admit into the clerical order on account of their impiety were not only received into the Church by them, but were even appointed the greater part of them to be Bishops, in order that they might have accomplices in their impiety. Among these was Leontius the eunuch, now of Antioch, and his predecessor Stephanus, George of Laodicea, and Theodosius who was of Tripolis, Eudoxius of Germanicia, and Eustathius, now of Sebastia.\footnote{Athanasius, \textit{Historia Arianorum ad Monachos} 4, Athanasius Werke II, 184-185; transl. NPNF II 4, 271.}

In the letter 263 “To the Westerners”, written in 377, Basil also mentions Eustathius’ ordination:

Ἐστὶ τοίνυν εἰς τῶν πολλῶν ἡμῖν κατασκευαζόντων λύπην, Εὐστάθιος ὁ ἐκ τῆς Σεβαστείας τῆς κατὰ τὴν

Now one of those who causes us much sorrow is Eustathius of Sebaste in Lesser Armenia, who,
taught of old by Arius at the time when Arius flourished at Alexandria, as the author of those wicked blasphemies against the Only-begotten, following him and being numbered among his most faithful disciples, on returning to his own country, gave a confession of sound faith to the most blessed bishop Hermogenes of Caesarea, who was judging him on the charge of false doctrine. And having thus received ordination at his hands, after the decease of the latter, he ran to Eusebius of Constantinople, a man who himself less than no one sponsored the impious doctrine of Arius.¹⁹⁷

Athanasius and Basil differ in establishing connection between Eustathius’ ordination and Arianism. In Athanasius’ story Eustathius was ordained because of his Arianism while Basil states that in Alexandria Eustathius was among the most faithful disciples of Arius, but after he had returned to Caesarea he confessed the orthodox faith and on that basis was ordained priest. I would not question the very fact of the ordination, but I do doubt in the connection between Eustathius of Sebastea and Arius.

Although Hanson dates Historia Arianorum precisely to 358,¹⁹⁸ but according to A. Robertson, “the date of the History is at first sight a difficulty. The fall of Liberius is dealt with in Part V., which must therefore have been written not earlier

¹⁹⁸ R.P.C. Hanson, The search for the Christian Doctrine of God, 420.
than 358 (the exact chronology of the lapse of Liberius is not certain), while yet in §4 Leontius, who died in the summer or autumn of 357, is still bishop of Antioch. We must therefore suppose that the History was begun at about the time when the *Apologia de Fuga* was finished (cf. the bitter conclusion of that tract) and completed when the lapse of Liberius was known in Egypt. A more accurate determination of date is not permitted by our materials.”

199 Since 358 Eustathius was an active member of the Homoeousian alliance and played an important role during the Synod in Ancyra in 358. It seems that Athanasius himself did not consider Homoeousians as Arians. On the contrary, he thought they are not far from the Nicaean creed:

πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀποδεχομένους τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα τῶν ἐν Νικαιᾷ γραφέντων, περὶ δὲ μόνον τὸ ὀμοούσιον ἀμφιβάλλοντας χρὴ μὴ ὡς πρὸς ἐχθροῦς διακείσθαι. καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἥμεις ὡς πρὸς Ἀρειομανίτας οὐδ’ ὡς μαχομένους πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐνιστάμεθα, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πρὸς ἀδελφοὺς διαλεγόμεθα τὴν αὐτὴν μὲν ἥμιν διάνοιαν ἔχοντας, περὶ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα μόνον διστάζοντας. καὶ γὰρ ὀμολογοῦντες ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός εἶναι καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἔτερας ὑποστάσεως τὸν υἱὸν κτίσμα τε μὴ εἶναι μηδὲ ποίημα αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ γνήσιον καὶ φύσιν γέννημα ἀιδίῳς τε αὐτῶν συνεῖναι τῷ πατρὶ λόγον ὀντα καὶ σοφίαν οὐ μακράν εἰσιν

Those, however, who accept everything else that was defined at Nicaea, and doubt only about the Coessential, must not be treated as enemies; nor do we here attack them as Ario-manics, nor as opponents of the Fathers, but we discuss the matter with them as brothers with brothers, who mean what we mean, and dispute only about the word.

For, confessing that the Son is from the essence of the Father, and not from other subsistence, and that He is not a creature nor work, but His genuine and natural offspring, and that He is eternally with the Father as being His Word and Wisdom, they are not far from accepting even the phrase, ‘Coessential.’ Now such

199 NPNF II 4, 266-267.
Ἀποδέξασθαι καὶ τὴν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου λέξιν. τοιοῦτος δὲ ἦστι Βασίλειος ὁ ἀπὸ Αγκύρας γράψας περὶ πίστεως. is Basil, who wrote from Ancyra concerning the faith.201

Unfortunately, this understanding was theoretical only. In Historia Arianorum Athanasius put into his list of priests and bishops ordained thanks to their involvement into the Arian “impiety” people who took part in the Homoiousian alliance: “Among them were Leontius the eunuch, now of Antioch, and his predecessor Stephanus, George of Laodicea, and Theodosius who was of Tripolis, Eudoxius of Germanicia, and Eustathius, now of Sebastia.”202 He mixed here Homoiousians who opposed Arians (George of Laodicea, Eustathius of Sebastea) and real Arians (Leontius of Antioch, Stephanus, Eudoxius of Germanicia). It is possible that there were personal issues that made Athanasius think of Homoiousians as of Arians and enemies. M. DelCogliano showed that George of Laodicea and Athanasius maintained mutual animosity that commenced in the times of conflict between Alexander and Arius. Both George of Laodicea and Athanasius brought different charges against each other also regarding their theology. That was the reason why Athanasius accused George of Arianism. But, as DelCogliano points out: “It is true that George was sympathetic to the Alexandrian theological trajectory to which Arius belonged and was willing to disagree, as Arius had, with his bishop. But he was no ‘Arian’.”203 DelCogliano defines the charges against George adduced by Athanasius as “polemical jab.”204 When Eustathius allied with George of Laodicea and Basil of Ancyra he automatically became an enemy of Athanasius.

Athanasius might have not known the real involvement of some people and he was probably not interested in details. The example of such an approach is his “account” of the actions in the Council of Seleucia (359). Athanasius names

201 Athanasius, De synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleuciae in Isauria 41, 1-2, Athanasius Werke II, 266-267, transl. NPNF II 4, 472.
204 M. DelCogliano, George of Laodicea: A Historical Reassessment, 673.
Eustathius among excommunicated by that Council because “the accusers pressed, and the accused put in pleas, and thereby were led on further by their irreligion and blasphemed the Lord” (τὼν δὲ κατηγορούμενων φευγόντων καὶ διὰ τούτο πλέον ἐν ἀσεβείαις ἔξαγομένων καὶ βλασφημούντων εἰς τὸν κύριον). Socrates lists Eustathius among deposed who “should not be restored to communion, until they made such a defense as would clear them from the imputations under which they lay.” But, Sozomen does not name him among excommunicated.

Athanasius mentions Eustathius once again as degraded by the Council of Sardica (343) on account of Arianism:

These were degraded in the great Synod of Sardica; Eustathius also now of Sebastea, Demophilus and Germinius, Eudoxius, and Basil, who are supporters of that impiety, were advanced in the same manner.

Eustathius at that time was not even a bishop so he could have not been deposed. It is clear that Athanasius was not informed well. He probably put the name of Eustathius among deposed as the one whom he associated with George of Laodicea listed by Sozomen among deposed at the Council of Serdica. As Hanson explains: “The Easterners branded all the Westerners as Sabellians. The Westerners stigmatized all the Easterners as Arians. Both charges were equally ridiculous.” It is possible that despite of his own attempts to distinguish the nuances of Eastern theology Athanasius remained mentally in the schemes commonly used in the West.

The only other mentions that Eustathius was disciple of Arius come from late letters of Basil. In the letter 244 to Patrophilus, bishop of Aegae, written in the

---

206 Socrates Scholasticus, *HE* II 40, 45, GCS NF 1, 176, transl. NPNF II 2, 70-71.
summer of 376 Basil accuses Eustathius of having followed Arius. “This Patrophilus was a friend of Eustathius of Sebaste and of Basil. After Basil’s break with Eustathius, he wrote to Basil expressing his surprise that Basil should regard Eustathius as an enemy after having been for so long his friend and champion. Basil replied in the present letter explaining his position, and asking Patrophilus to inform him whether he will remain in communion with him or join his enemies.”

Kaítoi ei de òllon taz òpere òllon evòünsas úpexein, ó émoi égkavon òpere Apòlináriou ápoloigíostho òmín òpere Aréiou tov idion didasqálon kai òpere Aetiou tov idion éautou maqhtou.

Later on in the same letter:

Αρείῳ κατηκολούθουν τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς· μετέθεντο πρὸς Ἐρμογένην τὸν κατὰ διάμετρον ἐχθρὸν ὑπὸ τῆς Αρείου κακοδόξιας, ὡς δηλοὶ αὐτὴ ἡ πίστις ἡ κατὰ Νίκαιαν παρ᾽ ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκφωνηθεῖσα ἐξ ἡ κατὰ Νίκαιαν παρ᾽ ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκφωνηθεῖσα ἐξ ἀρχῆς. Ἐκοιμήθη Ἐρμογένης, καὶ πάλιν μετέστησαν πρὸς Εὐσέβιον, ἀνδρα κορυφαῖον τοῦ κατὰ Αρείου κύκλου, ὡς οἱ πειρασθέντες φασίν.

Eustathius accused Basil of inclining to the teaching of Apollinarius. In this context in the letter 223 written in 375 to the very Eustathius Basil reminds him his alleged connections with Arius.

If one man must render account on behalf of another, let him who accuses me on behalf of Apollinarius make his defence to us on behalf of Arius, his own teacher, and on behalf of Aetius, his own disciple.

They followed Arius in the beginning; they changed to Hermogenes, who was diametrically opposed to the infamous teachings of Arius, as the creed originally proclaimed by that man at Nicaea shows. Hermogenes fell asleep, and again they changed to Eusebius, the chorus leader of the Arian circle, as those who have had experience of him say.

Ei de de tis twn genneisantwn amartias égklimata tois téknois gínnesai, polu dikaióteron tis Arieiou kata tisn mathiais autou gínnesai, kai ei tis Aetion égennise tois aíreitikon, eti tin kefalh tin patridas anakaihne tois paiados tis égklimata. Ei d' oú dikaiou épi' ēkeínois égkaleíshai tina, polllò dhi pnu dikaióteron ëmías eti tois mìnën ëmín prósíkousi rh logos en exën euðúnas, ei ge kai ëmarston olas, ei ti kai gégrapat aiutois âxiou kastakóísewos.

But for me, he who is being slandered by you is neither father nor son. For he was neither my teacher nor disciple. But if the iniquities of the parents must become charges against their children, it is much more just that the deeds of Arius should be against his disciples; and in the case of him who begot Aetius, the heretic, that the charges of the son should revert upon the head of the father. But if it is not just that anyone be accused on account of these, surely it is much more just that we should not undergo correction on account of those who have nothing to do with us, even if they sinned utterly, even if something has been written by them worthy of condemnation. 214

Basil's accusations are an example of defending by attacking. They were also, as Gribomont stated, “colored by rancor.”  215 Basil himself says some more about the source of those accusations – reports of slanderers:

Wherefore I did not admit even the accusations about their teachings, although many had insisted that they had no orthodox conceptions about God, but being made disciples by the champion of the present heresy, they were covertly disseminating his teachings; and since I had never been an ear-witness of them, I considered


συκοφάντας ἡγούμην τοὺς ἀπαγγέλλοντας.

The only reports that Eustathius was disciple of Arius come from Athanasius – who in my opinion was not eager to go into details of who and why was deposed in the Asian Church and used stereotypes while thinking of Eastern theology – and from late letters of Basil in which he defended himself from Eustathius’ charges of Apollinarism by attributing him Arius’ legacy. Already Looûs and Tenšek considered that message as unreliable.217 There are not reliable sources to confirm that Eustathius knew Arius, listened to him in Alexandria and was his disciple. On the contrary, Basil says that Eustathius was orthodox from the very beginning and suddenly changed when he accused Basil of Apollinarism:

ό δοκὼν εκ ραδιόν τις γήρας βαθὺ
ἐπιμέλειαν ἐαυτὸς πεποίησθαι ἐκ
tοιούτων προφάσεων οὕτω ὑπαρξὶς
ἐξηγοῦσθη [...].

What is also important even when Basil and Eustathius came into conflict, Basil admitted that he had never heard Arian statements from Eustathius:

Ὅθεν οὐδὲ τὰς περὶ τῶν δογμάτων
διαβολὰς προσείμην, καὶ τοιαύτας
διαβεβαιομένων μὴ όρθὰς ἔχειν
περὶ Θεοῦ τὰς ὑπολήψεις, ἀλλὰ τῶν
προστάτη τῆς νῦν αἰφέσεως
μαθητευθέντας τὰ ἐκεῖνον λάθος
κατασπείρειν διδάγματα· ἱπειδὴ
οὐδὲποτε αὐτήκοος ἐγενόμην,

Wherefore I did not admit even the accusations about their teachings, although many had insisted that they had no orthodox conceptions about God, but being made disciples by the champion of the present heresy, they were covertly disseminating his teachings; and since I had never been an ear-witness of them, I considered

Although Basil claims that Eustathius changed his beliefs and as a proof he listed the confessions signed by Eustathius: Ancyra (358), Seleucia (359), Constantinople (359), Zela (?), Lampsacus (364), Rome (366), Cyzicus (375), all those confessions were Homoiousians except for the one from Constantinople which was Homoian and the one from Rome which was Nicaean.

3. Ordination to priesthood (late 330s)

Jurgens dates Eustathius’ ordination to priesthood to the period of the 330s, after Eustathius of Antioch was banished around 330. But the only account on the fact that Eustathius was refused the ordination by Eustathius of Antioch because of his Arian inclination is the one by Athanasius. As I stated above I question the connection between Eustathius and Arius. I think that Athanasius’ allegation that Eustathius of Antioch refused to ordain Eustathius has the same cause: Athanasius was personally prejudiced against (among others) George of Laodicea – one of the most important Homoiousians and an ally of Eustathius. Moreover, Athanasius thought about the affairs in the Eastern Church on the basis of stereotypical presumptions. The account of Athanasius loses its reliability also because Athanasius and Basil differ in establishing connection between Eustathius’ ordination and Arianism. In Athanasius’ story Eustathius was ordained because of his Arianism while Basil states that in Alexandria Eustathius was among the most faithful disciples of Arius, but after he had returned to Caesarea he confessed the orthodox faith and on that basis was ordained priest.

220 F. Loofs (Eustathius von Sebaste und die chronologie der Basilius-Briefe, 78) thinks that Eustathius could not have signed anything in Constantinople (359/360) as he was deposed at that Council, but apparently during the council the issues of faith were examined first and the disciplinary ones later on. Eustathius could have signed the creed of Rimini during one of the sessions that took place at the end of December of 359 and was deposed at the beginning of January 360.
So, in my opinion the first credible information on Eustathius would be the fact told by Basil that he was ordained priest by Hermogenes of Caesarea.

Now one of those who causes us much sorrow is Eustathius of Sebaste in Lesser Armenia, who, taught of old by Arius at the time when Arius flourished at Alexandria, as the author of those wicked blasphemies against the Only-begotten, following him and being numbered among his most faithful disciples, on returning to his own country, gave a confession of sound faith to the most blessed bishop Hermogenes of Caesarea, who was judging him on the charge of false doctrine. And having thus received ordination at his hands, after the decease of the latter, he ran to Eusebius of Constantinople, a man who himself less than no one sponsored the impious doctrine of Arius.\footnote{Basil, \textit{Epišilulae} 263, 3, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 3, 123, transl. R.J. Deferrari, vol. 4, 93-94.}

Jurgens thinks that “we must presume that the ordination of which Basil speaks was ordination to the priesthood”\footnote{W.A. Jurgens, \textit{Eustathius of Sebaste}, 19.} and he is right as \textit{χειροτονία} can signify “ordination” and if Basil himself wanted to use it in a sense of ordination of the bishop he would have used the expression \textit{χειροτονία τῶν ἐπισκόπων}.\footnote{Basil, \textit{Epišilulae} 190, 1, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 2, 142.}
Hermogenes himself is known only from Basil’s letters. In the letter 81 Basil mentions him again as follows:

ἐξελεξάμην τὸ τιμώτατον σκεῦος, τὸν ἐκγόνον τοῦ μακαρίου Ἑρμογένους, τοῦ τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἀρρηκτον πίστιν γράψαντος ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ.

I have chosen that most worthy vessel, the offspring of the blessed Hermogenes – who, in the great Synod, wrote the great and invincible creed.\(^{227}\)

There is a problem with Basil’s description of Hermogenes as the one “who in the great Synod, wrote the great and invincible creed.” It is assumed that Basil means the Council of Nicaea (325), but according to the preserved lists of bishops who took part in the Council of Nicaea (325) it was Leontius who was there as bishop of Caesarea.\(^{228}\) Deferrari guesses that “Hermogenes may have been present in lower orders, and may have written the creed;”\(^{229}\) Jurgens attributes to him a position of a secretary of the Council,\(^{230}\) but these are pure speculations. Anyway, we do not know when Hermogenes became bishop of Caesarea or when he died either. We know from Basil that immediately (εὐθὺς) after Hermogenes had died Eustathius ran to Constantinople to Eusebius of Nicomedia. Eusebius was bishop of Constantinople between 338 and 341, so Eustathius must have been ordained before 341 and needed some time to come to Constantinople and to fall into disfavour of Eusebius. That is why I assume he was ordained priest in the late 330s.

4. Deposition by Eusebius of Nicomedia (between 338 and 341)

There are three accounts on Eustathius’ deposition by Eusebius of Nicomedia. In one of them Eusebius is called of Constantinople and the other states that Eustathius was bishop of Constantinople so we can assume that it happened when he was a bishop of Constantinople, namely between 338 and 341. One account comes from Sozomen:

\(^{230}\) W.A. Jurgens, Eustathius of Sebasta, 19.
He had been [...] deposed by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, for unfaithfulness in the discharge of certain duties that had devolved upon him.\textsuperscript{231}

Basil describes Eusebius as “over Constantinople” (ἐπὶ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως):

After the decease of the latter, he ran to Eusebius of Constantinople, a man who himself less than no one sponsored the impious doctrine of Arius. Then after being driven for some cause or other from that place, he returned.\textsuperscript{232}

And in the letter 244 Basil does not apply any bishopric to Eusebius:

Hermogenes fell asleep, and again they changed to Eusebius, the chorus leader of the Arian circle, as those who have had experience of him say. Falling away from this man for some reason or other, they again ran back to their fatherland, and again concealed their Arian sentiments.\textsuperscript{233}

Basil does not state any cause of Eustathius’ deposition. We do not even know what duties he was entrusted. Although Socrates uses the verb that in Christian literature used to be associated with deposition from any level of Church

\textsuperscript{231} Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
hierarchy (καθηρέθη), Basil does not mention any degradation of condemnation, but only states that Eustathius was expelled (ἐκείθεν ἀπελαθείς) and banished from that place (ἐκείθεν ἐκπεσόντες).

5. The Council of Serdica (343)

The only (seeming) account on deposing Eustathius of Sebastea at the Council of Serdica that took place most probably in 343⁴ comes from Athanasius of Alexandria.

οὗτοι μὲν σύν καὶ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Σαρδικήν γενομένῃ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ καθηρέθησαν· Εὐστάθιος τε ὁ νῦν ἐν Σεβαστείᾳ Δημόφιλός τε καὶ Γερμίνιος καὶ Εὐδόξιος καὶ Βασίλειος συνήγοροι τῆς ἁσσεβείας ὄντες εἰς τοῦτο προήχθησαν.

These were degraded in the great Synod of Sardica; Eustathius also now of Sebastea, Demophilus and Germinius, Eudoxius, and Basil, who are supporters of that impiety, were advanced in the same manner.²³⁵

The mention refers to the Council of Serdica seemingly only. Athanasius names here as “advanced in the same manner” four bishops whom he considers as Arians although three of them (Eustathius, Demophilus and Germinius) were Homoiousians. “In the same manner” refers to how the Council of Serdica treated the bishops but it does not necessarily mean that the Council itself treated them in that way. As we have no other confirmation of that fact I think we can treat it as a part of Athanasius’ polemics not report on history.

6. Deposed by his father Eulalius, bishop of Caesarea (early 350s)

When listing causes why Eustathius was deposed by the Council of Constantinople (360) both Socrates and Sozomen give as the first reason that he was deposed by his own father. Socrates states:

²³⁵ Athanasius, Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae VII 4, transl. NPNF II 4, 226.
he had been long before deposed by Eulalius, his own father, who was bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, for dressing in a style unbecoming the sacerdotal office.  

And Sozomen similarly:

πρώτον μὲν ὡς ἣνικα πρεσβύτερος ἦν προκατεγνώκει αὐτοῦ Ἐυλάιος ὁ πατὴρ καὶ τῶν εὐχῶν ἀφώρισεν, ἐπίσκοπος ὃν τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἐκκλησίας Ἐυλαλίου τοῦ ἔλαλητο τοῦ ἐπίσκοπου Καισαρείας ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἐκκλησίας.

As I explained above, the charges in Socrates’ account are not put chronologically. So I do not treat Sozomen’s πρώτον in the temporary meaning, but rather as a beginning of a list of charges: “first, in the first place.”

It is no surprise that Basil does not mention this deposition. He does list only changes of confession and omits all disciplinary issues. But, if Socrates is right that Eustathius was deposed “for dressing in a style unbecoming the sacerdotal office,” Basil could have passed the charge over for one more reason. As a pupil of Eustathius, Basil was wearing similar robe.

Obviously, Eustathius was deposed from the sacerdotal office (not a bishopric) for disciplinary (not doctrinal) reasons. My dating of the event depends in great measure on Basil who claims:

ἐπειδὴ ἐπανήλθεν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, τῷ μακαριωτάτῳ ἐπίσκοπῷ Ἐμμογένει τῷ Καισαρείας κρίνοντι αὐτὸν ἐπί τῇ κακοδοξίᾳ ὁμολογίαν ἔδωκε πίστεως ὑγιοὺς. Καὶ οὕτω τὴν χειροτονίαν ὑπὲρ

On returning to his own country, gave a confession of sound faith to the most blessed bishop Hermogenes of Caesarea, who was judging him on the charge of false doctrine. And having

---

236 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 1, GCS NF 1, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 72.
237 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
238 See Part III. Chapter 2: Ascetical issues.
thus received ordination at his hands, after the decease of the latter, he ran to Eusebius of Constantinople, a man who himself less than no one sponsored the impious doctrine of Arius. Then after being driven for some cause or other from that place, he returned and made a defence again before the people of his own country, concealing his impious sentiments and screening himself behind a kind of orthodoxy of words. And when he somehow obtained the bishopric, he seems immediately to have written an anathema of consubstantiation at their synod convened at Ancyra.239

Assuming that Eulalius was bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, there are two possible dates of the deposition of Eustathius by Eulalius. The deposition might have occurred slightly before 341, after Eustathius had been ordained by Hermogenes, had gone to Constantinople, had been deposed by Eusebius and had returned to Caesarea, but before Dianius became bishop of Caesarea as he is mentioned as such among the participants in the Council of Antioch (341).240 However, I think the deposition by Eulalius took place at some point between 343 when Dianius participated in the Council of Serdica as bishop of Caesarea and more or less 357 when Eustathius was ordained bishop of Sebastea. According to my calculation Eustathius became a priest in late 330s. We do not know the reason of his first deposition (by Eusebius, between 338 and 341), but nothing suggests it was anyhow connected to his later asceticism. Basil passes over

240 Sozomen, HE III 5, 10, GCS 50, 107.
the charges and Sozomen states that Eustathius was deposed “for unfaithfulness in
the discharge of certain duties”:

He had been [...] deposed by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, for
unfaithfulness in the discharge of certain duties that had devolved upon him.241

Since Caesarea in Cappadocia was a homeland for both Eustathius and
Basil,242 it is more than possible that Basil and Eustathius knew each other from
youth and actually Basil confirms that he had “an intimacy with the man which
dates from childhood (τῆς ἐκ παιδὸς συνηθείας τῆς υπαρχούσης μοι πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα),”243 “from boyhood he had performed such a service for a certain person”
(ὁ τοιῶσος δουλεύσας ἐκ παιδὸς τῷ δεινῷ)244 meaning Eustathius of Sebastea
whom the letters concern. So, if Eustathius had practiced his asceticism already in
340s, Basil would have known it for sure. And, as it appears from Letter 1 by Basil,
Basil and Eustathius remained in contact even when Basil was studying in Athens as
his letter is an answer to that of Eustathius. Nevertheless, in Letter 1 written around
357 Basil states:

Ἐγὼ κατέλιπον τὰς Ἀθῆνας κατὰ φήμην τῆς σῆς φιλοσοφίας.
Owing to the repute of your
philosophy, I left Athens.245

It seems that Eustathius became an ascetic while Basil was out of Caesarea.

While in Athens, Basil received a message/report (φήμη) on Eustathius’ ascetic
practice (φιλοσοφία)246 and decided to join him. Rousseau and Fedwick state that
Basil was in Athens between 349 and 355.247 Before Basil wrote his letter, probably

241 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
242 M. Przyszchowska, Fatherland (πατρίς) in the writings of Basil of Caesarea (in press).
246 Malingrey claims that the three Cappadocian Fathers integrated the term φιλοσοφία into the
Christian language as a designation of the ascetic way of life. A.-M. Malingrey, Philosophia. Étude d’un
247 P.J. Fedwick, A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea, in: Basil of Caesarea, christian,
humanist, ascetic: a sixteen-hundredth anniversary symposium, ed. P.J. Fedwick, Toronto 1981, 6; Rousseau,
Basil of Caesarea, 28.
about 357 or earlier\textsuperscript{248}, he had traveled to Constantinople, Caesarea, Syria and Egypt, so the journey must have lasted a few months, maybe years. Let’s give Eustathius some time to start his asceticism and become popular. I think it can be safely assumed that Eustathius begun his unique asceticism around 350 and all depositions based on charges connected to his “philosophy” occurred after that date.

Socrates as the only one gives as Eulalius’ charges:

$$
\text{ύπὸ Εὐλαλίου τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς καὶ ἐπισκόπου Καισαρείας τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ήδη πρότερον καθήρησε, ἐπειδὴ ἀνάρμοστον τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ στολῆν ἠμφίεστο.}
$$

he had been previously deposed by Eulalius, his own father, who was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, for dressing in a style unbecoming the sacerdotal office.\textsuperscript{240}

A charge concerning the way of dressing appears in Canon 12 of the Council of Gangra:

$$
\text{Εἴ τις διὰ νομιζόμενην ἀσκησιν περιβολαίῳ χρήσται, καὶ ὡς ἄν ἐκ τούτων τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἔχων καταψηφίζοιτο τῶν μετ' εὐλαβείας τὰς βήρους φοροῦντων καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ κοινῇ καὶ ἐν συνηθείᾳ ωὔσῃ ἐσθήτι κεχρημένων, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.}
$$

If, because of presumed asceticism, any man wear the periboleum and, claiming that one has righteousness because of this, pronounces judgment against those who with reverence wear the berus and make use of other common and customary clothing, let him be anathema.\textsuperscript{250}

So, if my deduction is correct, the deposition by Eulalius was the first deposition of Eustathius based on the charges connected to his way of practicing asceticism. Eulalius could have excommunicated Eustathius at the very beginning of his ascetic practice.

I definitely do not agree with Jurgens that the deposition by Eulalius and the Council of Gangra was one and the same event which, by the way, Jurgens dates for

\textsuperscript{248} J. Gribomont, \textit{Eustathe le philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée}, “Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique” 54 (1959), 120.

\textsuperscript{249} Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 1, GCS NF 1, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 72.

343. He argues as follows: “Is it not most probable then that the Eulalius who
signed at Gangra was Eulalius of Sebaste? And is it not quite probable that the
excommunication of Eustathius by his father, and his condemnation at Gangra are
one and the same event? Basil, although he knew Eustathius very well, was unaware
that he had been excommunicated by his father, and was unaware likewise that he
had been condemned at Gangra. It is easier to believe Basil ignorant of one of
Eustathius’ condemnations than it is to believe him ignorant of two. We are of the
opinion that Eustathius’ condemnation by his father for not wearing clerical garb
and his condemnation at Gangra for the same offense, a council at which his father
was present, are one and the same condemnation.”

First, as I have already indicated above, Eulalius was a very common name at
that time. Second, if according to Jurgens Eulalius was bishop of Sebastea and he
was present at the Council of Gangra, it would have been pointless to address the
letter to the bishops of Armenia. Third, I do not think that Basil did not know of
Eustathius’ depositions. The scope of his lists of charges was to show Eustathius’
changes of confessions; Basil passed over all councils that condemned Eustathius
on the basis of ascetical issues, not only deposition by Eulalius and the Council of
Gangra, but other councils as well: of Melitene, Antioch, Neocaesarea. And the
reason for the concealment did not have to be an ignorance but rather the fact that
Basil was a follower of Eustathius’ asceticism. Regarding the deposition by Eulalius
and the Council of Gangra there is no reason not to believe Socrates and Sozomen
who unanimously state that the first occurred when Eustathius was a priest: “for
dressing in a style unbecoming the sacerdotal office” (Socrates), “when a presbyter”
(Sozomen), while Sozomen states that at the Council of Gangra he “had been
deprived of his bishopric.”

7. Bishop of Sebastea (357)

It is not certain when exactly Eustathius was ordained bishop of Sebastea.
For sure, he was already bishop of Sebastea at the Council of Ancyra (358). J.

251 W.A. Jurgens, Eustathius of Sebaste, 23.
252 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 1, GCS NF 1, 180; Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180.
Gribomont was convinced that Eustathius was ordained before 356. T.Z. Tenšek thinks that on the basis of an information in Philostorgius HE III 27 we need to move the date of Eustathius’ ordination back to 351. Let’s look at the text itself:

Ὅτι φησι τοὺς περὶ Βασίλειον καὶ Εὐστάθιον, δι’ ἕχθασας γεγονότας τῶν Αετίων, διαβολὰς ὀτόπους συφράσαι καὶ τὸν Γάλλον ἐπὶ ταύτας παροξύναι· ὡστε ἐκεῖνον, ὡς ἐπισκόπως πιστεύσαντα καὶ πρὸς όργὴν ἐκταραχθέντα, κελεύσαι τὸν Αέτιον ἀναζητηθῆναι καὶ ἀμφοῖν τοῖς σκελοῖν κατεαγήναι.

He says that Basil and Eustathius and their group fabricated some absurd accusations against Aetius out of their hostility to him and used them to anger Gallus. He accordingly, because he trusted bishops and was moved to anger, ordered Aetius to be interrogated and both his legs to be broken.

For some reasons, this report cannot be relied on. Kopecek thinks that this account is an anachronism, most probably made by Philostorgius on purpose:

“Heilonstorgius’ account of the debate was an anachronistic doublet of a later debate involving precisely the same three men. This debate was held, according to Philostorgius, in Constantinople at the end of A.D. 359. Schladebach suggested that Philostorgius was motivated to the anachronism by a desire to explain (a) the hatred which Basil and Eustathius came to have for Aetius and (b) Gallus’ initial antipathy toward him.”

But, if we agreed with Kopecek we should consider as another anachronism the passage of HE III 16 which reads as follows:

Ὅτι Αέτιος, φησί, τοῖς περὶ Βασίλειον τὸν Αγκύρας καὶ Εὐστάθιον τὸν Σεβαστείας εἰς τοὺς περὶ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου λόγους καταστάς, καὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦς διελέγεις

Aetius, he says, held a debate with Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and their party about the term “consubstantial,” reducing them to utter silence by his refutation and incurring thereby their

---

254 T.Z. Tenšek, L’ascetismo nel Concilio di Gangra, 35.
255 Philostorgius, HE III 27, GCS 21, 52; transl. P.R. Amidon, 60-61.
ἀφωνοτάτους, ὡς οὗτος τερατολογεῖ, εἰς μίνους αὐτοῖς ἀσπονδον κατέστη.

What is interesting, in both above-quoted passages in the Greek original of Philostorgius’ epitome it is not stated that the participants in the debate were Basil and Eustathius themselves but some persons from their environment - τοὺς περὶ Βασιλείου και Εὐστάθιον, the fact noticed already by R.P. Vaggione. On the contrary, in HE IV 12, when referring to the debate in Constantinople Philostorgius talks about Basil and Eustathius themselves:

προειστήκεισαν δὲ τῶν μὲν κατ’ οὐσίαν ὁμοιὸν πρεσβεύντων Βασιλείος τε καὶ Εὐστάθιος...

I think that it is highly probable that Eustathius Philostorgius is talking about in HE III 16 and 27 is Eustathius of Antioch. Sometimes he adds the bishopric to the name ὁ τῆς Σεβαστείας Εὐστάθιος (HE III 16; IV 8), Εὐστάθιος ὁ Ἀντιοχείας (HE II 7), but very often uses the name without the origin/nickname. It seems that Philostorgius confused those two Eustathiiuses. The example of such a confusion can be found in HE III 18 when Philostorgius uses the name “Eustathius” without any addition, but it is clear he is talking about Eustathius of Antioch, while somewhat earlier in HE III 16 Philostorgius refers to Eustathius of Sebastea by name.

On the other hand, there is an evidence in Sozomen that still during the bishopric of Leontius there were a lot of the followers of Eustathius of Antioch in Antioch:

ὁν ὡς ἐτερόδοξον παρητείτο Αθανάσιος, τοῖς δὲ καλουμένοις Εὐσταθιανοῖς ἐκοινώνει ἐν ἰδίωτῶν οἰκίαις ἐκκλησιάζων. [...] τοὺς

Leontius obtained the bishopric.

Athanasius avoided him as a heretic, and communed with those who were called Eustathians, who assembled in a

257 Philostorgius, HE III 16, GCS 21, 47; transl. P.R. Amidon, 55.
259 Philostorgius, HE IV 12, GCS 21, 64; transl. P.R. Amidon, 71.
Eустαθίου ἐπαινέτας πολλοὺς ὄντας.

They could have had above-mentioned debates with Aetius. So I think that when Philostorgius talks about τοὺς περὶ Βασίλειον καὶ Εὐστάθιον in HE III 16 and HE III 27 with reference to the events at the beginning of 350s he refers to the followers of Eustathius of Antioch although in the first passage he names Eustathius of Sebastea. His mistake is understandable as only a few years later in 358 another man named Eustathius enters this system and together with the same Basil of Ancyra acts against Aetius – Eustathius of Sebastea.

Ὅτι, φησί, Βασίλειος, συλλαβὼν μεθ’ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν τε τῆς Σεβαστείας Εὐστάθιον καὶ ἐτέρους ἐκκλησίων προεστῶτας, τὸν τε Αέτιον μάλιστα εἶτα δὲ καὶ τὸν Εὐδόξιον πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα διασύρει, ἀλλὰ τε πλάττων περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὡς εἰσαν μῦσται καὶ κοινωνοὶ τῆς κατὰ Γάλλον ἐπαναστάσεως, συμπεριλαβὼν ταῖς κατ’ ἐκείνων διαβολαῖς καὶ τὸν Θεόφιλον.

He says that Basil took with him Eustathius of Sebaste and some other bishops and brought to the emperor accusations against Aetius especially, and also against Eudoxius, making up various charges against them, including that of being privy to and participants in Gallus’s revolt, and he implicated Theophilus as well in the charges.

It seems that Philostorgius was not really acquainted with the details of theology that he simply considered opposed to the ideas of the persons whom he admired and wanted to defend with his writing – namely Aetius and Eunomius. He was not interested in those details exactly to the same extend as Athanasius on the other side. That is why I think it was very easy for him to confuse one Eustathius with another, both being enemies of Aetius and living and acting more or less in the same places in the distance of a few years.

260 Sozomen, HE III 20, 4. 7, GCS 50, 134-135, transl. NPNF II 2, 298-299.
261 Philostorgius, HE IV 8, GCS 21, 61-62; transl. P.R. Amidon, 68.
With reference to chronology I rely on Basil as his account had as a scope to show Eustathius’ changes of confession made one by one in chronological order. And Basil states very clearly that immediately (εὐθὺς) after he had been ordained a bishop, he attended the Council of Ancyra:

Καὶ τυχῶν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ὡς ἐτυχέν, εὐθὺς φαίνεται γράψας ἀναθεματισμὸν τοῦ ὀμοούσιου ἐν τῷ κατὰ Αγκύραν γενομένῳ αὐτοῖς συλλόγῳ.

And when he somehow obtained the bishopric, he seems immediately to have written an anathema of consubstantiation at their synod convened at Ancyra.²⁶²

Apparently, Eustathius must have become a bishop of Sebastea in 357. It would explain why Basil addressed his first letter to him as “To Eustathius, the philosopher”, because the letter must have been written before his ordination to the see of Sebastea.

8. The Council of Ancyra (358)

In 358 Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea (the latter not personally, but he wrote a letter to the participants) called an anti-Aetius council to Ancyra. Homoiousians were at the East a bastion of orthodoxy that defended Trinitarian theology against Anomoeans. Hanson explains: “The statement which emerged from this council (it can hardly be called a formal encyclical), and which was certainly composed by Basil himself, marks the emergence of a new and coherent theological point of view. This is the theology of those whom Epiphanius, quite undeservedly, calls ‘Semi-Arians’, but who are usually today thought of as Homoiousians, a designation which is more accurate but still a little misleading.”²⁶³ Actually Homoiousians did not use the term ὁμοούσιος, but they emphasized that the Son is similar to the Father by substance/essence (ὁμοιός κατ’ οὐσίαν). It is important to notice that such an expression appeared in the course of conflict with Anomoeans as a direct opposition to ἀνόμοιος κατ’ οὐσίαν.

²⁶³ R.P.C. Hanson, The search for the Christian Doctrine of God, 349.
Neither Socrates nor Theodoret mention the Council of Ancyra, but we do have accounts by Sozomen and Epiphanius, and Hilary quotes its confession.\(^{264}\) Epiphanius confirms that the leaders of this alliance were Basil of Ancyra and George of the Laodicea.\(^{265}\) The letter by George of Laodicea as quoted by Epiphanius does not mention either Aetius or Eudoxius,\(^{266}\) but Sozmen rightly understood it as an exhortation to depose personally Eudoxius of Antioch and to excommunicate Aetius.\(^{267}\) Sozomen and Epiphanius differ in their accounts on the effects the Council. Sozomen states:

καὶ αἴροῦνται περὶ τούτου
πρεσβεύειν πρὸς βασιλέα αὐτός τε
Βασιλείως ὁ Αγκύρας ἐπίσκοπος καὶ
Εὐστάθιος ὁ Σεβαστείας καὶ
Ἐλεύσιος ὁ Κυζίκου καὶ Λεόντιος
πρεσβύτερος ἐκ θαλαμηπόλου
βασιλικοῦ. ὡς δὲ ἀφίκοντο εἰς τὰ
βασίλεια, καταλαμβάνουσιν
Ασφαλίων τινα πρεσβύτερον ἐξ
Ἀντιοχείας, εἰσάγαν σπουδαστήν
tῆς Αετίου αἱρέσεως, ἥδη πράξαντα
ἐφ᾽ ὧν παρεγένετο καὶ γράμματα
παρὰ βασιλεῶς κομισάμενον
ἐκδημεῖν μέλλοντα.
καταμηνυθείσης δὲ τῆς αἱρέσεως
diὰ τῶν ἐξ Ἀγκύρας πρεσβέων
καταψηφίζεται Κωνστάντιος τῶν
ἀμφί τὸν Ευδόξιον καὶ ἀνακομίζεται

In order to proffer this request to the emperor, they sent to him a deputation composed of the following bishops:

- Basil, bishop of Ancyra;
- Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste;
- Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus;
- and Leontius, the presbyter of the imperial bed-chamber.

On their arrival at the palace, they found that Asphalius, a presbyter of Antioch, and a zealot of the Aëtian heresy, was on the point of taking his departure, after having terminated the business for which he undertook the journey and having obtained a letter from the emperor. On receiving, however, the intelligence concerning the heresy conveyed by the deputation from Ancyra, Constantius condemned Eudoxius and his followers, withdrew


\(^{265}\) Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73, 1, 6, GCS 37, 268.

\(^{266}\) Epiphanius, *Panarion* 73, 12, 1 – 22, 4, GCS 37, 284–295.

\(^{267}\) Sozomen, HE IV 13, 6, GCS 50, 156.
It seems that delegates of both parties went to Constantius and finally the Homoioussians convinced him to act against Anomoeans. Epiphanius attributes the victory to the allies of Aetius:

καὶ ἐκρατύνθη τότε τὸ μέρος τούτων τῶν Ἑμιαρείων, τῶν περὶ Βασίλειον φημί καὶ Γεώργιον καὶ Σιλουανόν καὶ Λοιποῖς· ἔχοντες μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν σαρκὸς δεξιῶν, Κωνστάντιον τὸν βασιλέα, οἱ περὶ Εὐδόξιον καὶ Γεώργιον τὸν Ἀλεξανδρέα καὶ Εὐζώιον τὸν Ἀντιοχέα, καὶ οἱ μὲν περὶ Βασίλειον καὶ Γεώργιον τὸν Λαοδικέα ἔταπεινώθησαν, καίπερ πολλὰ ἰσχύσαντες, ἐξ ὧν πάλιν ἐτεροὶ δυνηθήσαν τῆς αὐτῆς αἰρέσεως καὶ συνόδου, καὶ γέγονε τὸ τῶν Αρειανῶν σύστημα εἰς τρία τάγματα. Ακάκιος γὰρ ὁ Παλαιστινός ὁ Καισαρεῖας ἀμα Μελιτῖος καὶ Ὄφρανιος τῷ Τυρίῳ καὶ Εὐτυχίῳ τῷ Ἐλευθεροπολίτῃ, διὰ τὸν πρὸς Κύριλλον τὸν Ἐφροσολυμίτην ἔδηλον τε καὶ μίσος, ἀνθίστατο τοῖς περὶ Βασίλειον καὶ Γεώργιον τὸν Λαοδικέα καὶ Σιλουανόν τὸν Ταρσέα, Ελευσίον τε τὸν Κυζίκου, Μακεδόνιον τὸν Κωνσταντινουπολίτην, Εὐστάθιον.

And at that time the party of these Semi-Arians – I mean Basil, George, Silvanus and the rest of them – were in the ascendant. But the others – Eudoxius, George of Alexandria, and Euzoeus of Antioch – opposed them, and had on their side an arm of flesh, the emperor Constantius. In spite of their great influence the party of Basil and George of Laodicea were humiliated. Still others of them broke with this faction and confederacy, and the Arian movement was divided into three groups. For because of his envy and hatred of Cyril of Jerusalem, this same Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, along with Melitius, Uranius of Tyre, and Eutychius of Eleutheropolis opposed Basil, George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Eleusius of Cyzicus, Macedonius of Constantinople, Eustathius of Sebaste and the newly consecrated

268 Sozomen, HE IV 13, 5-6, GCS 50, 156, transl. NPNF II 2, 308.
τὸν Σεβαστείας καὶ Ανιανὸν τὸν Ἀντιοχέα, τότε κατασταθέντα, κατ᾽ αὐτῶν τε ἐαυτὸν στρατεύσας ὁ αὐτὸς Ακάκιος πολλὴν φύρσιν εἰργάσατο.

Both Sozomen and Philostorgius state that the allies of Aetius were deposed and banished. Homoiōsians won the battle although it was already the beginning of a war. What is significant for my story is that both authors mention Eustathius of Sebastea as an important figure of the Homoiōsian alliance.

***

In the same 358 there were three more councils important for Eustathius: of Melitene, Neocaesarea and Gangra. I will describe them in a random order as it is impossible to establish the exact dates of all of them. But my dating is not random. All of them were held before the Council of Constantinople (360) as they appear in the charges brought against Eustathius during this council. And they could not have been held earlier as already after the Council of Ancyra Eustathius became known and so important that his case was examined by different councils. All three councils were held in the Diocese of Pontus.

It seems that Eustathian asceticism became very popular in the entire diocese. In the case of Gangra, the gathered bishops sent a letter to Armenia Minor in order to inform about their concerns/decisions.

269 Epiphanius, Panarion 73, 23, 3-4, GCS 37, 296, transl. F. Williams, 468.
270 Sozomen, HE IV 13, 6, GCS 50, 156; Philostorgius, HE IV 8.
9. The Council of Melitene (358)

Two sources mention Eustathius in the context of the Council of Melitene. Basil states that Eustathius was deposed by the Council of Constantinople (360) because of his former deposition by the Council of Melitene:

Ἐν δὲ τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει
συνέθετο πάλιν τοὺς ἄπο τῶν
αιρετικῶν προταθείσι. Καὶ οὕτως
ἀπελαθεὶς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς διὰ τὸ ἐν
τῇ Μελιτηνή προκαθήρησθαι ὁδὸν
ἐαυτῷ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως
ἐπενόησε τὴν ὡς ύμᾶς ἀφιέν.

And at Constantinople he again agreed with the proposals of the heretics. And when he had accordingly been expelled from his episcopacy on account of his former deposition at Melitine, he conceived of the visit to you as a means of restoring himself.²⁷¹

Basil suggests that Eustathius was deposed from bishopric so the Council of Melitene must have taken place after Eustathius’ ordination for the see of Sebastea. According to the very same Basil he received the bishopric and “immediately” after that went to Ancyra, so it seems very probable that the Council of Melitene was held in 358.²⁷²

The account by Sozomen reads as follows:

καὶ ὅτι ἀνατρέπειν ἐπισχεῖται τὰ
dόξαντα τοῖς ἐν Μελιτινη
συνελθούσι καὶ πλείστοις
ἐγκλήμασιν ἐνοχὸς ὄν δικαστής
ηζίου εἶναι καὶ ἑτεροδόξους τοὺς
ἄλλους ἀπεκάλει.

He had likewise endeavored to reverse the decrees of those convened at Melitina; and, although he was guilty of many crimes, he had the assurance to aspire to be judge over the others, and to stigmatize them as heretics.²⁷³

Jurgens emphasizes the incoherencies between those two accounts, namely that Basil talks about Eustathius’ deposition and Sozomen that he attempted to reverse the decrees of Melitene. He thinks that Eustathius was not deposed in

²⁷² The date given as well by Mansi, Sanctorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, ed. J.D. Mansi, vol. 3 (347-409), Florentiae 1759, 291-292.
²⁷³ Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
But, the report by Basil is more reliable as he was personally present at the Council of Constantinople. Philostorgius states:

Basil and Eustathius headed the group representing the doctrine of “like in substance,” and they were supported by others there, including another Basil; still a deacon, he surpassed many others in eloquence, but he shrank from public debates because of his timidity.275

Also Gregory of Nyssa indirectly confirms that Basil was present at the Council. He quotes the following accusation of Eunomius in his Contra Eunomium.

Then he says that certain teachers, whose names he again does not mention, have the final lap to run, and that our tutor and father is present and cheers thee on, but when the decision transfers power to the opposition he flees the places, having deserted his post, and pursues some homeland smoke, and he much disparages this man for cowardice in his accusation, as anyone who is interested can see from what is written there.276

275 Philostorgius, HE IV 12, GCS 21, 64, transl. P.R. Amidon, 71-72.
276 Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunomium I 79, GNO 1, 49, transl. S.G. Hall, 47.
In the next part of the text Gregory fights against the accusation of cowardice, not even mentioning that Basil was not present at the Council. Kopecek is right that “since Gregory of Nyssa did not challenge Eunomius’ accusation, it must have been substantially accurate.”

Although according to both accounts Basil fled after the first debate (which Kopecek calls the first Council) and he might not have listened to the part with depositions, it is likely that he heard the report from Eustathius himself as since 357 they were staying in the close relationship.

Anyway, I think that the incoherence between the account by Basil and Sozomen is only apparent. As seen in the case of the Council of Ancyra, Sozomen has a tendency to present his own interpretation of the documents he summarizes. It appears from other mentions about the Council of Melitene that the gathering of bishops examined disciplinary issues. Sozomen reports regarding Elpidius:

Elpidius was deposed because he had participated in the malpractices of Basil, and had occasioned great disorders; and because he had, contrary to the decrees of the council of Melitina, restored to his former rank in the presbytery a man named Eusebius, who had been deposed for having created Nectaria a deaconess, after she had been excommunicated on account of violating agreements and oaths; and to confer this honor upon her was clearly contrary to the laws of the Church.

Sozomen mentions Melitene also regarding Cyril of Jerusalem:

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, was deposed as he stayed in communion with Eustathius and Elpidius, in defiance of

---

278 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 16, GCS 50, 181; transl. NPNF II 2, 321.
κεκοινωνηκότα, ἑναντία σπουδάσασι τοῖς ἐν Μελιτινή 
συνελθοῦσι, μεθ' ἄν καὶ αὐτὸς συνεληλύθει.

If the Council had examined confessions or created a new one Basil would have mentioned it in the list of Eustathius’ confessions. Melitene appears in his letter as a cause for Eustathius’ deposition in Constantinople (360). It is no reason not to believe Basil that Eustathius had been deposed in Melitene although this deposition could have been ineffective. I am leaving here open the problem whether Meletius was ordained bishop of Sebastea and when (358 or 360, after Beroe or not) as it is not crucial for the story about Eustathius. On the basis of available sources it can be stated that Eustathius was deposed in Melitene, but it is difficult to determine whether he was substituted by Meletius in 358.

10. The Council of Neocaesarea (358)

In my opinion the Council of Neocaesarea that concerned Eustathius was held in 358 and similarly to Melitene and Gangra it referred only to the disciplinary issues. Actually, we know hardly anything about that gathering except for two mentions in Sozomen and Socrates. The one by Sozomen reads as follows:

μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐν Νεοκαισαρείᾳ τοῦ Πόντου ὑπὸ συνόδου ἀκοινώνητος ἐγένετο. and also because he had been excommunicated by a council held at Neocaesarea, a city of Pontus.

Socrates names the city Caesarea, but it is assumed that he refers to Neocaesarea.

279 Sozomen, HE IV 25, 1, GCS 50, 181, transl. NPNF II 2, 321 with alterations.
280 Sozomen and Socrates differ in their accounts: Sozomen (HE IV 25, 6, GCS 50, 182) says that Eustathius was replaced by Meletius after the Council of Constantinople (360) and Socrates (HE II 44, 1-2, GCS NF 1, 181-182) claims that Meletius became bishop of Sebastea before the Council of Constantinople (360) and even before the Council of Seleucia (359).
281 Against textbooks and C.A. Frazee, Anatolian Asceiticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathios of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea, 23.
282 The date given also by Mansi, Sanctorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, ed. J.D. Mansi, vol. 3 (347-409), 291-292.
283 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
Εὐστάθιος μέντοι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν
tῇ δὲ αὐτὸν γενομένῃ ἐν Γάγγρας τῆς
Παφλαγονίας συνόδῳ κατεκρίθη,
dιότι μετὰ τὸ καθαφρεθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν
tῇ κατὰ Καισάρειαν συνόδῳ πολλὰ
παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς τύπους
ἐπράττεν.

It seems that the deposition pronounced at this Council could have been as ineffective as the one of Melitene.

11. The Council of Gangra (358)

The discussion about the date of the Council of Gangra started with Tillemont in 1703 and has never reached the point of certainty and general agreement. Scholars have proposed different dates: 340,286 around 341,287 342,288 343,289 around 355,290 372 or 373291 and 376.292

It is worth noticing that the early dating (340-343) is based on two presumptions: first, that Eusebius named in the synodical letter is Eusebius of Nicomedia who died around 341,293 but nothing obliges us to believe that Eusebius

---

285 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 2, GCS NF 1, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 72-73.
293 C.A. Frazee, Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century, 19.
of Nicomedia was present at the council. Barnes and Laniado think that it is much more likely that the council was presided over by a bishop of Gangra (and therefore metropolitan of Paphlagonia) of the same name, unknown elsewhere.\textsuperscript{294}

The second presumption is the date attributed to the council by the Syriac translation. In the Latin translation by Chabot the statement reads as follows: “Absoluti sunt canones synodi quae in Gangris, sub consulatu Placidi et Romuli, anno 390 juxta la computationem Antiochenorum. Sunt numero viginti.”\textsuperscript{295} The consulate of Placidus and Romulus was in 343 and the year 390 of the era of Antioch coincide with 341/342 – although the two indications are inconsistent, Laniado is right that the indication with the names of the consuls was less prone to negligence of a copyist and that is why it is more reliable.\textsuperscript{296} But he is wrong when stating that the indication of the date was preserved in two manuscripts. Schulthess based the critical edition of Syriac canones on seven manuscripts of which six include the canons of the Council of Gangra.\textsuperscript{297} According to the editor the stemma originates from one Greek (lost) original and then divides into two basic families. One of these families groups three codices: AFH.\textsuperscript{298} Of this family, manuscript H does not contain the canons of Gangra, one manuscript has an indication of the date (F- Borg. Sir. 82 of Vaticana = former K. VI 4 from Museo Borgia) and neither manuscript A (Add. 14, 528 from British Museum – indicated by Laniado as the second one with the date) from the same family nor any other from the second family has it.\textsuperscript{299} Barnes is right that the above-quoted sentence is a “product of later guesswork”\textsuperscript{300} as it is present in one manuscript only while even the second one from the same family does not contain it.

The presumption that has never been articulated clearly is that the charges listed by Sozomen are put in chronological order. On the basis of the latter some


\textsuperscript{296} A. Laniado, \textit{Note sur la datation consente en syriaque du concile de Gangres}, 196-197.

\textsuperscript{297} \textit{Die Syrischen Kanones der Synoden von Nicaea bis Chalcedon nebst einigen zugehöriigen Dokumenten}, ed. F. Schulthess, Berlin 1908, IX.

\textsuperscript{298} \textit{Die Syrischen Kanones}, X.

\textsuperscript{299} \textit{Die Syrischen Kanones}, 63. The Syriac text consulted by Dominique Gonnet (HiSoMA-Sources Chrétienes).

\textsuperscript{300} T.D. Barnes, \textit{The date of the Council of Gangra}, 124.
scholars date Gangra for 341 following the chronological order of the charges listed by Sozomen and some for the period after 360 following their interpretation of the account by Socrates. As I have explained above, Sozomen might have not listed his charges in chronological order. Moreover, regarding the date of Gangra the account of Socrates is not so obviously opposed to Sozomen’s as it would seem at first glance. The report of Socrates reads as follows:

Εὐστάθιος δὲ ὁ τῆς ἐν Ἁρμενίᾳ Σεβαστείας οὔτε εἰς ἀπολογίαν ἐδέχθη, διότι ὕπο Ἐυλαλίου τοῦ ἱδίου πατρός καὶ ἑπισκόπου Καυσαρείας τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἤδη πρότερον καθήκητο, ἐπειδὴ ἀνάρμοστον τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ στολῆν ἡμφίεστο. Ιστέον δὲ ὅτι εἰς τόπον Εὐστάθιου Μελέτιος κατέστη ἑπίσκοπος, περὶ οὗ μικρὸν ὑστερον ἐρούμεν. Εὐστάθιος μέντοι καὶ μετὰ ταύτα ἐν τῇ δι᾿ αὐτῶν γενομένη ἐν Γάγγραις τῆς Παφλαγονίας συνόδῳ κατεκρίθη. [...] Ταύτα μὲν οὖν ὑστερον ἐγένετο.

Indeed, Sozomen says that after the Council of Constantinople (360) Eustathius was replaced by Meletius (HE IV 25) and Socrates says that the Council of Gangra took place after Meletius had been ordained to the bishopric of Sebastea (HE II 43). But it does not mean that according to Socrates the Council of Gangra gathered after the Council of Constantinople (360). Socrates clearly asserts that Meletius became bishop of Sebastea BEFORE the Council of Constantinople (360) and even before the Council of Seleucia (359):

301 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 1-2. 7, GCS NF 1, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 72-73.
It becomes us now to speak of Meletius, who, as we have recently observed, was created bishop of Sebastia in Armenia, after the deposition of Eustathius; from Sebastia he was transferred to Berœa, a city of Syria. Being present at the Synod of Seleucia, he subscribed the creed set forth there by Acacius, and immediately returned thence to Berœa. When the convention of the Synod at Constantinople was held, the people of Antioch finding that Eudoxius, captivated by the magnificence of the see of Constantinople, had contemned their church, they sent for Meletius, and invested him with the bishopric of the church at Antioch.

What’s more, he is convinced that after Meletius had been ordained to the see of Sebastea, he was bishop of Beroe and as such he took part in the Council of Seleucia (359) and Constantinople (360). According to Socrates, he was appointed to the see of Antioch in 360. So, when Socrates says that the Council of Gangra took place after Meletius had been ordained to the bishopric of Sebastea, he does not refer to the decision of the Council of Constantinople (360), but (probably) to the Council of Melitene (358). So, when he indicates that Gangra took place AFTER Meletius had been appointed for the see of Sebastea replacing Eustathius, he refers to the events BEFORE the Council of Constantinople (360). Actually, the account

302 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 44, 1-3, GCS NF 1, 181-182, transl. NPNF II 2, 73.
of Socrates confirms my dating of Gangra after Melitene (358) and before Constantinople (360).

The Council of Gangra might have been held in 358. My arguments are as follows:

My first argument is based on the fact that Eustathius was born and raised in Caesarea of Cappadocia. And the synodical letter is addressed by the bishops gathered in Gangra “to their most honored lords and fellow ministers in Armenia” (κυρίοις τιμωτάτοις ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ συλλειτουργοῖς) which obviously refers to Armenia Minor, the province of which Sebastea was the capital city. If it was assumed that Eustathius was from Sebastea as well as his father, it could be possible that bishops from Gangra informed his home Church about his exaggerated asceticism. However, I have established that Eustathius came from Caesarea in Cappadocia, was ordained priest there and in the early 350s was excommunicated by his father, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. So, the fact that the synodical letter of bishops gathered in Gangra was addressed specifically to the clergy of Armenia, proves that at the time of the Council of Gangra Eustathius was already bishop of Sebastea (most probably since 357). Since both Sozomen and Socrates list Gangra among the causes of his deposition in Constantinople (January 360), the Council of Gangra must have taken place before 360. It is very likely that it took place in 358.

Second, Sozomen states that Eustathius was deposed from bishopric in Gangra:

ἔπειτα δὲ ὡς οὐ δέον διδάσκαν τε καὶ πράττων καὶ φρονόν ἀφηρεθη τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς παρὰ τῶν ἐν Γάγγραις συνεληλυθότων, 

He had also been deprived of his bishopric by those who were convened in Gangra, on account of his having taught, acted, and thought contrary to sound doctrine.

The synodical letter and canons of Gangra really depose all those who do not obey the synodical restrictions although the council left open the way for change:

304 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
Because of these things, the holy synod convened in Gangra was compelled to vote in condemnation of them and to set forth definitions, to the effect that they are outside the church. But if they repent and anathematize each of the things recounted as evil, they will be acceptable. And to this end the holy synod has set forth everything they must anathematize in order to be received. But if anyone should not comply with the things listed [herein], such a one is anathematized as a heretic and will be excommunicated and separated from the church. And it will be necessary for the bishops to be on guard against such behavior in all things discovered among them.\footnote{Canones Synodi Gangrensis, synodical letter, ed. P. Joannou, 88-89, transl. O.L. Yarbrough, 451.}

---

It is difficult to determine whether the canons of Gangra were intended to condemn Eustathius himself or his disciples. The synodical letter is ambiguous:

Inasmuch as the most holy synod of bishops, having convened in the church at Gangra on account of certain pressing matters of ecclesiastical business, when the affairs concerning Eustathius were also investigated, discovered that many things were being done unlawfully by Eustathius’s followers, it has out of necessity
ποίησαι ἐσπούδασεν εἰς ἀναίρεσιν τῶν ὑπ᾿ αὐτοῦ κακῶς γινομένων·

established guidelines [concerning these things] and has hastened to make [them] known to all in order to put an end to the things being done evilly by him.306

Although the letter states that the Council examined the matters which concern Eustathius (ζητουμένων καὶ τῶν κατ᾿ Εὐστάθιον), the charges seem to refer to his disciples – partisans of Eustathius who violated ecclesiastical discipline (πολλὰ ἀθέσμαις γινόμενα ὑπὸ τούτων αὐτῶν τῶν περί Εὐστάθιον).307 But, as the canons do not depose anybody by name, it must be assumed that they did refer to Eustathius and his followers as well if they did not obey the rules. It is significant that Sozomen notes that for some time after Gangra Eustathius changed his way of dressing:

dιὰ δὴ ταύτα τοὺς πλησιοχώρους ἐπισκόπους συνελθεὶν ἐν Γάγγραις τῇ μητροπόλῃ Παφλαγόνων καὶ ἀλλοτρίους αὐτοὺς ψηφίσασθαι τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας, εἰ μὴ κατὰ τοὺς ὅρους τῆς συνόδου ἠκατον τῶν εἰσημένων ἀποκηρύξωσιν. ἐντεύθεν ἐπιδεικνύμενον, ὡς οὔκ αὐθαδείας ἑνεκεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς κατὰ θεόν ἀσκήσεως εἰσηγοῖτο ταύτα καὶ ἐπιτηθευότα, ἀμείψα τὴν στολὴν καὶ παραπλησίας τοῖς ἀλλοις ἰερεύσι τὰς προόδους ποιήσασθαι.

The bishops of the neighborhood of Gangra, the metropolis of Paphlagonia, assembled themselves together, and declared that all those who imbibed these opinions should be aliens to the Catholic Church, unless, according to the definitions of the Synod, they would renounce each of the aforesaid customs. It is said that from that time, Eustathius exchanged his clothing for the stole, and made his journeys habited like other priests, thus proving that he had not introduced and practiced these novelties out of self-

307 T.Z. Tenšek, L’ascetismo nel Concilio di Gangra, 68: “Comunque occorre notare che l’epistola sinodica è assai poco chiara; essa dice che le deviazioni sono apparse a seguito di Eustazio (κατ᾿ Εὐστάθιον) da coloro che erano attorno ad Eustazio (ὑπὸ τούτων αὐτῶν τῶν περί Εὐστάθιον).”
It is also important that the group of Eustathius’ disciples had enough influence to attract the attention of the council. And this is the next argument to date the Council of Gangra not for the beginning of Eustathius’ career.

12. Charged with perjury by the Council of Antioch (before 360)

Socrates is the only one who mentions that Eustathius was judged by the Council of Antioch. The remark is weird as it appears in the list of charges of the Council of Constantinople (360); Eustathius was deposed there on the basis of disciplinary issues and all the charges refer to discipline.

Eustathius, they said, was deposed because, when a presbyter, he had been condemned, and put away from the communion of prayers by Eulalius, his own father, who was bishop of the church of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia; and also because he had been excommunicated by a council held at Neocæsarea, a city of Pontus, and deposed by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, for unfaithfulness in the discharge of certain duties that had devolved upon him. He had also been deprived of his bishopric by those who were convened in Gangrœ, on account of his having taught, acted, and thought contrary to sound doctrine. He had been convicted of perjury by the council of Antioch. He had likewise

---

308 Sozomen, HE III 14, 36, GCS 50, 124, transl. NPNF II 2, 293-294.
καὶ ὅτι ἀνατρέπειν ἐπιχειρεῖ τὰ
dόξαντα τοῖς ἐν Μελιτινῇ
συνελθοῦσι καὶ πλείστοις
ἐγκλήμασιν ἐνοχὸς ἀν δικαστής
ἡξίων εἶναι καὶ ἑπεροδόξους τοὺς
ἀλλοὺς ἀπεκάλει.

The term “perjury” (ἐπιορκία) is quite rare in Sozomen: he uses it 4 times only including the above quoted text and he sometimes uses the verb ἐφιορκέω. The perjury may refer to doctrinal matters as “Arius had perjured himself (ἐπιώρκησεν) by declaring to the Emperor Constantine that he maintained the doctrines of the council of Nicaea.” But it seems that Sozomen applies the term “perjury” (ἐπιορκία) to any case of swearing falsely. He ascribes the perjury to Basil of Ancyra as well and it has nothing to do with the doctrine:

They further deposed that Basil had excited the clergy of Sirium against Germanius; and that, although he stated in writing that he had admitted Germanius, Valens, and Ursacius into communion, he had placed them as criminals before the tribunal of the African bishops; and that, when taxed with this deed, he had denied it, and perjured himself; and that, when he was afterwards convicted, he strove to justify his perjury by sophistical reasoning.

So, the perjury Sozomen is talking about could have referred to any kind of accusation that Eustathius refuted by swearing (falsely) and then was condemned for that by the Council of Antioch. Assuming that the condemnation was connected to the public/ascetic activity of Eustathius, it might have occurred after 357, but it is

---

309 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
310 Sozomen, HE IV 12, 2, GCS 50, 154, transl. NPNF II 2, 308.
311 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 6, GCS 50, 179, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
not so obvious. Eustathius could have sworn that he had fulfilled all the duties
devolved upon him by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople (before 341) and then
could have been caught perjuring.

13. The Council of Seleucia (359)

While the Westerns were debating in Rimini, the Easters gathered in Seleucia.
Undoubtedly, Homoiousians had an advantage at the starting point as they had a big
influence on Constantius. The main player in the ecclesiastical politics at that time
was Basil of Ancyra. Sozomen says that his opinion was pivotal when the place for
the council was decided (HE IV 16). The emperor wanted to conciliate between
moderate Arians and Homoiousians excluding radicals of both sides of the
spectrum – Aetius and Eunomius on one side and Athanasius and his followers on
the other.312 Before the council, Mark of Arethusa wrote the confession of faith
dated for 22 May 359 and called “dated creed.”313 The key statements of the creed
consisted in the expression that the Son is like the Father in all respects (ὁμοιὸν
κατὰ πάντα) and in placing a prohibition on using the term οὐσία with reference
to God. The council was intended to agree the creed and to examine some
disciplinary issues. Sozomen says that Cyril of Jerusalem and Eustathius of Sebastea
insisted to focus first at the matters of discipline:

εντεύθεν οἱ μὲν πρώτοι εἰς δόγμα ἐξετάζειν, οἱ δὲ τοὺς
βίους ἀνακρίνειν τῶν
cathegoreuménon ἐν αὐτῶις, ὃν
ήν Κύριλλος Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ
Εὐστάθιος ὁ Σεβαστείας,
ἀναγκαίον ἔλεγον.

Thus some were of the opinion that it was
necessary to commence with the discussion
of doctrinal topics, while others maintained
that inquiries ought first to be instituted into
the conduct of those among them against
whom accusations had been laid, as had been
the case with Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem,
Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, and others.314

312 R.P.C. Hanson, The search for the Christian Doctrine of God, 362.
313 It preserved in Greek in Athanasius (De Synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleuciae in Isauria 8, Athanasius
Werke II, 235-236) and Socrates Scholasticus (HE II 37, 19-24, GCS NF 1, 154-155).
314 Sozomen, HE IV 22, 4, GCS 50, 172, transl. NPNF II 2, 317; cf. Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 39,
11-13, GCS NF 1, 170.
However, the bishops started with the examination of the doctrine. Homoiousians divided: Basil of Ancyra already before the Council had signed the dated creed while others led by Silvanus of Tarsus wanted to sign the creed of Antioch in encaeniis (341).\textsuperscript{315} Acacius presented his own creed, when rejected he and his allies left the gathering. The creed signed by most and probably by Eustathius himself was the creed of Antioch in encaeniis (341).\textsuperscript{316} Then, on demand of Acacius, the bishops charged with disciplinary issues were excluded from the gathering. We do not know whether Eustathius was among them. Athanasius names Eustathius among excommunicated by that Council because “the accusers pressed, and the accused put in pleas, and thereby were led on further by their irreligion and blasphemed the Lord” (τῶν δὲ κατηγορούμενων φευγόντων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πλέον ἐν ἀσεβείας ἔξαγομένων καὶ βλασφημούντων εἰς τὸν κύριον).\textsuperscript{317} Although, Sozomen does not name him among excommunicated,\textsuperscript{318} but Socrates lists Eustathius among deposed who “should not be restored to communion, until they made such a defense as would clear them from the imputations under which they lay.”\textsuperscript{319} It is possible that Eustathius of Sebastea was among those who were temporarily suspended:

τοὺς δὲ πλέον ἄκοινωνήτους ἐποίησαν, ἄχρις ἂν πρὸς τὰ ἐπαγόμενα ἐγκλήματα

Many persons were likewise put out of communion until they

\textsuperscript{315} The second of four creeds produced by a council of ninety bishops gathered at Antioch (341) on the occasion of dedication of a church built by Constantius. The creed called “dedication creed” or in encaeniis preserved in Socrates Scholasticus (HE II 10, 10-18, GCS NF 1, 100-101) and in Athanasius (De synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleuciae in Isauria 23, Athanasius Werke II, 249-250). The key statements of the creed say that the Son is “unchanging and unaltering, exact image of the Godhead an the substance and will and power and glory of the Father” (τῆς θεότητος οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς ὁπωράλλακτον εἰκόνα) and that The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit “are three in hypostasis but one in agreement” (εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἕν). The creed anathemized the flagship Arian statement that “either time or occasion or age exists or did exist before the Son was begotten” (ἢ χρόνον ἢ καιρὸν ἢ αἰῶνα ἢ εἶναι ἢ γεγονέναι πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι τὸν υἱόν). Translation of the creed R.P.C. Hanson, The search for the Christian Doctrine of God, 286-287.

\textsuperscript{316} Sozomen, HE IV 22, 17, GCS 50, 174; Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 39, 20-21, GCS NF 1, 171.

\textsuperscript{317} Athanasius, De synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleuciae in Isauria 12, 5, Athanasius Werke II, 240, transl. NPNF II 4, 456.

\textsuperscript{318} Sozomen, HE IV 22, 25, GCS 50, 176.

\textsuperscript{319} Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 40, 45, GCS NF 1, 176, transl. NPNF II 2, 70-71.
ἀπολογήσωνται, καὶ τὰ πραχθέντα τῇ ἐκάστου παροικίᾳ ἐγραψαν.

could purge themselves of the crimes imputed to them.320

Deposed or suspended or not, Eustathius appeared at the Council of Constantinople (359/360) as bishop of Sebastea.

14. The Council of Constantinople (359/360)

It not certain that Eustathius was a delegate of the Council of Seleucia to the emperor as Jurgens wants.321 Nevertheless, Basil does state that he was in Constantinople:

Κάκειθεν ἐπὶ τήν Σελεύκειαν ἐλθὼν ἐγραψε μετὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ὀμοδόξων ἄ πάντες ἱσασιν. Ἐν δὲ τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει συνέθετο πάλιν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρετικῶν προταθείσι.

And going thence into Seleucia, in conjunction with those who held the same opinions as himself, he did what all know. And at Constantinople he again agreed with the proposals of the heretics.322

And that he signed a creed in Constantinople:

Παρελθόντες εἰς τήν ἑταιροπήν, ἵνα τὰ ἐν μέσῳ παραλείπω, ὡς εἰς ἐξεθέντο πίστεις. Ἐπ᾽ Ἀγκύρας ἀλλήν, ἐτέραν ἐν Σελευκεία, ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολει, τήν πολυθρύλητον.

Arriving at the episcopacy—to pass over the events of the interval—how many creeds they have set forth! At Ancyra one, another at Seleucia, another at Constantinople, the celebrated one.323

Sozomen confirms that the participants of the council were ten deputies of Seleucia and ten deputies of Rimini, but not exclusively. There were also the supporters of Acacius and “many other bishops, who, from various motives, had repaired to the city” (καὶ ἄλλων, οἵπερ ἐτυχον ἐνδημούντες).324 As a deputy of

320 Sozomen, HE IV 22, 26, GCS 50, 176, transl. NPNF II 2, 318.
321 W.A. Jurgens, Eustathius of Sebaste, 43.
324 Sozomen, HE IV 23, GCS 50, 177, transl. NPNF II 2, 319.
Seleucia or present for other reasons Eustathius apparently signed in Constantinople the creed of Rimini.

The next day preparations were made for the pompous ceremony of proclaiming him consul, which, according to the Roman custom, took place in the beginning of the month of January, and the whole of that day and part of the ensuing night the emperor spent with the bishops, and at length succeeded in persuading the deputies of the council of Seleucia to receive the formulary transmitted from Ariminum.325

This creed was similar with the “dated creed” with some significant exceptions.326 According to the preserved text the creed omitted “in all respects” (κατὰ πάντα) in the statement that the Son is like the Father (.openConnection).327 The anathemas that followed the creed were clearly anti-Arian so the Homoiousians could have regarded it as orthodox.328 Under the pressure of Constantius all bishops signed the creed, “even those who earlier had championed the doctrine of other in substance.”329

Kopecek claims that there were two councils of Constantinople: one in December 359 and the other in January 360330 and Hanson distinguishes them even by places: one in Nice and one in Constantinople.331 Sozomen and Socrates with one voice admit that the Council of Constantinople was held at Acacius bidding. I think that it is likely that one gathering first examined the issues of faith and then

325 Sozomen, HE IV 23, GCS 50, 178.
327 Athanasius, De Synodis Ariminii in Italia et Seleuciae in Isauria 30, Athanasius Werke II, 258-259; Theodoret, HE II 21, GCS 44, 145-146; Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 41, 15, GCS NF 1, 178.
329 Philostorgius, HE IV 12, GCS 21, 65, transl. P.R. Amidon, 74.
the disciplinary ones. Some sessions took place in the end of December of 359 and the final one with depositions at the beginning of January 360.

Philostorgius as the only one stresses the importance of Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebastea, who “headed the group representing the doctrine of like in substance” (προειστήκεισαν δὲ τῶν μὲν κατ᾿ οὖσιάν ὁμοίων πρεσβευόντων Βασίλειός τε καὶ Εὐστάθιος) and debated with Aetius. Philostorgius also states that the first debate was won by Aetius, but Constantius called Basil of Ancyra and Aetius to his palace and demanded explanations. Finally, he expelled Aetius and ordered the bishops to sign the formula of Rimini.

In January 360, all leaders of the Homoiousians were deposed, although the depositions were based on disciplinary charges:

Οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀκάκιον καὶ Εὐδόξιον ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει περὶ τὸ ἀντικαθαρεῖν καὶ αὐτοὶ τινὰς τοῦ ἐτέρου μέρους ἀγώνα ἐτίθεντο. Ἰστεόν δὲ ὅτι οὐδέτεροι διὰ θρησκείαν, ἀλλὰ διὰ ἐτέρας προφάσεις τὰς καθαίρεσις πεποίηνται. Διακρίνομενοι γὰρ οίᾳ περὶ πίστεως ἐν τῷ καθαρεῖν ἀλλήλους τὴν ἀλλήλων πίστιν οὐ διεμέμφοντο.

Among the deposed was Eustathius of Sebastea. The general character of the depositions is a cause why the charges listed by Sozomen and Socrates that I have been using as a source for the life of Eustathius until 360 focus on disciplinary matters and do not mention doctrinal issues.

---

332 Philostorgius, HE IV 12, GCS 21, 64, transl. P.R. Amidon, 71.
333 Philostorgius, HE IV 12, GCS 21, 64-65.
334 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 42, 1-2, GCS NF 1, 179, transl. NPNF II 2, 72.
15. Macedonians (after 360)

Philostorgius says that “those deposed were also banished, Basil to Illyricum and the others each to a different place (ὑπερφοίζονται δὲ καὶ οἱ καθαυρεθέντες, Βασίλειος μὲν εἰς Ἰλλυριούς, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἄλλος ἄλλαχόσε),” but Jurgens is right when he observes: “However Basil may have been exiled, Macedonius went to live in a suburb of his see when Constantinople was given to Eudoxius. Surely Philostorgius cannot have imagined that the suburbs of Constantinople were a place of exile! We must doubt also that Eleusius and Eustathius were exiled; for we find them shortly in close association with Macedonius. It may be, however, that they were forbidden entry to the territory of their former sees.”

Even when they were unanimously deposed by those assembled at Constantinople, they did not accept their deposition, calling the body a gathering of rebellious men, and refusing to speak of them as bishops, hoping thus to prevent them from ratifying the vote cast against them. And they added, as the reason for their not being bishops, the fact that, as their accuser says, they were the leaders of a wicked heresy.

It seems that the group was consolidating under the command of Macedonius who was staying near Constantinople (εἰς τι περὶ Πύλας χωρίον τῆς Βιθυνίας διέτριβεν). Basil of Ancyra lost his leadership and Macedonius became the most important figure of the Homoiousians.

---

335 Philostorgius, HE V 1, GCS 21, 66, transl. P.R. Amidon, 75
336 W.A. Jurgens, Eustathius of Sebaste, 45.
338 Sozomen, HE IV 26, 1, GCS 50, 182.
Macedonius on being ejected from Constantinople, bore his condemnation ill and became restless; he therefore associated himself with the other faction that had deposed Acacius and his party at Seleucia, and sent a deputation to Sophronius and Eleusius, to encourage them to adhere to that creed which was first promulgated at Antioch, and afterwards confirmed at Seleucia, proposing to give it the counterfeit name of the ‘homoiousian’ creed. By this means he drew around him a great number of adherents, who from him are still denominated ‘Macedonians.’ And although such as dissented from the Acacians at the Seleucian Synod had not previously used the term homoiousios, yet from that period they distinctly asserted it. There was, however, a popular report that this term did not originate with Macedonius, but was the invention rather of Marathonius, who a little before had been set over the church at Nicomedia; on which account the maintainers of this doctrine were also called ‘Marathonians.’ To this party Eustathius joined himself, who for the
Both Socrates and Sozomen confirm that after Constantius died (3 November 361) the Homoiousians gathered at different councils; they also name Eustathius among supporters of Macedonius:

At this period the adherents of Macedonius, among whom were Eleusius, Eustathius, and Sophronius, who now began openly to be called Macedonians, as constituting a distinct sect, adopted the bold measure on the death of Constantius, of calling together those of their own sentiments who had been convened at Seleucia, and of holding several councils. They condemned the partisans of Acacius and the faith which had been established at Ariminum, and confirmed the doctrines which had afterwards approved at Seleucia.

One of those councils held in different places was the Council of Zela named by Basil in the letter 251, 4. Eustathius probably was not restored to his see by Julian. Socrates informs that the emperor Jovian (363) “recalled from exile all those prelates whom Constantius had banished, and who had not been re-established by Julian.” Anyway, he did not appear among those who signed the Nicaean Creed in the letter addressed to Jovian (363) although it was signed by other Homoiousians:

---

339 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 45, 1-5, GCS NF 1, 182-183, transl. NPNF II 2, 73-74.
342 Socrates Scholasticus, HE III 24, 4, GCS NF 1, 225, transl. NPNF II 2, 94.
Basil of Ancyra, Silvanus of Tarsus, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis.\textsuperscript{343} The next time we meet Eustathius he signed the creed at the Council of Lampsacus (364).

16. From the Council of Lampsacus (364) to the Council of Sicily (365 or 366)

The Council of Lampsacus was a Homoiousian gathering which appealed to withdraw all creeds except for the one from Antioch \textit{in encaenis} (341) and “decreed that the doctrine of the Son being in substance like unto the Father, should have the ascendancy” (κρατεῖν δὲ τὸ ὄμοιον δοξάζειν τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ κατ’ οὐσίαν).\textsuperscript{344}

We know from Basil that Eustathius signed the decrees of Lampsacus.\textsuperscript{345} Unfortunately, Valens was at that time under the influence of Eudoxius, the Anomoean bishop of Constantinople.

When the deputies of the council of Lampsacus presented themselves before Valens, he merely exhorted them not to be at variance with Eudoxius. The deputies replied by reminding him of the artifices to which Eudoxius had resorted at Constantinople, and of his machinations to annul the decrees of the council of Seleucia; and these representations kindled the wrath of Valens to such a pitch, that he condemned the deputies to banishment, and made over the churches to the partisans of Eudoxius.\textsuperscript{346}

\textsuperscript{343} Socrates Scholasticus, HE III 25, 18, GCS NF 1, 227; Sozomen, HE VI 4, 3, GCS 50, 240.
\textsuperscript{344} Sozomen, HE VI 7, 4, GCS 50, 246, transl. NPNF II 2, 350.
\textsuperscript{345} Basil, \textit{Epistulae} 244, 9, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 3, 82; \textit{Epistulae} 251, 4, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 3, 92.
\textsuperscript{346} Sozomen, HE VI 7, 9, GCS 50, 246, transl. NPNF II 2, 351.
Jurgens thinks that “the exile, to which Sozomen testifies, can hardly have been effective.”  

συναχθέντες δὲ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι ἐν Λαμψάκῳ (πόλις δὲ ἔστι τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου) ἀνακεφαλαιοῦνται τὰ τῆς πίστεως ὀρθὰ δόγματα· καὶ παραθέντες τὴν πίστιν Λουκιανοῦ τοῦ μάρτυρος, ἀνεθεμάτισαν τὸ ἀνόμιον· καὶ ὑπογράφαντες τῇ πίστει τῇ προεκτεθείσῃ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, ἢρξαντο πάλιν οἱ ἐπίσκοποι ἐλαύνεσθαι καὶ ἐξορίζεσθαι, Ἐυδοξίου σὺν Αετίῳ καὶ Εὐνομίῳ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν αἰρετικῶν, τῶν τὸ ἀνόμιον πρεσβευόντων, στρατηγοῦντων.

The bishops gathered in Lampsacus (a city of the Hellespont) and drafted a summary of the orthodox doctrines of the faith. And setting out the creed of the martyr Lucian, they condemned the doctrine of “unlike.” They subscribed the creed published by the holy fathers in Nicæa and sent it to all the churches. But when the emperor Valens was drawn into the Anomoean sect almost immediately afterwards, the bishops once again began to be harried and banished; Eudoxius along with Aetius, Eunomius, and the other sectarians representing the Anomoean doctrine were behind this.

Actually, if the Homoiousians had not been banished, they would not have needed to ask Liberius for help which they did. After the Council of Lampsacus Homoiousians evidently were persecuted to that extent that they were afraid about their own lives. That is why they decided to ally with pope Liberius:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The bishops gathered in Lampsacus (a city of the Hellespont) and drafted a summary of the orthodox doctrines of the faith. And setting out the creed of the martyr Lucian, they condemned the doctrine of “unlike.” They subscribed the creed published by the holy fathers in Nicæa and sent it to all the churches. But when the emperor Valens was drawn into the Anomoean sect almost immediately afterwards, the bishops once again began to be harried and banished; Eudoxius along with Aetius, Eunomius, and the other sectarians representing the Anomoean doctrine were behind this.</th>
<th>The bishops gathered in Lampsacus (a city of the Hellespont) and drafted a summary of the orthodox doctrines of the faith. And setting out the creed of the martyr Lucian, they condemned the doctrine of “unlike.” They subscribed the creed published by the holy fathers in Nicæa and sent it to all the churches. But when the emperor Valens was drawn into the Anomoean sect almost immediately afterwards, the bishops once again began to be harried and banished; Eudoxius along with Aetius, Eunomius, and the other sectarians representing the Anomoean doctrine were behind this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actually, if the Homoiousians had not been banished, they would not have needed to ask Liberius for help which they did. After the Council of Lampsacus Homoiousians evidently were persecuted to that extent that they were afraid about their own lives. That is why they decided to ally with pope Liberius:</td>
<td>Actually, if the Homoiousians had not been banished, they would not have needed to ask Liberius for help which they did. After the Council of Lampsacus Homoiousians evidently were persecuted to that extent that they were afraid about their own lives. That is why they decided to ally with pope Liberius:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τῶν δὲ φρονούντων τὸ ὁμοούσιον σφοδρῶς τὸτε συνελαθέντων αὐθίς οἱ διώκοντες κατὰ τῶν Μακεδονιανῶν ἑχὼρουν. Οἱ δὲ φόβῳ</td>
<td>Τῶν δὲ φρονούντων τὸ ὁμοούσιον σφοδρῶς τὸτε συνελαθέντων αὐθίς οἱ διώκοντες κατὰ τῶν Μακεδονιανῶν ἑχὼρουν. Οἱ δὲ φόβῳ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

348 Philostorgius, HE VIII 8a, GCS 21, 110, transl. P.R. Amidon, 117.
μᾶλλον ἢ βία στενοχωρούμενοι κατὰ πόλεις διεπροσβεύοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους δηλοῦντες δεῖν ἐξ ἀνάγκης καταφεύγειν ἐπὶ τι τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ βασιλέας καὶ ἐπὶ Λιβέριον τὸν Ρώμης ἐτύπατον, ἀσπάζεσθαι τε τὴν ἐκείνων πίστιν μᾶλλον ἢ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς περὶ Εὐδόξιον. Πέμπουσιν οὖν Ἐυστάθιον τὸν Σεβαστείας, ὡς πολλάκις καθήκοντο, Σιλβανὸν Ταρσοῦ τῆς Κιλικίας, καὶ Θεόφιλον Κασταβάλων (Κιλικίας δὲ καὶ ἢδε πόλις), ἐντείλαμενοι μὴ διακριθήναι πρὸς Λιβέριον περὶ πίστεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ κοινωνῆσαι τῇ Ῥωμαιὸι ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ κυρώσαι τὴν τοῦ ὁμοούσιου πίστιν.

Among the delegates to the pope was Eustathius of Sebastea. Homoiosians signed the Homoousian creed explaining that “they considered the terms ‘like in all respects’ and homoousios to have precisely the same import” (μηδὲν τε διαφέρειν τοῦ ὁμοούσιον τὸ κατὰ πάντα ὁμοίον). They received a letter by Liberius admitting all Homoiosians to the ecclesiastical communion. The Homoiosian legates confirmed the Nicaean creed at the Council of Sicily. Bishops gathered in Sicily agreed to meet at the council of Tarsus to confirm the Homoousian creed and gave the delegates another letter of admission.

349 Socrates Scholasticus, HE IV 12, 2-3, GCS NF 1, 238, transl. NPNF II 2, 100; cf. Sozomen, HE VI 10, 4, GCS 50, 249.
350 Socrates Scholasticus, HE IV 12, 6, GCS NF 1, 238, transl. NPNF II 2, 100-101. The letter of delegates to Liberius: Socrates Scholasticus, HE IV 12, 10-20, GCS NF 1, 239-240; Sozomen, HE VI 11, 1-3, GCS 50, 250-251.
17. After the Council of Tyana (366)

The planned council of Tarsus was prevented by Eudoxius, but the Eastern bishops gathered in Tyana in Cappadocia, read the letters of admission by Liberius and other Western bishops and according to Basil Eustathius was restored to the bishopric of Sebastea, probably for the first time effectively after the Council of Constantinople (360):

And at Constantinople he again agreed with the proposals of the heretics. And when he had accordingly been expelled from his episcopacy on account of his former deposition at Melitine, he conceived of the visit to you as a means of restoring himself. And what it was that was proposed to him by the most blessed bishop Liberius, and what it was that he himself agreed to, we know not, except that he brought back a letter restoring him, by displaying which at the synod of Tyana he was restored to his place.

According to Basil Eustathius at some point returned to his Homoiousian believes:

Arriving at the episcopacy—to pass over the events of the interval—how many creeds they have set forth! At Ancyra one, another at Seleucia, another at Constantinople, the

---

352 Sozomen, HE VI 12, 2-3, GCS 50, 251-252.
celebrated one, at Lampsacus another, after this the one at Nice in Thrace, now again the one at Cyzicus. Of this last I only know so much as what I hear—that having suppressed “consubstantiality” they now add “like in substance,” and they subscribe with Eunomius to the blasphemies against the Holy Spirit.  

The above quoted letter comes from 376 so the last two councils (of Nice in Thrace and of Cyzicus) must have been held between 366 and 376, but there is no other source to say anything about their circumstances or character. After the Council of Sicily Eustathius disappears from the pages of the Historiae Ecclesiasticae, but we know from the letters by Basil that he was alive and active. In order to examine his activity at that time, it is necessary to analyze his relationship with Basil as his last years were marked by a sharp conflict between them.

Part III. Eustathius of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea

Chapter I. Friendship and hatred

The question of Basil’s homeland is crucial for establishing the time when he got to know Eustathius. Socrates Scholasticus says that the homeland of Basil was Caesarea in Cappadocia: he was “elevated to the bishopric of Caesarea in Cappadocia, which was his native country (τῆς ἐαυτοῦ πατρίδος).”355 Basil himself recognized Cappadocia as his fatherland as well. Except for quotation from Bible, references to paradise/heaven and 4 cases where the meaning of ἡ πατρίς is uncertain, Basil always and with no exceptions refers ἡ πατρίς (with the article) to Cappadocia and never to the any other country/homeland of anybody.356 As Y. Courtonne explains the custom of avoiding proper names and replacing them with a periphrasis is one of the characters of the rhetoric of this era.357 A fatherland (πατρίς) meant to Basil the place where somebody was born and raised as he wrote in one of his letters: “What man is so patriotic, honouring equally with his parents the fatherland which gave him birth and reared him (τὴν ἐνεγκοσάν καὶ θεσσαμένην πατρίδα), as are you yourself.”358

But, there is another oposing tradicion. According to Gregory of Nazianzus, the family of Basil’s father came from Pontus and the family of his mother was from Cappadocia – it is worth noting that Gregory refers to the homeland of the families rather than specifically of Basil’s father and mother: “On his father’s side Pontus offers to me many details, in no wise inferior to its wonders of old time, of which all history and poesy are full; there are many others concerned with this my native land, of illustrious men of Cappadocia, renowned for its youthful progeny, no

355 Socrates Scholasticus, HE IV 26, 11, GCS NF 1, 261.
356 M. Przyszchowska, Fatherland (πατρίς) in the writings of Basil of Caesarea, “Polish Journal of Political Science”.
less than for its horses. Accordingly we match with his father’s family that of his mother (Ὀθέν τῷ πατρῶῳ γένει τῷ μητρῶον ἡμεῖς ἀντανίσχομεν)

Gregory of Nazianzus says that Basil was first taught by his father, “acknowledged in those days by Pontus as its common teacher of virtue (κοινὸν παιδευτὴν ἀρετῆς ὁ Πόντος τηνικαύτα προούβαλλετο).” Gregory does not admit straightforwardly that Basil was brought up in Pontus, but the suggestion is clear enough to convince some scholars that Basil came from the province of Pontus (as well as his father). Pontus could have meant the entire diocese here, although in the same oration Gregory of Nazianzus uses the name in the narrow sense referring to the province when he described that Basil fled from Caesarea to Pontus when the conflict with Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea at that time, broke out. Also Gregory of Nyssa, Basil’s brother, mentions Pontus as his own fatherland. However, the context of those mentions is pivotal. Both statements about Pontus as his homeland come from his writings about Macrina. So, pointing out at Pontus as the fatheland of Basil (and Gregory of Nyssa) could have been a well-thought-out literary device, a part of the process of creating Macrina. The version with Pontus as the homeland of Basil could have seen reliable even in Basil’s own hometown since “Gregory was rewriting the history of Basil’s religious development, revealing a phase previously unknown to his congregation in Caesarea.”

359 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funebris in laudem Basili Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 3, SC 384, 123, transl. NPNF II 7, 396.
360 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funebris in laudem Basili Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 12, SC 384, 140; transl. NPNF II 7, 399.
361 Ph. Rousseau, Basil of Caesarea, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1998, 1: “Basil belonged to a relatively prosperous and locally prominent family in Pontus, near the Black Sea coast of Asia Minor;” A.M. Silvas, The Asketikon of St Basil the Great, Oxford - New York 2005, 1: “Basil was born in c. AD 329 to an aristocratic Christian family of Neocaesarea, the capital of Pontos Polemoniakos;” A.M. Silvas, The Asketikon of St Basil the Great, 62: “Basil lived at ‘home’ with his father, that is, in the city where his father pursued his career. All of this points to Neocaesarea, the metropolis of Pontos Polemoniakos, not to Caesarea metropolis of Cappadocia, as the family’s residence;” A.M. Silvas, Macrina the Younger. Philosopher of God, 10: “The family seat was not Caesarea of Cappadocia but the city of Neocaesarea, the metropolis of Pontus Polemoniacus;” R. van Dam, Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia, Philadelphia 2003, 9: “Basil had been raised in Pontus.”
362 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funebris in laudem Basili Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 29, SC 384, 190.
363 Gregory of Nyssa, Epistulae 19, 10, GNO 8/2, 65; Vita sanctae Macrinae 15, GNO 8/1, 387.
In Letter 210 to the learned in Neocaesarea Basil himself admits his acquaintance with the region from his childhood (διὰ τὴν ἐκ παιδός μοι πρὸς τὸ χωρίον τούτο συνήθειαν), because he was brought up there by his grandmother (ἐνταύθα γὰρ ἐτράφην παρὰ τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ τῇθῃ). The context of the letter is crucial. During the conflict with Atarbius, bishop of Neocaesarea, in 376, Basil addresses a letter to the laity of the city and by referring to his grandmother legitimizes himself as a lawful heir of “the tradition of the truly great Gregory Thaumaturgus and of those who followed after him up to the blessed Musonius.”

There is one hint that indicates that Basil was really brought up in Cappadocia: in Letter 37 without an address on behalf of a foster brother. “For I admit that I have many friends and relatives in my country (ἐπὶ τῆς πατρίδος), and that I myself have been appointed to the position of a father (εἰς τὴν πατρικὴν τάξιν) by reason of this station to which the Lord has appointed me. But I have only one foster brother, this man who is the son of the woman who nursed me, and I pray that the household in which I was brought up may remain at its old assessment.”

πατρικὴ τάξις refers or to the presbyterate, or to the episcopate – Basil obtained both in Caesarea in Cappadocia. As his wet-nurse lived in Cappadocia, he must have been nursed here, not in Pontus.

According to Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil “when sufficiently trained at home [...] set out for the city of Caesarea, to take his place in the schools there (Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἵκανὸς εἰς τῇ ἐνταύθα παιδεύσεως, [...] ἐπὶ τὴν Καισαρεόν πόλιν ἐπεϊγεταί, τῶν τῇδε μεθέξων παιδευτηρίων).” At some point, in Caesarea Basil got to know Eustathius, later bishop of Sebastea. Eustathius himself was ordained priest by Hermogenes, bishop of Caesarea, and Eustathius’ father Eulalius was bishop of Caesarea later on. It must be assumed that he came from Caesarea or at least spent there his youth. Basil himself confirms that he and Eustathius knew

---

368 J.R. Pouchet, Basile le Grand et son univers d’amis d’après sa correspondance, 186.
369 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funebris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 13, SC 384, 142, transl. NPNF II 7, 399.
each other from his childhood (ἐκ παιδός): he had “an intimacy with the man which dates from childhood (τῆς ἐκ παιδός συνθείας τῆς ύπαρχούσης μοι πρὸς τόν ἄνδρα)” and he “from boyhood had performed such a service for a certain person” (ὁ τοιώδες δουλεύσας ἐκ παιδός τῷ δείπνῳ) in both cases meaning Eustathius of Sebastea whom the letters concern. According to the classical Ancient division of human life παις was a second stage from seven to fourteen.

According to Gregory of Nazianzus, after attending a school in Caesarea, Basil went do Constantinople where he was trained in sophistry and philosophy and then went to Athens. Rousseau and Fedwick state that Basil was in Athens between 349 and 355. The point of reference that is usually used to date his studies is that he became acquainted with Julian who studied in Athens in the summer and fall of 355. But, as Gribomont noted, Basil’s meeting with Julian is attested only by the mutual correspondence of doubtful authorship.

In Letter 1 addressed to Eustathius the philosopher, Basil admits that he left Athens “owing to the repute of your philosophy (Ἐγὼ κατέλιπον τὰς Αθήνας κατὰ φήμην τῆς σῆς φιλοσοφίας).” The identity of that Eustathius was uncertain until 1959 when Jean Gribomont in his famous article established that it was Eustathius of Sebastea. Gribomont dated this letter for 357 on the basis of events that Eustathius of Sebastea was involved in.
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373 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funebris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcoporum), 14, SC 384, 146.
374 P.J. Fedwick, A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea, 6; Ph. Rousseau, Basil of Caesarea, 28.
376 Basil, Ἐπιστολαι 1, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, 3; transl. R.J. Deferrari, vol. 1, 3.
377 J. Gribomont, Eustathe le philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée, 115-124. Tillemont (L.S. Tillemont, Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles, vol. 9, Paris 1703, 810) was convinced that Eustathius that Basil followed was the famous Eustathius the philosopher. Fatti (F. Fatti, Eustazio di Sebaste, Eustazio filosofo, 443-473) advanced the thesis that Eustathius the philosopher and Eustathius of Sebastea could have been one and the same person – I have discussed this thesis in Chapter 1 of Part II.
378 J. Gribomont, Eustathe le philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée, 120.
While in Athens Basil received a message/report (φήμη) on Eustathius’ ascetic practice (φιλοσοφία) and decided to join him. It seems that Eustathius became an ascetic while Basil was out of Caesarea. As it appears from Letter 1 by Basil, Basil and Eustathius remained in contact when Basil was studying in Athens as his letter is an answer to that of Eustathius.

It is significant that even in the panegyric to the honour of Basil Gregory of Nazianzus mentions that his departure caused conflict between two friends:

Ἐνταύθα τι κατηγορήσω μὲν ἐμαυτοῦ, κατηγορήσω δὲ τῆς θείας ἐκείνης καὶ ἀληττοῦ ψυχῆς, εἰ καὶ τολμηρὸν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ, τὰς αἰτίας εἰπὼν τῆς περὶ τὴν ἐπανοδὸν φιλονεικίας, κρείττων ὡρθῆ τῶν κατεχόντων· καὶ βιὰ μὲν, συνεχωρῆθη δ’ οὖν ὁμοὶ τὴν ἐκδημιὰν· ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπελείφθην Αὐθήνης· τὸ μὲν τι μαλακισθεῖς, εἰρήσεται γὰρ τάληθές, τὸ δὲ τι προδοθεῖς παρ’ ἐκείνου, πεισθέντος ἀφείναι μη ἀφιέντα καὶ παραχωρῆσαι τοῖς ἐλκουσί. Πράγμα, πρὸν γενέσθαι, μὴ πιστεύομεν· γίνεται γὰρ ὡσπερ ἐνός σώματος εἰς δύο τομῆ καὶ ἀμφοτέρων νέκρωσις, ἢ μόσχων

And here I will bring an accusation against myself, and also, daring though it be, against that divine and irreproachable soul. For he, by detailing the reasons of his anxiety to return home, was able to prevail over their desire to retain him, and they were compelled, though with reluctance, to agree to his departure. But I was left behind at Athens, partly, to say the truth, because I had been prevailed on—partly because he had betrayed me, having been persuaded to forsake and hand over to his captors one who refused to forsake him. A thing incredible, before it happened. For it was like cutting one body into two, to the destruction of either part, or the severance of two bullocks who have shared the same manger and the same

379 Malingrey claims that the three Cappadocian Fathers integrated the term φιλοσοφία into the Christian language as a designation of the ascetic way of life. A.-M. Malingrey, Philosophia. Étude d’un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des Présocratiques au IVe siècle après J.-C., Paris 1961, 234.
380 Basil, Epistulae 1, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, 3, transl. R.J. Deferrari, vol. 1, 3; “you revived my spirit and consoled me wonderfully by your letter (θαυμαστῶς πως ἀνεκαλέσω καὶ παραμεθῇσα τοῖς γράμμασι).”
Silvas claims that the reason why Basil left Athens was the death of his brother Naucratius – the cause of “the anxiety to return home.” But, Basil himself testifies that he left Athens because of Eustathius. It is easy to explain why Gregory of Nazianzus passed over the reason of Basil’s departure. He never mentioned Eustathius in any of his writings – he clearly opposed his way of practicing asceticism. The way that was followed by Basil and became a bone of contention between Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil.

Basil left Athens and came back to his homeland (Caesarea) via Constantinople. In Letter 1, Basil states:

Yet when I reached the fatherland, and searching there for you, my great help, found you not, from that time on and ever since I have encountered many varied experiences which have put unexpected obstacles in my way.

According to Gregory of Nazianzus Basil went from Athens to Caesarea, so clearly πατρίς was Caesarea to him. It is significant that Basil expected to meet Eustathius in Caesarea not elsewhere – it must have been his usual place of stay.

Basil excuses himself why he stayed in Caesarea enumerating the “obstacles” that prevented him from meeting Eustathius:

For either I had to be sick and consequently to miss seeing you or I


383 See Part IV. Epilogue.


ἑῶαν βαδίζοντι συναπάρειν μὴ δύνασθαι.

found myself unable to join you as you set out for the Orient. 386

Most scholars claim that he was teaching rhetoric in Caesarea, 387 while Gribomont refuses that possibility. 388 Whatever Basil did, Gregory of Nazianzus confirms that “the city of Caesarea took possession of him (τὸν ἦ ἡ Καισαρείων κατέχει πόλις).” 389 So, Basil must have spent some time there and then travelled to Syria and Egypt following Eustathius. 390 When he was writing his Letter 1 in Alexandria, Eustathius apparently was nearby – in the same country (ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς χώρας) but they could not meet because of a prolonged sickness of Basil. 391

On the way from Egypt Basil visited Palestine, Coele-Syria and Mesopotamia where he had an opportunity to observe life of the ascetics. 392 Basil confessed in a letter to Eustathius of Sebastea:

On this account, then, having perceived some in my fatherland (ἐπὶ τῆς πατρίδος) trying to imitate the example of those men, I believed that I had found an aid to my own salvation. 393

Again, Gregory of Nazianzus gives us the external reference confirming that it was Caesarea not Pontus. Gregory describes a conflict between Basil and the then bishop of Caesarea and states that some ascetics “who have separated themselves from the world and consecrated their life to God” (οἱ κόσμου χωρίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν βίον καθιερώσαντες) 394 went over to Basil’s side. With

---

388 J. Gribomont, Eustathe le philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée, 121.
389 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funeris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopō), 25, SC 384, 182, transl. NPNF II 7, 404.
390 Basil, Epistolae 1, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, 4.
391 Basil, Epistolae 1, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, 4.
394 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funeris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopō), 28, SC 384, 188, transl. NPNF II 7, 405.
Gregory’s advice Basil “set out from the place into Pontus, and presided over the abodes of contemplation there.” According to Fatti in 362 Basil, already a priest, tried to become bishop of Caesarea and did his best to depose the newly appointed bishop – Eusebius. Basil “was then the leader of the Eustathian monks in the city.” When Basil arrived to Caesarea from his journey from Athens, Egipt, Palestine, Cœle-Syria and Mesopotamia, Eustathius must had been already ordained bishop of Sebastea. The monks he met in Caesarea might have been Eustathius’ disciples and apparently Basil joined them.

Between Basil’s return to Caesarea from his “ascetical” journey and the conflict with Eusebius (elected bishop in 362) an event took place which Gregory of Nazianzus did not mention. Namely, the Council of Constantinople (359) the first of two according to Kopeczek (the second one was in January 360). Philostorgius stresses the importance of Basil of Ancyr and Eustathius of Sebastea, who “headed the group representing the doctrine of like in substance” and debated with Aetius. There is no doubt that Basil as a deacon was present at the Council of Constantinople as a part of the Homoiousian group; his presence is confirmed not only by Philostorgius (HE IV 12), but also by Gregory of Nyssa. He admitted that Eunomius accused “our tutor and father” that “when the decision transfers power to the opposition he flees the places having deserted his post.” As Kopeczek rightly pointed out: “Since Gregory of Nyssa did not challenge Eunomius accusation, it must have been substantially accurate.”

It is clear that Basil and Eustathius cooperated not only on ascetical, but also on dogmatic level. Basil himself testifies that he was a kind of Eustathius’ dogmatic think-tank: before Eustathius went to Lampsacus (364) he had consulted Basil.

---

395 Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio 43* (*Funebris in laudem Basili Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi*), 29, SC 384, 190, transl. NPNF II 7, 405.
399 Philostorgius, HE IV 12, GCS 21, 64, transl. P.R. Amidon, 71.
400 Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium I*, 79, GNO 1, 49; transl. S.G. Hall, 47.
Ask yourself: How often did you visit us in the monastery on the river Iris, when, moreover, our most divinely-favoured brother Gregory was present with me, achieving the same purpose in life as myself? Did you ever hear any such thing? Did you receive any suggestion of it, small or great? And at Eusinoe, when you, about to set out for Lampsacus with several bishops, summoned me, was not our conversation about faith? And all the time were not your short-hand writers present as I dictated objections to the heresy? Were not the most faithful of your disciples in my presence the whole time?

The writing against the heresy (τὰ πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν) that Basil is mentioning was most probably *Adversus Eunomium*. Eusinoe is usually identified with Eusene - a town of Pontus, not far from the coast, a little to the northwest of Amisus (Samsun).

Having been ordained bishop of Caesarea Basil received a letter from Eustathius (not preserved) and in his answer praises Eustathius as his supporter and shield-fellow (παραστάτην καὶ συνασπιστήν) who gives him a spiritual help in the battles for the faith. In 372 Eustathius and Basil together with other 30 bishops signed a letter to the Italians and Gauls asking them for help against the heresy. In 373 Eustathius signed the confession of faith formulated by Basil.

---

But shortly after that the relationship between Basil and Eustathius changed from close and devoted friendship to open hatred. Eustathius charged Basil with Sabellianism and supporting Appolinarius of Laodicea; Basil gave as good as he got and accused Eustathius of Arianism and denying the deity of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{406} Both charges might have been only slanders. In order to validate them I shall analyse in detail the ascetical similarities between Basil and Eustathius and try to answer the question whether Eustathius was Pneumatomachos. Then, I shall present the thesis that the true reason of the conflict was administrative: Basil acted as a metropolitan of Pontus and appointed bishops in Armenia Minor which Eustathius must have perceived as encroaching on his territory.

\section*{Chapter II. Ascetical issues}

It is obvious but not always taken into account that we have no direct access to Eustathius’ ascetical ideas. The only preserved sources are the synodical letter and canons of the Council of Gangra (358 according to my dating) that condemned some aspects of asceticism connected to Eustathius, but it is not clear whether the canons of Gangra referred to Eustathius himself or to his disciples. The synodical letter is ambiguous; although it states that the Council examined the matters which concern Eustathius (ζητομένων καὶ τῶν κατ’ Εὐστάθιον), the charges seem to refer to his disciples – partisans of Eustathius who violated ecclesiastical discipline (πολλὰ ἁθέσμως γινόμενα ὑπὸ τούτων αὐτῶν τῶν περὶ Εὐστάθιον).\textsuperscript{407}

1. Exceptions

The case becomes even more complicated as individualism was one of the main characteristics of this asceticism – the feature that was emphasized by the synodical letter of the Council of Gangra:

\begin{quote}

| ἕκαστος γὰρ αὐτῶν, ἐπειδὴ τοῦ κανόνος τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ ἔξηλθεν, ὥσπερ νόμους ἰδιαζόντας ἐσχεν οὔτε |

\end{quote}

For each of them, upon leaving the rule of the church, became, as it were, a law unto himself. For there is

The individualism of Eustathian asceticism needs to be explained carefully. Silvas thinks that “Basil inculcates an obedience diametrically opposed to the independent if not to say arrogant manner of the enthusiasts.” To prove her thesis she evokes places where Basil speaks about personal obedience to the superior of the community.

Basil’s idea of obedience is something different from blind carrying out orders of a superior. The analysis by J. Gribomont has shown that in Basil both being a superior and being obedient in the community are special charismas. Basil treats the community as one body that has as a scope to fulfill God’s will towards the community and each of its member. Obedience to a superior is a fundament of the life of the community – a member must obey decision of a superior regarding his activities and duties. Basil claims that “self-control does not consist in abstinence from irrational foods, resulting in the severity to the body condemned by the Apostle, but in complete secession from one’s own will” and warns about a danger of giving new adepts a possibility to choose between communities as “they suffer harm through pride of intellect, because they are not conforming to what is being taught them, but are becoming accustomed to sit as habitual judges and critics of the community.” Nevertheless, he allows a possibility of leaving the community:

---

411 Basil, Regulae brevius tractatae 74, 96, 105, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125; Regulae fusius tractatae 7.
Certainly, those who have made an irrevocable and reciprocal promise to live together cannot leave at will, inasmuch as their not persevering in what they have pledged comes from one of two causes: either from the wrongs suffered in living the common life or from an unsteadiness of resolution in him who is changing his course.  

Basil adds some conditions to be fulfilled if the reason of leaving is the misbehavior of brothers, such as making an open charge, but if it does not help “he may withdraw. In acting thus, he will not be separating himself from brethren but from strangers.” The possibility of disobedience is also allowed if the superior orders something contrary to the divine commandments:

Therefore, whatever is said in accordance with the Lord’s commandment or is directed to the Lord’s commandment, we must obey, even if it seems to hold a threat of death; but we must in no way pay heed to anything that is contrary to the commandment or hinders the commandment, not even if an angel from heaven or one of the apostles should enjoin it, whether promising life or threatening death.

---

Although obedience to the superior is one of the most important features of Basil’s community, the final resort is always a conscience and individual judgement of everyone. On the other hand, communities can differ one from another depending on the charisma of a leader as his role is to discern God’s will and each superior can do it individually.417

However, the synodical letter of the Council of Gangra does not refer to that kind of obedience. It clearly concerns Church regulations (τοῦ κανόνος τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ) and indicates that some ascetical behaviours act to the detriment of the Church (ἐπὶ διαβολὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας). Disobedience to the community’s superior can harm the community or the disobedient, but not the Church.

Acting against the regulation was what the synodical letter describes with an expression “as if he had his own laws” (ὡσπερ νόμους ἰδιάζοντας ἐσχέν). Those exceptions, own laws seem to be very pious as they stress the necessity of piety and prudence. The Council of Gangra condemns that motivation which at first glance seems to be praiseworthy; canons described it as: “under pretence of asceticism” (διὰ νομιζόμενην ἁσκήσιν),418 “for the sake of asceticism” (προφάσει τῆς ἁσκῆσιας),419 “for the sake of piety” (προφάσει θεοσεβείας),420 “under pretence of piety” (διὰ νομιζόμενην θεοσέβειαν),421 “because of his perfect understanding in the matter” (ἐπικυρωθέντος ἐν αὐτῷ τελείου λόγισμοῦ),422 “from a presumptuous disposition” (ὑπερηφάνω διαθέσει).423

The individualism the synodical letter is talking about might have referred to two aspects: acting independently of ecclesiastical hierarchy and individual interpretation of the Holy Scripture at variance with official interpretation of the Church. Those two characteristics cause that all attempts of looking for a consistent ascetical system in Basil’s writings – the system that would prove Eustathius’

417 J. Gribomont, Obéissance et Évangile selon Saint Basile le Grand, 214: “Le rôle du proœstwòς n’ira jamais pourtant jusqu’à incarner l’autorité divine, à donner une valeur religieuse aux actions indifférentes; il consiste seulement à discerner, selon une ligne prophétique, quelle est sur chacun la volonté de Dieu.”
419 Canones Synodi Gangrensis, canon 15, ed. P.P. Joannou, 95.
421 Canones Synodi Gangrensis, canon 17, ed. P.P. Joannou, 96.
422 Canones Synodi Gangrensis, canon 19, ed. P.P. Joannou, 97.
423 Canones Synodi Gangrensis, canon 20, ed. P.P. Joannou, 97.
influence on Basil – are foredoomed to failure. And that is probably why scholars differ so much in estimating that influence – from stating that Basil was more or less faithful imitator of Eustathius\textsuperscript{424} to claiming that his asceticism was “aimed at weaning Pontic ascetic communities from vestiges of Eustathius’ influence.”\textsuperscript{425}

Looking for differences between Basil teaching and ideas condemned in Gangra is pointless – those differences could be the best proof that Basil followed Eustathius’ principle of individualism. The only way to find out whether Basilian asceticism had Eustathian features is to check whether it positively contained any of those condemned ideas. That is why I will not point out characteristics that differ Basil from asceticism condemned in Gangra, but only the ones that coincide.

Silvas claims that Basil “promotes collaboration with local church authorities that distributions of property are to be entrusted to ‘those who preside over the local churches’, that is, the local bishop or his deputy.”\textsuperscript{426} The evoked quotation comes from \textit{Regulae brevius tractatae} 187. If Basil had put a full stop here, Silvas would be perfectly right, but this is not the end of the phrase. Basil adds: “if he is faithful and capable of prudent administration” (ἐὰν ἤ πιστός, καὶ φρονίμως οἰκονομεῖν δυνάμενος).\textsuperscript{427} This is the core of Eustathian asceticism. Hierarchs could have been obeyed if they were devout and prudent. If not, Basil gives an ascetic the right to act independently, according to his own judgment, although this acting would be against Church regulations (τοῦ κανόνος τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ), as the rule established in Gangra allows no exceptions:

\begin{align*}
\text{Εἰ τις καρποφορίας ἐκκλησιαστικάς ἐθέλει ἐξωθεῖν τῆς ἐκκλησίας} & \quad \text{If anyone wishes to receive or give church funds outside the church,}\n\text{contrary to the will of the bishop or}\n\end{align*}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{426} A.M. Silvas, \textit{The Asketikon of St Basil the Great}, 26.
\item \textsuperscript{427} Basil, \textit{Regulae brevius tractatae} 187, PG 31, 1208; trans. A.M. Silvas, in: \textit{The Asketikon of St Basil the Great}, 376.
\end{itemize}
the one entrusted with such matters, and wishes to act without his consent, let such a one be anathema.428

Basil orders that “all bound slaves who flee to religious communities for refuge should be admonished and sent back to their masters”429 – seemingly in accordance with canon 3 of the Council of Gangra which stated:

If, under pretext of piety, anyone teaches a slave to despise his master and to withdraw from service and not to serve his master to the utmost with good will and all honor, let such a one be anathema.430

But Basil adds an exception as the Council of Gangra named it – “under pretext of piety”:

If, however, it should be the case of a wicked master who gives unlawful commands and forces the slave to transgress the command of the true Master, our Lord Jesus Christ, then it is our duty to oppose him, that the Name of God be not blasphemed by that slave’s performing an act displeasing to God.431

Basil’s teaching on the reception of married persons and slaves into the ascetic community has been considered by some scholars as very similar to the

positions condemned by the Council of Gangra.\textsuperscript{432} On the contrary, Silvas sees in those rules “new measures” that constitute Basil’s answers to the concerns of the Council of Gangra with only some exceptions that for her have no importance.\textsuperscript{433} In my opinion, those exceptions are the main characteristics of Eustathian asceticism as the regulations of the Council of Gangra provided no exceptions.

Another example of exception allowed by Basil is connected to canon 6 of the Council of Gangra:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{p{0.6\textwidth}p{0.4\textwidth}}
| ζ. Περί τῶν τὰς λειτουργίας ἐξω τῶν ἐκκλησίων ποιουμένων. & Canon VI. \\
| Εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδία ἐκκλησιάζων καταφρονών τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑθέλω πράττειν, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. & If anyone assembles outside the church on his or her own initiative and, despising the church, desires to perform church functions in the absence of a presbyter who conforms to the judgment of the bishop, let such a one be anathema.\textsuperscript{434} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

It is obvious that according to the Council there could have been no exception, but Basil did allow an exception – he says it is absolutely impermissible to celebrate the Eucharist in the private house unless it is necessary (ἐκτός εἰ μὴ ἐν ἀνάγκῃ).\textsuperscript{435} Again, the necessity was to be stated by individual judgment probably of the superior of the community.

In the Epilogue bishops gathered in Gangra summarized that concept of asceticism:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{p{0.6\textwidth}p{0.4\textwidth}}
| Ταῦτα δὲ γράφομεν οὐκ ἐκκόπτοντες τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἀσκεῖσθαι βουλομένους, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἔστω | We write these things not to cut off those in the church of God who wish to practice asceticism according to the Scriptures but [to cut off] those who undertake the practice of asceticism to \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{432} W.K. Lowther Clarke, \textit{St Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism}, Cambridge 1913, 162; T.G. Kardong, \textit{Who was Basil’s mentor? Part 1}, 197.


\textsuperscript{435} Basil, \textit{Regulae brevius tractatae} 310, PG 31, 1304.
Basil’s asceticism is obviously based on the Scriptures, but in some circumstances it refuses to obey ecclesiastical canons “under the pretence of asceticism”. In *De iudicio Dei* Basil straightforwardly describes the scope of his ascetical writing: that we turn away from habits of our own will and from “discernment of human tradition” (τῆς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παραδόσεων παρατηρήσεως) and that we behave according to the Gospel.437

2. *Style of dressing*

Style of dressing was clearly one of the crucial indicators of Eustathian asceticism. Canon 13 of the Council of Gangra condemns women who adopted men’s clothing, but there are no indicators that Basil recommended that custom to anyone. The question of dressing Eustathius and Basil themselves is much more complicated.

In the Synodical Letter the Council stated that Eustathians “wear strange dresses to the downfall of the common mode of dress” (ξένα ἀμφίασμα ἐπί καταπτώσει κοινότητος τῶν ἀμφιασμάτων συνάγοντες).438 ἀμφίασμα means nothing specific but “garment”. Canon 12 of the Council of Gangra refers again to men’s clothing and reads as follows:

| Canon XII. | ΙΒ. Περὶ τῶν περιβολαίων χρωμένων καὶ καταφρονοῦντων τῶν βήμους φοροῦντων. |

---

437 Basil, *De iudicio Dei*, PG 31, 676.
If, because of presumed asceticism, any man wear the periboleum and, claiming that one has righteousness because of this, pronounces judgment against those who with reverence wear the berus and make use of other common and customary clothing, let him be anathema.\textsuperscript{439}

The term περιβόλαιον does not mean any specific robe or garment, but according to Liddell-Scott Lexicon “that which is thrown round, covering”, according to Lampe Lexicon it was a cloak. In the text it is opposed to βήρος.

“Birrus/byrrus - A waterproof cloak of Gallic origin: modern authors have speculated that it was similar to the sagum, lacerna or paenula, but there is insufficient evidence to support any of these, and the birrus has not been unequivocally identified in artistic representations. It may have had a hood (cucullus) and seems to have been made in a range of different qualities (SHA Carinus 20.6 implies good quality, whereas Code of Theodosius 14.10.1 says slaves might wear it). The word appears quite late, being unused in extant literature before the second century AD, but was quite common throughout the Roman world by AD 300. In the Church Fathers the birrus is worn by the clergy.”\textsuperscript{440} Although the canon itself does not mention clergy, but the term βήρος indicates that the problem of the inappropriate dressing concerned priests. That interpretation is confirmed by Sozomen’s account. He states that Eustathius himself or his followers “did not retain the customary tunics and stoles (χιτώνας συνήθεις καὶ στολάς) for their dress, but used a strange and unwonted garb (ξένη καὶ ἄθεται ἐσθήτη)”\textsuperscript{441} and after the Council of Gangra

\textsuperscript{439} Canones Synodi Gangrensis, canon 12, ed. P.P. Joannou, 94, transl. O.L. Yarbrough, 452–453.
\textsuperscript{441} Sozomen, HE III 14, 33, GCS 50, 123, transl. NPNF II 2, 293.
Eustathius exchanged his stole, and made his journeys habited like other priests, thus proving that he had not introduced and practiced these novelties out of self-will, but for the sake of a godly asceticism.442

στολή was “generally, equipment, outfit, especially clothes, so garments in general.” Similar charge occurred in Socrates’ account on the deposition of Eustathius by his father – according to my dating some 5-8 years before the Council of Gangra. Socrates claims that Eulalius deposed him because of dressing a stole inappropiate for the priesthood (ἀνάμοιστον τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ στολῆν).444 Up to this point no source has specified what kind of dress Eustathius wore. There is also no clear distinction between Eustathius himself and his followers. The only account that specifies a type of that dress is the one by Socrates:

Αὐτὸς τε φιλοσόφου σχῆμα φορῶν καὶ τοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας αὐτῷ ἐξὴν στολὴ χρήσθαι ἐποίει.

He himself wore the habit of a philosopher, and induced his followers to adopt a new and extraordinary garb.445

It must have been Socrates’ interpretation of Gangra’s decrees unless he had some additional documentation. Some scholars think that Socrates thought of the dress of an ascetic / a habit as the term φιλοσοφία at that time frequently occurred in a technical sense of an ascetic or monastic life.446 However, Socrates uses the noun φιλόσοφος exclusively with reference to Pagan philosophers.447 On the basis of

442 Sozomen, HE III 14, 36, GCS 50, 124, transl. NPNF II 2, 294 with alterations.
443 L. Cleland, G. Davies, L. Llewellyn-Jones, Greek and Roman Dress from A to Z, 182.
444 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 1, GCS NF 1, 180.
445 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 4, GCS NF 1, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 72.
447 Meropius and Metrodoros (HE I 19, 3, GCS NF 1, 61), Ancient philosophers in general (HE I 7, 9, GCS NF 1, 17; HE II 35, 8, GCS NF 1, 150; HE III 7, 20, GCS NF 1, 199; HE III 23, 13, GCS NF 1, 220; HE IV 25, 5, GCS NF 1, 259; HE IV 26, 8, GCS NF 1, 260; HE VII 2, 3, GCS NF 1, 348; HE VII 27, 4, GCS NF 1, 376), Maximus (HE III 1, 16, GCS NF 1, 188; HE V 21, 2, GCS NF 1, 295), Socrates (HE III 16, 20, GCS NF 1, 212; HE III 23, 12, GCS NF 1, 220), Plato and Xenophon.
above-quoted excerpt, some scholars claim that Eustathius wore τριβών – a short cloak traditionally connected to the outfit of philosophers. Socrates clearly associated τριβών specifically with Pagan philosophers. He used that term only three times, in all of the cases τριβών is for him an attribute of a Pagan philosopher. Describing actions of Julian he states:

Ἐτίμα δὲ καὶ τούς περὶ παιδείαν ἔστουδακότας, μάλιστα δὲ τούς ἐπαγγελλομένους φιλοσοφεῖν. 56. Διό καὶ τοὺς πανταχὴ <τοιούτους> ἤγεν ἡ φήμη βραβάζοντας ἐπὶ τὰ βασίλεια· οἱ φοροῦντες τοὺς τρίβωνας πολλοὶ ἐκ τοῦ σχήματος μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκ παιδείας ἐδείκνυντο, πάντες δὲ ἦσαν βαρεῖς τοῖς χριστιανικός, ἀνδρεῖς ἀπατεώνες καὶ ἀεὶ τοῦ κρατοῦντος οἰκειούμενοι τὴν θρησκείαν.

Describing Jovian’s actions against Pagans, he adds: “The philosophers also laid aside their palliums, and clothed themselves in ordinary attire (οἵ τε τριβωνοφόροι τοὺς τρίβωνας ἀπετίθεντο <τότε> καὶ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν σχῆμα μετημφιέννυντο”). The most interesting here is that he calls Pagan philosophers “those who wear tribon” (οἵ τριβωνοφόροι). The third time, Socrates uses the term τριβών with reference to Silvanus bishop of Troas formerly of Philippopolis:

To those who were eminent for literary attainments, he extended the most flattering patronage, and especially to those who were professional philosophers; in consequence of which, abundance of pretenders to learning of this sort resorted to the palace from all quarters, wearing their palliums, being more conspicuous for their costume than their erudition. These impostors, who invariably adopted the religious sentiments of their prince, were all inimical to the welfare of the Christians.

(HE III 23, 13, GCS NF 1, 220), Empedocles (HE I 22, 2, GCS NF 1, 66), Pagan philosophers around Julian and Julian himself as a Pagan (HE III 1, GCS NF 1, 187-193), Marc Aurelius (HE III 23, 14, GCS NF 1, 220), Themistius (HE IV 32, 2, GCS NF 1, 268), Andragathius (HE VI 3, 1, GCS NF 1, 313), Theon and Hypatia (HE VII 15, 1, GCS NF 1, 360).

449 Socrates Scholasticus, HE III 1, 55-56, GCS NF 1, 192, transl. NPNF II 2, 94.
450 Socrates Scholasticus, HE III 24, 6, GCS NF 1, 225, transl. NPNF II 2, 94.
“Silvanus was formerly a rhetorician, and had been brought up in the school of Troilus the sophist; but aiming at perfection in his Christian course, he entered on the ascetic mode of life, and set aside the rhetorician’s pallium (τρίβωνα φορεῖν οὐ προήρητο).” 451

So, it can be stated with certainty that Socrates interpreted the text of Gangra’s regulations or knew it from other sources that Eustathius wore τρίβων. He might have used the expression φιλοσόφου σχήμα instead of indicating τρίβων as in Roman world “‘dress was not limited to clothing, but also includes hairstyles, shaving habits, jewelry, and other accessories.’” 452 Anyway, in Socrates it is clearly an insult since he treated Pagan philosophers as enemies of the Christians.

The question is whether it was Socrates’ interpretation only or what bishops gathered in Gangra condemned was indeed wearing τρίβων by priests. Urbano claims: “Socrates writes that Eustathius dressed in the philosopher’s mantle (αὐτός τε φιλοσόφου σχήμα φορῶν) and prescribed an otherwise undescribed ‘strange raiment’ (ξένη στολή) for his followers. This latter, called the περιβόλαιον in the Acts of the Council of Gangra, was probably not the same tribon worn by Eustathius. Socrates seems to distinguish Eustathius’ dress from that of his followers. Instead, Eustathius probably reserved the tribon for himself as a marker of both pedagogical and moral authority in his role as leader of the community.” 453 I am not convinced that Socrates distinguished between Eustathius’ dressing and the one of his disciples. The bishops gathered in Gangra must have considered τρίβων as a strange garment (ξένη στολή) for priests. Fatti thinks that bishops condemned it as “foreign” to the Church, because it expressed a universe of values, and a type of authority, which had little to do with those of the Christianity and its leaders. 454 In the Cappadocian environment some 50 years before Socrates (at least among Cappadocian Fathers) τρίβων usually had no pejorative connotation, but was a

451 Socrates Scholasticus, HE VII 37, 1, GCS NF 1, 386, transl. NPNF II 2, 173-174.
454 F. Fatti, Eustazio di Sebaste, Eustazio filosofo, 460-461.
distinction of a rhetor as profession. Only once, Gregory of Nazianzus says that God wanted to punish the arrogance of Greeks who considered those who wore τρίβων and a beard as good (οἳ τῷ τρίβωνι καὶ τῇ ύπηνη τὸ σεμνὸν ύποδύονται).

In a praising tone, he states that Basil wore “single tunic and well-worn cloak (ἐν χιτώνιον καὶ τριβώνιον).” Gregory expresses no astonishment or indignation because of that fact. Between the Council of Gangra (358) and the death of Basil (378–379) people might have got used to bishops worn in τρίβων of the philosophers/rhetors. Or, τρίβων might have been concerned as inappropriate for priests/bishops only in some circles. Moreover, τρίβων apparently was not so technical term as we think and had some synonyms. In 5th – 6th century, Hezychius defined τρίβων as στολή with signes as ornament (στολή ἔχουσα σημεία ὡς γάμμα) and τριβώνιον (diminutive used by Gregory of Nazianzus in reference with Basil) as πάλλιον, περιβόλαιον. Here we are – περιβόλαιον is the term used by the Council of Ganga in canon 12.

Basil himself never mentions τρίβων either as his own dress or the one recommended for ascetics. In Letter 223 to Eustathius of Sebastea he admits that he himself used the thick cloak and the girdle (τὸ παχὺ ἰμάτιον καὶ ἡ ζώνη). “an outer garment, it tends to be worn over a tunic, although men frequently wear it alone, revealing part of the chest, shoulders and one arm. [...] It became the Roman pallium and continued to be associated with the Greek world.

455 In such a meaning Gregory of Nazianzus used that term in the Oratio 43 (Funeris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 17, SC 384, 158; Epistulae 98, 1, GCS 53, 80; Carmina moralia, PG 37, 697.
456 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 25 (In laudem Heronis philosophi), 5, SC 284, 166.
457 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funeris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 61, SC 384, 258.
and intellectual activity.”

So, it can definitely describe the same thing as the term τρίβων.

In Letter 2 Basil mentions χιτών as the only dress of the ascetic, claiming that “the tunic ought to be of such thickness that it will require no auxiliary garment to keep the wearer warm.” He praises virtues of the ascetic life claiming that the soul “is dragged down no more by thought of food nor anxiety concerning coats (πρὸς περιβολαίων μέριμναν).” On the other hand, when Basil distances himself from “anxiety concerning coats” he wants to stress his own modest and ascetical approach to the dress. In a long disquisition, he explains that way of dressing is extremely important for the ascetic:

Χρήσιμον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐσθήτου ἰδίωμα προκηρυττούσης ἐκαστον, καὶ προδιαμαστρομένης τὸ ἐπαγγέλμα τῆς κατὰ Θεόν ζωῆς ὡστε ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὴν πράξει παρὰ τῶν συντυχανόντων ἢμιν ἀπαιτεῖσθαι. Οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως τὸ ἀπρεπές καὶ ἀσχημόνον ἐν τοῖς τυχοῦσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς μεγάλα ὑπερσχυμένοις διαφαίνεται. Δημότην μὲν γὰρ, ἢ τινα τῶν τυχόντων διδόντα πληγὰς ἢ λαμβάνοντα δημοσία, καὶ φωνᾶς ἀπρεπεῖς ἀφιέντα, καὶ ἐν καπηλείοις διαιτῶμεν, καὶ ἀλλὰ παραπλήσια τούτως ἀσχημονοῦντα, οὐκ ἂν τις ὑδίως οὐδὲ παρατηρήσειεν,

This distinctiveness in dress is also useful as giving advance notice of each of us, by proclaiming our profession of the devout life. Actions in conformity with this profession are, in consequence, expected from us by those whom we meet. The standard of indecorous and unseemly conduct is not the same for ordinary folk as for those who make profession of great aspirations. No one would take particular notice of the man in the street who would inflict blows on a passerby or publicly suffer them himself, or who would use obscene language, or loiter in the shops, or commit other unseemly actions of

---

μονούντα, οὐκ ἂν τις ὀδιώς οὐδὲ παρατηρήσειεν, ἀκόλουθα εἶναι τῇ ὅλῃ προαρίστῃ τοῦ βίου καταδεχόμενος τά γινόμενα· τόν δὲ ἐν ἐπαγγέλματι ἀκριβείας, καὶ τό τυχόν παρίδη τῶν καθηκόντων, πάντες ἐπιτηροῦσι, καὶ ἀν’ ὅνειδους αὐτῶν προφέρουσι, ποιούντες τὸ εἰρήμενόν ὅτι, Στραφέντες ὀξέοισιν ὑμᾶς. Ωστε οἴονει παιδαγωγία τίς ἐστι τοῖς ἀσθενεστέροις, πρὸς τὸ καὶ ἀκοντας αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν φαύλων εἰργεσθαι, ἵ διὰ τοῦ σχήματος ἐπαγγελία. Ως οὖν ἐστὶ τι στρατιώτου ἰδιὸν ἐν τῷ ἐνδύματι, καὶ ἀλλο τοῦ συγκλητικοῦ, καὶ ἀλλο ἄλλον, ἀφ’ ὅν εἰκάζεται αὐτῶν, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, τὰ ἀξιώματα, οὕτως εἰναι τινα καὶ Χριστιανοῦ ἰδιότητα καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσθήτος εὐπρεπεῖς καὶ ἀκόλουθον σώζουσαν τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου παραδεδομένην κοσμότητα.

Basil clearly accepts here and justifies a specific dress that distinguishes an ascetic from other people, a dress that apparently was condemned by the Council of Gangra with reference to priests. Fatti claims that Basil wore τρίβων, because he

---

was a follower of Eustathius.\textsuperscript{465} Actually, Basil used τριβώνιον – a type of garment that was also called πάλλιον or περιβόλαιον.

3. Assemblies in the honour of the martyrs

There is a point of Eustathian asceticism that needs broader explanation. Canon 20 of the Council of Gangra refers to the assemblies in the honour of the martyrs:

\begin{verbatim}
Εἴ τις αἰτιᾶται ὑπερηφάνως διαθέσει
κεχρημένος καὶ βδελυσσόμενος τὰς
συνάξεις τῶν μαρτύρων ἢ τὰς ἐν
αὐτοῖς γινομένας λειτουργίας καὶ
τὰς μνήμας αὐτῶν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.
\end{verbatim}

If, assuming an arrogant disposition and loathing, anyone condemns the assemblies [in honor?] of the martyrs or the services held in them [martyria?] and in memory of [the martyrs], let such a one be anathema.\textsuperscript{466}

Basil position on the celebrations in honour of the martyrs has been interpreted by scholars in two diametrically opposed ways. On the basis of the same text from \textit{Regulæ fusius tractatae} 40 Tenšek says that it is obvious that Basil was under influence of Eustathius\textsuperscript{467} while Frank claims that Basil disquisition was directed against Eustathians.\textsuperscript{468} The very text by Basil read as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
Περὶ τῶν ἐν συνόδοις πραγματείων.
Αλλ' οὐδὲ τὰς ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις
γινομένας ἁγορασίας οἰκείας ἢμιν ὁ
λόγος δείκνυται. Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλου τινὸς
ἐνεκεν ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις ἢ ἐν τοῖς
περὶ αὐτὰ τόποις φαίνεσθαι
ἐπιβάλλει Χριστιανοὶ, ἢ προσευχῇς
ἐνεκεν καὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὑπόμνησιν
ἐλθόντας τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ὑπὲρ
\end{verbatim}

Concerning business transactions at public assemblies. Scripture tells us, that commercial transactions in martyrs’ sanctuaries are inappropriate for us; for it does not befit Christians to appear at these shrines or in their environs for any other purpose than to pray and, by recalling to memory the saints' conflict unto death in behalf of piety, to be animated to a

\textsuperscript{466} \textit{Canones Synodi Gangrensis}, canon 20, ed. P.P. Joannou, 97, transl. O.L. Yarbrough, 454.
\textsuperscript{467} T.Z. Tenšek, \textit{L’ascetismo nel Concilio di Gangra}, 104.
like zeal. They should be mindful, also, of the most dread wrath of the Lord, because, even though He is always and everywhere meek and humble of heart, as it is written, yet He threatened with the scourge those and those only buying and selling in the temple, because trafficking in merchandise changed this house of prayer into a den of thieves.

Furthermore, when others are setting us an example of disregarding the practice which obtained among the saints, by making the shrines the occasion and place for a market and a fair and common trade instead of praying for one another, adoring God together, imploring His aid with tears, making satisfaction for their sins, thanking Him for His benefactions and strengthening their faith by hearing words of exhortation (practices which we know to have occurred within our own memory), we ought not to imitate them and confirm their unseemly conduct by also participating in such commercial pursuits. We should, on the contrary, imitate those assemblies described in the Gospel as taking place in the time of our Lord Jesus Christ and obey the
πράγματος· ἀλλὰ μιμεῖσθαι τὰς ἐπὶ
tοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν
tοῖς Εὐαγγελίοις ἱστορουμέναις
συνόδους, καὶ πληροῦν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ
Αποστόλου ὡς συντελοῦντα τῶ
τοιοῦτοι τύπω διατεταγμένα. Γράφει
dὲ οὕτως Ὄταν συνέρχησθε, ἐκαστὸς
융 ὑψιμὸν ἕχει, διδαχὴν ἕχει,
ἀποκάλυψιν ἕχει, γλῶσσαν ἕχει,
ἐρμηνείαν ἕχει· πάντα πρὸς
οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω.

The Council of Gangra used the term σύναξις in Canons 5 and 6 –
apparently in the meaning of liturgical assemblies. But, in the Canon 20 the word
σύναξις seems to be something different from liturgy, as it is juxtaposed by the
conjunction “or” (ἢ) with “service” (λειτουργία) and “commemoration” (μνήμη).
Basil himself seems to avoid the term σύναξις; apart from quoting twice Ps. 38:7
where the term appears, he uses it only three times in his writings: all of them in his
late letters. In Letter 188 written in 374 to Amphiloche σύναξις appears in the
negative context – in the definition of “illegal assembly” (παρασυναγωγῆ):

παρασυναγωγῆς δὲ τὰς συνάξεις τὰς
παρὰ τῶν ἀνυποτάκτων
πρεσβυτέρων ἢ ἑπισκόπων καὶ παρὰ
tῶν ἀπαθετῶν λαῶν γινομένας.
Οἶνον εἰ τις ἐν πταῖσματι ἔξετασθεῖς
ἐπεσχέθη τῆς λειτουργίας καὶ μὴ
ὑπέκυψε τοῖς κανόσιν, ἀλλʼ ἐαυτῷ
ἔξεδίκησε τὴν προεδρίαν καὶ τὴν

illegal congregations, assemblies
brought into being by insubordinate
presbyters or bishops, and by
uninstructed laymen. For example, if
someone who has been apprehended
in error has been forbidden the
exercise of his office and has not
submitted to the canons, but has
unjustly arrogated to himself the

It is difficult to determine whether the second use of σύναξις in Basil has anything to do with public celebrations or not. In Letter 243 written in 376 to the bishops of Italy and Gaul Basil complains that there is no more that blessed joy of souls which arises in the souls of those who believe in the Lord at the gatherings and because of the holy community of spiritual gifts.

Just above the quoted excerpt Basil lists other phenomena of religious life that are missing: gatherings of Christians (σύλλογοι Χριστιανῶν), precedence of teachers (διδασκάλων προεδρίαι), teachings of salvation (διδάγματα σωτηρία), assemblies (πανηγύρεις), evening singing of hymns (ὑμνῳδίαι νυκτεριναι). The term automatically associated with public celebrations is πανήγυρις – the name that in Classic use of Greek meant “general or national assembly, especially a festal assembly in honour of a national god.” So, it is probable that σύναξις does not mean here public celebration but rather small gathering in the circle of more spiritual believers.

In Letter 156 written in 373 to Evagrius the presbyter, Basil expresses his sadness that Evagrius refused to take part in their religious service (μετασχεῖν αὐτῶν τῆς συνάξεως) with Dorotheus. The context says nothing about the character of that service.

However, it would be an abuse to claim that Basil did not use the term σύναξις in order to avoid being associated with Eustathians. The frequency of his

---

usage of this word does not differ significantly from the one of Gregory of Nazianzus—four times and Gregory of Nyssa—twice, while John Chrysostom used it around hundred times. Socrates Scholasticus used the term σύναξις 12 times in the meaning of ecclesiastical celebrations, Epiphanius 11 times, but Sozomen only twice. No territorial pattern can be traced; it seems that some authors were eager to use it more and some less often.

In 4th century several names for ecclesiastical assembly were used and it is usually impossible to determine what kind of gathering was meant in every single situation. There were no technical terms for different kinds of assemblies. From what Basil says, it can be deduced that ecclesiastical gatherings not always/not only meant Eucharist, but as well “praying for one another, adoring God together, imploring His aid with tears, making satisfaction for their sins, thanking Him for His benefactions and strengthening their faith by hearing words of exhortation.”

Different names could have been applied to all kinds of ecclesiastical gatherings: σύναξις, λειτουργία, ἐκκλησιάζω, πανήγυρις, σύλλογος, μνήμη, σύνοδος, tā ἅγια, συναγωγή, tā τῆς ἐκκλησίας. For instance Sozomen summarizing in HE III 14 decrees of the Council of Gangra uses the expression ἐν οἴκιας ἐκκλησιάζοντας instead of συνάξεις used by the Council, obviously treating them as synonyms.

The case becomes even more complicated as all of those expressions could have meant “assembly, gathering”, but

✓ first, not necessary ecclesiastical or liturgical, it could have been any kind of gathering,
✓ second, each of those names has also different meaning, used as well by the very same authors who applied them to ecclesiastical gatherings. Here are some examples (all of them according to Lampe Lexicon):

πανήγυρις - 1. festal assembly, festival, 2. time of rejoicing, festivity, 3. festal oration, laudatory speech, 4. assembly, 5. market, trading–fair;
ἐκκλησιάζω - 1. attend an assembly, 2. address a church meeting, preach, 3. preach to, teach, 4. be member of, belong to the Church, 5. be received, approved by Church;
σύναξις - A. a bringing together, combination, sum, B. gathering, assembly for public worship and instruction, religious service, C. of the day on which a σύναξις was held, feast day, festival, D. those assembled for a service, congregation, E. form of worship or prayer obligatory upon monks and nuns, perh. sometimes referring to eucharist but also to an office, F. shrine;

λειτουργία - A. public service, B. service, C. service to God;

μνήμη - A. memory; 1. remembrance, of blessed memory, 2. commemoration, 3. faculty of memory, plur., powers of memory, 4. act of memory, recollection, 5. record, 6. mention, 7. representation, B., mina;

συναγωγή - assembly, A. of persons; 1. act of gathering together, assembling, 2. assemblage, concourse, crowd, of a social gathering, multitude of nations, 3. union with God, B. of things; 1. bringing or drawing together, 2. collection; of thoughts, i.e. recollection, combination, 3. ? content, or poss. scheme; 4. conclusion, summary, C. in connexion with public worship; 1. Jewish; a. act of assembling for worship, b. assembly of persons for worship, congregation, c. the congregation of Israel, d. the Jewish community, e. place of worship, synagogue, f. synagogue of the Samaritans, 2. Christian; a. coming together, meeting for worship, b. assembly of persons for worship, Christian congregation, c. the whole Christian body, Church, d. = σύναξις, public worship, e. place of worship, Christian church, 3. as term of contempt; a. heret. congregation, b. party, sect, c. meeting–house, conventicle;

σύνοδος - A. companion on a journey, fellow traveller, of things that go together, equivalent, B. of persons, coming together, meeting, C. of things, coming together.

Assuming that Canon 20 of the Council of Gangra by all three names (σύναξις, λειτουργία, μνήμη) meant some kinds of liturgical gatherings, it is obvious that in Regulae fusius tractatae 40 Basil does not refer to Gangra’s canon at all. What Gangra concerned was condemning and abhorring the very sense of
honouring the martyrs. Basil’s remarks consider some misbehaviours during the feasts in honour of the martyrs.

The cult of martyrs was deep-rooted in the tradition of Asia Minor. Known from the end of 2nd century it became very popular when the persecutions had ended. To such an extent that the manifestations of that cult could seem to be the major phenomenon of the religious life of the 4th century. But the forms of expressing such beliefs were very much dependent on traditional ways in which the pagans honoured their deceased: they cared about the burial, often monumental, celebrated banquets at the tomb on the day of funeral and every year on its anniversary. The funeral banquet, in honour of deceased, especially martyrs, had been accepted by the Church as a lesser evil to replace it with the pagan festivals of the same kind; but some Fathers of the Church at the end of the 4th century concerned to repress the resulting abuses, not only Basil, but Ambrose and Augustine as well.

4. Was Basil an Eustathian?

The letters by Basil confirm that Basil and Eustathius had long-lasting and close relationship from the very childhood of Basil until the conflict started in 372. According to Sozomen some people claimed that Eustathius was a real author of the ascetical book attributed to Basil:

Ἀρμενίοις δὲ καὶ Παφλαγόσι καὶ τοῖς πρὸς τῷ Πόντῳ οὐκοῦσι λέγεται Εὐστάθιος ὁ τὴν ἐν Σεβαστείᾳ τῆς Αρμενίας ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτροπεύσας μοναχικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἁξίας, καὶ τῆς ἐν ταύτῃ σπουδαίας ἀγωγῆς, ἐδεσμάτων τε, ὡς χρή μετέχειν καὶ ἀπέχεσθαι, καὶ ἐσθῆτος, ἢ δεῖ

It is said that Eustathius, who governed the church of Sebaste in Armenia, founded a society of monks in Armenia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus, and became the author of a zealous discipline, both as to what meats were to be partaken of or to be avoided, what garments were to be worn, and what customs

κεχρήσθαι, καὶ ήθων καὶ πολιτείας ἀκριβοὺς εἰσηγητὴν γενόμενον, ὡς καὶ τὴν ἐπιγεγραμμένην Βασιλείου τοῦ Καππαδόκου Ασκητικὴν βίβλον ἰσχυρίζεσθαι τινας αὐτοῦ γραφῆν εἶναι.

This thesis is unverifiable on the basis of the preserved sources as there are no writings by Eustathius. W.K. Lowther Clarke noted: “Basil owed much to Eustathius, and the teaching and practices of the latter must have been to some extent represented in Basil’s Ascetica so much so that those who recalled Eustathius’ teaching and championed his memory could say that the ideas were really his. It was but a short step to take when they or others went on to ascribe the actual writing to him. Just how much is Eustathian it is impossible to say.”

Amand says that it is very likely that a great part of Eustathius’ ascetic ideas and his monastic rules were preserved in the softened, humanized and more systematic form in the rules of Basil. Frazee states that it was Eustathius’ life “which provided Basil’s inspiration and his brotherhoods were the model for Basil’s communities.” Tenšek presents similar position: he points out that there is no proof that Eustathius ever wrote anything, but he left “a spiritual tradition and lived experience.”

What can be stated with certainty is that Basil’s asceticism had some characteristics condemned by the Council of Gangra. In my opinion – crucial ones. Although in many points Basil’s rules gave recommendations different or sometimes even directly opposed to some attitudes condemned in Gangra, it does not mean he was less Eustathian. It only proves that he followed Eustathius’ principle of individualism and independent interpretation of the way asceticism should be practiced. Basil stresses that it is necessary for an ascetic to read and contemplate the Holy Scripture, he himself used to read and interpret the Bible on his own.

---

475 Sozomen, HE III 14, 31, GCS 50, 123, transl. NPNF II 2, 293.
476 W.K. Lowther Clarke, St Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism, Cambridge 1913, 161.
478 C.A. Frazee, Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathios of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea, 16.
and apply it to his life according to his own judgment.\textsuperscript{481} It is significant that the basis for his moral rules is only and exclusively the Holy Scripture, Basil never refers to any tradition, never quotes any saints or other holy writers. Although it is generally assumed that he together with Gregory of Nazianzus created \textit{Philologia} – a collection of texts by Origen, it is very likely that they were not the authors of this book. Marguerite Harl analyzed the sources and it seems that there is no convincing proof of their authorship.\textsuperscript{482} The effect of Harl’s research seems to me coherent with the general attitude of Basil – he was focused on the Holy Scripture and even if he used other intellectual tools (as dialectic) during dogmatic disputes, he did it only because it was necessary to refute heretical theses.\textsuperscript{483}

What Basil approves in general is not so important to state whether he was an Eustathian or not – the most important is that he allows exceptions if an ascetic recognized that something is against the piety i.e. against his version of piety. That is why I do agree with Gribomont’s statement that Basil was much closer to the condemned ascetics than to the bishops gathered in Gangra.\textsuperscript{484} The visible attribute of that closeness was Basil’s dress, apparently the same as condemned by the canon 12 of the Council of Gangra.

\textbf{Chapter III. Was Eustathius Pneumatomachos?}

It is commonly accepted that Eustathius of Sebastea became Pneumatomachos in the last years of his life. At first glance the statements about Eustathius’ participation in the Pneumatomachian heresy seem to be clear and unquestionable. On closer inspection, the case loses obviousness.

In the 5\textsuperscript{th} century \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica} by Socrates Scholasticus there is a statement that is usually interpreted as if Eustathius was Pneumatomachos. The very account by Socrates reads as follows:

\textsuperscript{481} Basil, \textit{Epistulae} 223, 2, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 3, 10.
\textsuperscript{483} Basil, \textit{De fide} 1-2, PG 31, 677-680.
\textsuperscript{484} J. Gribomont, \textit{St. Basile et le monachisme enthousiaste}, 135.
By this means he drew around him a great number of adherents, who from him are still denominated ‘Macedonians.’ And although such as dissented from the Acacians at the Seleucian Synod had not previously used the term homoiousios, yet from that period they distinctly asserted it.

There was, however, a popular report that this term did not originate with Macedonius, but was the invention rather of Marathonius, who a little before had been set over the church at Nicomedia; on which account the maintainers of this doctrine were also called ‘Marathonians.’ To this party Eustathius joined himself, who for the reasons before stated had been ejected from the church at Sebastia. But when Macedonius began to deny the Divinity of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, Eustathius said: ‘I can neither admit that the Holy Spirit is God, nor can I dare affirm him to be a creature.’

For this reason those who hold the homoousion of the Son call these heretics ‘Pneumatomachi.’

---

485 Socrates Scholasticus HE II 45, 3-7, GCS NF 1, 182-183, transl. NPNF II 2, 73-74.
A closer look reveals that the above-quoted text is not so unambiguous as it seems. It is certain that Eustathius belonged to the Homoiousian alliance as well as Macedonius did. DelCogliano has defined the meaning of ecclesiastical alliance as follows: “In recent scholarship, the notion of an ‘alliance’ or ‘ecclesial alliance’ has been used instead of ‘church party’ to name groups or networks that arise because of some common value or are formed for the promotion of a specific agenda in the ecclesiastical sphere. These values or agendas may or may not be theological. Such groups are characterised by features such as the performance of ecclesiastical communion, sufficient doctrinal agreement with respect to both principles and terminologies, the struggle with common enemies, the activity of mutual defence, the exercise of public ecclesio-political support, loyalty to revered figures, local ecclesiastical traditions, and personal friendship. No single feature, value or agenda is necessary to constitute an ecclesial alliance, and individuals or individual Churches may be part of a larger ecclesial alliance for different reasons.”

According to Socrates at certain point Macedonius started to deny the divinity of the Holy Spirit. And then, there is a phrase about the reaction of Eustathius usually interpreted as if he shared Macedonius’ convictions:

Ως δὲ ὁ Μακεδόνιος τὸ ἁγίον πνεῦμα συναναλαβεῖν εἰς τὴν θεολογίαν τῆς Τριάδος ἐξέκλινεν, τότε καὶ Ἐυστάθιος· Ἐγώ, ἔφη, οὔτε Θεόν ὡνομάζειν αἴρομαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον οὔτε κτίσμα καλεῖν ἀν τολμήσαμι.

But when Macedonius began to deny the Divinity of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, Eustathius said: ‘I can neither admit that the Holy Spirit is God, nor can I dare affirm him to be a creature.’

The sentence that describes the change in Macedonius’ believes begins with δέ, correctly translated into English as “but”. “δέ serves to mark that something is different from what precedes, but only to offset it, not to exclude or contradict it; it denotes only a slight contrast, and is therefore weaker than ἀλλὰ, but stronger than καί. δέ is adversative and copulative; but the two uses are not always clearly to be

487 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 45, 6, GCS NF 1, 183, transl. NPNF II 2, 74.
distinguished.” The adversative character of δέ is weakened here by καί placed at the beginning of the second part of the sentence. But, it is worth noticing that Socrates is extremely cautious in his appraisal of Pneumatomachians. He adds that “those who hold the homoousion of the Son call these heretics ‘Pneumatomachi.’”

The statement of Eustathius in Socrates is his only quotation in entire literature. Although it seems heretical from today’s perspective, at the time and place it was voiced it was perfectly orthodox and coherent with the teaching of Basil the Great. The sentence quoted by Socrates understood by scholars as a proof that Eustathius was Pneumatomachos, was Basil own requirement to find somebody orthodox. In his two letters written in 372 or 373 he calls to receive in communion those who do not call the Holy Spirit a creature:

Μηδὲν τοίνυν πλέον ἐπιζητῶμεν, ἀλλὰ προτεινώμεθα τοῖς βουλομένοις ἡμῖν συνάπτεσθαι ἀδελφῶι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν, κἂν ἐκείνη συνθῶνται, ἐπερατῶμεν καὶ τὸ μὴ δείν λέγεσθαι κτίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιον μηδὲ κοινωνικοῦς αὐτῶν εἶναι τοὺς λέγοντας.

Let us then seek nothing more, but merely propose the Creed of Nicaea to the brethren who wish to join us; and if they agree to this, let us demand also that the Holy Spirit shall not be called a creature, and that those who do so call Him shall not be communicants with them.

προσθείναι δὲ τῇ πίστει ἐκείνῃ καὶ τὸ μὴ χρῆναι λέγειν κτίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιον, μὴ μέντοι μηδὲ τοῖς λέγουσι κοινωνεῖν and that you add to the aforesaid Creed that one must not speak of the Holy Spirit as a creature, nor have communion with those who so speak of Him.

The letters were written before the conflict between Basil and Eustathius broke out, but it is obvious that the problem of the Holy Spirit was already

489 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 45, 7, GCS NF 1, 183, transl. NPNF II 2, 74.
discussed in the Church – the problem of the divinity Holy Spirit is strictly
correlated to the Arian view of the Son as created. Although at the beginning of the
Arian and later on Eunomian controversy the debate was focused on the divinity of
the Son, the question of the status of the Holy Spirit was always present and
discussed. I do agree with Beeley who points out the continuity of Basil’s teaching
on the Holy Spirit; he claims: “The early Contra Eunomium is in some respects Basil’s
strongest statement of the Spirit’s divinity, and it provides the blueprint for his later
work, including the De Spiritu Sancto.” Contra Eunomium was written in the early
period of Basil’s writing, it was finished in 366 and De Spiritu Sancto is one of the
last writings by Basil, written after 374. Basil himself noticed that
Pneumatomachian ideas had their roots in Arius and were developed by his
followers i.e. Aetius and Eunomius:

κατὰ μικρὸν δὲ προϊόντα τὰ πονηρὰ
tῆς ἁσβείας σπέρματα ἡ πρότερον
μὲν ὑπὸ Ἀρείου τοῦ προστάτου τῆς
ἀφέσεως κατεβλῆθη, ύστερον δὲ ὑπὸ
tῶν τὰ ἑκείνου κακῶς διαδεξαμένων
ἐπὶ λύμη τῶν Ἐκκλησίων ἐξετράφη
καὶ ἡ ἀκολούθια τῆς ἁσβείας εἰς τὴν
κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἑληφθήμιαν
ἀπέσκηψεν.

The term πνευματομάχος appeared in Asia Minor for the first time around
372. Earlier, Athanasius used the participle πνευματομαχοῦντες with reference to
those who claimed that the Holy Spirit was created, but the Son was not. It seems
that it was Basil who around 372 invented the noun ὁ πνευματομάχος. He used it
5 times in his writings: twice in the De spiritu Sancto (XI 27 and XLI 52), once in

---

496 Athanasius, Epistulae quattuor ad Serapionem 1, 32 and 3, 2.
Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos (PG 31, 613), in Letter 140, 2 and in Letter 263, 3. In all 4 cases except for the last one Basil uses the term πνευματομάχοι in the Arian/Eunomian context.

The case of De Spiritu Sancto is especially important for my research. I disagree with scholars who claim that a part (chapters X-XXVII) of De Spiritu Sancto by Basil is either a record of his dispute with Eustathius held in June 372 or a later reaction to Eustathius’ theses. The only name of the opponent that Basil himself mentions in De Spiritu Sancto is Aetius (II 4). When Basil refers to that debate with Eustathius, he never gives any details and there is no reason to assume that the discussion concerned the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In Letter 98 Basil only summarizes the debate in one sentence:

Εὐσταθίου, ἢ καὶ γενομένη ἡμῖν. Διὰ γὰρ τὸ παρὰ πολλῶν καταβολήθαι αὐτῶν ὡς περὶ τὴν πίστιν παραχαράσσοντά τι, ἀφικόμεθα αὐτῷ εἰς λόγους καὶ εὑρομεν σὺν Θεῷ πρὸς πᾶσαν ὁθόνητα εὐγνωμόνως ἀκολουθοῦντα.

In Letter 99 Basil describes the debate in detail, but again without naming charges against Eustathius:

We made a special effort to enter into conference with our brother Eustathius.
Εὐσταθίῳ. Καὶ προετείναμεν αὐτῷ τὰ περὶ τῆς πίστεως ἐγκλήματα ὡς προφέρομουν αὐτῷ οἱ περὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Θεόδοτον, καὶ ἡξίωσαμεν, εἰ μὲν ἔπεται τῇ ὀρθῇ πίστει, φανερὸν ἦμιν καταστῆσαι, ὡστε ἡμᾶς εἶναι κοινωνικούς εἰ δὲ ἀλλοτρίως ἔχει, ἁκριβῶς εἰδέναι ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐξομοίασεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀλλοτρίως. Πολλῶν τοίνυν γενομένων λόγων πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ πάσης ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ περὶ τούτων σκέψει δαπανηθεὶς, καταλαβοῦσα ἡμᾶς εἰς ἑαυτὸν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐναντίον καταστῆσαι, ὥστε ἡμᾶς διεκρίθημεν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων εἰς ὅσον ὁμολογούμενον πέρας τὸν λόγον προαγαγόντες. Τῇ δὲ ἐξῆς πάλιν, ἐωθὲν συγκαθεσθέντες, περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν διελεγόμεθα, ἐπελθόντος ἡδη καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ποιμενίου, τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τῆς Σεβαστείας, καὶ σφοδρῶς ἦμιν τὸν ἐναντίον γυμνάζοντος λόγον. Κατὰ μικρὸν ὅν ἡμεῖς τε ύπερ ὅν ἐδοξεῖν ἦμιν ἐγκαλεῖν ἀπελυόμεθα κάκεινος εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐπιζητομένων ύρ', ἡμῶν συγκατάθεσιν just mentioned. And we presented to him the charges regarding his faith, such as our brother Theodotus and his followers bring against him, and we asked him, in case he followed the orthodox Faith, to make this fact manifest to us so that we might be in communion with him; but if he was otherwise disposed, we asked him to know clearly that we too should be otherwise disposed toward him. Thereupon, after we had conversed much with each other, and after the whole of that day had been consumed in the examination of these matters, evening having now fallen, we parted from each other without having brought our discussion to any conclusion to which we could both agree. But after we had again assembled on the morning of the following day, we were entering upon a discussion of the same subject, when our brother, Poimenius, presbyter of Sebasteia, entered our conference also, and began vigorously to press the opposing doctrine against us. Little by little we for our part, accordingly, kept clearing away the charges upon the strength of which they seemed to accuse us, and we brought them to such an assent regarding the subjects of our
προσηγάγομεν, ὡστε χάριτι τοῦ Κυρίου εὑρεθῆναι ἡμᾶς μηδὲ εἰς τὸ μικρότατον πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφερομένους. Οὕτω τοίνυν περὶ ἑνάτην ποὺ ὄραν ἀνέστημεν ἐπὶ τὰς προσευχὰς εὐχαριστῆσαντες τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ δόντι ἡμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν.

I would not agree with Zachhuber and Rousseau in their appraisal of the roots of the conflict. Zachhuber states that the connection between Basil and Eustathius “seems to have been conditioned by their common devotion to monasticism in the first place”. He suggests that the substance of their friendship “was always the common ascetic ideal while doctrinal concurrence was presumed – until, finally, it was discovered to be missing.” Also Rousseau claims: “Basil’s disenchantment with Eustathius focused on his Trinitarian theology, and in particular on his attitude to the Holy Spirit, whose divinity he seemed to oppose.”

Doctrinal issues could have been only appearances and the real cause of the conflict might have been different. It seems to be a fight for power, specifically for jurisdiction and right to ordain bishops in Armenia. It is worth noticing that in his Letter 223 dated for 375 (more or less at the time when *De Spiritu Sancto* was written) to Eustathius himself Basil did not even mention any heretical convictions of Eustathius (either Pneumatomachians or any other) – he defended himself from Eustathius’ accusations of Sabelianism and clearly stated that the reason of the conflict was NOT doctrinal. He admitted that he forced Eustathius to sign the confession of faith only because of the pressure of others:

καὶ ἐπειδὴ ύπογραφῇ τινὶ πίστεως προελήφθησαν ἢν ἦμεις αὐτοῖς

And when they were forestalled by an outline of faith which we offered them—not because we ourselves

---

mistrusted their mind (for I confess it), but merely because we wished to allay the suspicions against them which most of our brethren of like mind held—in order that nothing from that confession might seem to meet them as an obstacle to their being accepted by those now in power, they have renounced communion with us; and as an excuse for the break this letter was devised.503

Although in Letters 244 and 263 Basil claims that Eustathius changed his beliefs and as a proof he listed the confessions signed by Eustathius: Ancyra (358), Seleucia (359), Constantinople (359/360), Zela (?), Lampsacus (364), Rome (366), Cyzicus (375), all those confessions were Homoioussians except for the one of Constantinople which was Homoian504 and the one from Rome which was Nicaean. The creed signed in Constantinople was regarded heretical by Homoousians and Homoioussians as well as by Anomeans, although all bishops signed it under pressure of Constantius present during the Council. Filostorgius testifies that after the Council “those sent into exile repudiated their own subscriptions that they had put to the Ariminum creed and once again announced their adherence, some to the consubstantialist doctrine and others to that of like in substance.”505

504 Loofs (Eustathius von Sebaste und die chronologie der Basilius-Briefe, 78) thinks that Eustathius could not have signed anything in Constantinople (360) as he was deposed at that Council, apparently during the council the issues of faith were examined first and the disciplinary ones later on. Eustathius could have signed the creed during one of the sessions that took place at the end of December of 359 and was deposed at the beginning of January 360. Eustathius apparently signed the altered “dated creed” — that omitted “in all respects” (κατὰ πάντα) in the statement that the Son is like the Father (ὁμοιον) — at the first one and was deposed by the second one taken over by Anomoeans.
So, the question is why Basil calls Eustathius πρωτοστάτης τῆς τῶν Πνευματομάχων αἱρέσεως/the leader of the Pneumatomachian heresy. The answer seems to me quite obvious. Letter 263 was addressed to “the Westeners”. The accusation of Pneumatomachian heresy might have been a similar slander as of the contacts with Arius. Letter 263 concerns three persons who were staying in communion with the Church, but Basil considered them hidden heretics:

Οἱ δὲ τὴν δορὰν τοῦ προβάτου περιβεβλημένοι καὶ τὴν ἑπιφάνειαν ἠμερον προβαλλόμενοι καὶ προείμαν, ἐνδοθεν δὲ σπαράσσοντες ἁρείδως τὰ Χριστοῦ ποιμνία καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐξ ἡμῶν ὄρμησθαι εὐκόλως ἐμβάλλοντες βλάβην τοῖς ἀπλουστέροις, οὕτως εἰσιν οἱ χαλεποὶ καὶ δυσφύλακτοι.

Those who have clothed themselves in the skin of a sheep, and present a gentle and mild appearance, but inwardly are rending unsparingly the flocks of Christ, and, because they have come from amongst ourselves, easily inflict injury on the simpler folk, these are they who are harmful and difficult to guard against.

Those “hidden heretics” are: Eustathius of Sebastea, Apollinarius of Laodicea and Paulinus of Antioch. Paulinus of Antioch was the rival of Meletius of Antioch and their conflict was a cause of the Meletian schism. Meletius was a close friend of Basil who tried to restitute him for the see of Antioch after he had been exiled. Around 375 Basil got a message that Paulinus received letters of support “from the West,” letters that confirmed his right to the Antiochean see. Letter 263 is a reaction to that information. Both sides of the conflict charged each other on heresy: Paulinus charged Meletius of having been ordained bishop by Arians, but the conflict was clearly administrative rather than doctrinal. Apparently, charging of heresy was customary in such kind of conflicts.

507 See Part II. Chapter II 2 of the present study.
510 Socrates Scholasticus, HE V 5, 4, GCS NF 1, 277.
Since 372 Basil was in conflict with Eustathius and in my opinion the reason of the conflict was similarly not doctrinal, but administrative. Basil demanded his rights to ordain bishops in Armenia Minor. Eustathius accused Basil of being well disposed towards Apollinarius and he circularized an old letter by Basil to Apollinarius together with the collection of quotations without naming their author, but apparently attributed to Apollinarius. Basil himself never read those heretical statements in Appolinarius’ books, he “had merely heard others relate them.”

Basil himself explains in the letter to Meletius why he accused Apollinarius:

I knew that the charge which has now sprung up against Apollinarius, that man who is so ready to say anything, would surprise the ears of your Perfection. For in fact not even I myself was aware until the present time that the situation was as it is; but now the Sebastenes, having sought out these matters from some source, have brought them before the public, and they are circulating a document from which they bring accusations chiefly against us as well, on the ground that we hold the same views as those expressed in the document. [...] For when writing to some of their own adherents, and after making this false accusation against us, they added the words mentioned above, calling them the expressions of heretics, but concealing the name of the father of the document, in order that to people at large we might be considered the

---

512 See below Part III. Chapter IV. Real reasons of the conflict.
ἀν τοῦ μέχρι όμορα συνθεῖναι προῆλθεν αὐτῶν ἢ ἐπίνοια, ὡς γε ἐμαυτὸν πείθω. Ὡθεν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ καὶ τὴν καθ’ ἡμῶν κρατοῦσαν βλασφημίαν ἀπώδοσθαι καὶ δείξαι πάσιν ὡς οὐδέν ἡμῖν ἐστι κοινὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἐκείνοις λέγοντας, ἡμαγκάσθημεν μνησθῆναι τού ἀνδρὸς ὡς προσεγγίζοντος τὴ ἀσεβεία τοῦ Σαβελλίου.

Letter 263 was written in 377.515 Demosthenes, vicar of diocese of Pontus appointed in 375, treated Basil with outright hostility and favouritize Eustathius.516 So, Basil decided to ask for the support from the West. Basil was counting on Western bishops supporting his version as it was not reliable in Asia Minor because of the personal issues:

Ἀνάγκη δὲ τούτων ὑμοναστι μνησθῆναι, ἵνα καὶ αὗτοι γνωρίσητε τοὺς τὰς ταραχὰς παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐργαζομένους καὶ ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις ἡμῶν φανερῶν καταστήσητε. Ο μὲν γὰρ παρ’ ἡμῶν λόγος ὑποπτός ἐστι τοῖς πολλοῖς ὡς τάχα διὰ τινὰς ἰδιωτικὰς φιλονεικίας τὴν μικροψυχίαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐλομένων. Τίμεις δὲ ὅσον μακρὰν αὐτῶν ἀπῳκουμένων τυγχάνετε, τοσοῦτοι πλέον παρὰ τοῖς λαοῖς τὸ ἀξιόπιστον

We must mention these by name, in order that you also may know who they are that cause disturbances among us; and do you make the matter clear to our churches. For statements made by us are suspected by the many, on the ground that we perhaps through certain personal quarrels hold ill-will towards them. But as for you, inasmuch as you happen to live far away from them, so much the greater is the confidence you enjoy in the eyes of the laity, in

515 F. Loofs, Eustathius von Sébaste und die chronologie der Basilius-Briefe, 55.
ἔχετε, πρὸς τῷ καὶ τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν συναρέσθαι ύμῖν εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν καταπονουμένων ἐπιμέλειαν. Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ συμφώνως πλείονες ὁμοῦ τὰ αὐτὰ δογματίσητε, δήλον ὅτι τὸ πλῆθος τῶν δογματισάντων ἀναντίρρητον πᾶσι τὴν παραδοχὴν κατασκευάσει τοῦ δόγματος.

Basil could not have asked “the Westeners” for help if he confessed that the conflict between him and Eustathius regarded jurisdiction and not doctrinal matters. As Garsoïan rightly points out – it was impossible for any bishop to usurp the right to ordain bishops on the terrain of the other without accusing him on heresy. And it was very easy for Basil to push Eustathius into the label of “Pneumatomachian”; that epithet used to be associated with Eunomians/Arians and the Westerners treated Homoiousians as exactly the same Arians as Eunomians.

I think that Pneumatomachians might have not been a distinct heresy. In Asia Minor it was only another epithet for Anomoeans, invented by Basil the Great. Actually, Basil himself seems to admit that in Letter 244 dated for 376:

accurō ὅτι τὸ ὁμούσιον κατασιγάσαντες, τὸ κατ’ οὐσίαν ὁμοίον νῦν περιφέρουσι καὶ τάς εἰς τὸ Ἀγιὸν Πνεῦμα βλασφημίας μετ’ Ἑυνομίῳ συγγράφουσι.

At that time, Basil himself entered into the Nicaean alliance and he was eager to use “Western” rhetoric and label “Arians” all his ecclesiastical adversaries. Nevertheless, the charge of using “like in substance” voiced by Basil seems

addition to the fact that God’s grace co-operates with you in the care of those who labour. And if, besides, a considerable number of you together declare the same doctrines with one voice, it is clear that the multitude of those who have so declared will bring about for all the acceptance of the doctrine without contradiction.517

---

ridiculous. Basil himself interpreted “like in substance” as coherent with the Nicaean Creed. Although some scholars doubt that Basil belonged to Homoiousian alliance, there are clear evidences of that both in external sources and in the very writings by Basil. There is no doubt that Basil was present at the Council of Constantinople (359) as a part of the Homoiousian group; his presence is confirmed not only by Philostorgius (HE IV 12), but also by Gregory of Nyssa. He admitted that Eunomius accused “our tutor and father” that “when the decision transfers power to the opposition he flees the places having deserted his post.” As Kopecek rightly pointed out: “Since Gregory of Nyssa did not challenge Eunomius accusation, it must have been substantially accurate.” What is more important, Homoiousian convictions can be traced in the very writings by Basil. In the famous Letter 9 he admits straightforwardly:

τὸ ὁμοίον κατ᾽ ὑσίαν, εἰ μὲν προσκείμενον ἔχει τὸ ἀπαραλλάκτως, δέχομαι τὴν φωνῆν ὡς εἰς ταὐτὸν τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ φέρουσαν, κατὰ τὴν ὧν ἐγὼ δηλονότι τοῦ ὁμοούσιου διάνοιαν.

I accept the phrase “like in substance,” provided the qualification “invariably” is added to it, on the ground that it comes to the same thing as “identity of substance,” according, be it understood, to the sound conception of the term.523

Although the above-quoted text comes from 361 or 362, Basil never changed his way of thinking. There are no similarly straightforward statements in Basil, but even in De Spiritu Sancto – the writing written after 374, that according to Pruche has as a scope to justify equivalence between “equal in honour” (ὁμότιμος) and “consubstantial” (ὁμοούσιος)524 – Basil states that what is concurrent with the substance (σύνδρομον ὑπὸ τῆς ὑσίας) is alike (ὁμοίον) and equal:

Ὁ ἔωραβάκως ἐμέ, ἔωρακε τὸν Πατέρα, οὗ τὸν χαρακτήρα, οὐδὲ τὴν μορφήν—He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; not the express image, nor yet

521 Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunomium I, 79, GNO 1, 49; transl. S.G. Hall, 47.
καθαρά γὰρ συνθέσεως ἡ θεία φύσις; ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῦ θελήματος, ὅπερ σύνδρομον ὑπὲρ τῆς οὐσίας, ὁμοιον καὶ ἰσον, μᾶλλον δὲ ταύτων ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ θεωρεῖται.

the form, for the divine nature does not admit of combination; but the goodness of the will, which, being concurrent with the essence, is beheld as like and equal, or rather the same, in the Father as in the Son.\(^\text{525}\)

Even in this late writing Basil still interpreted ὅμοιος in the Homoiousian way, although he was not eager to talk about that openly. He admitted himself that he “definitely decided not to make his own convictions public” (ἀλλως τε μηδὲ πάνυ δημοσιεύειν τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἐγνωκότας),\(^\text{526}\) probably because of political reasons.

Basil (like all Homoiusians) was first of all anti-Anomoean. Since he interpreted ὅμοιος as ὁμοιός κατ’ οὐσίαν he could accept both expressions (ὅμοιος κατ’ οὐσίαν).\(^\text{527}\) Exactly like Eustathius of Sebastea. Both of them were inclined to sign the Homoiousian or the Nicaean creed depending on political circumstances, because both of them understood those creeds as expressing the same content. However, Basil himself admitted that he preferred the expression ὁμοιός κατ’ οὐσίαν\(^\text{528}\) as in my opinion it more directly opposed ἀνόμοιος of Aetius and Eunomius.\(^\text{529}\) Already Harnack noticed hidden Homoiousian convictions

525 Basil, De Spiritu Sancto VIII 21, SC 17 bis, 318, transl. NPNF II 8, 14.
527 It is interesting that Basil understood οὐσία in Aristotelian way (he stresses its significance as “being”) so the term can refer both to the common substance and to the particular being. K. Kochańczyk-Bonińska (Defining substance in Basil the Great’s dispute with Eunomius about the incomprehensibility of God, E-patrológos 4/1 (2019), 98) explains: “The unique properties that individuate particulars do not rupture the unity of nature. This point is fundamental to Basil’s theological project. Unfortunately, he uses the same family of terms to speak both of the distinguishing marks and the propria that belong to and reveal the divine substance. The difference is that the propria are predicated of a common ousia, whereas the distinguishing terms refer to that which is unique to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”
528 Basil, Epistulae 9, 3, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, 39.
529 It is true that neither Aetius nor Eunomius used the very term ἀνόμοιος in their writings, but they used synonyms (Aetius, Syntagmation 4, ed. L.R. Wickham, 541: τὸ ἐν υἱῶν ἀνόμοιον; Syntagmation 10, ed. L.R. Wickham, 541: ἀνομοιομέρης; Eunomius, Liber apologeticus 18, ed. R.P. Vaggonne, 56: παραλλαγέων τὰς οὐσίας; Liber apologeticus 26, ed. R.P. Vaggonne, 70: μητέ μην ὁμοιοῦσιν <μηδὲ ὁμοιοῦσιν>). Kopecek (A history of neo-arianism, t. 1, 202-203) claims that Aetius avoided the term ἀνόμοιος in order to come into agreement with Acacius and Eudoxius. But, it seems that they did use the term ἀνόμοιος during debates. Already in the synodical letter of the Council of Ancyra
behind orthodox credo of 4th century, he even insisted that it was the Homoiousian – Basil of Ancyra who was the real father of the official doctrine of the Trinity in the form in which the Churches have held to it.\footnote{350}{A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, transl. N. Buchanan, vol. 4, Boston 1898, 100. Scholars still differ in their opinions on possible influence of Athanasius and/or Homoiousians on Basil and on how much he was Nicaean in his writings on the Holy Spirit. For the summary of different points of view see D.A. Giulea, *Basil of Caesarea’S Authorship of Epistle 361 and His Relationship with the Homoiousians Reconsidered*, “Vigiliae Christianae” 72 (2018), 43-44.}

As Ch. Beeley observes: “Basil’s reputation as an ardent defender of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and its consubstantiality with God the Father depends to a great extent on Gregory’s [of Nazianzus] Letter 58 to Basil and his Oration 43 In Praise of Basil. In Letter 58, Gregory describes his recent defence of Basil against charges that Basil has failed to confess the Spirit’s full divinity. Most readers have taken Gregory’s account at face value, ignoring the sarcasm with which Gregory is in fact criticizing Basil’s for his refusal to confess the Spirit’s divinity – a rhetorical force that is confirmed by Basil’s angry reply. Similarly, in his memorial oration for Basil, Gregory depicts Basil in terms of his own, strongly Trinitarian position, chiefly in order to bolster his position in Basil’s former community; the piece is not an example of unadulterated historical accuracy.”\footnote{351}{Ch. Beeley, *The Holy Spirit in the Cappadocians: Past and Present*, “Modern Theology” 26 (2010), 92.}

In the very writings by Basil, there is not even single statement either that the Holy Spirit is ὁμοούσιος with the Father and the Son or that the Holy Spirit is God. In all places evoked by scholars as a proof that Basil called the Holy Spirit God, he speaks about the Spirit’s equality of honour with the Father and the Son like in the Letter 90 dated for 372:

\begin{quote}
Λαλείσθω καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν μετὰ παραθεσίας τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐκείνον κήρυγμα
\end{quote}

Let us also pronounce with boldness that good dogma of the Fathers,

(358) quoted by Epiphanius (*Panarion* 73, 9, 7, ed. K. Holl, Vol. 3, 281) there is an anathema against those who claim that the Son is unlike the invisible God in essence (ἀνόμοιον λέγοι [καὶ] κατ' οὕσιαν τὸν θεόν). Theodoret (HE II 23; transl. NPNF II 3, 88) describes an event that occurred after the Council of Seleucia (359). Eudoxius was charged in front of Constantius of creating the creed containing the statement that “the Son is unlike (ἀνόμοιος) God the Father. Constantius ordered this exposition of the faith to be read, and was displeased with the blasphemy which it involved. He therefore asked Eudoxius if he had drawn it up. Eudoxius instantly repudiated the authorship, and said that it was written by Actius. [...] Actius, totally ignorant of what had taken place, and unaware of the drift of the enquiry, expected that he should win praise by confession, and owned that he was the author of the phrases in question.”
which overwhelms the accursed heresy of Al ios, and builds the
curches on the sound doctrine,
wherein the Son is confessed to be
substantial with the Father, and
the Holy Spirit is numbered with
them in like honour and so
adored.\(^{532}\)

Similar statements appear in the confession of faith (Letter 125 by Basil)
signed by Eustathius of Sebastea in 373.

We must anathematize those who call
the Holy Spirit a creature, both those
who think so, and those who will not
confess that He is holy by nature,
even as the Father is holy by nature,
and as the Son is holy by nature, but
deprive Him of His divine and blessed
nature. And the proof of orthodox
opinion is not to separate Him from
the Father and the Son (for we must
be baptized as we have received the
words of baptism, and we must
believe as we are baptized, and we
must give glory as we have believed,
to the Father, the Son, and the Holy
Ghost), but to abstain from
communion with those, as open
blasphemers, who call Him a creature;
since this point is agreed upon (for
comment is necessary because of the

ἐπισημείωσες διὰ τούς συκοφάντας) ὅτι οὔτε ἀγέννητον λέγομεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον, ἕνα γὰρ οίδαμεν ἀγέννητον καὶ μίαν τῶν ὅντων ἀρχὴν, τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὔτε γεννητόν, ἕνα γὰρ Μονογενῆ ἐν τῇ παραδόσει τῆς πίστεως διδάγμεθα· τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι διδαχθέντες ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ὀμολογούμεν ἀκτίστας. Αναθεματίζειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς λειτουργικὸν λέγοντας τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον, ὡς διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης εἰς τὴν τοῦ κτίσματος κατάγοντας τάξιν.

Therefore, we must add the particular to the general and thus confess the faith; the Godhead is something general, the paternity something particular, and combining these we should say: I believe in God the Father. And again in the confession of the Son we should do likewise—combine the particular with the general, and say: I believe in God the Son. Similarly too in

Therefore, we must add the particular to the general and thus confess the faith; the Godhead is something general, the paternity something particular, and combining these we should say: I believe in God the Father. And again in the confession of the Son we should do likewise—combine the particular with the general, and say: I believe in God the Son. Similarly too in.

the case of the Holy Spirit, we should frame on the same principle our utterance of the reference to Him and say: I believe also in the divine Holy Spirit, so that throughout the whole, both unity is preserved in the confession of the one Godhead, and that which is peculiar to the Persons is confessed in the distinction made in the characteristics attributed to each. 534

Only in the Letter 8 and the Letter 360 in the corpus of Basil’s letters there are clear statements that the Holy Spirit is God (Letter 8: δέον ὁμολογεῖν Θεὸν τὸν Πατέρα, Θεὸν τὸν Υἱὸν, Θεὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον; Letter 360: ὁμολογῶ καὶ συντίθημι πιστεύειν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, Θεόν τὸν Πατέρα, Θεόν τὸν Υἱὸν, Θεόν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον), but as Courtonne claims - the authorship of the first is uncertain 535 and the second one (to Julian) is certainly apocryphal. 536 As Beeley points out it was Gregory of Nazianzus who first dared to call the Holy Spirit God. 537 The first time the expression Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον appears in his Oration 13 dated for 372 538 but when he used it in 380 as bishop of Constantinople he noticed the audacity of his own words and added εἰ μὴ τραχύνῃ - “do not be angry” to the phrase Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον. 539

Summing up, there are no reliable sources to confirm that Eustathius was Pneumatomachos. The only charges of Pneumatomachian heresy come from Basil and appear in a contexts that allow to advance a thesis that they arose due to the

535 Basil, Epistulae 8, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1, 22.
537 Ch. Beeley, The Holy Spirit in the Cappadocians: Past and Present, 100.
538 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 13, 4, PG 35, 856.
539 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 33, 16, PG 36, 236; transl. NPNF II 7, 334. Beeley (The Holy Spirit in the Cappadocians, 100) translates the interjection “if you don’t mind!”. 
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political and not doctrinal reasons. In fact, Eustathius was Homoiousian exactly as his former friend and later adversary – Basil of Caesarea.

Chapter IV. Real reasons of the conflict

A lot of scholars claim that Basil and Eustathius remained close friends until Eustathius became a Pneumatomachian. No writings by Eustathius preserved, the only source that testifies Eustathius’ inclination to that heresy is Basil. What is important – late Basil. On the earlier stages Eustathius was accused of Arianism by Athanasius, but that charge was based on general Western conviction that Homoiousians were Arians. Apparently, Basil shared Homoiousians ideas with Eustathius as well as ascetical ones and his charges had political background. Although it cannot be stated with certainty it is highly probable that Eustathius’ Pneumatomachism was a product of Basil’s propaganda.

The starting point to find out the real reasons of the conflict between Basil and Eustathius is a fluid structure of ecclesiastical subordination and vague procedure of electing bishops at that time. Although there were some attempts of regulating, they remained at such a point of generalization that to all intents and purposes the structure depended on local relationships and personalities. Canon 4 of the Council of Nicæa (325) stated:

\[
\text{Επίσκοπον προσήκειν μάλιστα μὲν ύπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ Καθίστασθαι. εἰ δὲ δυσχερές εἰη τὸ τοιοῦτον ἡ διὰ κατεπείγουσαν ἀνάγκην, ἡ δὲ μῆκος ὀδοῦ, ἐξ ἀπαντος τρεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένους, συμψήφω ἡ γινομένων.}
\]

It is by all means proper that a bishop should be appointed by all the bishops in the province; but should this be difficult, either on account of urgent necessity or because of distance, three at least should meet together, and the suffrages of the absent [bishops] also

---

being given and communicated in
writing, then the ordination should take place. But in every province the ratification of what is done should be left to the Metropolitan.\textsuperscript{541}

Unfortunately, the very same council did not specify whether ecclesiastical provinces should always follow civil administrative divisions, whether metropolitans should be bishops residing in the capitals of civil provinces, whether ecclesiastical administration should follow the civil one only up to provinces or should spread up to dioceses. Canon 6 seemed to approve \textit{status quo} that at some points did not harmonized with civil administrative divisions:

Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis prevail, that the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction in all these, since the like is customary for the Bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the Churches retain their privileges. And this is to be universally understood, that if anyone be made bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan, the great Synod has declared that such a man ought not to be a bishop. If, however, two or three bishops shall from natural love of contradiction, oppose the common suffrage of the rest, it being reasonable and in accordance with the ecclesiastical

\textsuperscript{541} Concilium Nicaenum, canon 4, ed. J.D. Mansi, vol. 2, 669, transl. NPNF II 14, 11.
law, then let the choice of the majority prevail.\textsuperscript{542}

Although it seems clear that a metropolitan bishop had the final word when new bishops were to be appointed, but the problem is that the Council did not define which bishopries were metropolises except for Alexandria, Rome and Antioch. Moreover, Barnes shows that the administrative system created by Diocletian is not easy to be established in details.\textsuperscript{543} Norton summarises: “The structures put in place by Diocletian and his successors had divided the empire (from the top down) into prefectures, dioceses, and provinces, which with some exceptions were administered respectively by Praetorian prefects, vicars and governors. [...] Thus by the middle of the fourth century we find four Praetorian prefectures, those of (1) the East (Oriens), which ran from Thrace through Asia minor, Syria, Palestine and Egypt to Libya; (2) Illyricum, which covered Greece and the eastern Balkan regions; (3) Italy which comprised the western Balkans, Italy and Africa; and (4) the Gauls, which covered Gaul, Spain and Britain. These were broken down into 13 dioceses, which were themselves composed of 119 provinces (after Constantine’s reforms).”\textsuperscript{544}

But, the structure changed. At some point around 371 Valens divided the province of Cappadocia into two provinces: Cappadocia Prima and Cappadocia Secunda. Gregory of Nazianzus left a detailed description of the problems that the new civil division caused in the ecclesiastical hierarchy:

\textit{When our country had been divided into two provinces and metropolitical sees, and a great part of the former was being added to the new one, this again roused their factious spirit. The one thought it right that the ecclesiastical boundaries should be settled by the\textsuperscript{542} Concilium Nicaenum, canon 6, ed. J.D. Mansi, vol. 2, 669-771, transl. NPNF II 14, 15.\textsuperscript{543} T.D. Barnes, The new empire of Diocletian and Constantine, Cambridge (MA) 1982, 209-211.\textsuperscript{544} P. Norton, Episcopal elections 250-600. Hierarchy and popular will in Late Antiquity, New York 2007, 118.}
καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μετεποιεῖτο τῶν νεωστὶ προσελθόντων, ὡς αὐτῶ διαφερόντων ἤδη κάκεινου κεχωρισμένων. Ο δὲ τῆς παλαιᾶς εἰχετο συνηθείας καὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ἁνωθεν διαιρέσεως. Ἐξ ὧν πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ, τὰ μὲν συνέβαινεν ἤδη, τὰ δὲ ὁδίνετο. Ὁπεσπῶντο σύνοδοι παρὰ τοῦ νέου μητροπολίτου, πρόσοδοι διηρπάζοντο· πρεσβύτεροι τῶν ἐκκλησίων, οἱ μὲν συνεβαίνει καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐκκλησίων χεῖρον ἔχειν διϊσταμένων καὶ τεμνομένων. Καὶ γάρ πως ταῖς καινοτομίαις χαίρουσιν ἄνθρωποι καὶ τὰ σφῶν ἤδεως παρακερδαίνουσι· καὶ ὅσον τὸ καθεστῶταν ἢ καταλυθην ἐπαναγαγεῖν. Ὁ δὲ πλεῖον αὐτῶν ἐξεμπέθη, αἱ Ταυρικαὶ πρόσοδοι καὶ παρόδιοι, αὐτῶ μὲν ὀρώμεναι, ἐκείνω δὲ προσγενόμεναι, καὶ τὸν ἁγιὸν Ὡρέστην ἐκκατοπούσθαι μέγα ἐτίθετο· ὡς καὶ τῶν ἡμιόνων λαβέσθαι ποτὲ τοῦ ἄνδρός ἰδίαι ὀδὸν ὄδεύοντος, εἰργαῖν τοῦ πρῶσων civil ones: and therefore claimed those newly added, as belonging to him, and severed from their former metropolitan. The other clung to the ancient custom, and to the division which had come down from our fathers. Many painful results either actually followed, or were struggling in the womb of the future. Synods were wrongfully gathered by the new metropolitan, and revenues seized upon. Some of the presbyters of the churches refused obedience, others were won over. In consequence the affairs of the churches fell into a sad state of dissension and division. Novelty indeed has a certain charm for men, and they readily turn events to their own advantage, and it is easier to overthrow something which is already established, than to restore it when overthrown. What however enraged him [i.e. Anthymus, bishop of Tyana] most was, that the revenues of the Taurus, which passed along before his eyes, accrued to his rival [i.e. Basil, bishop of Caesarea], as also the offerings at Saint Orestes’, of which he was greatly desirous to reap the fruits. He [i.e. Anthymus, bishop of Tyana] even went so far as, on one occasion
when Basil was riding along his own road, to seize his mules by the bridle and bar the passage with a robber band. And with how specious a pretext, the care of his spiritual children and of the souls entrusted to him, and the defence of the faith – pretexts which veiled that most common vice, insatiable avarice – and further, the wrongfulness of paying dues to heretics, a heretic being anyone who had displeased him.545

Two things are of crucial importance in the above-quoted description: first, it was not obvious that the ecclesiastical structure should follow the civil one; second, apparently it was customary to accuse of heresy a political rival. Actually, it worked in both ways: doctrinal enemies accused each other of unmoral behavior and political enemies – of heresy. Both kind of charges could have been similarly fake. The example of such (most probably) false accusation are depositions made by the Council of Constantinople (360) where Homoiousian bishops were charged with and deposed on the basis of disciplinary offences. Gregory of Nazianzus reveals a mechanism that must have been very common. Not only charges of Apollinarism formulated by Eustathius against Basil, but also charges of Arianism and Pneumatomiachism formulated by Basil against Eustathius could have been parts of the political conflict.

In 370 Basil became bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, capital city of the civil province of Cappadocia. Under Diocletian the large province of Cappadocia was divided into four main units: Pisidia, Cappadocia, Armenia Minor, and Pontus Polemoniacus.546 At the times of Basil, the civil province of Cappadocia was a part of a bigger unit: dioceses of Pontus with the headquarter in Amaseia. Apparently,

545 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funeris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 58, SC 384, 248-252; transl. NPNF II 7, 414.
the ecclesiastical subordination in the region did not follow the civil one since Basil could have demanded to ordain bishops in neighboring provinces that in the past were parts of the large province of Cappadocia. There are no sources that could reveal the politics of Basil’s predecessors, but it seems possible that bishops of Caesarea in Cappadocia considered themselves metropolitans over much larger territory than the civil province of Cappadocia. The metropolitan power of Caesarea over Armenia must have been a relic of the times when Armenia just received Christianity and Gregory the Illuminator was sent to Caesarea in Cappadocia to be ordained by bishop Leontius.

There were only a few episcopal sees in Armenia Minor in 4th century; the list of bishops who took part in the Council of Nicaea (325) names two episcopal sees in Armenia Minor: Sebastea and Satala, Sebastea as the first, so apparently more important. After 325 in Armenia Minor at least three more sees were created: in Nicopolis, Melitene and Colonia. The correspondence of Basil shows that he acted as a metropolitan over Armenia. It is significant that already at the beginning of his bishopric Basil calls Theodot, the bishop of Nicopolis in Armenia Minor, the bishop given (τοῦ δοθέντος ἐπισκόπου) him εἰς συνεργίαν – it could mean a cooperation, but as well assistance as if Theodot were a kind of auxiliary bishop that today would be called suffragan.

The situation in Armenia Minor was additionally complicated by the conflict between Basil and Anthymus of Tyana that broke out after the civil province of Cappadocia was divided around 371. Anthimus openly fought for his own independence and metropolitan status of Tyana, the civil capital of Cappadocia Secunda. At some point before 372 Anthymus ordained a certain Faustus for a

bishop in Armenia in place of Cyril. It seems that ordaining bishops in Armenia was an important prerogative of a metropolitan of Cappadocia.

In 371 Basil started to ordain bishops in Armenia (δοῦναι ἐπισκόπους τῇ Ἁρμενίᾳ). Basil himself claims that he was supposed to do it out of the imperial ordinance (τῷ βασιλικῷ προστάγματι). Gregory of Nazianzus describes the confrontation between Basil and Valens, but according to his version the effect was that Valens decided not to persecute or expel Basil — nothing about any manifestation of kindness and all the more any privilege. It is hardly imaginable that Valens could have given a privilege to ordain bishops to any other bishop as the ordination of bishops was beyond any civil authority. Norton explains: “Imperial intervention in elections was not a widespread phenomenon. It is all too easy to over-estimate the capability or desire of the emperors to interfere on a wholesale basis in elections. The emperors appear to have concerned themselves at most with the occupants of the great sees, the patriarchates, whom they would have considered in the same way as they would their Praetorian prefect, or any other senior civil or military official. It was the job of these men to arrange affairs on a lower level properly.” So it is rather probable that Basil had a good relationship with the vicar of Pontus and thanks to that he tried to expand a range of his influences out of his own initiative and not of any ordinance. He could have hoped to succeed until he had vicar’s support. Van Dam points out: “To explain Basil’s success in gaining favours from both emperor and prefect even after confrontations with them it is therefore unnecessary to invent any ad hominem hypotheses about the social class of the bishop, his political skills, or his moral qualities (although these may well have been contributing factors). We are dealing here not so much with aspects of Basil’s personality, as rather with structural features of a Roman empire whose central

554 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funebris in tandem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 52-54, SC 384, 234-240.
555 P. Norton, Episcopal elections 250-600, 239.
administration had to rely upon local men of authority, whoever they were, in order to function efficiently.”

Norton claims that people played an important role in the choice of bishops and the correspondence Basil confirms it:

Ἐδεξάμην δὲ καὶ ψηφίσματα παρὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Σατάλων, παράκλησιν ἥχοντα δοθῆναι αὐτοῖς παρ’ ἰμῶν ἐπίσκοπον.

I have received, too, a voted decision from the church of Satala, with the request that a bishop be given them by us.

It is clear that a range of influence on ecclesiastical affairs of both civil and ecclesiastical authorities was based on their effectiveness in persuading people: laity and clergy. A new bishop was elected by the people of Satala and the task of Basil was to ordain him.

It is not by coincidence that conflict between Basil and Eustathius started just after Basil had intervened in Satala – in the territory that Eustathius must have considered his own. Because of his power base, Basil initially succeeded. The things changed in 375 when Demosthenes became a new vicar of Pontus. Basil himself testifies that the vicar (βικάριος) of Pontus treated him with outright hostility and took sides with henchmen of Eustathius. By the way, he gives us a detailed description of how the elections of bishops looked like in reality:

Πείθειν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐπειράτο δέξασθαι τὸν Ἐυστάθιον καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον. Ως δὲ εἶδεν αὐτοὺς ἐκόντας οὐκ ἐνδιδόντας, νῦν πειράται βιωτέρα χειρὶ ἐγκαταστῆσαι τὸν διδόμενον.

[Demosthenes] tried to persuade them [the Nicopolitans] to accept Eustathius, and through him to take their bishop.

And since he saw that they did not yield willingly, he now tries with a stronger hand to establish him who is being given them. And some expectation of a

556 R. van Dam, Emperor, bishops and friends in late antique Cappadocia, 60.
557 P. Norton, Episcopal elections 250-600, 6.
560 J.R. Pouchet, Basile le Grand et son univers d’amis d’après sa correspondance, 374.
Apparently, Eustathius became such an important figure that he demanded his right to ordain bishops in other sees of Armenia Minor. Eustathius was bishop of Sebastea since 357 (with some breaks that are difficult to establish precisely as it is impossible to find out which of his depositions were effective). Nothing is known about his conflicts with previous bishops of Caesarea in Cappadocia. At the beginning of 370s Theodot of Nicopolis started to fight Eustathius under the pretext of his unorthodoxy. That the reason of the conflict was fake is clear from the fact that Theodot refused to take note of Basil’s testimony on Eustathius’ orthodoxy. Since the ecclesiastical subordination in Armenia Minor was so vague, bishops of Sebastea and Nicomedia could have fought for a metropolitan status. Basil himself confessed in the letter written in 375 to the very Eustathius that the reason of the conflict was a struggle for power:

Ἀλλ’ οὐ γὰρ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ χωρισμοῦ αἰτία, ἑτέρα δὲ ἐστὶ τῆς διαστάσεως ἢ ὑπόθεσις ἢν ἐγὼ λέγειν αἰσχύνομαι, καὶ ἐσίγνησα δὲ πάντα τὸν χρόνον, εἰ μὴ τὰ νῦν πεπραγμένα ἀναγκαίαν μοι καθίστη διὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν λυσιτελές τῆς ὅλης αὐτῶν προαιρέσεως τὴν φανέρωσιν. Νομιζέτωσαν οἱ χρηστοὶ ἐμπόδιον

And yet the letter is not responsible for the parting, but there is another pretext of the separation, which I am ashamed to mention; and I would have been silent for all time if their recent deeds did not make the disclosure of their entire purpose incumbent upon me for the good of the many. Our excellent friends have decided that communion with us was a hindrance to their recovery of dominion!  

---

According to Jurgens the primary cause of the break in friendship between Basil and Eustathius was that “which Basil has categorized as Eustathius’ ambition for power.” Jurgens thinks that Eustathius wanted to regain the favour of the emperor and that is why he signed the heretical (Pneumatomachian) creed. If it had been so, Basil as well would had to sign the heretical creed in order to obtain emperor’s grace. Apparently, the political reality was much more complicated and dependent on relationships on much lower level. And charges of heresy used to be an integral part of struggle for power in the Church of 4th century.

565 W.A. Jurgens, Eustathius of Sebaste, 81-82.
Part VI. Epilogue

It is doubtful that Basil and Gregory had sister named Macrina. In accordance with the custom of the time, the first daughter should have got the name after her maternal grandmother as it was in the family of Gregory of Nazianzus: his sister Gorgonia was named after their maternal grandmother and Gorgonia’s daughter Nonna as well. Macrina the Younger would have received her name contrary to the custom after her paternal grandmother, Macrina the Elder. It is worth noticing that Basil (the first son) got his name according to the custom after his father, as well as Gregory of Nazianzus.

Existed or not, Macrina described by Gregory of Nyssa is certainly a literary construct. Now, it is time to put the question: why? For what reason could anybody invent a saint? In my opinion, Macrina was invented in order to substitute Eustathius of Sebastea and Basil as his follower in the history of asceticism.

Maraval thought that Macrina was an intermediary between Eustathius and Basil, but Gregory overrated the role of Macrina to such an extent that he omitted Eustathius at all. Already in 1959, J. Gribomont noticed the contradiction between descriptions of Basil’s conversion and claimed that \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} passes over Eustathius as since 375 he was openly a Pneumatomachos. So the suggestion is clear: Eustathius was substituted by Macrina in order to cover the heretic inspirer of Basil. Fatti specifies more precisely that the Council of Constantinople (381) anathematized all heretic doctrines including Pneumatomachians and it was very dangerous to declare somebody a disciple of the heresiarch. I myself thought that it was the most probable explanation, until I discovered that it is more than likely that Eustathius never signed any heretical creed and his unorthodoxy was only Basil’s propaganda.

568 J. Gribomont, Eustache le philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée, 123. The idea is present also in P. Maraval, Intoduction, SC 178, 52 and S. Elm, Virgin of God, 135.
569 F. Fatti, Monachesimo anatolico. Eustazio di Sebastia e Basilio di Cesarea, 84-85.
570 M. Przyszychowska, Macrina the Younger – the invented saint, “Studia Pelplińskie” 52 (2018), 338.
Fatti thinks that Eustathius was blot out from the life of Basil by Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus because they wanted all credits for creating monasticism in Cappadocia and Pontus to go to Basil.\textsuperscript{571} However, if Gregory of Nyssa really had wanted to promote Basil, he could have done it directly by writing \textit{Vita sancti Basilii} instead of \textit{Vita sanctae Marcinae} and the dialogue with brother Basil instead of the dialogue with sister Macrina. On the contrary, in the \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} Basil is shown as braggart when he returned from the school of rhetoric (from Athens?):

\begin{quote}
Λαβοῦσα τοῖνυν αὐτὸν ύπερφυώς ἐπηρμένον τῷ περὶ τοὺς λόγους φρονήματι καὶ πάντα περιφρονοῦντα τὰ ἀξίωματα καὶ ύπὲρ τοὺς ἐν τῇ δυναστείᾳ λαμπροὺς ἐπηρμένον τῷ ὑγκῷ.
\end{quote}

He was excessively puffed up by his rhetorical abilities and disdainful of all great reputations, and considered himself better than the leading men in the district.\textsuperscript{572}

In this story it was Macrina who “took him over and lured him quickly to the goal of philosophy (κάκεῖνον πρὸς τὸν τῆς φιλοσοφίας σκοπὸν ἐπεσπάσατο).”\textsuperscript{573} Basil appears in \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} six more times: twice he is a point of reference for other siblings: “The second of the four brothers after the great Basil was named Naucratius;”\textsuperscript{574} Peter “was no less esteemed than the great Basil for the excellent qualities of his later life;”\textsuperscript{575} twice his death is recalled to show Macrina’s apatheia in the face of a misfortune\textsuperscript{576} and once it serves as a pretext to start a conversation on “the higher philosophy.”\textsuperscript{577} The only passage that seemingly describes Basil’s career mentions as his only achievement that he ordained Peter for a priest:

\begin{quote}
574 Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 8, GNO 8/1, 378, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 168.
575 Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 12, GNO 8/1, 384, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 172.
576 Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 14, GNO 8/1, 385-386.
577 Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 17, GNO 8/1, 389.
\end{quote}
Ἐν τούτῳ ὁ πολὺς ἐν ἁγίοις Βασίλειος τῆς μεγάλης Καισαρείων ἐκκλησίας ἀνεδείχθη προστάτης· ὃς ἔτι τὸν κλήρον τῆς ἐν τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ἱερωσύνης τὸν ἄδειφὸν ἄγει ταῖς μυστικαῖς ἔκτων ἱερουργίαις ἀφιερώσας. Καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν αὐτοῖς ἐτί τὸ σεμνότερον τε καὶ ἀγιώτερον προῆλθε ὁ βίος τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐπαυξηθείσης. Οκτὼ δὲ μετὰ τούτῳ διαγενομένων ἑτῶν τῷ ἐνάτῳ ἑνιαυτῷ ὁ κατὰ πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὀνομαστός Βασίλειος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸν θεὸν μετοικιζέται.

At this time, Basil, distinguished among the holy, was made Bishop of Caesarea. He led his brother to the holy vocation of the priesthood, and consecrated him in the mystical services himself. And through this also, their life progressed to a loftier and higher degree, seeing that their philosophy was enhanced by the consecration. Eight years later, Basil, renowned throughout the entire world, left the world of men and went to God.578

It would be really difficult to claim that this could be a way of praising anybody. There must have been other reason for inventing Macrina.

Macrina’s way of practicing asceticism is clearly kind of a counterpoise to the asceticism condemned in Gangra – the fact already pointed out by Robert Wiśniewski.579 *Vita sanctae Macrinae* is evidently anti-Eustathian:

✓ Emmelia, Macrina’s mother is a saint although she was married: “Her mother was extremely virtuous, following the will of God in all things and embracing an exceptionally pure and spotless way of life, so that she had chosen not to marry. However, since she was an orphan and flowering in the springtime of her beauty, and the fame of her loveliness had attracted many suitors, there was danger that, if she were not joined to someone by choice, she might suffer some unwished-for violence, because some of the suitors maddened by her beauty were preparing to carry her off. For this reason, she chose a man well known and recommended for the dignity of his life, and

thus she acquired a guardian for her own life” in accordance with Canon 1 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ Naucratius used to go hunting to procure food for the old people (Vita sanctae Macrinae 8, GNO 8/1, 379), so the community clearly did not condemn eating meat in accordance with Canon 2 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ Macrina’s mother had maids (Vita sanctae Macrinae 7, GNO 8/1, 378) and Naucratius had housemen (Vita sanctae Macrinae 8, GNO 8/1, 378) who were treated as “sisters and equals rather than her slaves and underlings,” but were not taught to despise their masters in accordance with Canon 3 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ liturgy is always celebrated in the church with no exceptions (Vita sanctae Macrinae 16, GNO 8/1, 388; 22, GNO 8/1, 395; 34, GNO 8/1, 409) in accordance with Canon 6 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ Macrina gave all her wealth into the hands of the priest (Vita sanctae Macrinae 20, GNO 8/1, 393) in accordance with Canon 8 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ Vita sanctae Macrinae stresses the significance of marriage even if somebody chooses virginity (Vita sanctae Macrinae 5, GNO 8/1, 375) in accordance with Canon 9 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ married people could visit the monastery and spend there some time (Vita sanctae Macrinae 37, GNO 8/1, 410), they were never treated arrogantly in accordance with Canon 10 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ although the ascetics lived very modestly, they organized feasting (εὐῳχία) for the guests (Vita sanctae Macrinae 38, GNO 8/1, 412) in accordance with Canon 11 of the Council of Gangra,

✓ Macrina wore women clothes such as a veil - τῆς κεφαλῆς ἡ καλυπτρα (Vita sanctae Macrinae 29, GNO 8/1, 403) in accordance with Canon 13 of the Council of Gangra,

Gregory of Nyssa, Vita sanctae Macrinae 2, GNO 8/1, 372, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 164.
in *Vita sanctae Macrinae* no woman abandons her husband or wishes to withdraw from marriage in accordance with Canon 14 of the Council of Gangra, only widows can become members of the community,

in accordance with Canons 15 and 16 of the Council of Gangra, neither mother (Emmelia) abandoned her children nor daughter (Macrina) abandoned her mother under pretext of asceticism, but they lived together: “She settled upon a safeguard for her noble decision, namely, a resolve never to be separated for a moment from her mother, so that her mother often used to say to her that the rest of her children she had carried in her womb for a fixed time, but this daughter she always bore, encompassing her in her womb at all times and under all circumstances,”

the family worshipped martyrs (*Vita sanctae Macrinae* 15, GNO 8/1, 387; 34, GNO 8/1, 408) in accordance with Canon 20 of the Council of Gangra.

Although it cannot be determined which of those condemned points were realized by Eustathius himself and which by his followers, it is evident that the ascetic life pictured in *Vita sanctae Macrinae* opposes Eustathian asceticism and is not inspired by Eustathius as Driscoll wanted. As shown above, Basil remained faithful to the crucial indicators of Eustathian ascetic life. One of this pivotal features was individualism which is absolutely absent in *Vita sanctae Macrinae*. In Macrina’s asceticism there is no place for exceptions based on individual judgment of the ascetic. Macrina knows the Bible well and sings psalms all day long, but she does not interpret the Holy Scripture on her own. There is also no place for disobedience to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Even poverty must be limited according

---

581 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 5, GNO 8/1, 376, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 166.
583 My analysis opposes A.M. Silvas, who claimed (*Macrina the Younger: Philosopher of God*, 43): “A careful comparison of the VSM and the Small Asketikon reveals an overwhelming agreement between the Annisa community and the form of ascetic community taught in the Small Asketikon. That is, most of the features of the community at Annisa in 379 were already in place by about 365. Many of the hyper-ascetic correctives of the council of Gangra were operative even then. Yet the Small Asketikon itself is the culmination of considerable prior development in the conception of the ascetic life.”
to the decision of the priest; when the way of burying Macrina was being decided, it turned out that she did not possess anything but a dress, a covering of her head and sandals. When Gregory asked her companion whether Macrina would oppose if he brought some of the things that he had got ready for the funeral, the companion answered:

If she were alive, she would accept such a gift from you for two reasons: on account of your priesthood, which she always honored, and, on account of your kinship, she would not have thought that what belonged to her brother was not also hers. It was for this reason that she ordered her body to be prepared by your hands.\textsuperscript{584}

Although she was a superior of the community, Macrina did not even have access to her own money, but she gave all her wealth into the hands of the priest.\textsuperscript{585}

J. Daniélou claims that at the beginning Basil was disciple of Eustathius and then changed and ordered his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa to write \textit{De virginitate} as counterpoise to the asceticism of Eustathius.\textsuperscript{586} Daniélou bases on the fact that Gregory holds Basil up as an example of virtue. However, it is rather a rhetorical device. Gregory does not mention Basil by name and – on purpose.

Although he claims that “our most reverend bishop and father” is the only one that could be “capable of teaching these things,” he wants everyone to choose his/her own teacher:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
If she were alive, she would accept such a gift from you for two reasons: on account of your priesthood, which she always honored, and, on account of your kinship, she would not have thought that what belonged to her brother was not also hers. It was for this reason that she ordered her body to be prepared by your hands.\textsuperscript{584} & If she were alive, she would accept such a gift from you for two reasons: on account of your priesthood, which she always honored, and, on account of your kinship, she would not have thought that what belonged to her brother was not also hers. It was for this reason that she ordered her body to be prepared by your hands.\textsuperscript{584} \\
Since descriptions aimed at establishing virtue are not as powerful as the living voice and the actual examples of what is & Since descriptions aimed at establishing virtue are not as powerful as the living voice and the actual examples of what is \end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{584} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 29, GNO 8/1, 403, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 184. \\
\textsuperscript{585} Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} 20, GNO 8/1, 393. \\
good, we have, perforce, referred at the end of the discourse to our most reverend bishop and father as the only one capable of teaching these things. We did not mention him by name, but the treatise refers to him enigmatically, so that the advice bidding the young to follow in the footsteps of one who has gone before them may not seem incomprehensible to those who have access to the treatise. Asking only who the fitting guide is for such a life, let them select for themselves those who, by the grace of God, point the way to the safeguarding of a life of virtue. For either they will find the one they seek or they will not be ignorant of what kind of person he must be.  

Gregory felt obliged to refer to Basil, but he did it in such a way that it was rather diminishing than honouring – like in Vita sanctae Macrinae. As Meredith noticed, “it is instructive to compare Gregory of Nyssa’s account of Basil with his warm appraisal of their sister Macrina, whose name, significantly, occurs nowhere in the correspondence of Basil. Again the difference in tone may be purely accidental, but the suggestion that there was a sort of ‘axis’ in the family, with the masterful

---

Basil on one side, Gregory, Macrina and Peter on the other, may not beside the point.”\(^{588}\)

Macrina’s asceticism opposes Basil’s asceticism not only in excluding individualism and exceptions based on individual judgment, but in one more crucial aspect: the attitude towards family. R. van Dam put it this way: “By not marrying, not having children, and not accepting a position as a municipal magistrate or a teacher, Basil declined to take on the usual obligations of male adulthood in Greek cities. His friend Gregory of Nazianzus had adopted a similar life, although with one important difference, since he had assumed responsibility for looking after his elderly parents. As the oldest son, Basil might have been expected likewise to look after his mother. Instead, Macrina, who never married, exonerated Basil by staying with and caring for their mother.”\(^{589}\) Not only Macrina, but also Naucratius and Peter took care of their mother. Macrina “furnished food for her mother from her own labor, and, in addition, she shared her mother’s worries,” “she was a sharer of her mother’s toils, taking on part of her cares and lightening the heaviness of her griefs.”\(^{590}\) Naucratius “also zealously carried out his mother’s wishes if she asked anything for herself, and, in these two ways, he charted his life’s course, controlling his young manhood by his labor and caring for his mother,”\(^{591}\) “he lived this way for five years, philosophizing and making his mother’s life a blessed one because of the way that he regulated his own life through moderation and put all his energy into fulfilling her every wish.”\(^{592}\) Peter “was above all a co-worker with his sister and mother in every phase of their angelic existence.”\(^{593}\) When Macrina was lying on her death-bed and Gregory was complaining about his difficulties and persecutions she reminded him of the most important gift of God – the family:

\[
\text{Οὐ παύσῃ, φησίν, ἀγνωμόνως ἐπὶ τοῖς θείοις ἀγαθοῖς διακείμενος; οὐ \theorapeúσεις τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ ἀχάριστον;}
\]

\[
\text{Will you ever stop ignoring the good things that come from God? Will you not remedy the thanklessness of}
\]


\(^{589}\) R. van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, 37.

\(^{590}\) Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 5, GNO 8/1, 376, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 167.

\(^{591}\) Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 8, GNO 8/1, 379, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 169.

\(^{592}\) Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 9, GNO 8/1, 379, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 169.

\(^{593}\) Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 12, GNO 8/1, 384, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 172.
Momigliano noted: “In this complex experimentation with religious figures, the life of Macrina is therefore eccentric. It is the life of a sister surrounded by mother, brothers, and sisters; it is at the same time the story of an aristocratic clan fully conscious of its own distinction.”

The attitude towards the family distances Gregory of Nyssa from Basil (his own brother!) and brings him closer to Gregory of Nazianzus. Gregory of Nazianzus never mentioned Eustathius – he clearly opposed his way of practicing asceticism. The way that was followed by Basil. The main difference between those two kinds of asceticism did not lie in strict morals or in the attitude towards the poor, or in the zealousness in reading the Holy Scriptures and in praying, or in renouncing the pleasures and comforts – in all those points both ascetics were similar. The difference lied in the attitude towards own family. Gregory of Nazianzus admits that himself:

The city of Caesarea took possession of him, as a second founder and patron, but in course of time he was occasionally absent, as a matter of necessity due to our separation, and with a view to our determined course of philosophy. Dutiful attendance on my aged parents, and a succession of misfortunes kept me apart from

---

594 Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* 21, GNO 8/1, 394, transl. V. Woods Callahan, 178.
596 F. Fatti, *Nei panni del vescovo. Gregorio, Basilio e il filosofo Eustazio*, 177-238.
ἀπήγαγεν οὖν καλῶς μὲν ἴσως οὐδὲ δικαίως, ἀπήγαγε δ' οὖν.

him, perhaps without right or justice, but so it was.  

Van Dam noted: “For all his love of solitude and ascetic isolation, Gregory had always remained a family man. Basil had rejected his father’s vocation as a teacher in order to become an ascetic and finally a bishop. In the process, he had estranged himself not only from his father’s family in Pontus, but also from his siblings and other relatives. Although Gregory had likewise been reluctant to imitate his father’s career as a cleric, he had never distanced himself from his parents, his family, and his relatives. His devotion to his father in particular was always a dominant influence in his life.”

Gregory of Nazianzus was not so close friend of Basil as it is commonly assumed. The picture of the idyllic friendship was a product of Gregory’s rhetoric, “it would be Gregory’s own writings that contributed to the formation of this image of an ideal friendship.” Gregory was rewriting the history of his relationship with Basil in order to regain the position in Cappadocia after he returned from Constantinople (381). He also treated the friendship with Basil as a part of the classical culture he was committed to.

Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa apparently shared the same idea of the family that according to S. Elm could have had its roots in philosophy: “As he made clear, the ideal Christian Greek philosopher was first and foremost embodied by Gregory himself. But, as is evident from the shared assumptions of Neoplatonist philosophy, such a man also needed an appropriately sacred ‘genesis’. And since a philosopher’s divine inspiration was prefigured in his origins, it was made manifest not only in himself, but also, of course, in his entire family.”

597 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio 43 (Funeris in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi), 25, SC 384, 182; transl. NPNF II 7, 404.
598 R. van Dam, Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia, 58.
599 R. van Dam, Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia, 155-156.
Honoring members of the family was the pivotal part of constructing his own image as a philosopher.\textsuperscript{603} Gregory of Nazianzus realized that plan by praising his brother Cesarius, his father Gregory and his sister Gorgonia in the funeral orations (Oratio 7, 18 and 8).

G. Luck demonstrated a lot of parallels between \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} and Gregory of Nazianzus’ Oration 8 on his sister Gorgonia (PG 35, 789-817): both ladies led very simple lifestyle which must have been unusual in their social circle, they were naturally beautiful without any external ornaments, both were charitable and were teachers for others, after the accident (Gorgonia) and during the illness (Macrina) both refused to consult the doctor as it required to get undressed and both were miraculously healed thanks to their own prayers.\textsuperscript{604} S. Elm claims that Gregory of Nazianzus’ oration was “the earliest hagiographic text in praise of a Christian woman.”\textsuperscript{605}

Taking all above into account, I think that Macrina was invented by Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus in order to substitute Eustathius of Sebastea in the first place and Basil as his follower as well. The main goal of \textit{Vita sanctae Macrinae} is to create a model of asceticism and communal life alternative to the Eustathian one.

Macrina became a part of a long tradition of fictitious women guiding men into mysteries of philosophy and true wisdom: Diotima from Plato’s \textit{Symposium}, Rhoda from \textit{The Shepherd of Hermas}, 11 women from Methodius of Olympus’ \textit{Symposium}. She was also not the first fictional ascetic. In the middle 370s Jerome wrote \textit{Vita beati Pauli monachi Thebani}, the life of the first eremite. Since 1877 many scholars have claimed that it is a life of a completely fictional character.\textsuperscript{606} The hagiography was written in Latin, but it was translated into Greek and spread widely in the East as well as in the West.\textsuperscript{607} Even if it had not been translated into Greek

\textsuperscript{603} S. Elm, \textit{Gregory’s women: Creating a philosopher’s family}, 191.
\textsuperscript{604} G. Luck, \textit{Notes on the Vita Macrinae}, 23-25.
\textsuperscript{605} S. Elm, \textit{Gregory’s women: Creating a philosopher’s family}, 187.
before *Vita sanctae Macrinae*, Jerome could have told about it personally to both Gregories when they met in Constantinople in the years 380-381. *Vita beati Pauli* by Jerome sets up the precedent of substitution of one leader and master for another.\textsuperscript{608} It is very likely that is was aimed at presenting model of monastic life alternative to the one presented in *Vita Antonii*.\textsuperscript{609}

\textsuperscript{608} Jerome attested that openly at the very beginning of his *Vita beati Pauli monachi Thebani* (SC 508, 144-146; transl. NPNF II 6, 404): “It has been a subject of wide-spread and frequent discussion what monk was the first to give a signal example of the hermit life. [...] So then inasmuch as both Greek and Roman writers have handed down careful accounts of Antony, I have determined to write a short history of Paul’s early and latter days.”

\textsuperscript{609} S. Rebenich, *Inventing an Ascetic Hero*, 20-23.
Appendix I. Vita sanctae Macrinae


(1) Τὸ μὲν εἶδος τοῦ βιβλίου ὄσον ἐν τῷ τῆς προγραφὴς τύπῳ ἐπιστολή εἶναι δοκεῖ, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ύπὲρ τὸν ἐπιστολιμαίον ὅρον ἐστίν εἰς συγγραφικὴν μακρηγορίαν παρατεινόμενον· ἀλλ’ ἀπολογεῖται ύπὲρ ἡμῶν ἡ υπόθεσις, ὡς ἐνεκεν γράψαι διεκελεύσω, πλείων οὖσα ἡ κατ’ ἐπιστολῆς συμμετρίαν. Πάντως δὲ οὖκ ἀμηγονεῖς τῆς συντυχίας, ὅτε κατ’ εὐχὴν Ιεροσολύμωις ἐπιφοίτησάς μέλλων, ἐφ’ όι τὰ σημεῖα τῆς τοῦ κυρίου διὰ σαφὸς ἐπιθημίας ἐν [371] τοῖς τόποις ἰδεῖν, συνέδραμόν σοι κατὰ τήν Ἀντιόχου πόλιν καὶ παντοῖων ἀνακινουμένων ἡμῖν λόγων (οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰκὸς ἦν ἐν σιωτῇ τὴν συντυχίαν εἶναι, πολλὰς τῷ λόγῳ τὰς ἀφορμὰς τῆς σῆς συνέσεως ύποβαλλόντις), οίᾳ δὴ φιλεὶ πολλάκις ἐν τούτοις γίνεσθαι, εἰς μνήμην βίου τίνος εὐδοκίμου προῆλθε ὑέων ὁ λόγος. Γυνὴ δὲ ἦν ἡ τοῦ διηγήματος ἀφορμή, εἰπέρ γνηθοῦκ οἶδα γὰρ εἰ πρέπον ἐστίν ἐκ τῆς φύσεως 1. From the heading of this work, you might think that it is a letter, but it has extended itself into a rather lengthy monograph. My excuse is that you ordered me to write on a subject that goes beyond the scope of a letter. In any case, you will recall our meeting in Antioch, where we happened to come across each other as I was on my way to Jerusalem to fulfill a vow to see the evidence of our Lord’s sojourn in the flesh in that region of the world. We talked of all sorts of things (indeed, seeing you precipitated so many topics of conversation that it was not likely to be a silent encounter) and, as often happens, the flow of our conversation turned to the life of an esteemed person. We spoke of a woman, if one may refer to her as that, for I do not know if it is right to use that natural designation for one who went beyond the nature of a woman. We did not have to
rely on hearsay since experience was our teacher, and the details of our story did not depend on the testimony of others. The maiden we spoke of was no stranger to my family so that I did not have to learn the wondrous facts about her from others; we were born of the same parents, she being, as it were, an offering of first fruits, the earliest flowering of our mother’s womb. At that time, you suggested that a history of her good deeds ought to be written because you thought such a life should not be lost sight of in time and, that having raised herself to the highest peak of human virtue through philosophy, she should not be passed over in silence and her life rendered ineffective. Accordingly, I thought it right to obey [164] you and to write her life story as briefly as I could in an artless and simple narrative.

2. The maiden’s name was Macrina. She had been given this name by her parents in memory of a remarkable Macrina earlier in the family, our father’s mother, who

(2) Μακρίνα ἦν ὄνομα τῇ παρθένῳ, εὐδόκιμος δὲ τις πάλαι κατὰ τὸ γένος ἦν ἡ Μακρίνα, μήτηρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν γεγενημένη, ταῖς ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ
ὁμολογίας τῶν καιρῶν διωγμῶν ἐναθλήσασα, ἡ ἐπωνυμάσθη παρὰ τῶν γονέων ἡ παῖς. Αλλὰ τούτῳ μὲν ἢν ἐν φανερῶ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ παρὰ τῶν γινωσκόντων ὄνομαζόμενον, ἔτερον δὲ κατὰ τὸ λεληθὸς αὐτὴ ἐπεκέκλητο, ὃ πρῖν παρελθεῖν διά τῶν ὁδίων εἰς φῶς ἐκ τινὸς ἐπιφανείας ἐπωνυμάσθη. Ἡν γὰρ δὴ τοιαύτη κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν καὶ ἡ μήτηρ ὡς πανταχὸς τῷ θείῳ βουλήματι χειραγωγεῖσθαι, διαφερόντως δὲ τὴν καθαρὰν τε καὶ ἀκηλίδωτον τοῦ βίου διαγωγὴν ἀσπασαμένην, ὡς μηδὲ τὸν γάμον ἐκουσίως ἐλέσθαι. Άλλ᾽ ἐπειδὴ ὀρφανὴ μὲν ἢν ἀμφοτέρων ἦν, ὑπερήνθει δὲ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ σώματος καὶ πολλοῦςτη φήμη τῆς εὐμορφίας πρὸς τὴν μνηστείαν συνήγειρε, κίνδυνος δὲ ἦν, εἰ μὴ κατὰ τὸ ἐκουσίον τινι συναρμοσθεὶς, παθεῖν τι τῶν ἄβουλήτων ἢν ἐπιγείας, πρὸς ἀρπαγᾶς παρεκκενασμένων τῶν ἑπιμεμνημένων τῷ κάλλει·διὰ τούτῳ ἐλομένη τὸν ἐπὶ σεμνότητι βίου γνωριζόμενον τε καὶ μαρτυροῦμενον, ὡστε φύλακα κτήσασθαι τῆς ἱδίας ζωῆς, εὐθὺς ἐν ταῖς πρῶταις ὁδίσι ταύτης γίνεται μήτηρ. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ παρῆν ὁ καιρὸς, καθ’ ὅν ἐδει had distinguished herself in the confession of Christ at the time of the persecutions. This was her official name which her acquaintances used, but she had been given another secretly in connection with a vision which occurred before she came into the light at birth. Her mother was extremely virtuous, following the will of God in all things and embracing an exceptionally pure and spotless way of life, so that she had chosen not to marry. However, since she was an orphan and flowering in the springtime of her beauty, and the fame of her loveliness had attracted many suitors, there was danger that, if she were not joined to someone by choice, she might suffer some unwished-for violence, because some of the suitors maddened by her beauty were preparing to carry her off. For this reason, she chose a man well known and recommended for the dignity of his life, and thus she acquired a guardian for her own life. In her first pregnancy, she became Macrina’s mother. When the time
λυθήναι τὴν ὡδίνα τῷ τόκῳ, εἰς ὑπὸν καταπεσοῦσα φέρειν ἑδόκει διὰ χειρός τὸ ἐτί υπὸ τῶν σπλάγχνων περιεχόμενον καὶ τίνα ἐν εἰδει καὶ σχῆματι μεγαλοπρεπεστέρῳ ὡς κατὰ ἀνθρωπον ἐπιφανέντα προσεπιεῖν τῇ βασταζομένῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος Θέκλης, ἐκείνης Θέκλης, ὡς πολὺς ἐν ταῖς παρθένους ὁ λόγος. Ποιήσαντα δὲ τούτο εἰς τρὶς μεταστήνα τῶν ὄψεων καὶ δοῦναι τῇ ὡδίνι τὴν εὐκολίαν, ὡς ὁμοῦ τε τοῦ ὑπὸν αὐτήν διαναστήναι καὶ τὸ ἐνυπνίον ὑπαρ ἱδεῖν. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ὄνομα τὸ κεκρυμμένον ἐκεῖνο ἦν. Δοκεῖ δὲ μοι μὴ τοσοῦτον πρὸς τὴν ὀνοματικὴν κλῆσιν [373] ὁδηγῶν τὴν γειναμένην ὁ ἐπιφανεῖς τοῦτο προσφερέγχασθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν βίον προεπεῖν τῆς νέας καὶ τὴν τῆς προαιρέσεως ὑπερβαίνειν ἱδία τῆς ὀμοιότητας ἐνδείξασθαι.

(3) Τρέφεται τοίνυν τὸ παιδίον, οὕσης μὲν αὐτῷ καὶ τιθηνοῦ ἱδίας, τὰ δὲ πολλὰ τῆς μητρὸς ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ ταῖς ἱδίαις τιθηνουμένης. Ὑπερβάσα τῇ τῶν νηπίων ἡλικίαν εὐμαθῆς ἢ τῶν παιδικῶν μαθημάτων, καὶ πρὸς ὅπερ ἢ τῶν γονέων κρίσεις ἢ γέγεν μαθημα, κατ᾽ came in which she was to be freed from her pain by giving birth to the child, she fell asleep and seemed to be holding in her hands the child still in her womb, and a person of greater than human shape and form appeared to be addressing the infant by the name of Thecla.

(There was a Thecla of much fame among virgins.) After doing this and invoking her as a witness three times, he disappeared from sight and gave ease to her pain so that as she awoke from her sleep she saw the dream realized. This, then, was her secret name. It seems to me that the one who appeared was not so much indicating how the child should be named, but foretelling the life of the child and intimating that she would choose a life similar to that of her namesake.

3. So the child grew, nursed chiefly by her mother although [165] she had a nurse of her own. Upon leaving infancy, she was quick to learn what children learn, and to whatever learning the judgment of her parents directed her, the little one’s nature responded brilliantly.
ἐκεῖνο ἡ φύσις τῆς νέας διέλαμπεν. Ἡν δὲ τῇ μητρὶ σπουδὴ παιδεύσαι μὲν τὴν παῖδα, μὴ μέντοι τὴν ἐξωθὲν ταύτην καὶ ἐγκύκλιον παιδευσιν, ὡς τὰ πολλὰ διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων αἱ πρῶται τῶν παιδευομένων ἡλικίαι διδάσκονται. Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ὕστερ καὶ παντάπασιν ἀπρεπὲς ἢ τὰ τραγικὰ πάθη, ὡς ἐκ γυναικῶν τὰς ἁρχὰς καὶ τὰς υποθέσεις τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἐδωκεν, ἡ τὰς κωμικὰς ἀσχημοσύνας ἢ τῶν κατὰ τὸ Ἰλιον κακῶν τὰς αἰτίας ἀπαλὴν καὶ εὐπλαστὸν φύσιν διδάσκεσθαι, καταμολυνομένην τρόπον τινά τοῖς ἀσεμνοτέροις περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν διηγήσαμι. Αὐτῆς τῆς θεσπνεύστου γραφῆς εὐληπτότερα ταῖς πρῶταις ἡλικίαις δοκεῖ, ταύτα ἢ τῇ παιδὶ τὰ μαθήματα καὶ μάλιστα ἢ τὸν Σολομώντος Σοφία καὶ ταύτης πλέον ὡς πρὸς τὸν ἠθικὸν ἔφερε βίον. Αὐτὰ καὶ τῆς ψαλμοδούμενης γραφῆς οὐδὲ ὡς ὡς ἠγνόει καυχοῖς ἱδίοις ἐκαστον μέρος τῆς ψαλμοθῆς ἢπὶ[t374] διεξούσα τῆς τε κοίτης διανισταμένη καὶ τῶν σπουδαίων ἀπτομένη τε καὶ ἀναπαυομένη καὶ προσιεμένη τροφῆν καὶ ἀναχωροῦσα τραπέζης καὶ ἐπὶ

Her mother was eager to have the child given instruction, but not in the secular curriculum, which meant, for the most part, teaching the youngsters through poetry. For she thought that it was shameful and altogether unfitting to teach the soft and pliable nature either the passionate themes of tragedy (which are based on the stories of women and give the poets their ideas and plots), or the unseemly antics of comedy, or the shameful activities of the immoral characters in the Iliad, defiling the child’s nature with the undignified tales about women. Instead of this, whatever of inspired Scripture was adaptable to the early years, this was the child’s subject matter, especially the Wisdom of Solomon and beyond this whatever leads us to a moral life. She was especially well versed in the Psalms, going through each part of the Psalter at the proper time; when she got up or did her daily tasks or rested, when she sat down to eat or rose from the table, when she went to bed or rose from it for prayer, she had the Psalter with her at all times,
κοίτην ἱούσα καὶ εἰς προσευχὰς διανισταμένη, πανταχοῦ τὴν ψαλμοδίαν εἶχεν οἴνον τίνα σύνοδον ἀγαθὴν μηδενὸς ἀπολιμπανομένην χρόνον.

(4) Τούτοις συναυξανομένη καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐπιτηδεύμασι καὶ τὴν χεῖρα πρὸς τὴν ἐριουργίαν διαφερόντας ἀσκήσας πρόεισιν εἰς δωδέκατον ἔτος, ἐν ὦ μάλιστα τὸ τῆς νεότητος ἄνθος ἐκλάμπειν ἄρχεται. Ἐνθα δὴ καὶ θαυμάζειν ἄξιον, ὡς οὐδὲ κεκρυμμένον τῆς νεότητος τὸ κάλλος ἐλάνθανεν οὐδὲ τι κατὰ τὴν πατρίδα πᾶσαν ἐκείνην τοιούτον θαύμα ἐδόκει οἶνον ἐν συγκρίσει τοῦ κάλλους ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς εὐμορφίας εῖναι, ὡς μηδὲ ἐναγάφην χεῖρας ἐφικέσθαι δυνηθῆναι τῆς ὥρας· ἀλλὰ τὴν πάντα μηχανωμένην τέχνην καὶ τοῖς μεγίστοις ἐπιτολμώσαν, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν στοιχείων τὰς εἰκόνας διὰ τῆς μιμήσεως ἀνατυπούσθαι, τὴν τῆς μορφῆς ἐκείνης εὐκληρίαν μὴ ἰσχύσας δι’ ἀκριβείας μιμήσασθαι. Τούτου χάριν πολὺς ἐσμὸς τῶν μνηστευόντων τὸν γάμον αὐτῆς τοῖς γονεύσι περιεχεῖτο. Ο δὲ πατήρ (ἡν γὰρ δὴ σώφρων καὶ κρίνειν τὸ καλὸν like a good and faithful traveling companion.

4. Growing up with these and similar pursuits and becoming extraordinarily skilled in the working of wool, she came to her twelfth year in which the flowering of youth begins especially to shine forth. Here, it is worth marveling at how the young girl’s beauty did not escape notice, although it had been concealed. Nor did there seem to be anything in all that country comparable to her beauty and her loveliness, so that the hand of the painters could not reproduce its perfection, and the art that devises all things and dares the greatest things, even to the fashioning of planets through imitation, was not powerful enough to imitate the excellence of her form.

Consequently, a great stream of suitors for her hand crowded round her parents. Her father (he was wise and considered outstanding in his judgment of what was good) singled out from
ἐπεσκεμμένος) ευδόκιμόν τινα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ γένους, γνώρισις ἐπὶ σωφροσύνη, ἀρτι τῶν παιδευτηρίων ἐπανήκοντα τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποκρίνας ἐκείνῳ κατεγγυάν ἐγνώκει τὴν παιδία, εἴπερ εἰς ἥλικιαν ἐλθοί. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ὁ μὲν ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἢ ταῖς χρηστοτέραις [375] καὶ καθάπερ τι τῶν κεχαρισμένων ἐδών τὴν διὰ τῶν λόγων ευδοκίμων προσήγε τῷ πατρὶ τῆς νέας, ἐν τοῖς υπὲρ τῶν ἀδικουμένων ἀγώσι τὴν τῶν λόγων ἐπιδεικνύμενος δύναμιν. Ὁ δὲ φθόνος ἐπικόπτει τὰς χρηστοτέρας ἐλπίδας ἀναφάντας αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς ἐν ἑλεείνῃ τῇ νεότητι.

5. The girl was not unaware of what her father had decided, and when the young man’s death broke off what had been planned for her, she called her father’s decision a marriage on the grounds that what had been decided had actually taken place and she determined to spend the rest of her life by herself; and her decision was more firmly fixed than her age would have warranted. When her parents talked of marriage (many men wanted to marry her on account of the reputation of her beauty), she used
τὸν ἀπαξ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆ
κυρωθέντα γάμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς
ἐτερον ἀναγκάζεσθαι βλέπειν, ἐνὸς
όντος ἐν τῇ φύσει τοῦ γάμου ὡς μία
gένεσις καὶ θάνατος εἰς· τὸν δὲ
συναρμοσθέντα κατὰ τὴν τῶν γονέων
κρίσιν μὴ τεθνάναι διουσχυρίζετο, ἀλλὰ
tὸν τῷ θεῷ ζώντα διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς
ἀναστάσεως ἀπόδημον κρίνειν καὶ οὐ
νεκρὸν ἀτοπον δὲ εἶναι τῷ ἐκδημοῦντι
νυμφῶν μὴ φυλάσσειν τὴν πίστιν. Τοὺς
tοιούτους λόγους ἀπωθομένη τοὺς
παραπείθειν ἐπιχειροῦντας ἐν
ἐδοκίμασεν ἐαυτῇ τῆς ἀγαθῆς κρίσεως
φυλακτήριον, τὸ μηδέποτε τῆς ἱδίας
μητρὸς μηδὲ ἐν ἀκαριεὶ τοῦ χρόνου
diaζευχθῆναι, ως [376] πολλάκις τὴν
μητέρα πρὸς αὐτὴν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τὰ λοιπὰ
tῶν τέκνων τεταγμένων τινὶ χρόνῳ
ἐκυφόρησεν, ἐκείνην δὲ διὰ παντὸς ἐν
ἐαυτῇ φέρειν πάντοτε τρόπον τινὰ τοῖς
σπλάγχνοις ἐαυτῆς περιέχουσα. Ἀλλ’
οὐκ ἦν ἐπίπονος οὐδὲ ἀκερδής τῇ μητρὶ
tῆς θυγατρὸς ὡς συνδιαγωγή-ἀντὶ γὰρ
πολλῶν αὐτῆς θεραπαινίδων ἦν ἢ παρὰ
tῆς θυγατρὸς γινομένη θεραπεία καὶ ἢν
ἀντίδοσις τις ἀγαθή παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων
αλλήλαις αὐτοπληροῦμεν. Η μὲν γὰρ
to say that it was out of place and
unlawful not to accept once and
for all a marriage determined for
her by her father and to be forced
to look to another, since marriage
is by nature unique, as are birth and
death. She insisted that the young
man joined to her by her parent’s
decision was not dead, but living in
God because of the hope of the
resurrection, merely off on a
journey and not a dead body, and it
was out of place, she maintained,
for a bride not to keep faith with
an absent husband. Thrusting aside
the arguments of those trying to
persuade her, she settled upon a
safeguard for her noble decision,
namely, a resolve never to be
separated for a moment from her
mother, so that her mother often
used to say to her that the rest of
her children she had carried in her
womb for a fixed time, but this
daughter she always bore,
encompassing her in her womb at
times and under all
circumstances. Certainly, the
companionship of her [167]
daughter was not burdensome or
disadvantageous for the mother,
because the care she received from her daughter surpassed that of many of her maidservants and there was an exchange of kindly offices between them. The older woman cared for the young woman’s soul and the daughter for her mother’s body, fulfilling in all things every desirable service, often even making bread for her mother with her own hands. Not that this was her principal concern, but when she had anointed her hands with mystic services, thinking that it was in keeping with her way of life, in the remaining time she furnished food for her mother from her own labor, and, in addition, she shared her mother’s worries. Her mother had four sons and five daughters and was paying taxes to three governors because her property was scattered over that many provinces. In a variety of ways, therefore, her mother was distracted by worries. (By this time her father had left this life.) In all of these affairs, Macrina was a sharer of her mother’s toils, taking on part of her cares and lightening the heaviness of her griefs. In
μητρώοις ὁφθαλμοῖς διὰ παντὸς εὐθυνόμενον τε καὶ μαρτυροῦμενον, ὀμοῦ τε παρέσχε πρὸς τὸν ἱσον σκοπόν, τὸν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λέγω, μεγάλην τῇ μητρὶ διὰ τοῦ βίου ἑαυτῆς τὴν ψφήγησιν, κατ’ ὀλίγον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν αἰώλὸν τε καὶ λιτοτέραν ζωῆς ἐφελκομένη.

(6) Καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ κατὰ τὰς ἀδελφὰς πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν ἐκάστῃ μετ’ εὔσχημοσύνης ἢ μήτηρ ὕκονομήσατο, ἐπάνεισιν ἐν τούτῳ τῶν παιδευτηρίων πολλῷ χρόνῳ προασκηθεῖς τοῖς λόγοις ὁ πολύς Βασίλειος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῆς προειρημένης. Λαβοῦσα τοῖνυν αὐτὸν ὑπερφυὼς ἐπηρεμένον τῷ περὶ τοὺς λόγους φρονήματι καὶ πάντα περιφρονοῦντα τὰ ἀξίωματα καὶ ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἐν τῇ δυναστείᾳ λαμπροὺς ἐπηρεμένον τῷ ὄγκῳ, τοσοῦτῳ τάχει κάκεινον πρὸς τὸν τῆς φιλοσοφίας σκοπὸν ἐπεσπάσατο, ὡστε ἀποστάντα τῆς κοσμικῆς περιφανείας καὶ υπερφιόντα τοῦ διὰ τῶν λόγων θαυμάζεσθαι πρὸς τὸν ἐργατικὸν τούτον καὶ αὐτόχειρα βιόν

addition, under her mother’s direction, she kept her life blameless and witnessed in everything by her, and, at the same time, because of her own life, she provided her mother with an impressive leadership to the same goal; I speak of the goal of philosophy, drawing her on little by little to the immaterial and simpler life.

6. After the mother had skillfully arranged what seemed best for each of Macrina’s sisters, her brother, the distinguished Basil, came home from school where he had had practice in rhetoric for a long time. He was excessively puffed up by his rhetorical abilities and disdainful of all great reputations, and considered himself better than the leading men in the district, but Macrina took him over and lured him so quickly to the goal of philosophy that he withdrew from the worldly show and began to look down upon acclaim through oratory and went over to this life full of labors for one’s own hand to perform, providing for himself, [168]
αὐτομολήσαι, διὰ τῆς τελείας ἀκτιμοσύνης ἀνεμπόδιστον ἑαυτῷ τὸν εἰς ἀρετὴν βίον παρασκευάζοντα. Ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ἐκείνου βίος καὶ τὰ ἐφεξῆς ἐπιτηδεύματα, δι’ ὅνοματός ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ύρῃ ἡλίῳ γενόμενος ἀπέκρυψε τῇ δόξῃ πάντας τοὺς ἐν ἀρετῇ διαλάμψαντας, μακρὰς ἄν εἰς συγγραφὴς καὶ χρόνου πολλοῦ· ἐξαι ἀκτημοσύνης ἀνεμπόδιστον ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἱερὸς ἐστὶν ἵνα ἄρετὴν νεμόποδιστον ἑαυτῷ τὸν χρόνῳ παρασκευάζοντα.

7. When there was no longer any necessity for them to continue their rather worldly way of life, Macrina persuaded her mother to give up her customary mode of living and her more ostentatious existence and the services of her maids, to which she had long been accustomed, and to put herself on a level with the many by entering into a common life with her maids, making them her sisters and equals rather than her slaves and underlings. But here, I want to insert something into the narrative and not to leave unrecorded an incident which testifies so well to Macrina’s exalted character.
(8) Ἡν τῶν τεσσάρων ἀδελφῶν ὁ δεύτερος μετὰ τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον, Ναυκράτιος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, φύσεως ἐὐκληρία καὶ σώματος κάλλει καὶ όψῃ καὶ τάχει καὶ τῇ πρὸς πᾶν ἐπιτηδειότητι διαφέρον τῶν ἄλλων. Προελθὼν οὔτος εἰς δεύτερον ἐτος καὶ εἰκοστὸν καὶ δύος τῶν οἰκείων πόνων ἐπὶ δημοσίας ἀκοῆς τὰς ἀποδείξεις, ὥστε ἀπαν ἐπ᾿ αὐτῷ σεισθῆναι τῶν ἀκουόντων τὸ θέατρον, θεία τινὶ προμηθεία τῶν ἐν χερσίν ἀπάντων ὑπεριδῶν πρὸς τὸν μονήρη καὶ ακτήμονα βίον ἀπῆλθεν ἐν μεγάλῃ τινὶ τῆς διανοίας ὀρμη, οὐδὲν ἐπαγόμενος μεθ᾿ ἀυτοῦ πλὴν ἐαυτῶν· εἰπετο δὲ τις αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν Χρυσάφιος τοῦνομα, τῷ τε πρὸς αὐτόν ἔχειν ἐκείνον ἐπιτηδείας καὶ τῷ τῆς αὐτῆς προαίρεσιν περὶ τὸν βίον ἐνστήσασθαι. Διήγε τοῖνυν καθ᾿ ἐαυτὸν ἐσχατίαν τινα καταλαβὼν πρὸς τῷ Ἰρίδι. Ποταμός δὲ ὁ Ἰρίς ἔστι μέσον διαφέρων τὸν Πόντον, ὡς ἀπ᾿ αὐτῆς τῆς Ἀρμενίας τὰς ἀρχαὶ ἔχων διὰ τῶν ἠμετέρων τόπων ἐπὶ τὸν Εὔξεινον Πόντον τὸ ἑείθρον ἑκδίδωσι. Περὶ τούτων εὑρὼν τινα τόπων ὁ νεανίας ὠλὴ βαθεία κομῶντα καὶ [379] λαγόνι τινι
a rocky cliff overhead, far from the noises of the city, military activities, and the business of rhetoric in the lawcourts. Having freed himself from all the usual distractions of human life, with his own hands, he cared for a group of old people living together in poverty and infirmity, judging it to be in keeping with his life to be occupied with such an activity. Having special skills in matters pertaining to all kinds of hunting, he used to go hunting to procure food for the old people and, at the same time, he tamed his youthful vigor. He also zealously carried out his mother’s wishes if she asked anything for herself, and, in these two ways, he charted his life’s course, controlling his young manhood by his labor and caring for his mother; and thus he made his way to God by following divine injunctions.

(9) Πέμπτον διήγαγεν ἓτος τούτον τόν τρόπον φιλοσοφών καὶ μακαριστῆν ποιῶν τὴν μητέρα τῇ ἰδίᾳ ζωῇ, οἷς τε κατεκόσμει διὰ σωφροσύνης τήν

9. He lived this way for five years, philosophizing and making his mother’s life a blessed one because of the way that he regulated his own life through moderation and
οίκειαν ζωήν οίς τε παρείχε πάσαν τήν δύναμιν εαυτοῦ τῷ θελήματι τῆς γεννησαμένης. Εἶτα βαρύ τι καὶ τραγικῶν πάθος ἡ ἐπιβουλή, οἷοι τοῦ ἀντικείμενου τῇ μητρὶ συνηνέχθη, τινὸς τῶν συνήθθην καὶ γνωρίμων ἐπαγαγόντος τῷ νέῳ τοῦ θάνατον· ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ θήρας ὧν καὶ γηρωκομουμένος τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, νεκρὸς τῷ οίκῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπανάγεται αὐτὸς τε ἐκεῖνος καὶ ὁ κοινωνὸς αὐτῷ τοῦ βίου Ἀπρινίδιος. Πόρρω δὲ ἦν τῶν γινομένων ἡ μήτηρ, τριῶν ἡμερῶν ὀδὸν ἀφετῶσα τῆς συμφορᾶς, καὶ τὶς ἀφίκετο παρ’ αὐτὴν μηνών τὸ πάθος. Ἡ δὲ τελεία μὲν τοῖς κατ’ ἀρετὴν ἀπασιν ἦν, πλὴν ἐκράτει κάκεινης κατὰ τὸ ἴσον ἡ φύσις· ὀκλάσασα γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπνοὺς τε καὶ ἀφθονοὺς παραχρήματον ἐγένετο, τοῦ λογισμοῦ τῷ πάθει παραχωρήσαντος, καὶ ἔκειτο ὁμοῦ τῇ προσβολῇ τῆς πονηρᾶς ἀκοής, put all his energy into fulfilling her every wish. Then, there occurred for the mother a grave and tragic experience, planned, I think, by the Adversary, which brought the entire family to misfortune and lamentation. He was unexpectedly snatched from life. It was not illness, which prepares one to anticipate the disaster, nor any of the usually anticipated things that brought the young man to death. He went out to hunt, which was his means of furnishing provisions for the old people. He was brought home dead, he and Chrysaphius, his companion. His mother was a three-day journey away from the scene and someone came to her to report what had taken place. She was perfectly schooled in virtue, but nature won out even over her. She became breathless and speechless on the spot and fainted, reason giving way to passion, and she lay there under the impact of the terrible news like a noble athlete felled by an unforeseen blow.
καθάπερ τις ἀθλητής γενναίος ἀπροσδοκήτω κατασεισθείσα πληγή.

(10) Ἐν τούτῳ διεφάνη τῆς μεγάλης Μακρίνης ἡ ἀρετή, ὅπως τῷ πάθει τὸν λογισμόν ἀντιστήσασα ἑαυτήν τε ἀπτωτὸν διεφύλαξε καὶ τῆς μητρικῆς ἀσθενείας ἔρεισμα γενομένη πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ τῆς λύπης αὐτῆς ἀνισμήσατο, τῷ καθ’ ἑαυτήν στερρῷ τε καὶ ἀνενδότῳ καὶ τὴν τῆς μητρὸς ψυχὴν πρὸς ἀνδρείαν παιδοτριβήσασα. Οὕκοιν ὡς παρεσύρη τὸ πάθος τῇ μήτῃ ἑαυτῆς ἀνακινήσας τὴν μητρὶς ἀσθενείας ἔρεισμα γενομένη πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ τῆς λύπης αὐτῆς ἀνισμήσατο, τῷ καθ’ ἑαυτήν στερρῷ τε καὶ ἀνενδότῳ καὶ τὴν τῆς μητρὸς ψυχὴν πρὸς ἀνδρείαν παιδοτριβήσασα. Οὐκοίν ὡς παρεσύρη τὸ πάθος τῷ πάθει ἡ μήτηρ οὐδὲ ἐπαθεὶ δυσγενεὶς τι καὶ γυναικεῖον, ὡστε βοήσαι πρὸς τὸ κακὸν ἢ περιφρέξασθαι τὸ ἰμάτιον ἢ ἐπικωκύσαι τῷ πάθει ἢ ταῖς γυναικαῖς μελῳδίαις ἀνακινήσαι τοὺς θρήνους. Ἀλλὰ [381] ἦσυχη διεκαρτέρει τὰς τῆς φύσεως προσβολὰς ἀπωθουμένη λογισμοῖς τοῖς τε ἵδιοις καὶ τοῖς παρὰ τῆς θυγατρῶς αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κακοῦ θεραπείαν προσαγομένοις. Τότε γὰρ δὴ μάλιστα ἡ ψηλὴ τε καὶ ἔστημεν ἡ τῆς παρθένου ψυχὴ διεφάνη, ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἢ μὲν φύσις τῷ ἱδιον ἐπισχεῖν ἀδελφὸς γὰρ ἢν καὶ ἀδελφῶν ὁ κεχαρισμένος ὁ τῷ τοιούτῳ τρόπῳ τοῦ θανάτου ἀναρπασθείς· ὑποκαθάρισε καὶ ἀναφάγετο τῆς δούλης ἀνακινήσης.
transcending her nature, she lifted her mother up with her own line of reasoning and put her beyond what had happened, directing her by her own example to patience and fortitude. In particular, Macrina’s life, always exalted by virtue, did not give the mother an opportunity to grieve for the one who was absent and caused her to rejoice rather in the good that was present.

11. When the care of rearing the children and the responsibility of educating them and establishing them in life was over, and most of the resources connected with the more material life were divided up among younger members of the family, then, as I said before, Macrina’s life became for her mother a guide towards the philosophical and unworldly way of life, and, turning her aside from all that she was used to, she led her to her own standard of simplicity. She prepared her to put herself on a level with the community of virgins so that she shared with them the same food and lodging and all other things one needs in daily life,
πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν διαφοράς ύψωσεις αὐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς. Καὶ τοιαύτης ἦν ἡ τοῦ βίου τάξις καὶ τοσούτον τὸ ύψος τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ ἡ σεμνή τῆς ζωῆς πολιτεία ἐν [382] τῇ καθ’ ἡμέραν τε καὶ νύκτα διαγωγῇ, ὡς ύπερβαίνειν τὴν ἐκ τῶν λόγων ύπογραφήν. Καθάπερ γὰρ αἱ διὰ θανάτου τῶν σωμάτων ἐκλυθεῖσαι ψυχαί καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον τούτον μεριμνῶν συνεκλύονται, οὕτως κεχώριστο ἡ τοῦ βίου τάξις καὶ τὸ ὅψις τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς ἀνατομίας καὶ πρὸς μίμησιν τῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων διαγωγῆς ἐρωθημένη. Εν όις γὰρ οὐθυμός, οὐ φθόνος, οὐ μίσος, οὐχ ὑπερψία, οὐκ ἄλλο τι τῶν τοιούτων ἐνεῳράτο, ἢ τι τῶν ματαίων ἐπιθυμία, τιμῆς τε καὶ δόξης καὶ τύφου καὶ υπερηφανίας καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων, ἐκβέβλητος-τρυφή δὲ ἦν ἡ ἐγκράτεια καὶ δόξα τὸ μὴ γινώσκεσθαι, πλοῦτος δὲ ἡ ἀκτιμοσύνη καὶ τὸ πᾶσαν τὴν ὕλην περιουσίαν οἰόν τινα κόριν τῶν σωμάτων ἀποτινάξασθαι, ἔργον δὲ τῶν μὲν κατὰ τὴν ζωὴν ταύτην σπουδαζομένων οὐδὲν, ότι μὴ πάρεργον, μόνη δὲ ἡ τῶν θείων μελέτη and there was no difference between her life and theirs. The arrangement of their life, the high level of their philosophy, the lofty regimen of their activities night and day was such that it transcends description. Just as by death souls are freed from the body and released from the cares of this life, so their life was [171] separated from these things, divorced from all mortal vanity and attuned to an imitation of the existence of the angels. Among them was seen no anger, no envy, no hatred, no arrogance, or any such thing; neither was there in them longing for foolish things like honor and fame and vanity, nor a contempt for others; all such qualities had been put aside. Continence was their luxury and not being known their fame; their wealth consisted in their poverty and the shaking off of all worldly abundance like dust from the body. They were not occupied with the concerns of this life; that is, they were not preoccupied. Rather, their one concern was the Divine; there was constant prayer and an unceasing
καὶ τὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἁδιάλειπτον καὶ ἡ ἀπαυστος ὑμνωδία, κατὰ τὸ ἵσον πάντι συμπαρατεινομένη τῷ χρόνῳ διὰ νυκτός καὶ ἡμέρας πάσης, ὡστε αὕτας καὶ ἔργον εἶναι τούτο καὶ ἔργον ἀνάπαυσιν. Τὴν τοιών Τοιώτην διαγωγὴν τίς ἀν ὑπ’ ὅψιν ἀγάποι λόγος ἀνθρώπινος, παρ’ οἶς μεθόριος ἢ ἡ ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς ἀσώματος φύσεως. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐλευθερωθῆναι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παθημάτων τὴν φύσιν κρείττον ἡ κατὰ ἀνθρωπον ἢ, τὸ δὲ ἐν σώματι φαίνεσθαι καὶ σχῆματi περιείλῃθαι καὶ τοῖς αἰσθητικοῖς ὁργάνοις συζύγην ἐν τούτω τῆς ἀγγελικῆς τε καὶ ἀσώματον φύσεως τὸ ἔλαττον εἶχον. Τάχα δ’ ἂν τις τολμήσας εἶποι [383] μηδὲ πρὸς τὸ καταδεῖστερον τὴν παραλλαγὴν εἶναι, ὅτι σαρκὶ συζύγησαι καθ’ ὁμοιότητα τῶν ἀσώματον δυνάμεων οὐκ ἐβαρύνυτο τῷ ἑφολκίῳ τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλ’ ἀνωφερὴς τε καὶ μετέωρος ἢν αὐτῶν ἡ ἡμέρας συνηύξετο τῷ χρόνῳ τὰ κατορθώματα, αὐτὸ πρὸς τὸ

singing of hymns distributed throughout the entire day and night, so that this was for them both their work and their rest from work. What human word could bring this kind of life before your eyes? Their existence bordered on both the human and the incorporeal nature. On the one hand, a nature freed from human cares is more than human, whereas, to appear in the body and to be embraced by form and to live with the senses is to have a nature less than angelic and incorporeal. Perhaps some daring person might say the difference was negligible because, although living in the flesh because of their affinity to the bodiless powers, they were not weighted down by the allurements of the body, but, borne upwards in midair, they participated in the life of the celestial powers. Not a little time was spent in this way and, in time, their successes increased and always their philosophy gave them additional aids for discovering goods leading them to greater purity.
καθαρώτερον ταῖς τῶν ἐφευρισκομένων ἀγαθῶν προσθήκαις τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐπιδιδούσης.

(12) Ἡν δὲ αὐτὴ ὁ μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν μέγαν τοῦτον τοῦ βίου σκοπόν ὑπηρετῶν ἀδελφός τις ὁμογάστης, Πέτρος ὁνομα αὐτῷ, ἐφ’ ὦ ἐλήξαν τής μητρὸς ἡμῶν ἀι ὠδίνες. Οὕτως γὰρ ἦν ὁ τελευταῖος τῶν γονέων βλαστός, ὡς ὁμοία τε και όρφανος ὁνομάσθη ἄμα γὰρ τῷ παρελθείν τοῦτον εἰς φῶς καταλείπει ὁ πατήρ τὸν βιόν. Ἀλλ’ ἐπεβυτάτη τῶν ἀδελφῶν, περὶ ἕς ὁ λόγος, μικρὰ τῆς θηλῆς αὐτὸν παρὰ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν μετασχόντα εὐθὺς ἀποσπάσασα τῆς τιθηνουμένης δε’ ἐαυτῆς ἀνατρέφεται καὶ ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν ψυχή τῆς παραλεῖπεν ἥγαγε παιδευον, τοῖς ἱεροῖς τῶν μαθημάτων ἐκ νηπίων αὐτὸν ἐνασκήσασα, ὡς μὴ δούναι τῇ ψυχῇ σχολῆς πρὸς τὶ τῶν ματαίων ἐπικληθῆναι. Ἀλλὰ πάντα γενομένη τῷ νέῳ, πατήρ, διδάσκαλος, παιδαγωγὸς, μήτηρ, ἄγαθοῦ πατὸς σύμβουλος, τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν ἀπειρογάσατο, ὡς πρὶν ἐξελθεῖν τὴν ἡλικίαν τῶν παῖδων ἐτὶ ἐν μειρακιώδει τῇ ἀπαλότητι τῆς ώρας ἀνθούντα πρὸς τὸν [384] ψηλὸν τῆς

12. Macrina had a brother who was a great help towards this fine goal of life; he was named Peter and he was the youngest of us, the last offspring of our parents called at once both son and orphan, for as he came into the light of life his father departed from it. His eldest sister, the subject of our story, took him almost immediately from his nurse’s breast and reared him herself and led him to all the higher education, [172] exercising him from babyhood in sacred learning so as not to give him leisure to incline his soul to vanities. She became all things to the boy; father, teacher, attendant, mother, the counselor of every good, and she held him in check so that, even before his flowering in the tenderness of youth, he was raised to the high goal of philosophy, and, by some good fortune of nature, he had such skill in every form of handicraft that without instruction he arrived at a complete mastery of skills upon which most people
philosophia sēkopon ἐπαρθήναι καὶ τινὶ φύσεως εὐκληρία πρὸς πᾶσαν τέχνης ἱδέαν τὴν διὰ χειρὸς ἐνεργουμένην ἐπιτηδείας ἔχειν, ὡς μηδενός καθηγουμένου διὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας ἐκάστου τὴν ἐπιστήμην καταρθώσκεναι, ὅν χρόνῳ καὶ πόνῳ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἢ μάθησις παραγίνεται. Οὕτως τοῖνυν τῆς περὶ τούς ἐξωθέν τῶν λόγων ἀσχολίας ύπερικών, ἱκανήν δὲ διδάσκαλον παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ μαθήματος τὴν φύσιν ἔχων ἀεὶ τῇ πρὸς τὴν ἀδελφὴν βλέπων καὶ σκοπὸν ἀγαθοῦ παντὸς ἐκείνην ποιούμενος εἰς τοσοῦτον ἐπέδακεν ἀρετῆς, ὡς μηδέν ἐλαττον τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου δοκεῖν ἔχειν ἐν τοῖς κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν προτερήμασιν. Ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῷ μετὰ ταῦτα βιῶ· τότε δὲ ἀντὶ πάντων ἢν τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ συνεργῶν αὐταῖς πρὸς τὴν ἀγγελικήν ἐκείνην ἐζωῆν. Ὅς ποτε καὶ σποτειψίας χαλεπῆς γεγενημένης καὶ πολλῶν πανταχόθεν κατά φήμην τῆς εὐποίας πρὸς τὴν ἐσχατίαν, ἐν ἡ κατῴκουν, ἐπιφορέοντας τοσοῦτον δι᾽ ἐπινοιῶν τὰς τροφὰς ἐπελέυσασεν, ὡς τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἐπιφορτισσάν τοῖς πολίν εἶναι τὴν ἐρημιάν δοκεῖν.

expend much time and energy. So, scorning extraneous instructions and having nature as an adequate teacher of all good learning and always looking to his sister and making her the focal point of every good, he became so virtuous that he was no less esteemed than the great Basil for the excellent qualities of his later life. But then, he was above all a co-worker with his sister and mother in every phase of their angelic existence. Once, when there was a terrible famine and many people came pouring in to our region because of the fame of its prosperity, he furnished so much nourishment through his foresight that the large numbers going to and fro made the hermitage seem like a city.
At this time, our mother, having come to a rich old age, went to God, taking her departure from life in the arms of these two of her children. Worth recording is the blessing she gave to each of her children, suitably remembering each of the absent ones so that none would be without a blessing, and through prayer entrusting especially to God the two who were with her. As they were sitting beside her bed, she touched each of them with her hand and said to God in her last words: ‘To you, O Lord, I offer the first and tenth fruit of my pains. The first fruit, my eldest daughter here, and this my tenth, my last-born son. Both have been dedicated to you by law and are your votive offerings. May sanctification, therefore, come to this first and tenth.’ And she indicated specifically [173] her daughter and her son. Having finished her blessing, she ended her life, instructing her children to place her body in our father’s tomb. These two, having fulfilled her command, attained to a higher level of philosophy, always

(13) Ἐν τούτῳ εἰς γῆςας λιπαρὸν προελθοῦσα ἢ μήτηρ πρὸς τὸν θεόν μετανίστατο, ἐν ταῖς ἀμφότερων τῶν τέκνων χερσὶ τὸν βίον έαυτῆς ἀναπαύσασα. Ἡς ἀξίων τὴν τῆς εὔλογιας ἱστορήσαι φωνήν, ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν τέκνων ἐχομῆσαι, τῶν τε μὴ παρόντων έκάστου κατὰ τὸ πρόσφορον ἐπιμνησθεύσα, ὡς μηδένα γενέσθαι τῆς εὔλογιας ἀπόκληρον, καὶ διαφερόντως τοὺς παρόντας αὐτῆς τῷ θεῷ διὰ προσευχῆς παραθεμένη.

Παρακαθημένων γὰρ αὐτῆς κατὰ τὸ πλάγιον [385] ἔφ’ ἐκάτερα τῆς κλίνης τῶν δύο τούτων ἐκατέρα χειρὶ ἐφαψαμένη τῶν τέκνων ταῦτα πρὸς τὸν θεόν εἶπεν ἐν τελευταίας φωναῖς· Σοί, κύριε, καὶ ἀπάρχομαι καὶ ἀποδεκατὼ τὸν καρπὸν τῶν ὁμόνων. Ἀπαρχή μοι ἡ πρωτότοκος αὕτη καὶ ἐπιδέκατος οὕτως, ἡ τελευταία ὁμός. Σοὶ δὲ ἀφιέρωται παρὰ τοῦ νόμου ἀμφότερα καὶ σὰ ἐστιν ἀναθήματα. Ὅψιν ἐλθοὺς ὁ ἀγιασμός ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαρχήν μου ταύτην καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον τούτο, δείξασα ταῖς δεικτικαίς φωναῖς τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ τὸν παῖδα. Ἡ μὲν οὖν τοῦ εὐλογεῖν παυσαμένη καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ ἐπαύσατο, τοῖς
struggling in their individual lives and eclipsing their early successes by their later ones.

14. At this time, Basil, distinguished among the holy, was made Bishop of Caesarea. He led his brother to the holy vocation of the priesthood, and consecrated him in the mystical services himself. And through this also, their life progressed to a loftier and higher degree, seeing that their philosophy was enhanced by the consecration. Eight years later, Basil, renowned throughout the entire world, left the world of men and went to God, and his death was a common source of grief for his country and the world. When Macrina heard the report of his distant death, she was greatly disturbed by such a loss. (How could this fail to touch her when even the enemies of truth were affected by it?) But, just as they say gold is tested in many furnaces, that if it gets through the first firing...
and is tested in the second and, in the last is finally cleansed of all extraneous matter (this is the most accurate proof of true gold if, after all this firing, no impurity remains), something similar happened in her case. When her lofty understanding had been tried by the different attacks of grief, the genuine and undebased quality of her soul was revealed in every way; previously, by the departure of her other brother, then, by the separation from her mother, and, in the third instance, when Basil, the common honor of the family, departed from human life. She remained like an undefeated athlete, in no way overcome by the onslaught of misfortunes.

15. About nine months after this disaster, there was a synod of bishops in the city of Antioch, in which I participated. And when
ἡθροίζετο, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς μετέσχομεν. Καὶ επειδή πάλιν [387] πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἕκαστος ἀπελύθημεν, πρὶν τὸν ἕναυτὸν παρελθεῖν, ἐνθύμιον ἐμοὶ τῷ Γρηγορίῳ γίνεται πρὸς αὐτὴν διαβήναι. Πολὺς γὰρ ἦν ὁ διὰ μέσου χρόνος, ἐν ὧν τὰς ἐπισκέψεις αἱ τῶν πειρασμῶν περιστάσεις ἐκάλυπταν, ὡς ὑπέμενον πανταχὸς τῆς πατρίδος ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς αἰρέσεως ἐπιστατούντων ἐξελαυνόμενος. Καὶ ἀριθμοῦντι μοι τὸν διὰ μέσου χρόνον, ἐν ὧν τὴν κατ’ ὀρθαλμοῦς συντυχίαν οἱ πειρασμοὶ διεκόλυταν, οὐκ ὕλιγον ἐφαίνετο τὸ διάστημα ὁκτὼ μικροῦ δεῖν παραμετρούμενον ἐτεσίν. Επειδή τοῖνυν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ὁδοῦ διανύσας μιᾶς ἡμέρας ἀπείχον ὡδόν, ὡφις τις ἡμῖν ἐξ ἐνυπνίου φανεῖσα φοβερὰς ἐποίει τὰς ἐλπίδας τοῦ μέλλοντος. Ξέκοιοι γὰρ λείψανα μαρτύρων διὰ χειρὸς φέρειν, εἶναι δὲ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἄγην οἰα ἐκ καθαροῦ γίνεται κατόπτρον, ὅταν πρὸς τὸν ἠλιον τεθή ἀντιπρόσωπον, ὥστε μοι τὰς ὑφεις πρὸς τὴν μαρμαρωγὴν τῆς λαμπρόδονος ἀμβλύνεσθαι. Καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μοι νυκτὸς εἰς τρὶς γεγομένης τῆς τοιαύτης ὑφεις συμβαλείν μὲν οὐκ
d each of us was leaving to return to his own diocese before the year was out, I, Gregory, thought often of visiting Macrina. For a long time had elapsed during which [174] the circumstances of my trials had prevented our coming together, since I was exiled time and again by the leaders of heresy. When I counted up the time during which these troubles prevented our coming face to face, it added up to almost eight years. When I had almost finished the journey and was about one day away from my destination, a vision, appearing in my sleep, aroused fearful forebodings about the future. I seemed to be carrying the relics of martyrs in my hand and a light seemed to come from them, as happens when the sun is reflected on a bright mirror so that the eye is dazzled by the brilliance of the beam. That same night, the vision occurred three times. I was not able to interpret its meaning clearly, but I foresaw some grief for my soul and I was waiting for the outcome to clarify the dream. When I came near the outskirts of
εἴχον καθαρώς τοῦ ἐνυπνίου τὸ 
αἴνιγμα, λύπην δὲ τινα τῇ ψυχῇ 
προεώρων καὶ ἐπετήρουν τῇ ἐκβάσει 
κρίναι τὴν φαντασίαν. Καὶ δὴ 
γενόμενος πλησίον τῆς ἐσχατιάς, ἐν ἡ 
διήγειν ἐκείνη τὴν ἀγγελικὴν τε καὶ 
ἐπουράνιον κατορθοῦσα ζωήν, ἥρομην 
tῶν ἐπιτηδείων τινὰ περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ 
πρῶτον, εἰ παρὼν [388] εἰς-φήσαντος 
δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν ἐξωριμηκέναι καὶ 
tετάρτην ἡμέραν ἄγειν, συνεὶς ὅπερ ἦν, 
ὅτι δὲ ἐτέρας ὀδοῦ γέγονε ναὐτῷ πρὸς 
ἡμᾶς ὁ ὄρμη, τότε καὶ περὶ τῆς μεγάλης 
ἐπιθυμανόμην τοῦ δὲ φήσαντος ἐν 
ἀρρωστίᾳ γεγεννησθαι τινι 
σπουδαιότερον εἰχόμην ἐν ἐπείξει τὸ 
λειτομένον τῆς ὁδοῦ διανύουν καὶ γάρ 
μὲ τις καὶ φόβος μηνυτῆς τοῦ 
μέλλοντος ύποδραμον διετάρασσεν.

(16) Ὡς δὲ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐγενόμην τὸν 
tόπον (καὶ προκατήγγειλε τῇ 
ἀδελφότητι τὴν παρουσίαν ἡ φήμη), τὸ 
τε συνταγμα τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπαν ἐκ τοῦ 
ἀνδρῶνος πρὸς ἡμᾶς προεχθὲι-σύνηθες 
γὰρ αὐτοῖς τιμᾶν τῇ ὑπαντήσει τοὺς 
cαταθυμίους-ὁ δὲ ἐν γυναιξὶ τῆς 
παρθενίας χορὸς εὐκόσιμως κατὰ τὴν 
ἐκκλησίαν τὴν εἰσοδον ἡμῶν ἀνέμενεν.

16. As I made my way (rumor had 
announced my presence 
beforehand to the community), a 
line of men streamed toward us. It 
was customary for them to 
welcome guests by coming out to 
meet them. However, a group of 
women from the convent waited 
modestly at the entrance of the 
church for us. When the prayer and 
the place where that lady was 
leading her angelic and celestial life, 
I asked one of die workmen, first, 
if my brother happened to be 
there. He replied that he had gone 
out to meet us about four days 
earlier, and this was true, but he 
had taken a different road. Then, I 
inquired about the Superior and, 
when he said that she was ill, I was 
more eager than ever to complete 
the trip, for a certain fear, an omen 
of the future, was disturbing me.
blessing were finished and the women had responded to the blessing by bowing their heads, they removed themselves from our presence and went off to their own quarters. Since not one of them remained with me, I correctly surmised that their Superior was not among them. An attendant led me to the house where the Superior was and opened the door, and I entered that sacred place. She was already very ill, but she was not resting on a couch or bed, [175] but upon the ground; there was a board covered with a coarse cloth, and another board supported her head, designed to be used instead of a pillow, supporting the sinews of her neck slantwise and conveniently supporting the neck.

(17) Επειδὴ δὲ τέλος εἶχεν ἡ εὐχή τε καὶ ἡ εὐλογία καὶ οἶ μὲν μετὰ τὸ ὑποσχεῖν τῇ εὐλογίᾳ τὴν κεφαλὴν εὐσχημόνως ἀναποδίζουσαι πρὸς ἑαυτὰς ἀνεκχώρουν, ὑπελείπετο δὲ ἐς αὐτῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὐδεμία, εἰκάσας ὅτε ἦν, μὴ ἐν ἐκείναις εἶναι τὴν καθηγουμένην, προηγησαμένου τινὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον, ἐν ὧ ἦν ἡ μεγάλη, καὶ τὴν θυραν διαπέτασαν, ἐντὸς τῆς ιερᾶς εκείνης ἐγενόμην μονῆς. Ἡ δὲ σφοδρὰς ἤδη τῇ ἀρρωστίᾳ κατείχετο, ἀνεπαύετο δὲ οὐκ ἐπὶ κλίνῃς τινὸς ἢ στρωμνῆς, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐδάφους, σανίδος ύποτεταμένης τῷ σάκκῳ καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔτερας πάλιν σανίδος ύπερειδοῦσης, ἢς ἡ ἐργασία τοιαύτη τις ἦν, ὡς ἀντὶ προσκεφαλαίου τῇ κεφαλῇ γίνεσθαι, ἐν λοξῷ [389] τῷ σχήματι τοὺς τένοντας ύποβάίνουσα καὶ καταθυμίως ἀνέχουσα ἐφ’ ἑαυτῆς τὸν αὐχένα.

17. When she saw me standing at the door, she raised herself on her elbow; her strength was already so wasted by fever that she was not able to come towards me, but she fixed her hands on the floor and, stretching as far forward as she could, she paid me the honor of a
προτείνασα τὴν τῆς ὑπαντήσεως ἐπλήρου τιμήν. κἀγὼ προσδραμών καὶ ταῖς χερσίν ὑπολαβῶν χαμαί τὸ πρόσωπον κεκλιμένον ἀνώθωσά τε πάλιν αὐτήν καὶ ἀπέδωκα τῷ συνήθει τῆς κατακλίσεως σχήματι. Ἡ δὲ προτείνασα τῷ θεῷ τὴν χείρα· Καὶ ταύτην ἐπλήρωσάς μοι, φησί, τὴν χάριν ὁ θεός, καὶ σὺς ἐστέρησάς με ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας μου, ὅτι ἐκίνησας τὸν σὸν οἰκήτην εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν τῆς παιδίσκης σου. Καὶ ὡς ἂν μηδεμίαν ἐπαγάγοι τῇ ἐμῇ ψυχῇ δυσθυμίαν, τὸν στεναγμὸν κατεπράϋνε καὶ τὴν συνοχὴν τοῦ ἀσθμάτος κρύπτειν πῶς ἐβιάζετο, διὰ πάντων τὸ πρὸς τὸ φαιδρότερον μεθηρμόζετο, τὰς καταθυμίας λόγων αὐτῆς τὰς κατάρχουσας καὶ ἡμῖν τὰς ἀφομιὰς δὴ ὧν ἡρώτα παρασκεύαζονσα. Τῆς δὲ περὶ τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου μνήμης τῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ τοῦ λόγου παρεμπεσοῦσης, ἐμοὶ μὲν ἐπάκλαξεν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ συνέπιπτεν ἐν κατηφείᾳ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ ἐξεχέιτο τῶν βλεφάρων τὰ δάκρυα ἢ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἀπέσχε τῷ ημετέρῳ συνταπεινωθῆναι πάθει, [390] ὡστε ἀφομιὴν ποιησαμένῃ τῆς ψηλοτέρας bow. I ran to her and, lifting her bowed head, I put her back in her accustomed reclining position. But she stretched out her hand to God and said: ‘You have granted me this favor, O God, and have not deprived me of my desire, since you have impelled your servant to visit your handmaid.’ And in order not to disturb me, she tried to cover up her groans and to conceal somehow the difficulty she had in breathing, and, through it all, she adjusted herself to the brighter side. She initiated suitable topics of conversation and gave me an opportunity to speak by asking me questions. As we spoke, we recalled the memory of the great Basil and my soul was afflicted and my face fell and tears poured from my eyes. But she was so far from being downcast by our sorrow that she made the mentioning of the saint a starting point towards the higher philosophy. She rehearsed such arguments, explaining the human situation through natural principles and disclosing the divine plan hidden in misfortune, and she spoke of certain aspects of the
ϕιλοσοφίας τήν περὶ τοῦ ἀγίου μνήμην τοιούτους διεξήλθε λόγους φυσιολογούσα τε τὸ ἀνθρώπινον και τήν θείαν οἰκονομίαν τήν διὰ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν κεκρυμμένην τῷ λόγῳ διακαλύπτουσα τὰ τε περὶ τῆς μελλούσης ζωῆς καθάπερ θεοφορομένη τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι διεξίστηκε· ἢστε μοι τήν ψυχήν ἐξω μικρῶν δείν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως εἶναι δοκεῖν συνεπαρθεῖσαν τοῖς λεγομένοις καὶ ἐντὸς τῶν ὑφρανίων ἀδύτων τῇ χειραγωγίᾳ τοῦ λόγου καθισταμένην.

(18) Καὶ ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἰωβ ἱστορίας ἀκούσαν, ὅτι πανταχόθεν τῇ σηπεδόνι τῶν τραυμάτων ὅλω τῷ σώματι διὰ ἱχώρων ὁ ἄνηρ συντηκόμενος οὐ πρὸς τὸ ἁλγύνον τὴν ἀίσθησιν τοῖς λογισμοῖς ἐπεκλίνετο, ἀλλ’ ἐν μὲν τῷ σώματι τὸ ἁλγυόν εἶχεν, ὃ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐνέργειαν οὐκ ἠμβλύνετο οὐδὲ διέκοπτε τὸν λόγον τοῖς ψηλοτέροις ἐμβατεύοντα· τοιοῦτον τι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς μεγάλης ἑώρου ἐκείνης, τοῦ πυρετοῦ πάσαν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῆς καταφρύγοντος καὶ πρὸς τὸν θάνατον συνελαύνοντος, καθάπερ δρόσῳ τινὶ τῷ ἐξεστήλθε λόγος τῷ ἀνθρώπινῳ καὶ τοῖς λογισμοῖς μελλούσῃς καθάπερ διεξίστηκε· ἢστε μοι τῇ ψυχῇ ἐξω μικρῶν δείν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως εἶναι δοκεῖν συνεπαρθεῖσαν τοῖς λεγομένοις καὶ ἐντὸς τῶν ὑφρανίων ἀδύτων τῇ χειραγωγίᾳ τοῦ λόγου καθισταμένην.

18. And just as we hear in the story of Job, that when the man was wasting away and his whole body was covered with erupting and putrefying sores, he did not direct attention to his pain but kept the pain inside his body, neither blessing [176] his own activity nor cutting off the conversation when it embarked upon higher matters. Such a thing as this I was seeing in the case of this Superior also; although the fever was burning up all her energy and leading her to death, she was refreshing her body as if by a kind of dew, she kept her
mind free in the contemplation of higher things and unimpeded by the disease. If my treatise were not becoming too long, I would put down everything in order: how she was lifted up by her discourse on the soul; how she explained the reason for life in the flesh, why man exists; how he is mortal, whence death comes; and what release there is from death back again into life. In all of this, she went on as if inspired by the power of the Holy Spirit, explaining it all clearly and logically. Her speech flowed with complete ease, just as a stream of water goes down a hill without obstruction.

(19) Ἐπεὶ δὲ συνεπεράνθη ὁ λόγος· Ὡρασοὶ, φησίν, ἀδελφέ, πολλῷ τῷ κόπῳ τῆς ὀδοιπορίας πεπονηκότι βραχύ τι διαναπάνωσι τὸ σώμα. Κάμοι μεγάλη μὲν καὶ ἀληθῆς ἀνέσις ἢν τὸ προσοφάν τε αὐτῆν καὶ τῶν μεγάλων ἐπακροάσθαι λόγων ἔπει δὲ τοῦτο κεχαρισμένον ἢν καὶ φίλον αὐτῇ, ἢς ἂν διὰ πάντων πείθεσθαι τῇ διδασκάλῳ

19. When the conversation was finished, she said: ‘Now, brother, it is time for you to rest your body awhile because the trip must have been tiring.’ For me, just seeing her and hearing her noble words was truly a great source of relaxation, but, since it was pleasing and desirable to her, in order to seem obedient to her as my teacher in all
things, I found a pleasant resting place in one of the gardens nearby and rested in the shade of the vine-clad trees. However, I was unable to enjoy myself because my soul was overwhelmed by the anticipation of sorrows. For the vision in my dream seemed to have been explained by what I had seen. Truly, this was what had appeared, the remains of a holy martyr had been ‘dead to sin,’ but illuminated by the grace of the indwelling spirit. I explained this to one of those to whom I had previously told the dream. Guessing, I know not how, that we were dejected by the grief that was to come, Macrina sent a message bidding us to cheer up and to be more hopeful about her condition for she perceived a turn for the better. This was not said to deceive us, but was actually the truth, although we did not recognize it at the time. For just as a runner who has outrun his rival and comes to the end of the course when he nears the judges’ stand and sees the victor’s crown, as if he has already obtained the prize, he rejoices within himself and
όντι γὰρ καθάπερ τις δρομεύς
παραδραμῶν τὸν ἀντίπαλον καὶ ἤδη
πρὸς τὸ τέρματο τοῦ σταδίου γενόμενος,
προσεγγίζων τε τῷ βραβείῳ καὶ τὸν
ἐπινίκιον στέφανον βλέπων, ὡς ἤδη
tετυχήσως τοῦ προκειμένου
ἐπαγάλλεταί τε αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς
eυνοούσοις τῶν θεατῶν τὴν νίκην
eυαγγελίζεται, ἀπὸ τοιαύτης ἠμῖν
diaθέσεως κακείνη τὰ χρηστότερα περὶ
ἔαυτῆς ἐλπίζειν ἐδίδοι, ἢδη πρὸς τὸ
βραβείον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως βλέπουσα
καὶ μονονυχίᾳ τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ
ἔφ’ ἔαυτῆς φθεγγομένη, ὅτι Ἀπόκειται
μοι λοιπὸν ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος,
ὅτι ἤσιον ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ δίκαιος κριτής,
ἐπειδὴ Τὸν καλὸν ἀγώνα ἡγώνισμαι καὶ
tὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα καὶ τὴν πίστιν
tετήρησα. Ἡμές μὲν οὖν πρὸς τὴν τῶν
ἀγαθῶν ἀγγελίαν εὐθυμοὶ
katastάντες τῆς τῶν προκειμένων
ἀπολαύσεως ἦμεν: ποικίλα δὲ ἢν ταῦτα
καὶ πάσης πεπλήρωσες θυμηδίας ἡ
παρασκευὴ οὕτω τῆς μεγάλης ἐκείνης
καὶ μέχρι τούτων τῇ σπουδῇ κατιούσης.

(20) Ἐπεὶ δὲ πάλιν ἐν ὅρθολμοις ἦμεν
αὐτῆς, οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν εὐσχολὸν ὄραν
ἐφ’ ἐαυτῶν διάγειν, ἀναλαβοῦσα τῶν
announces his victory to the
cheering onlookers, in the same
way, Macrina led us to hope for
greater good for herself, for she
was already looking towards the
prize of her high calling and, in her
words, almost echoed the words of
the apostle: ‘Now there is laid up
for me the crown of Justice which
the just Judge will give me since I
have fought the good fight,
finished the race, kept the faith.’
Reassured by this message, we
began to enjoy what was put before
us and the offerings were varied
and pleasurable since the great lady
was very thoughtful also in such
matters.

20. When we returned to her
presence (for she did not allow us
to idle away the time by ourselves),
she took up the story of her life
ἐκ νεότητος αὐτῆς βεβιωμένων τὴν μνήμην καθάπερ ἐπὶ συγγραφής πάντα κατεξῆς διεξήρχετο καὶ ὡσα τῆς τῶν πατέρων ζωῆς δία μνήμης εἶχε καὶ τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἐμῆς [393] γενέσεως καὶ τὸν μετὰ ταύτα βιον-σκοπὸς δὲ αὐτῆς τοῦ διηγήματος ἦν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐχαριστία. Τῶν τε γὰρ γονέων ἀπεδείκνυ τὸν βίον οὗ τοσοῦτον ἐκ περιουσίας λαμπρὸν τοῖς τότε καὶ περὶβλεπτὸν ὡντα, ὡσον ἐκ θείας φιλανθρωπίας ἐπαυξηθέντα, τῶν μὲν τοῦ πατρὸς γονέων διὰ τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ὁμολογίαν δεδημευμένων, τοῦ δὲ κατὰ μητέρα προπάτορος ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἀγανακτήσεως ἀνηρμημένου καὶ πάντων τῶν προσόντων εἰς ἐτέρους μετακεχωρηκότων δεσπότας καὶ ὡμος εἰς τοσοῦτον αὐτοῖς διὰ πίστεως τὴν ζωὴν αὐξηθήναι, ὡς μὴ εἶναι τὸν ὑπέρ αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις ὁνομαζόμενον πάλιν δὲ τῆς περιουσίας αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν τέκνων ἐννεαχῆ διατμηθεῖσης, οὔτως ἑκάστῳ δὲ ἐυλογίας πληθυνθῆναι τὴν μοίραν, ὡς ὑπέρ τὴν τῶν γονέων εὐκλησίαν τὴν ἑκάστου τῶν τέκνων εἶναι ζωήν. Αὐτῆς δὲ ἐκείνης τῶν μὲν ἐπονομασθέντων

from infancy as if she were putting it all into a monograph. She told what she remembered of our parents’ life, both what happened before my birth and afterwards. What she concentrated on in her story was thanksgiving to God, for what she stressed in the life of our parents was not so much their being outstanding among their contemporaries because of their prosperity, but their having been enhanced by divine favor. Our father’s parents had been deprived of their possessions because of the confession of Christ; our mother’s grandfather was killed by the anger of the emperor and all his property handed over to other masters. Nevertheless, their life was so exalted on account of their faith that no one had a greater reputation among the men of that time. Later, when their property was divided nine ways in accordance with the number of the children, the share of each had been so bountifully increased that the children lived more prosperously than their parents. Macrina did not accept the amount.
that was assigned to her in the equal distribution, but gave it all into [178] the hands of the priest in accordance with the divine command. By divine dispensation, her existence was such that she never stopped using her hands in the service of God, nor did she look to men for help or any opportunity for living a life of comfort. She never turned away anyone who asked for something, nor did she look for benefactors, but God, in His blessings, secretly made her little resources of activity grow as seeds, as it were, into a full-flowering harvest.

(21) Ἐμοῦ δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους [394] πόνους ἐν οἷς ἦμην διεξόντος, πρότερον μὲν τὸν βασιλέας Οὐαλέντος διὰ τὴν πίστιν ἐλαύνοντος, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ τῆς ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίας καρδίας, ὑποτάσσομαι συγχύσεως καὶ καμάτους ἐκκαλουμένης· ὁ παύσῃ, φησίν, ἀγνωμόνως ἐπὶ τοῖς καθαροῖς ἐνθοῦς καὶ καμίνις ἐκκαθάρισέν με κατὰ τὸν κόσμον

21. I told her about the difficulties in which I had been involved; first, how the Emperor Valens drove me into exile for the faith, then, the confusion in the churches which called me to disputes and disagreements. She said: “Will you ever stop ignoring the good things that come from God? Will you not remedy the thanklessness of your soul? Compare your lot with that of our parents, although, as far as this world is concerned, it is true...
that we are proud of being well born and coming from a good family. Our father in the past was well thought of because of his education, and his reputation was established in the local law courts. Later, although he surpassed the rest in rhetoric, his fame did not go beyond the Pontic region, but he was satisfied to be looked up to in his own land. Whereas you,’ she continued, ‘are known in the cities, among the peoples and the tribes; churches send you forth and summon you as ally and advocate, and do you not see the grace in it? Do you not realize the cause of such blessings, namely, that the prayers of your parents are lifting you to the heights, since you have little or nothing within yourself by which to achieve this?’
When dawn came, it was clear to me that this day was to be the last for her in the life of the flesh, for the fever had [179] consumed all her natural strength. When she saw our concern about her weakness, she tried to rouse us from our downcast hopes by dispersing again with her beautiful words the grief of our souls with her last slight and labored breathing. At this point, especially, my soul was in conflict because of what it was confronted by. My disposition was naturally made gloomy by the anticipation of never again hearing such a voice, but actually I had not yet accepted the idea that she was going to leave this mortal life, and my soul was so exalted by appearances that I secretly thought that she had transcended the common nature. For the fact was that, in her last breath, she experienced nothing strange in the expectation of the change and displayed no cowardice towards the departure from life. Instead, she philosophized with high intelligence on what had been decided upon by her about this life.
from the beginning up to her last breath, and this made her appear to belong no longer to the world of men. It was as if an angel had by some providence taken on human form, an angel who had no relation with or similarity to the life of the flesh and for whom it was not at all unreasonable to remain detached since the flesh was not part of her experience. For this reason, she seemed to me to be making clear to those present the divine and pure love of the unseen Bridegroom which she had secretly nourished in the depths of her soul, and she seemed to be communicating the disposition in her heart to go to the One she was longing for, so that, once loosed from the chains of the body, she might quickly be with Him. Truly, her race was towards the Beloved and nothing of the pleasure of life diverted her attention.

(23) Καὶ τῆς μὲν ἡμέρας ἤδη παραχήκει τὸ πλέον καὶ ὁ ἥλιος πρὸς δυσμᾶς ἐπεκλίνετο. Τῇ δὲ οὐκ ἐνεδίδοι ἡ προθυμία, ἀλλ’ ὅσον τῇ ἐξόδῳ

23. The day was almost over and the sun was beginning to set, but the zeal in her did not decline. Indeed, as she neared her end and saw the beauty of the Bridegroom...
She said: ‘O Lord, You have freed us from the fear of death; You have made the end of life here the beginning of a true life for us. For a time, You give rest to our bodies in sleep and You awaken us again with the last trumpet. The dust from which You fashioned us with Your hands You give back to the dust of the earth for safekeeping, and You who have relinquished it will recall it after reshaping with incorruptibility and grace our mortal and graceless substance. You redeemed us from

προσήγγιζεν, ὡς πλέον θεωροῦσα τοῦ νυμφίου τὸ κάλλος ἐν σφοδροτέρᾳ τῇ ἐπείξει πρὸς τὸν ποθούμενον ἵππο, τοιαύτα φθεγγομένη οὐκέτι πρὸς ἡμᾶς τούς παρόντας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκείνον εἰς ὃν ἀτενεῖς ἀφεώρα τοῖς ὁμμασι. Πρὸς γὰρ ἀνατολῆν ἐτέραπτο αὐτῇ τὸ χαμεύνιον, καὶ ἀποστάσα τοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαλέγεσθαι δι’ εὐχῆς ὤμιλε· τὸ λοιπὸν τῷ θεῷ χερσί τε ἐπείξει πρὸς τὸν ποθούμενον ἱετο, ὡστε ἡμᾶς ἐπαίειν μετρίῳ τῆς λεγομένης—συμφορα τοῖς τοιαύτα φθεγγομένη οὐκέτι πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαλέγεσθαι δι’ εὐχῆς ὡμίλει. Ἕπειρα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐγίνετο καὶ παρ’ ἐκείνου ἠκούετο. [24]
the curse and from sin, having taken both upon Yourself; You crushed the heads of the serpent who had seized us with his jaws in the abyss of disobedience. Breaking down the gates of hell and overcoming the one who had the empire of death, You opened up for us a path to the resurrection. For those who fear You, You gave as a token the sign of the holy cross for the destruction of the Adversary and the salvation of our life. O God everlasting, towards whom I have directed myself from my mother’s womb, whom my soul has loved with all its strength, to whom I have dedicated my body and my soul from my infancy up to now, prepare for me a shining angel to lead me to the place of refreshment where is the water of relaxation near the bosom of the holy Fathers. You who broke the flaming sword and compassionately gave Paradise back to the man crucified with You, remember me also in Your kingdom, for I, too, have been crucified with You, having nailed my flesh through fear of You and
σάρκας μου και ἀπὸ τῶν κριμάτων σου φοβηθείσα. Μή διαχωρισάτω με τὸ χάσμα τὸ φοβερὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκλεκτῶν σου, μηδὲ ἀντιστήτω ὁ βάσκανος τῇ ὁδῷ μου μηδὲ εὐφέσθη ἑκατενώπιον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου ἡ ἁμαρτία μου, εἰ τι σφαλείσα διὰ τὴν ἁσθενείαν τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ἐν λόγῳ ἐν ἑργῷ ἐκατὰ διάνοιαν ἡμαρτον. Ὁ ἐχὼν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, ἀνες μοι, ἵνα ἀναψύξω καὶ εὐφέσθω ἑνώπιον σου ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματός μου μή ἔχουσα στίλον ἡ ὑποτίδα ἐν τῇ μορφῇ τῆς ψυχῆς μου, ἀλλ’ ἁμαρτόμοι καὶ ἀκηλίδωτος προσδεχθείη ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου ὡς θυμίαμα ἑνώπιον σου.

25. As she said this, she made the sign of the cross upon her eyes and mouth and heart, and little by little, as the fever dried up her tongue, she was no longer able to speak clearly; her voice gave out and only from the trembling of her lips and the motion of her hands did we know that she was continuing to pray. Then, evening came on and the lamp was brought in. Macrina directed her eye toward the beam of light and made it clear that she...
was eager to say the nocturnal prayer and, although her voice failed her, with her heart and the movement of her hands, she fulfilled her desire and moved her lips in keeping with the impulse within her. When she had completed the thanksgiving and indicated that the prayer was over by making the sign of the cross, she breathed a deep breath and with the prayer her life came to an end. From then on, she was without breath and movement, and I recalled an injunction she had given me when I arrived, saying that she wanted my hands to be placed upon her eyes and the customary care of the body to be taken by me. So I placed my hand, deadened by grief, upon her holy face so as not to seem to disregard her request. Actually, her eyes required no [182] attention; it was as if she was asleep with her eyelids becomingly lowered; her lips were set naturally and her hands rested naturally on her breast and the whole position of her body was so spontaneously harmonious that
προσφυγώς μεμυκότα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες εὐπρεπῶς ἐπανακλιθεῖσαι τῷ στήθει πάσα τε ἡ τοῦ σώματος θέσις αὐτομάτως κατὰ τὸ εὐσχήμον ἀρμοσθείσα οὐδὲν τῆς τῶν κοσμοῦντων χειρὸς ἐπεδέετο.

(26) Ἐμοὶ δὲ διεχθέν ἐγίνετο πάρετος ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ οἶς τὸ φαινόμενον ἐβλεπον καὶ οἷς τὴν ἀκοὴν διὰ τῆς γοργῆς τῶν παρθένων οἰμωγῆς περιηχούμην. Τέως μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡσυχία [400] διεκαρτέρουν ἐκεῖναι, τῇ ψυχῇ τὴν ὀδύνην ἐγκατακλείουσα, καὶ τὴν τῆς οἰμωγῆς ὀρμήν τῷ πρὸς αὐτὴν φόβῳ κατέπνιγον, ὡσπερ δεδοικυῖα καὶ σιωπῶντος ἢδη τοῦ προσώπου τὴν ἐπιτίθεσιν, μὴ που παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον αὐταῖς φωνῆς τινος παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐκφαγείσης λυπηθείη πρὸς τὸ γινόμενον ἡ διδάσκαλος. Καὶ οἴονει πυρὸς τινος ἐνδοθὲν αὐτῶν τἀς ψυχὰς διασμύχοντος, ἔτει οὐκέτι κατακρατείσθαι δι’ ἡσυχίας τὸ πάθος ἢδύνατο, ἀθρόως πυρὸς τις καὶ ἄσχετος ἀναρρήγνυται ἡχὸς, ὡστε μοι μηκέτι μένειν ἐν τῷ καθεστηκότι τὸν λογισμὸν, ἀλλὰ καθάπερ χειμάρρου τινὸς ἐπικλύσαντος ὑποβρύχιον there was no need for any arranging hand.

26. My soul was disquieted for two reasons, because of what I saw and because I heard the weeping of the virgins. Until now, they had controlled themselves and kept in check the grief in their souls and they had choked down the impulse to cry out for fear of her, as if they were afraid of the reproach of her voice already silent; lest, contrary to her order, a sound should break forth from them and their teacher be troubled by it. But when their suffering could no longer be controlled in silence (their grief was affecting their souls like a consuming fire within them), suddenly, a bitter, unrestrained cry broke forth, so that my reason no longer maintained itself, but, like a mountain stream overflowing, it was overwhelmed below the surface by my suffering and, disregarding the tasks at hand, I gave myself over wholly to
παρενεχθήναι το πάθει και τῶν ἐν χερσίν ἀμελήσαντα ὅλον τῶν θρήνων εἶναι. Καὶ μοι δικαία πως ἐδόκει καὶ εὐλογος ἡ τοῦ πάθους ἀφομή ταῖς παρθένοις εἶναι. Όυ γάρ συνηθείας τινὸς ἡ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα κηδεμονίας τῆν στέρησιν ἀπωδύροντο οὕδ᾽ ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον οὐδέν, ἑφ᾽ ὡς πρὸς τὰς συμφορὰς δυσανασχετοὺσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς τῆς κατὰ θεὸν ἐλπίδος αὐτῆς καὶ τῆς τῶν ψυχῶν σωτηρίας ἀποσχισθεῖαι ταῦτα ἐβῶν καὶ ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις ἀπωδύροντο. Ἑσβέσθη, λέγουσαι, τῶν ὀρθαλμῶν ἡμῶν ὁ λόχνος· ἀπήρθη τὸ φῶς τῆς τῶν ψυχῶν ὁδηγίας· διελύθη τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν ἡ ἀσφάλεια ἡρθη ἡ σφραγίς τῆς ἀφθαρσίας· δεισπάσθη ὁ σύνδεσμος τῆς ὄμορφοσύνης, συνετρίβη τὸ στήριγμα τῶν ἀπονοῦντων, ἀφηρέθη ἡ θεραπεία τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων. Επὶ [401] σοῦ ἡμῖν καὶ ἡ νῦς ἀντὶ ἡμέρας ἦν καθαρὰ ζωὴ φωτιζομένη· νῦν δὲ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα πρὸς ζόφον μεταστράφησεται. Χαλεπώτερον δὲ παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας τὸ πάθος ἐξέκαισαν αἱ μητέρα αὐτῆς καὶ τροφὸν ἀνακαλοῦσαν. Ἡσαν δὲ αὐταί, ἄς ἐν τῷ τῆς σιτοδείας καιρῷ κατὰ τὰς lamentation. The cause of the maidens' grief seemed to me to be just and reasonable. They were not bewailing the deprivation of some ordinary bond or carnal attraction or any other such thing for which one mourns. But, as if they were torn away from their hope in God or the salvation of their souls, they cried out and loudly bewailed as follows: 'The lamp of our life has been extinguished; the light that directed the path of our souls has been taken away; the safety of our lives has been destroyed; the seal of our incorruptibility has been removed; the bond of our union has been demolished; the support of the feeble has been shattered; the care of the weak taken away. With you even our night was illuminated like day by the pure life, but now even the day is turned into darkness.' The ones who called her mother and nurse were more seriously distraught than the rest. These were those she had nursed and reared after finding them prostrate [183] along the highway at the moment of starvation and
she led them to the pure and uncorrupted life.

27. But when I recalled my soul from the depths, gazing intently at the holy head, and, as if I were rebuked for the disorderly conduct of the women, I said: ‘Look at her,’ shouting at the maidens in a loud voice, ‘and be mindful of the instructions she gave you for order and graciousness in everything. Her divine soul sanctioned one moment of tears for us, commanding us to weep at the moment of prayer. This command we can obey by changing the wailing of our lamentation into a united singing of psalms.’ I said this with a loud voice to drown out the noise of the wailing. Then, I bade them withdraw a little to their quarters nearby and to leave behind a few of those whose services she accepted during her lifetime.

28. Among these, there was a woman outstanding for her wealth and birth and the beauty of her
τοῦ σώματος ὥρα καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ
περιφανεία περίβλεπτος ἐν νέοτητι
gενομένη καὶ συνοικισθεῖσά τινι τῶν
ἐπὶ μείζονος ἁζίας καὶ βραχὺν
συνοικήσασα χρόνον καὶ [402] ἐν νέῳ
τῷ σώματι τῆς συζύγιας διαζευχθεῖσα,
φυλικά τε καὶ παιδαγωγὸν τῆς χαριᾶς
tὴν μεγάλην Μακρίναν πουησαμένη,
συνὴν τὰ πολλὰ ταῖς παρθένοις τὸν
πρὸς ἀφετὴν βίον παρ’ αὐτῶν
ἐκδίδασκομένη. Ὄντειαν δὲ ὅνομα τῇ
gυναίκι, ἢς ὁ πατὴρ Αράξιος ἦν τῶν εἰς
τὴν ὑπατον συντελοῦντων θυγατέρας πρὸς
tαῦτην εἰπὸν ἄνεπιφθονον εἶναι νῦν
γοῦν τὸν μουσίκευτον ἐπιβαλεῖν
cόσμον τῷ σώματι καὶ λαμπραῖς
ὀθόναις κατακοσμήσαι τὴν καθαρὰν
ἐκείνην καὶ ἀκηλιδωτὸν σάρκα. Ἡ δὲ
μεθεῖν ἐφ’ ἥρχηναι, τί τῇ ἁγίᾳ περὶ
tούτων καλῶς ἔχειν ἐδοκιμάσθῃ μὴ γὰρ
ἐναγές εἶναι παρὰ τὸ κεχαρισμένον
αὐτῇ τι παρ’ ἡμῶν γενέσθαι. Πάντως δὲ
ὁ τῷ θεῷ φίλον τε καὶ εὐάρεστον,
κάκεινη καταθύμιον εἶναι.

(29) Καὶ ἦν τις προτεταγμένη τοῦ ὄρχῳ
tῆς παρθενίας ἐν τῷ τῆς διακονίας
βαθμῷ, Λαμπάδιον ὅνομα αὐτῆς ἡ
ἀκριβῶς ἐφ’ ἄγνωσκεῖν περὶ τῶν κατὰ
body, and admired in her youth for
her other attributes. She had been
married to a distinguished man
and, after having been with him for
a short time, she was released from
marriage while still quite young.
She made Macrina the guardian
and director of her widowhood,
and, spending much of her time
with the women, she learned from
them the life of virtue. The
woman’s name was Vetiana, whose
father was Araxius, one of the
senators. I told her that now, at
least, it was suitable to put brighter
raiment on the body and to adorn
with shining ornament that pure
and unsullied flesh. She replied that
it was necessary to learn what
decisions had been made by the
holy one about these matters, for it
would not be right for us to do
anything to her contrary to what
would be pleasing to her. But what
was dear and pleasing to God -was
also desirable to her.

29. There was a certain woman, a
deaconess in charge of a group of
the women, whose name was
Lampadium, and she said she knew
exactly what Macrina had decided
τὴν ταφὴν δεδομένων ἑκείνη. Ἐπει δὲ ἡρόμην αὐτὴν περὶ τούτων (παρούσα γὰρ ἐτύχε τῇ βουλεύσει), ἐφι μετὰ δακρύων ταύτα λέγουσα· 'Ἡ ἁγία κόσμος ὁ καθαρὸς βίος διεσπουδάσθη τούτῳ καὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἐγκαλλώπισμα καὶ τοῦ θανάτου ἐντάφιον ἑκείνη ἐστι· τῷ ὁσα πρὸς καλλωπισμὸν σώματος βλέπει, οὕτε ἐν τῷ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνῳ προσήκατο ὡς τὴν παρούσαν χρῆσιν ἐταμείεσθα, ὡστε οὐδὲ βουλομένοις [403] ἡμῖν ἔσται τι πλέον τῆς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο παρασκευής παρούσης. — Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς ἀποκειμένοις εὔφειν, ἐφιν ἐγώ, τῶν ἐπικοσμήσα τι δυναμένων τὴν ἐκφοράν; — Ποίοις, εἴπεν, ἀποκειμένοις ἐν χερσὶν ἔχεις πάν τὸ ἀπόθετον ἵδιον τὸ ἴματιον, ἵδιον τῆς κεφαλῆς ἤ καλύπτρα, τὰ τετριμένα τῶν ποδῶν ὕποδήματα οὕτος ὁ πλούτος, αὕτη ἡ περιουσία. Οὐδὲν παρὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐν ἀποκρύφοις ἀπόκειται κιβωτοῖς τισιν ἢ θαλάμοις ἦσοφαιμένον. Μίαν ἀποθήκην ἦδει τοῦ ἱδίου πλούτου, τὸν θησαυρὸν τὸν οὐράνιον· ἐκεί πάντα ἀποθεμένη οὐδέν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὑπελείπετο. Τι οὖν, ἐφιν πρὸς αὐτὴν about her burial. When I asked her about it (for she happened to be [184] present at our discussion) she replied weeping: ‘For the holy one, the pure life was what she sought as adornment; for her, this was both the ornament of her life and the shroud of death. She had so little concern for dress that she owned nothing during her lifetime and stored none away for the present situation, so that, even if we desired it, there is nothing more to use than what is already here.’ I said: ‘Is there nothing in the storage closets to decorate the funeral bier?’ ‘What closets?’ she replied. ‘You have everything she possessed in your hands. Look at her dress, look at the covering of her head, her worn sandals. This is her wealth, this is her property. There is nothing beyond what you see put aside in hidden places or made secure in treasures houses. She recognized one storage place for private wealth: the treasury of heaven. There she deposited everything and left nothing behind on earth.’ I said to her: ‘What if I brought some of the things I had
ἐγὼ, εἰ τῶν ἐμοὶ τι πρὸς τὴν ταφήν ἔτοιμασμένων προσαγάγομι μή τι τῶν ἀβουλήτων αὐτῆ διὰ τοῦτον γενήσεται; Οὐκ οἴεσθαί ἐφι τοῦτο παρὰ γνώμην εἶναι αὐτῆ·προσέσθαι γὰρ ἄν αὐτῆν καὶ ἠώσαν τὴν τοιαύτην παρὰ σοῦ τιμῆν κατ’ ἀμφότερα, διὰ τὴν ἰερωσύνην τὴν ἄει τιμᾶν αὐτῆ καὶ διὰ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς φύσεως μηδὲ γὰρ ἄν ἀλλότριον ἐαυτῆς τὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ νομίζαι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ταῖς σαίς χερσὶ περικοσμηθήναι τὸ σώμα διεκελεύσατο.

(30) Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτο ἐδέδοκτο καὶ ἔδει περισταλῆναι ταῖς ὀθόναις τὸ ἱερὸν σώμα ἐκεῖνο, διελομένοι τὴν σπουδὴν [404] ἀλλος ἀλλο τι περὶ αὐτῆν ἔπονοῦμεν. Καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν τὴν ἐσθῆτα τῶν ἐμῶν τινὶ προσαγαγεῖν ἐνεκελεύσαμην, ἢ δὲ μηνυμονευθεῖσα Ὀνετιανὴ τὴν ἄγιαν ἐκείνην κεφαλὴν ταῖς ἱδίαις χερσὶ κατακοσμοῦσα, ἐπειδή κατὰ τὸν αὐχένα τὴν χεῖρα ἥνεγκεν· Ἰδου, φησὶ, πρῶς ἐμὲ βλέψασα, οἶος περιδέραιος κόσμος τῆς ἁγίας ἐξήρτηται. Καὶ ἀμα τοῦτο λέγουσα ἐκλύσασα τὸν δεσμὸν ἐκ τοῦ κατόπιν προέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα καὶ δείκνυσί μοι σιδήρου τὸν θύτον καὶ got ready for the funeral? Would this be against her wish?' She replied that she did not think it would be. 'For,' she said, 'if she were alive, she would accept such a gift from you for two reasons: on account of your priesthood, which she always honored, and, on account of your kinship, she would not have thought that what belonged to her brother was not also hers. It was for this reason that she ordered her body to be prepared by your hands.'

30. When this was decided upon and it was necessary for the sacred body to be dressed in fine linen, we divided the various tasks among us. I told one of my attendants to bring in the robe. Vetiana, whom I have mentioned before, was arranging that holy head with her own hands when she put her hand on her neck and said looking at me: 'See the necklace the holy one wore.' And, at the same time, she unfastened the chain, stretched out her hand, and showed me an iron cross and a ring of the same material. Both of these worn on a thin chain were always on her
δακτύλιον τινα τῆς αὐτής ὀλης, ἀπερ ἀμφότερα λεπτῆς ὀρμίας ἐξημένα ἐπὶ τῆς καρδίας διὰ παντὸς ἦν. Καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπον·Κοινὸν γενέσθω τὸ κτήμα. Καὶ σὺ μὲν ἔχε τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ φυλακτήριον·ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρκεσεὶ ἢ τοῦ δακτυλίου κληρονομία. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦτον σφραγίδος ὁ σταυρὸς ἐγκεχάρακτο ὡς ἐνατενίσασα φησι πάλιν πρὸς ἐμὲ ἡ γυνὴ·Οὐκ ἀπὸ σκοποῦ σοι γέγονεν ἡ ἐκλογή τοῦτοι τοῦ κτήματος. Κοίλος γὰρ κατὰ τὴν σφενδόνην ἑστίν ὁ δακτύλιος καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν τοῦ ἔξυλου τῆς ζωῆς κατακέκρυπται·καὶ οὕτως ἀνωθὲν ἡ σφραγίς τῷ ἴδιῳ τύπῳ μηνύει τὸ ὑποκείμενον.

31. When the time came to cover the body with the robe, the injunction of the great lady made it necessary for me to perform this function. The woman who was present and sharing the great assignment with us said: ‘Do not pass over the greatest of the miracles of the saint.’ ‘What is that?’ I asked. She laid bare a part of the breast and said: ‘Do you see this thin, almost imperceptible, scar below the neck?’ It was like a mark...
made by a small needle. At the same time, she brought the lamp nearer to the place she was showing me. ‘What is miraculous about that,’ I said, ‘if the body has a small mark here?’ She said: ‘This is left on the body as a reminder of the great help of God. At one time, there was a painful sore here and there was the risk that if it was not cut out it would develop into an irremediable illness if it should spread to places near the heart. Her mother begged her to accept the doctor’s care and implored her many times saying that the art of medicine was given by God to man for his preservation. But Macrina considered worse than the disease laying bare part of the body to another’s eyes, and one evening, after she had finished her usual tasks connected with her mother, she went inside the sanctuary and all night supplicated the God of healing, pouring out a stream from her eyes upon the ground, and she used the mud from her tears as a remedy for the disease. When her mother was earnestly distressed and asking her again to see the
doctor, she said that there was a cure for her disease if her mother
with her own hand would make the sign of the cross on the place.
When the mother put her hand inside to make the sign of the cross
on her breast, the sign of the cross worked and the sore
disappeared. But this,' she said, 'is a small token and was seen then
instead of the terrible sore, and remained to the end as a reminder,
I suppose, of the divine consideration, a cause and reason
for unceasing thanksgiving to God.'
κάλλος λαμπρύνοιτο. Ἐκράτει τὰ
dedougemēna kai tò iματιον ἐπεβλήθη ἢ
de ἔλαμπε καὶ ἐν τῷ φαυ, τῆς θείας,
οίμαι, δυνάμεως καὶ ταύτην προσθείσθης
τὴν χάριν τῷ σώματι, ὡστε κατὰ τὴν
tou ἐνυπνιοῦ ὑφιν ἀκριβῶς αὐγάς τινας
ἐκ τοῦ κάλλους ἐκλάμπειν δοκεῖν.

33. While we were engaged in these
activities and the maidens’ psalm-
singing, mingled with lamentation,
resounded through the place, in
some way the report spread about
on all sides and all the people of
the area began to rush in so that
the vestibule was not large enough
to hold them. There was an all
night vigil with hymn-singing as is
the custom in the case of the praise
of martyrs, and, when it was
finished and day dawned, a crowd
of those who had hurried in from
the entire countryside, men and
women both, broke in on the
psalmody with their cries of grief.
Although my soul was distressed
by my misfortune, I kept thinking,
nevertheless, how it should be
possible not to leave undone
anything suitable for such an
occasion. Separating the flow of
people according to sex, I put the women with the choir of nuns and the men in the ranks of the monks. I arranged for the singing to come rhythmically and harmoniously from the group, blended well as in choral singing with the common responses of all. But as the day was advancing and the place was overcrowded by the multitude of people, the bishop of the region, whose name [187] was Araxius (he was present with the full company of his priests), ordered the bier to be brought forward immediately, on the grounds that there was quite a distance to be covered and the crowd would prevent the swift movement of the funeral procession. At the same time, he ordered all the priests who were with him to escort the bier themselves.

34. When this was decided upon and the activity begun, I went to one side of the bier and called him to the other, and two of the others, distinguished in rank, took their position at the opposite end. I led
ὅπισθεν τῆς κλίνης μέρος ύπολαβόντων, ἦν εἰς τὸ πρόσω ἐχόμενος βάδην, ὡς εἰκός, καὶ κατ' ὅλιγον ἦμιν γινομένης τῆς κινήσεως. Τοῦ γὰρ λαοῦ περὶ τὴν κλίνην πεπυκνώμενου καὶ πάντων ἀπλήστως ἐχόντων τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐκείνου θεάματος οὐκ ἦν εὔπορον ἐν εὐκολίᾳ τὴν πορείαν ἦμιν διανύσθαι· προηγεῖτο δὲ καθ' ἑκάτερον μέρος διακόνων τε καὶ ύπηρετῶν πλήθος οὐκ ὅλιγον στοιχηρὸν τοῦ σκηνῶματος προσπομπεύοντες, ἐκ ἱεροῦ λαμπάδας διὰ χειρὸς ἐκχόντες πάντες, καὶ ἦν τις μυστικὴ πομπὴ τὸ γινόμενον, ὁμοφώνως τῆς ψαλμώδιας ἀπ' ἄκρων ἐπὶ ἑσχάτους καθάπερ ἐν τῇ τῶν τριῶν παίδων ὑμνώδια μελῳδούμενης. Ἐπτὰ δὲ ὄντων ἢ ὁκτὼ τῶν διὰ μέσου σταδίων ἀπὸ τῆς ἑσχατιάς ἐπὶ τὸν ρήμαν μαρτύρων ὅπως, ἐν ω καὶ τὰ τῶν γονέων ἀπεκείτο σώματα, διὰ πᾶσης σχεδὸν τῆς ἡμέρας μόλις τὴν ὄδον διηνύσαμεν. Οὐ γὰρ εἰδὼ τὸ πλήθος τὸ τε συνερχόμενον καὶ τὸ ἄει προσγινόμενον κατὰ γνώμην τὴν πρόοδον γίνεσθαι. Επειδὴ οὖν ἐντὸς τῶν θυρῶν τοῦ ὅπως κατεστήμεν,
the tomb of our parents was being opened in which she was to be placed, one of them cried out saying that no longer would we look upon her divine face. The rest of the maidens joined her in her outburst and confusion drowned out the orderly and sacred singing. Everyone wept in response to the wailing of the maidens. We nodded for silence and the leader guided them to prayer by intoning the usual prayers of the Church and the people came to attention. [188]

(35) When the proper ceremony was finished, the fear of the divine command not to uncover the shamelessness of father and mother came upon me. 'How,' I said, 'shall I ward off such a judgment if I look upon the
common shame of human nature in the bodies of our parents, since they have surely fallen apart and disintegrated and been changed into a disgusting and disagreeable formlessness? As I was considering this, and Noe’s anger against his son was rousing fear in me, the story of Noe indicated what ought to be done. Before the bodies came into view when the cover of the tomb was lifted they were covered from one end to the other by a pure linen cloth. When they were covered thus with the linen, the bishop I have mentioned and I lifted that holy body from the bier and placed it beside our mother, fulfilling the common prayer of both of them. For this they had asked from God all through their life, that after death their bodies should be together and that in death they should not be deprived of the comradeship they had had in their lifetime.

(36) When everything was accomplished and it was necessary to go back, I fell upon the tomb
and kissed the dust and retraced my steps, downcast and tearful, thinking of the good of which my life had been deprived. Along the way, a certain distinguished military man in charge of a garrison of soldiers in a district of Pontus, called Sebastopolis, met us graciously when I arrived there and, hearing of my misfortune, he was greatly disturbed (for he was connected with our family through kinship and association). He told me the story of a miracle connected with Macrina and, adding only this to my story, I shall come to an end. When I had stopped crying and we stood talking, he said to me: ‘Hear what a great and substantial good has been removed from human life,’ and, speaking thus, he began his tale:

(37) ‘It happened that my wife and I were eager to visit the monastery of virtue (for that is what I think that place [189] should be called) in which the blessed soul spent her
ἐκεῖνον κατονομάξεσθαι, ἐν ὧν τὴν
diαγωγὴν εἴχεν ἢ μακαρία ψυχή. Συνήν
dὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ θυγάτριον, ὦ τις ἔκ
λοιμώδους ἀρρωστίας συνέβη περὶ τὸν
ὀρθαλμὸν συμφορά· καὶ ἢν [411] θέαμα
eideχθες καὶ ἐλεεινόν, παχυνθέντος τοῦ
περὶ τὴν κόρην χιτῶνος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ
πάθους ὑπολευκαίνοντος. Ως δὲ ἔντος
ήμεν τῆς θείας ἐκείνης διαγωγῆς,
dielόμενοι κατὰ γένος τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν
tῶν ἐν τόπῳ πεισθεῖν ἐγώ τε καὶ
ἡ ὀμόζυγος, ἐγώ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἀνδρῶν
ήμην, ὅν καθηγεῖτο Πέτρος ὁ σὺς
ἀδελφός, ἡ δὲ τοῦ παρθενῶν ἐντὸς
gενομένη τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνῆν. Συμμέτρου
dὲ διαγενομένου ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ
diaστήματος, καῳρὸν εἶναι τοῦ
ἀποχωρεῖν τῆς ἐσχατικῆς πάλιν
ἐκφίλαμεν, καὶ ἤδη πρὸς τοῦτο ἦν ἡμῖν
ἡ ὀμήπι, σύμφωνοι δὲ παρ’ ἐκατέρων ἡ
περὶ ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφούν ἐγίνετο. Ἐμοὶ
tε γὰρ ὁ σὺς ἀδελφός μένειν
ἐνεκελεύετο καὶ μετασχεῖν τῆς
φιλοσοφοῦν τραπέζης· ἢ τε μακαρία τὴν
ἐμῆς γαμετῆς ὦ μεθίει, ἀλλ’ ἐν
κόλποις ἔχουσα τὸ θυγάτριον ὦ
πρότερον ἐλεγεν ἀποδώσειν, πρὸν
τράπεζαν αὐτοῖς παραστήσασθαι, καὶ

life. There was with us our little girl
who was suffering from an eye
ailment resulting from an infectious
sickness. It was a terrible and pitiful
thing to see her as the membrane
around the pupil was swollen and
whitened by the disease. As we
entered the monastery, we
separated, my wife and I, for I
went to the men’s quarters where
your brother Peter was Superior,
and she went to the woman’s
quarters to be with the holy one.
After an interval of time, we
thought it was the hour for us to
go home. We were getting ready to
leave, but a kindly remonstrance
came to us from both quarters.
Your brother urged me to remain
and share the monastic table. The
blessed one would not let my wife
go, and said she would not give up
my daughter, whom she was
holding in her arms, until she had
given them a meal and offered
them the wealth of philosophy. She
kissed the child as one might
expect and put her lips on her eyes
and, when she noticed the diseased
pupil, she said: “If you do me the
favor of remaining for dinner, I will
When the feasting was over and grace said (the great Peter, having entertained and cheered us with special graciousness, and the great Macrina, having said goodbye to my wife with every courtesy), we started the journey home bright and happy. Each of us told his own story on the way. I spoke of everything I had seen and heard in the men’s quarters, and she told...
everything systematically, as in a history, and did not think it right to omit the smallest details. She was telling everything in order, as if going through a treatise, and when she came to the point at which the medicine was promised, interrupting the narrative she said: “What have we done? [190] How did we forget the promise, the medicine for the eyes?” I was annoyed at our thoughtlessness and quickly sent one of my men back to ask for the medicine, when the child, who happened to be in her nurse’s arms, looked at her mother, and the mother fixing her gaze on the child’s eyes, said: “Stop being upset by our carelessness.” She said this in a loud voice, joyfully and fearfully. “Nothing of what was promised to us has been omitted, but the true medicine that heals diseases, the cure that comes from prayer, this she has given us, and it has already worked; nothing at all is left of the disease of the eyes.” As she said this, she took our child and put her in my arms and I, also, then comprehended the miracles in the gospel which I had not believed.
before and I said: “What a great thing it is for sight to be restored to
the blind by the hand of God, if now His handmaiden makes such
cures and has done such a thing
through faith in Him, a fact no less
impressive than these miracles.”

This was what he told me, and
tears fell as he spoke and his voice
was choked with emotion. This is
the story of the soldier.

(39) I do not think it is wise to add
to my story all the other details we
heard from those who lived with
her and knew her life accurately,
for most men judge the credibility
of what they hear according to the
measure of their own experience,
and what is beyond the power of
the hearer they insult with the
suspicion of falsehood as outside
of the truth. Therefore, I pass over
that incredible farming
phenomenon at the time of the
famine when, as the grain was given out in proportion to the need, the amount did not seem to grow smaller, but remained the same as it was before it was given to those asking for it. And after this, there were other events more surprising than these; the healing of disease, the casting out of devils, true prophecies of future events, all of which are believed to be true by those who knew the details accurately, amazing although they are. But for the material-minded, they are beyond what can be accepted. They do not [191] know that the distribution of graces is in proportion to one’s faith, meager for those of little faith, great for those who have within themselves great room for faith. So, in order not to do harm to those who have no faith in the gifts of God, I have decided against enumerating the greater miracles, judging it sufficient to end my work about Macrina with what I have already related.
Appendix II. Sources on Eustathius of Sebastea

Socrates Scholasticus

Eustathius bishop of Sebastia in Armenia was not even permitted to make his defense; because he had been long before deposed by Eulalius, his own father, who was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, for dressing in a style unbecoming the sacerdotal office. Let it be noted that Meletius was appointed his successor, of whom we shall hereafter speak. Eustathius indeed was subsequently condemned by a Synod convened on his account at Gangra in Paphlagonia; he having, after his deposition by the council at Cæsarea, done many things repugnant to the ecclesiastical canons. For he had ‘forbidden marriage,’ and maintained that meats were to be abstained from: he even separated many from their wives, and persuaded those who disliked to assemble in the churches to commune at home. Under the pretext of piety, he also seduced servants from their masters. He himself wore the habit of a philosopher, and induced his followers to adopt a new and extraordinary garb, directing that the
Eustathius, they said, was deposed because, when a presbyter, he had been condemned, and put away from the communion of prayers by Eulalius, his own father, who was bishop of the church of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia; and also because he had been

Eυσταθίου δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ὡς ἤνικα πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ προκατεγνώκει αὐτὸν Εὐλάλιος ὁ πατήρ καὶ τῶν εὐχῶν ἀφώρισεν, ἐπίσκοπος ὡς τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἐκκλησίας Καισαρείας, μετὰ δὲ τούτο ἐν

610 Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 43, 1-6, GCS NF 1, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 72-73.
Neocæsarea, a city of Pontus, and deposed by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, for unfaithfulness in the discharge of certain duties that had devolved upon him. He had also been deprived of his bishopric by those who were convened in Gangrae, on account of his having taught, acted, and thought contrary to sound doctrine. He had been convicted of perjury by the council of Antioch. He had likewise endeavored to reverse the decrees of those convened at Melitina; and, although he was guilty of many crimes, he had the assurance to aspire to be judge over the others, and to stigmatize them as heretics.611

Basil

Now one of those who causes us much sorrow is Eustathius of Sebaste in Lesser Armenia, who, taught of old by Arius at the time when Arius flourished at Alexandria, as the author of those wicked blasphemies against the Only-begotten, following him and being numbered among his most faithful disciples, on returning to his

611 Sozomen, HE IV 24, 9, GCS 50, 180, transl. NPNF II 2, 320.
own country, gave a confession of sound faith to the most blessed bishop Hermogenes of Caesarea, who was judging him on the charge of false doctrine. And having thus received ordination at his hands, after the decease of the latter, he ran to Eusebius of Constantinople, a man who himself less than no one sponsored the impious doctrine of Arius. Then after being driven for some cause or other from that place, he returned and made a defence again before the people of his own country, concealing his impious sentiments and screening himself behind a kind of orthodoxy of words. And when he somehow obtained the bishopric, he seems immediately to have written an anathema of consubstantiation at their synod convened at Ancyra. And going thence into Seleucia, in conjunction with those who held the same opinions as himself, he did what all know. And at Constantinople he again agreed with the proposals of the heretics. And when he had accordingly been expelled from his episcopacy on account of his former deposition at Melitine, he conceived of the visit to you as a means of
ἀπελαθεὶς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ Μελιτηνῇ προκαθημησθαί ὁδὸν ἕαυτῷ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως ἐπενόησε τὴν ὡς ύμᾶς ἀφιξίν. Καὶ τίνα μὲν ἐστὶν ἀ προετάθη αὐτῷ παρὰ τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ἐπισκόπου Λιβερίου, τίνα δὲ ἀ αὐτὸς συνεθέτο ἀγνοούμεν, πλὴν ὅτι ἐπιστολὴν ἐκομισαν ἀποκαθιστώσαν αὐτὸν, ἢν ἐπιδείξας τῇ κατὰ Τύαναν συνόδῳ ἀποκατέστη τῷ τόπῳ. Οὔτος γὰρ πορθεὶ τὴν πίστιν ἑκείνην ἐφ’ ἡ ἐδέχθη καὶ τοῖς ἀναθεματίζοντι τὸ ὄμοιωσον σύνεστι καὶ πρωτοστάτης ἑστὶ τῆς τῶν Πνευματομάχων αἱρέσεως.

They followed Arius in the beginning; they changed to Hermogenes, who was diametrically opposed to the infamous teachings of Arius, as the creed originally proclaimed by that man at Nicæa shows. Hermogenes fell asleep, and again they changed to Eusebius, the chorus leader of the Arian circle, as those who have had experience of him say. Falling away

They followed Arius in the beginning; and what it was that was proposed to him by the most blessed bishop Liberius, and what it was that lie himself agreed to, we know not, except that he brought back a letter restoring him, by displaying which at the synod of Tyana he was restored to his place. This man now tries to destroy that creed on the basis of which he was received, and he associates with those who anathematize consubstantiation, and is the leader of the heresy of the pneumatomachi.612

from this man for some reason or other, they again ran back to their fatherland, and again concealed their Arian sentiments. Arriving at the episcopacy—to pass over the events of the interval—how many creeds they have set forth! At Ancyra one, another at Seleucia, another at Constantinople, the celebrated one, at Lampsacus another, after this the one at Nice in Thrace, now again the one at Cyzicus. Of this last I only know so much as what I hear—that having suppressed “consubstantiality” they now add “like in substance,” and they subscribe with Eunomius to the blasphemies against the Holy Spirit.613

Appendix III. The Council of Gangra

The synodical letter


Συνοδικὴ ἐπιστολή

Συνοδική ἐπιστολή

The synodical letter

The synodical letter

Inasmuch as the most holy synod of bishops, having convened in the church at Gangra on account of certain pressing matters of ecclesiastical business, when the affairs concerning Eustathius were also investigated, discovered that many things were being done unlawfully by Eustathius’s followers, it has out of necessity established guidelines [concerning these things] and has hastened to make [them] known to all in order to put an end to the things being done evilly by him.
For as a result of their condemnation of marriage and their enjoining that no one who is married has hope before God, many married women, being deceived, have withdrawn from their own husbands, and men from their own wives. Then afterwards, not being able to control themselves, the women have committed adultery. And for this reason, they have fallen into reproach. Moreover, they were found to be promoting withdrawal from the houses of God and the church, [and] disposed contemptuously against the church and the things [done] in the church, have established their own assemblies, churches, different teachings, and other things in opposition to the churches and the things [done] in the church. They wear strange dress to the downfall of the common mode of dress; ecclesiastical funds that have always been given to the church they distribute to themselves and their followers, as if [they were making distributions] to saints; slaves withdraw from their masters and, because of their strange dress, despise their masters; contrary to custom, women put on male dress in place of women’s, thinking they are
γυναίκες παρὰ τὸ σύνηθες ἃντι ἁμφισμάτων γυναικείων ἀνδρικά ἁμφιάσματα ἀναλαμβάνουσαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦτων οἰόμεναι δικαιοσθαί πολλαὶ δὲ ἀποκείρονται προφασεὶ θεοσεβείας τὴν φύσιν τῆς κόμης τῆς γυναικείας: νηστείας τὸ ἐν κυριακῇ ποιούμενοι καὶ τῆς ἁγίότητος τῆς ἐλευθέρας ἡμέρας καταφρονοῦντες καὶ τῶν νηστείων τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τεταγμένων ύπερφρονοῦντες καὶ ἐφθαίνοντες, καὶ τινὲς αὐτῶν μεταλήψεις κρεών βδελυγμένοι καὶ ἐν οἴκοις γεγαμηκότων εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι μὴ βουλόμενοι καὶ [88] γινομένων εὐχῶν καταφρονοῦντες καὶ πολλάκις προσφορῶν ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς οἰκίαις τῶν γεγαμηκότων γινομένων μὴ μεταλαμβάνοντες· καὶ πρεσβυτέρων γεγαμηκότων ύπερφρονοῦντες καὶ τῶν λειτουργῶν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν γινομένων μὴ ἀπτόμενοι· καὶ τὰς συνάξεις τῶν μαρτύρων καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ συνερχομένων καὶ λειτουργοῦντων καταγινώσκοντες· καὶ πλουσίων δὲ τῶν μὴ πάντων τῶν ύπαρχόντων justified by this; and many [women], under pretext of piety, cut off the natural growth of feminine hair; they observe fasts on the Lord's day and despise the holiness of the free day and, condemning the fasts ordained in the churches, they eat [during these fasts]; some of them loathe the eating of meat; they do not wish to make prayers in the homes of married persons and despise such prayers when they are made; frequently they do not participate in the oblations taking place in the very houses of married persons; they condemn married presbyters; they do not engage in the liturgies when performed by married presbyters; they deplore the assembly of the martyrs and those who gather and conduct services there. For each of [451] them, upon leaving the rule of the church, became, as it were, a law unto himself. For there is not a common opinion among the whole lot of them, but each puts forward whatever he thinks, to the slander of the church and to his own harm.
Because of these things, the holy synod convened in Gangra was compelled to vote in condemnation of them and to set forth definitions, to the effect that they are outside the church. But if they repent and anathematize each of the things recounted as evil, they will be acceptable. And to this end the holy synod has set forth everything they must anathematize in order to be received. But if anyone should not comply with the things listed [herein], such a one is anathematized as a heretic and will be excommunicated and separated from the church. And it will be necessary for the bishops to be on guard against such behavior in all things discovered among them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Canon I.**

If anyone censures marriage, and loathes or censures the faithful and pious woman who sleeps with her husband, claiming she is not able to enter the kingdom, let such a one be anathema.

**Canon II.**

If anyone condemns those who with reverence and faith eat meat that is without blood, has not been sacrificed to idols, and is not strangled, claiming that because of their partaking they are without hope, let such a one be anathema.

**Canon III.**

If, under pretext of piety, anyone teaches a slave to despise his master and to withdraw from service and not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canon IV.</th>
<th>Canon V.</th>
<th>Canon VI.</th>
<th>Canon VII.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ. Περὶ τῶν διακρινομένων ἀπὸ γεγαμηκότων κοινωνῆσαι πρεσβυτέρου.</td>
<td>Ε. Περὶ τῶν τάς ἐν ἐκκλησίαις συνάξεις εὐτελιζόντων.</td>
<td>Ε. Περὶ τῶν τάς λειτουργίας ἐξω τῶν ἐκκλησίων ποιουμένων.</td>
<td>Ζ. Περὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καρποφορίων τῶν παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εἰ τις διακρίνοιτο παρὰ πρεσβυτέρου γεγαμηκότος, ὡς μὴ χρῄγαι λειτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ προσφορὰς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.</td>
<td>Εἰ τις διδάσκει τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ εὐκαταφρόνητον εἶναι καὶ τάς ἐν αὐτῷ συνάξεις, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.</td>
<td>Εἰ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάζοι, καταφρονών τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐθέλοι πράττειν, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.</td>
<td>Εἰ τις διδάσκει τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καρποφορίων, καταφρονών τῶν παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If anyone separates himself from a married presbyter, claiming that it is not necessary to partake of the offering when he is celebrating, let such a one be anathema. [452]</td>
<td>If anyone teaches that the house of God and the assemblies held in it are readily despised, let such a one be anathema.</td>
<td>If anyone assembles outside the church on his or her own initiative and, despising the church, desires to perform church functions in the absence of a presbyter who conforms to the judgment of the bishop, let such a one be anathema.</td>
<td>If anyone assembles outside the church on his or her own initiative and, despising the church, desires to perform church functions in the absence of a presbyter who conforms to the judgment of the bishop, let such a one be anathema.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ἀναχωρεῖν τῆς ὑπηρεσίας, καὶ μὴ μετ’ εὐνοίας καὶ πάσης τιμῆς τῶ ἑαυτοῦ δεσπότῃ ἐξυπηρετεῖσθαι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. [91] to serve his master to the utmost with good will and all honor, let such a one be anathema.
If anyone wishes to receive or give church funds outside the church, contrary to the will of the bishop or the one entrusted with such matters, and wishes to act without his consent, let such a one be anathema.

**Canon VIII.**

If anyone, except the bishop or the one commissioned with the stewardship of alms, gives or receives funds, let the one giving and the one receiving be anathema.

**Canon IX.**

If anyone practices virginity or self-control, withdrawing from marriage as if it were a loathsome thing and not because of the inherent beauty and sanctity of virginity, let such a one be anathema.

**Canon X.**

If any of those who practice virginity for the Lord’s sake acts arrogantly toward those who are married, let such a one be anathema.
Canon XI.

If anyone despises those who hold love feasts out of faith and invite the brothers out of honor for the Lord, and does not wish to accept invitations out of disdain for what is done, let such a one be anathema.

Canon XII.

If, because of presumed asceticism, any man wear the periboleum and, claiming that one has righteousness because of this, pronounces judgment against those who with reverence wear the berus and make use of other common and customary clothing, let him be anathema.

Canon XIII.

If, because of presumed asceticism, any woman change her clothing, and in place of the clothing customary for women adopt that of men, let her be anathema.

Canon XIV.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Εἰ τις γυνὴ καταλιμπάνοι τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ ἀναχωρεῖν αὐτοῦ ἑθέλοι, ἑβελυσσομένη τὸν γάμον, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.</td>
<td>If any woman abandons her husband and wishes to withdraw from marriage because she loathes it, let her be anathema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΙΕ. Περὶ τῶν ἐν προφάσει εὐλαβείας περιορώντων τὰ τέκνα. Εἰ τις καταλιμπάνοι τὰ ἄντον τέκνα καὶ μὴ τεκνοτροφοῖ καὶ τὸ ὀσόν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ πρὸς θεοσέβειαν τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀνάγοι, ἀλλὰ προφάσει τῆς ἀσκήσεως ἀμελοίη, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. [96]</td>
<td>Canon XV. If anyone abandons his or her own children and does not provide for them and, as far as possible, rear them in accordance with the proper piety, but under pretext of asceticism neglects them, let such a one be anathema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ις. Περὶ τῶν ἐν προφάσει εὐλαβείας περιορώντων γονέας. Εἰ τινὰ τέκνα γονέων, μάλιστα πιστῶν, ἀναχωροῖ προφάσει θεοσέβειας καὶ μὴ τὴν καθήκουσαν τιμὴν τοῖς γονεύσιν ἀπονέμοι, προτιμωμένης δηλονότι παρ’ αὐτῶν τῆς θεοσέβειας, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.</td>
<td>Canon XVI. If, under pretext of asceticism, any children abandon their parents, especially [if the parents are] believers, and do not bestow on them the honor that is their due, that is to say, shall prefer piety to them, let them be anathema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΙΖ. Περὶ γυναικῶν προφάσει εὐλαβείας ἀποκειρομένων. Εἰ τὶς γυναικῶν διὰ νομιζομένην θεοσέβειαν ἀποκείροιτο τὴν κόμην, ἢν ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός εἰς ὑπόμνησιν τῆς ύποταγῆς, ὡς ἂν παραλύουσα τὸ πρόσταγμα τῆς ύποταγῆς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.</td>
<td>Canon XVII. If, because of presumed asceticism, any woman cuts her hair, which God gave as a reminder of [her] subjection, under the impression that this annuls the ordinance of subjection, let her be anathema.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ΙΗ. Περὶ τῶν ἐν κυριακαῖς νηστεύόντων.
Εἰ τις διὰ νομίζομένην ἁσκησιν ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ νηστεύοι, ἀνάθεμα ἐστω. [97]

ΙΘ. Περὶ τῶν τάς ἐκκλησιαστικάς νηστεύόντων νηστείας.
Εἰ τις τῶν ἀσκοῦντων χωρὶς σωματικής ἁνάγκης ύπερφηρανεύοιτο καὶ τὰς παραδεδομένας νηστείας εἰς τὸ κοινὸν καὶ φυλαττομένας ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παραλύῃ, ἐπικυροῦντος ἐν αὐτῷ τελείου λογισμοῦ, ἀνάθεμα ἐστω.

Κ. Περὶ τῶν τάς μαρτύρων βδελυσσομένων συνάξεις.
Εἰ τις αἰτώται ύπερφηράνω διαθέσει κεχρημένος καὶ βδελυσσόμενος τὰς συνάξεις τῶν μαρτύρων ἢ τὰς ἐν αὐτῶς γινομένας λειτουργίας καὶ τὰς μνήμας αὐτῶν, ἀνάθεμα ἐστω. [98]

Ἐπίλογος
Ταῦτα δὲ γράφομεν οὐκ ἐκκόπτοντες τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς ἁσκεῖσθαι βουλομένους, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀσκεῖσθαι βουλομένους.

Canon XVIII.
If, because of presumed asceticism, anyone fasts on the Lord’s day, let such a one be anathema.

Canon XIX.
If any of those practicing asceticism without bodily necessity behaves arrogantly and sets aside the traditional fasts commonly kept by the church, claiming that one’s perfect power of reasoning undermines the validity of these fasts, let such a one be anathema. [454]

Canon XX.
If, assuming an arrogant disposition and loathing, anyone condemns the assemblies [in honor?] of the martyrs or the services held in them [martyria?] and in memory of [the martyrs], let such a one be anathema.

Epilogue.
We write these things not to cut off those in the church of God who wish to practice asceticism according to the Scriptures but [to cut off] those who undertake the practice of asceticism to
λαμβάνοντας τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῆς ἀσκήσεως εἰς ὑπερηφάνειαν καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἀφελεστέρως βιοῦντων ἐπαιρομένους τε καὶ παρὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας καινισμοὺς εἰσάγοντας. Ημεῖς τοιγαροῦν καὶ παρθενιαὶ ἡμεῖς τοις μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης θαυμάζομεν, καὶ ἐγκράτειαν μετὰ σεμνότητος καὶ θεοσεβείας γινομένην ἀποδεχόμεθα, καὶ ἀναχώρησιν τῶν ἀφελεστέρως βιοῦντων ἐπαιρομένους τε καὶ παρὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ τοὺς καινισμοὺς εἰσάγοντας.

For this reason we admire virginity [when practiced] with humility and we approve of self-control [when practiced] with dignity and piety; we also approve of withdrawal from worldly affairs [when it is done] with humility; and we honor the noble union of marriage; we do not disdain wealth [when used] with righteousness and [the giving of] alms; we praise plainness and frugality of dress, with simple concern only for the body; but we do not approve of going about in lascivious and effeminate dress; we honor the house of God and we approve of the meetings held in them as holy and beneficial, not limiting reverence to the houses but honoring every place built in the name of God; and we approve the communal meeting in the church of God for the benefit of the community; and we bless the brothers’ abundant good works on behalf of the poor, because they are performed in accordance with the
ἐν ὀνόματι θεοῦ οἰκοδομηθέντα τιμῶμεν, καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ σύνοδον κοινὴν εἰς ἀφέλειαν τοῦ κοινοῦ ἀποδεχόμεθα καὶ τὰς καθ’ ύπερβολὴν εὐποίας τῶν ἁδελφῶν τὰς κατὰ τὰς παραδόσεις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς γινομένας μακαρίζομεν, καὶ πάντα, συνελόντα εἰπεῖν, τὰ παραδοθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν παραδόσεων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ γίνεσθαι εὐχόμεθα.
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Streszczenie

Wielu badaczy uważa Makrynę Młodszą za założycielkę pierwszych wspólnot monastycznych w Poncie, ascetkę i nauczycielkę swoich młodszych braci, w tym Bazylego Wielkiego i Grzegorza z Nyssy. Zainteresowanie Makryną znacznie wzrosło w ostatnich latach, głównie za sprawą przedstawicielek teologii feministycznej, poszukujących znaczących postaci kobiecych w starożytności.

Problem w tym, że jedynie źródła, jakie o niej wspominają, to trzy pisma Grzegorza z Nyssy (Żywot świętej Makryny, list 19 oraz dialog O duszy i zmartwychwstaniu) oraz jeden wiersz Grzegorza z Nazjanzu. Uczeni głowią się od lat, dlaczego o tak wzniosłej siostrze słowem nie wspomina Bazyli Wielki, który mizoginem przecież nie był; wielokrotnie wypowiadał się w samych superlatywach o swojej babce Makrynie Starszej i swojej matce Emmelii. Makryna nie pojawia się także w innych źródłach, w których moglibyśmy się jej spodziewać: ani w Historiach Kościelnych dotyczących IV wieku, a napisanych w pierwszej połowie V wieku, ani w listach Grzegorza z Nazjanzu.

Badacze zwykle traktują dzieła dotyczące Makryny Młodszej jako skarbnicę informacji na temat historycznych wydarzeń i osób. Jednak każde z tych czterech pism zostało napisane zgodnie z zasadami gatunków literackich, których celem nie było i nie miało być opisywanie historii, ale które miały zupełnie inne zadania takie jak zachęta moralna, polemika czy uhonorowanie kogoś.

Żywot świętej Makryny jest najobszerniejszym dziełem Grzegorza z Nyssy na temat Makryny. Pytanie o jego gatunek literacki jest sprawą absolutnie kluczową, a mimo to najczęściej jest pomijane lub traktowane jako mało istotne. Tymczasem od odpowiedzi na to pytanie zależy, czy będziemy traktować podane w tym dziele informacje jako fakty, czy nie. Żywot świętej Makryny nie jest ani kroniką rodzinną, ani biografią filozoficzną, lecz jest hagiografią. Charakterystyczne cechy hagiografii to kontekst religijny oraz cel, którym jest pokazanie modelu życia i podbudowanie czytelników. Opisywane osoby i zdarzenia nie muszą ani nie mają ambicji być autentyczne/historyczne, ale parenetyczne czyli mają służyć ukazaniu pewnego wzorca do naśladowania.

List 19 również nie jest relacją historyczną, ale popisem retorycznym. Opowiadanie o Makrynie jest tak rażąco nierealne, że nawet nie udaje
charakterystyki rzeczywistej osoby. Większa część Grzegorzowego „opisu” to cytaty z Pisma świętego, określenia, które w Biblii odnoszą się do samego Boga lub do apostoła Pawła. Jasne jest, że jest to model do naśladowania, a nie spis cech konkretnego człowieka.


Epitafium 120 Grzegorza z Nazjanzu jest jedyną wzmianką o Makrynie poza pismami samego Grzegorza z Nyssy. Epitafium z definicji nie ma za zadanie opowiadać o rzeczywistych wydarzeniach, ale ma na celu uhonorowanie kogoś.

Pierwszą część niniejszej pracy poświęciłam analizie gatunków literackich wyżej wymienionych dzieł oraz konfrontacji informacji zawartych w pismach o Makrynie z innymi źródłami. Efektem tych badań było postawienie tezy, że Makryna opisana przez Grzegorza z Nyssy i Grzegorza z Nazjanzu została przez nich wymyślona, by zastąpić prawdziwego inspiratora życia ascetycznego w Poncie – Eustacjusza z Sebasty. Druga część pracy dotyczy właśnie Eustacjusza z Sebasty: zaczyna się od analizy źródeł, które o nim mówią, a następnie przedstawia moją rekonstrukcję jego życiorysu. Przy okazji datowania życia Eustacjusza ustaliłam między innymi inną od powszechnie przyjętej datę synodu w Gangrach.

W trzeciej części zbadalam relację Eustacjusza z Sebasty i Bazylego Wielkiego, spróbowałam też rozwikłać najważniejsze kontrowersje z nią związane,
przede wszystkim czy i na ile Bazyli był uczniem Eustacjusza, czy wpływ ten ograniczał się do kwestii ascetycznych, czy też dotyczył także zagadnień doktrynalnych. Zajęłam się ponadto szukaniem przyczyn konfliktu między Bazylim i Eustacjuszem; doszłam do wniosku, że powodem zmiany ich przyjaźni w nienawiść była najprawdopodobniej walka o władzę, a konkretnie o ordynowanie biskupów w Armenii Mniejszej. Kościelna struktura podporządkowania biskupów metropoliom była płynna w tym czasie, wiele zależało od indywidualnej przebojowości sprawujących urzędy, a ich osobiste aspiracje prowadziły do konfliktów. Jestem skłonna twierdzić, że konflikt doktrynalny Bazylego i Eustacjusza był jedynie przykrywką dla konfliktu administracyjnego.