

Apollinarius und seine Folgen

Herausgegeben von
SILKE-PETRA BERGJAN,
BENJAMIN GLEEDE und
MARTIN HEIMGARTNER

*Studien und Texte zu
Antike und Christentum*

93

Mohr Siebeck

Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity

Herausgeber/Editors

CHRISTOPH MARKSCHIES (Berlin) · MARTIN WALLRAFF (Basel)
CHRISTIAN WILDBERG (Princeton)

Beirat/Advisory Board

PETER BROWN (Princeton) · SUSANNA ELM (Berkeley)
JOHANNES HAHN (Münster) · EMANUELA PRINZIVALLI (Rom)
JÖRG RÜPKE (Erfurt)

Apollinarius und seine Folgen

Herausgegeben von

Silke-Petra Bergjan, Benjamin Gleede
und Martin Heimgartner

Mohr Siebeck

SILKE-PETRA BERGJAN ist Professorin für Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Zürich.

BENJAMIN GLEEDE ist Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter (SNF Projekt) am Lehrstuhl für Kirchen und Theologiegeschichte an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Zürich.

MARTIN HEIMGARTNER ist apl. Professor für Kirchengeschichte an der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg und Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter (SNF Projekt) am Lehrstuhl für Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Zürich.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-153588-8

ISBN 978-3-16-153587-1

ISSN 1436-3003 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2015 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. www.mohr.de

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Das Buch wurde von Laupp & Göbel in Nehren gesetzt und auf alterungsbeständiges Werkdruckpapier gedruckt und von der Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren gebunden.

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort	VII
---------------	-----

I. Der frühe Apollinarius: Nachrichten aus der Zeit um und vor 360

<i>Susanna Elm</i> Apollinarius of Laodicea and Gregory of Nazianzus: The Early Years	3
<i>Kelley McCarthy Spoerl</i> The Circumstances of Apollinarius's Election in Laodicea	19
<i>Volker Henning Drecoll</i> Apollinarius, <i>Ad Iovianum</i> : Analyse und Bedeutung für die Apollinariuschronologie	35
<i>Markus Vinzent</i> Pseudo-Athanasius, <i>Oratio contra Arianos IV</i> : Apollinarius's Earliest Extant Work	59

II. Zur Theologie des Apollinarius

<i>Hanns Christof Brennecke</i> „Apollinaristischer Arianismus“ oder „arianischer Apollinarismus“ – Ein dogmengeschichtliches Konstrukt?	73
<i>Johannes Zachhuber</i> Derivative Genera in Apollinarius of Laodicea: Some Remarks on the Philosophical Coherence of his Thought	93
<i>Benjamin Gleede</i> Τὸ ὅλον θεολογεῖν καὶ τὸ ὅλον ἀνθρωπολογεῖν: Der Sprachgebrauch der Schrift als Wurzel apollinarischer Christologie	115
<i>Ekkehard Mühlenberg</i> Theologie und Frömmigkeit bei den Apollinaristen	129

III. Fragmente des Apollinarius und Schriften seiner Gegner in ihren Überlieferungskontexten

Uta Heil

Athanasius, Apollinarius und der pseudathanasianische *Sermo contra omnes
haereses* 143

Alessandro Capone

Pseudo-Athanasius, *De incarnatione contra Apollinarium*:
Einleitende Bemerkungen zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung 167

Martin Heimgartner

Neue Fragmente Diodors von Tarsus aus den Schriften „Gegen Apollinarius“,
„Gegen die Manichäer“ und „Über den heiligen Geist“ 185

Karin Metzler

Segen für die Stämme Israels. Neue Testimonien für die Auslegung
des Apollinarius von Gen 49 und Dtn 33 (aus CPG 3680) 205

IV. Apollinarius in der Wahrnehmung der späteren Jahrhunderte

Silke-Petra Bergjan

Theodoret von Cyrus, Apollinarius und die Apollinaristen in Antiochien 229

Claudia Rammelt

„Apollinaristisches“ aus und in Edessa. Eine Spurensuche 259

Theresia Hainthaler

Die apollinaristischen Fälschungen und die christologischen Debatten
des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts. Einige Beobachtungen 269

Patrick Andrist

The Two Faces of Apollinarius: A Glimpse into the Complex Reception
of an Uncommon Heretic in Byzantium 285

Vorwort

Apollinarius gehört, bemisst man seine Wirkung auf die ihm nachfolgenden Generationen von Theologen und Bischöfen, zu den bedeutendsten Gestalten der Alten Kirche. Hochgebildet spürte er theologischen Fragen nach, stellte Zusammenhänge her, die man im Lager der Nizäner lieber unberücksichtigt gelassen hätte, und ging schließlich einen Weg, auf dem man ihm nicht folgen wollte. Dennoch konnte man ihm Zeit seines Lebens nur schwer den Respekt entziehen und entließ ihn nur ungern aus den eigenen Reihen. Er hatte Schüler und Anhänger, von denen noch für lange Zeit, wenn auch sehr sporadisch, Nachrichten zu finden sind. Seine Anhänger, Apollinaristen oder apollinaristische Gruppen und Gemeinden, hatten eine solche Bedeutung, dass es zum Teil geboten war, ihnen entgegenzukommen und vermittelnde Positionen einzunehmen. Seine Lehre hatte eine Anziehungskraft auch bei denen, die keine Apollinaristen sein wollten, und blieb für lange Zeit präsent. Auf der anderen Seite ließen sich seine theologischen Schlüsse auf wenige Sätze reduzieren und wirkten, einmal als häretisch entlarvt, als leicht erkennbare Häretikerschablone weiter. In den christologischen Streitigkeiten seit dem 5. Jahrhundert bot er den Parteien eine Folie der Abgrenzung. Es bestand Konsens, dass Apollinarius in seinen Ausführungen die Grenze des Tolerierbaren überschritten hatte und damit die Grenze definiert hatte, die es nicht zu berühren galt.

Die Beschäftigung mit seiner Theologie gibt den Arbeiten zum christologischen Streit bis heute eine Tiefenschärfe, die ohne die Kenntnisse seiner fragmentarisch überlieferten Schriften nicht zu erreichen ist. Dies gilt insbesondere auch für die Arbeit an den Texten von Vertretern der antiochenischen Theologie und ostsyrischen Kirche. Die Diskussionen im Umfeld von Apollinarius und die Geschichte der späteren apollinaristischen Gruppen haben in letzter Zeit vermehrt Aufmerksamkeit erhalten. Zahlreiche Fragmente und Texte sind seit und von Lietzmann identifiziert worden, und damit stellt sich die Frage nach den Überlieferungskontexten dieser Nachrichten. Die Verwendung der „Figur“ Apollinarius in den antiken Diskussionen und die Kenntnisse von den Texten und der Lehre des Apollinarius bis ins 8. Jahrhundert bedürfen der Bearbeitung.

Hierzu haben wir zu einer Tagung eingeladen, die in Filzbach im Kanton Glarus vom 22.–24. 6. 2011 stattgefunden hat. Die Ergebnisse sind in diesem Band zusammengefasst.

Aufmerksamkeit fand der frühe Apollinarius, soweit die Quellen eine Momentaufnahme erlauben und sich ein Bild von Apollinarius im Kontext der 360er Jahre zeichnen läßt. Eine Reihe von Aufsätzen kommt dabei zu dem Ergebnis, dass Apollinarius sehr viel stärker als bisher allgemein hin angenommen im Umfeld von Antiochien zu verstehen ist.

Gregor von Nazianz ist bekannt durch seine Äußerungen über Apollinarius in der Mitte der 380er Jahre, daneben gibt es aber frühere Begegnungspunkte. *Susanna Elm* zeigt auf, dass Diodor, Gregor von Nazianz und Apollinarius, alle Gegner des Eunomius, Photins und Kaiser Julians, in den 60er Jahren sehr viel mehr gemeinsam hatten als sie

trennte. 360/61 schrieb Apollinarius *Kata meros pistis* in Reaktion auf die Apologie des Eunomius; wenig später arbeitete Gregor von Nazianz an seiner *Oratio* 2. Nachdem sein Vater mit der Unterschrift unter das homöische Bekenntnis von 360 ein Schisma in Nazianz verursacht hat, sucht Gregor nach einer Antwort, die eine Alternative formuliert, ohne auf die Seite der Gegner seines Vaters einzuschwenken. Gregor ist in Annisi bei Basilius, während dieser im Briefwechsel mit Apollinarius steht. Es steht zu vermuten, dass Apollinarius nicht nur Basilius beeinflusste, sondern auch das Denken Gregors prägte.

Kelley McCarthy Spoerl nennt Gründe dafür, dass Apollinarius zwischen Ende 359 und Anfang 360 Bischof von Laodicea wurde und dort erst 360 mit der Einsetzung von Pelagius als Bischof ein Schisma begann. Apollinarius war nach Spoerl also nicht seit 346, dem bei Sozomenus erwähnten Besuch von Athanasius in Laodicea, ein marginalisierter früher Nizäner in Parallele zu Paulinus in Antiochien, der auch erst um 362 als Bischof eingesetzt wurde. Apollinarius hatte vielmehr in der anti-markellischen Ausrichtung seiner Theologie Anknüpfungspunkte zu Georg von Laodicea, und es steht zu erwarten, dass Apollinarius ein respektierter Kleriker in Laodicea war. Die Exkommunikation des Apollinarius durch Gregor wurde wahrscheinlich entweder nicht umgesetzt oder von Apollinarius angefochten. Aus diesen Überlegungen folgt, dass der Einfluss von Athanasius auf Apollinarius geringer zu veranschlagen ist und Apollinarius' Theologie vielmehr im Umfeld von Laodicea und somit von Antiochien zu verorten ist.

Neben dem Brief des Apollinarius an Basilius (ep. 362), der meist griechisch betitelten Schrift *Kata meros pistis*, der *Epistula ad Dionysium I* und dem *Tomus ad Antiochenos 7* von 362 ist vor allem der Brief an Jovian eine wichtige Quelle für die Lehre des Apollinarius in den 60er Jahren. *Volker Henning Drecoll* analysiert *Ad Iovianum* und zeigt, dass es sich in den Briefen *Ad Iovianum* und *Ad Dionysium I* um Zeugnisse einer Diskussion handelt, die sich erheblich von der der 70er Jahre unterscheidet. In *Ad Iovianum* liegt der früheste Beleg des Begriffs $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ vor, ohne dass aber die später für Apollinarius so bezeichnende Christologie in diesem Text bereits greifbar ist. Da die fragliche Echtheit der Fragmente aus der Eudoxiusschrift *De incarnatione* in der *Doctrina Patrum* seine Überlegungen nur bedingt stützen können, formuliert Drecoll mit der gebührenden Vorsicht die These, dass möglicherweise der Ausdruck $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in Antiochien in den 60er Jahren diskutiert wurde. Dass es sich in der in *Ad Iovianum* abgewiesenen Position um die Diodors handelt, passt in die Zeit und an den Ort. Apollinarius richtet sich aber nach Drecoll nicht nur gegen Diodor, sondern sucht Anknüpfungspunkte an Vertreter der eusebianischen (anti-markellischen) Mittelposition und wirbt unter denen, die sich dem nizänischen $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ zu öffnen bereit waren. Dies würde bedeuten, dass nicht nur Basilius und Athanasius, wie im *Tomus ad Antiochenos* belegt, sondern auch Apollinarius eigene Bemühungen zur Zusammenführung der nizänischen Kirchenleute unternahm. Für Drecoll ist deutlich, dass aus der Zeit vor 373 keine Quellen vorliegen, die ein „christologisches Sonderprofil“ des Apollinarius belegen können.

Die Gegenthese, nämlich dass es möglich ist, in der Apollinariuschronologie bis in die 40er Jahre vorzudringen, vertritt *Markus Vinzent*. Er datiert Ps.-Athanasius, *Contra Arianos IV* auf 340 und geht davon aus, dass Athanasius seine drei Bücher *Contra Arianos* erst nach und in Reaktion auf *Contra Arianos IV* geschrieben hat. Zugleich hält Vinzent es für sehr unwahrscheinlich, dass Apollinarius um 346, als Athanasius bei ihm in Laodicea Station machte, bekannt war, ohne bereits etwas veröffentlicht zu haben. In der Sache,

so zeigt Vinzent, steht *Contra Arianos IV* den Schriften *Contra Sabellianos* und *Adversus Eunomium IV–V*, aber auch *Kata meros pistis* nahe, wie aus den Ausführungen zur Trinitätslehre hervorgeht. Vinzent kommt daher zu dem Ergebnis, dass in *Contra Arianos IV* das früheste erhaltene Werk des Apollinarius vorliegt. Es gehört in eine Zeit, in der Osten und Westen die Trinitätslehre erst entwickelten und in der Apollinarius daran gelegen war, Brücken zu bauen, indem er die göttliche Monarchie von der eusebianischen Subordination abgrenzte und das *homoousios* von der markellischen Monas.

In einem zweiten Teil steht die Theologie des Apollinarius im Mittelpunkt. Die Herkunft der Lehre vom seelenlosen Christus aus der innerantiochenischen Diskussion, die Ausformulierung der Idiomenkommunikation durch Apollinarius und vor allem die Trinitätslehre des Apollinarius sind hier die Themen. Die Trinitätslehre bildet insgesamt einen Schwerpunkt in der Diskussion. Wichtige Bezugspunkte sind der Brief 362 an Basilius, der *Tomus ad Antiochenus 7* und der erste Brief an Dionysius.

Hanns Christof Brennecke fragt nach der Herkunft der seit dem Ende des 4. Jahrhunderts oft belegten und wiederholten These, dass schon Arius die Lehre vom seelenlosen Christus gekannt habe und somit Apollinarius in Arius und den Arianern Vorgänger seiner eigenen Lehre habe. Gegen diese These spricht schon, dass in den arianischen Dokumenten und vor allem den Synodenbekenntnissen die Menschwerdung bis in die 60er Jahre kein Problem ist, vielmehr die Ausdrücke *σάρξ*, *σῶμα* und *ἄνθρωπος* undifferenziert nebeneinander verwendet werden. Erst Mitte der 70er Jahre schreibt Epiphanius von den Arianern, dass sie die menschliche Seele Christi leugnen, ohne dies jedoch mit Apollinarius in Verbindung zu bringen. Einzig Eustathius von Antiochien hält den Arianern vor, einen *Χριστὸς ἄψυχος* zu lehren. Für die Annahme einer arianischen Lehre vom seelenlosen Christus ist dieses Zeugnis nicht hinreichend. Die Frage nach der menschlichen Seele hat in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Arianismus bis zu Epiphanius keine Rolle gespielt. Das Bekenntnis des Eudoxius, das als Fragment aus der Schrift *De incarnatione in Doctrina Patrum 9* überliefert ist, muss nach Brennecke als Fälschung betrachtet werden. Erst im *Tomus ad Antiochenos 7* und in der Langrezension der Ignatiusbriefe (ein Dokument homöisch-antiochenischen Ursprungs) begegnet die Lehre vom *Χριστὸς ἄψυχος*. Dies verweist auf eine innerantiochenische Diskussion, an der Apollinarius beteiligt war.

Johannes Zschhuber wendet sich der Trinitätslehre des Apollinarius zu und nimmt seinen Ausgangspunkt in dessen Erklärung der trinitarischen Wesensgleichheit durch Aufnahme und Weiterentwicklung des Modells der derivativen Genera im Brief an Basilius (ep. 362). Apollinarius erklärt den Begriff der Homousie darin, dass der Sohn und überhaupt die Nachkommen das gleiche Wesen haben wie der Vater bzw. wie der erste der Familie oder das erste Beispiel einer Gattung. Wesensgleichheit ist bestimmt durch Herkunftsbeziehungen. Alle Familienmitglieder sind in der Herkunft von ein- und derselben *ἀρχή* gleich. Apollinarius' Argumentation kann, wie Zschhuber zeigt, in der Perspektive der neuplatonischen Interpretation der aristotelischen Kategorien durchaus Plausibilität beanspruchen. Das Modell der generativen Genera durchzieht und erklärt ebenso Anthropologie und Christologie des Apollinarius und zeigt damit die beachtliche Kohärenz seines Denkens auf.

Benjamin Gleede analysiert die Hoheitstitel und Niedrigkeitsaussagen in der Christologie des Apollinarius und zeigt, dass nach Apollinarius bei bleibender Unterschiedenheit der Naturen von Gottheit und Menschheit in Christus die Prädikate von dem geeinten

Subjekt gemeinsam ausgesagt werden. Wie der Mensch aus den Teilen von Seele und Leib besteht und dennoch durch einen gemeinsamen Namen bezeichnet wird, so geht es in der Christologie wesentlich darum, „die Prädikate ‚geschaffen‘ und ‚ungeschaffen‘ in einer Prädikation zusammenzuführen“, so die Formulierung von Apollinarius. Gleede interpretiert dies als eine Antwort auf die antiochenische Zwei-Naturenlehre, wobei Apollinarius eine Modifikation der Hinsichtendifferenzierung gelingt. Auf der Grundlage der Subjektseinheit formuliert Apollinarius erstmals das Konzept der Idiomenkommunikation für die Christologie aus. Gleede bezieht sich vor allem auf die beiden Texte *Περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐνότητος τοῦ σώματος πρὸς τὴν θεότητα* und den ersten Brief an Dionysius.

Ekkehard Mühlberg setzt ein mit der Hochschätzung des Zusammentreffens von Theologie und Frömmigkeit bei Apollinarius durch Adolf von Harnack und stellt dieser Gregor von Nyssas Vorbehalte gegenüber Apollinarius entgegen, der diesen sogar für gefährlich hält und dabei die Folgen von dessen Soteriologie für die Lebensführung im Blick hat. In der Tat hat die christologische Konzeption ethische Bezüge. Mühlberg schließt: „Denn bei Apollinarius ist der sichtbar erschienene Gott auch die anschauliche Quelle für die Lebensgestaltung.“

Im dritten Teil finden sich die Arbeiten zur Überlieferung der anti-apollinaristischen Schriften im Rahmen der Athanasius-Corpora, aber auch bisher unbekannt Testimonien werden vorgestellt.

Uta Heil widmet sich dem Thema der anti-apollinaristischen Schriften, die sich neben den apollinaristischen Schriften in den antiken Sammlungen der Athanasius-Schriften finden. Der *Sermo contra omnes haereses* ist ein Beispiel eines solchen pseudathanasianischen anti-apollinaristischen Werkes. Die Frage ist, ob mit der Einfügung von anti-apollinaristischen Texten in eine apollinaristisch-athanasianische Textsammlung diese theologisch neutralisiert werden sollte und möglicherweise ein anti-apollinaristischer Text spezifisch für die Sammlung abgefasst wurde, oder ob im Habitus des Archivars Texte zusammengenommen wurden, ohne dass ein Widerspruch in den Texten störte. Der Text ist in der Zeitspanne zwischen den ersten Verurteilungen ab 377 und vor den Auseinandersetzungen anzusiedeln, die ab 428 beginnen. Der Autor verarbeitet in der Schrift wesentlich Material aus den Athanasius-Schriften. Mit Ausnahme der Apollinaristen sind die Häresien, die er auflistet und beschreibt, auch im Werk des Athanasius zu finden. Der Autor bietet also einen anti-apollinaristisch aktualisierten Athanasius.

Alessandro Capone wendet sich der handschriftlichen Überlieferung der anti-apollinaristischen Schrift *De incarnatione contra Apollinarium* zu, die in das alexandrinische Milieu gehört und wichtigen Aufschluss über apollinaristische Gruppen am Ende des 4. Jahrhunderts gibt. Das Werk besteht aus zwei Büchern und ist in den Athanasius-Corpora breit bezeugt. Der handschriftlichen Überlieferung kann man jedoch entnehmen, dass es sich um ursprünglich voneinander unabhängige anti-apollinaristische Schriften handelt, die auch eine jeweils unterschiedliche Überlieferungsgeschichte haben. Leontius von Byzanz ist der erste, der beide Bücher kennt. Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts zirkulierte *Liber I (De incarnatione Christi contra Apollinarium)* unter dem Namen von Athanasius. Etwas später, Ende 5. Jahrhundert bzw. Anfang 6. Jahrhundert, erscheint auch *Liber II (De salutari epiphania contra Apollinarium)* als Athanasius fest zugeschriebenes Werk.

Martin Heimgartner veröffentlicht in diesem Band vier bisher unedierte Fragmente von Diodor von Tarsus aus dem Vatopedi-Florileg sowie zwei weitere Fragmente, die im

42. Brief des ostsyrischen Patriarchen Timotheus I. erhalten sind. Im Vatopedi-Florileg finden sich Fragmente über die Ablehnung der Präexistenz der Seele, und zwar aus Diodors Schrift gegen die Manichäer und aus seiner Schrift gegen Apollinarius. Obwohl der Zusammenhang mit der Schrift des Apollinarius, auf die sich Diodor bezieht, nicht mehr sichtbar ist, ist interessant, dass offensichtlich in der Auseinandersetzung mit Apollinarius die Diskussion um die Präexistenz der Seele eine Rolle gespielt hat. Bei den Diodor-Fragmenten im Londoner Florileg und bei Timotheus handelt es sich zum Teil um Referate der Position von Diodors Gegner Apollinarius, die schon Cyrill nicht mehr von der Position Diodors unterschieden hat, so dass Diodor in die Nähe des Apollinarius gestellt wurde. In den Diodor-Fragmenten bei Timotheus handelt es sich um ein Referat der Apollinarius-Position.

Karin Metzler wendet sich Apollinarius als Exegeten zu und veröffentlicht neue Testimonien seiner Auslegung zu Gen 49 und Dtn 33. Es handelt sich um Testimonien aus den Kommentaren Prokops zu den entsprechenden Stellen, die nicht in der Katenenüberlieferung zu finden sind bzw. nicht als solche zu identifizieren oder bisher nur in lateinischer Übersetzung bekannt waren.

Im letzten Teil geht es um die „Folgen“: die Apollinaristen in Antiochien, die Kenntnisse über Person und Werk im 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert und die Verwendung der Apollinarius-Schriften in den späteren christologischen Auseinandersetzungen.

Silke-Petra Bergjan setzt mit der Nachricht aus Theodorets Kirchengeschichte ein, dass unter Bischof Theodot 427/28 die Kirche der Apollinaristen in Antiochien mit der Mehrheitskirche zusammenging und Theodoret selbst also die Vereinigung der antiochenischen Kirche mit den Apollinaristen erlebte. Theodoret spricht über diese Vereinigung wie über eine ansteckende Krankheit, mit deren Folgen er sich konfrontiert sieht. In diesem Umfeld erklären sich sowohl seine zum Teil heftigen anti-apollinaristischen Äußerungen als auch der als werbende Schrift zu verstehende *Eranistes*. Theodoret kennt den Zusammenhang zwischen einer arianischen und einer apollinaristischen Christologie und macht in den Dokumenten, die im Zusammenhang mit dem Konzil von Ephesus überliefert sind, weidlich Gebrauch davon. Seine Kritik macht aber insbesondere nicht vor der Trinitätslehre des Apollinarius halt, die weithin als unangefochten galt. Die Trinitätslehre des Apollinarius entsprach für Theodoret nicht mehr den Anforderungen, wie sie im 5. Jahrhundert gestellt wurden. Im lokalen Umfeld Antiochiens ist aber vor allem auch die Schrift *Eranistes* zu lesen. Es fällt auf, dass die Florilegien, die jedes der drei Bücher beschließen, mit Zitaten aus Apollinarius-Schriften enden, welche die Zwei-Naturen-Lehre des Apollinarius belegen sollen und die dann den Dialogpartner des *Orthodoxos*, den *Eranistes*, überzeugen. Es wird dargelegt, dass die ehemaligen Apollinaristen in der antiochenischen Kirche die Adressaten der Schrift sind.

Claudia Rammelt geht den Bezügen auf Apollinarius in Edessa und insbesondere bei Ibas von Edessa nach und findet keine Spuren von Apollinaristen in dieser Stadt.

Theresia Hainthaler geht den frühesten Nachrichten über die apollinaristische Herkunft von bestimmten unter dem Pseudonym etwa des Athanasius kursierenden Texten im 5. Jahrhundert, dann aber vor allem im 6. Jahrhundert nach und zeigt auf, wie die Texte strittig werden und auf der anderen Seite ohne ein Wissen über ihre apollinaristische Herkunft in den christologischen Auseinandersetzungen weiterverwendet werden.

Patrick Andrist zeigt, wie das Bild von Apollinarius zwischen dem 5. und 8. Jahrhundert von der Dichotomie geprägt ist zwischen Apollinarius als dem Lehrer der häretischen

Apollinaristen und dem geachteten Exegeten, dessen Vorlesungen Hieronymus in Antiochien besuchte und dessen dreißig Bücher gegen Porphyrius er auch nach dessen Verurteilung durch die römische Synode 378 unter Damasus lobend erwähnt. In der *Souda* finden sich zwei so unterschiedliche Einträge, einmal zu dem Literaten und Poeten Apollinarius und zum andern zu dem Verfechter häretischer Lehren, dass die Person des Apollinarius nicht mehr zusammengehalten zu werden scheint. Patrick Andrist dokumentiert detailliert die beiden Gesichter des Apollinarius in den byzantinischen Quellen.¹

Die Tagung in Filzbach, auf welche die Aufsätze dieses Bandes zurückgehen, konnte stattfinden mit der großzügigen Unterstützung des Zürcher Universitätsvereins, des Hochschulvereins und der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Zürich, mit Mitteln des Schweizerischen Nationalfonds sowie des Bundesprogramms für Chancengleichheit.

Für die unermüdliche Organisation der Tagung danken wir besonders Claudia Herrmann, für die Herstellung des Manuskripts der sorgfältigen Arbeit von Jonathan Bieler und für das Korrekturlesen Dr. Samuel Zinsli.

¹ Die Ergebnisse dieses Bandes sind eingegangen in den Artikel: Silke-Petra Bergjan, Apollinarius of Laodicea, Brill Encyclopaedia of Early Christianity, Leiden, im Druck.

I. Der frühe Apollinarius:
Nachrichten aus der Zeit um und vor 360

Apollinarius of Laodicea and Gregory of Nazianzus: The Early Years

Susanna Elm

Gregory of Nazianzus's relation to Apollinarius of Laodicea, I suggest, began earlier than the late 370s and the 380s. Rather, Apollinarius, or at least the Antiochene milieu to which he belonged, may well have been a neglected link during Gregory's formative years.¹ As an opening statement this may not qualify as a "hook." However, nearly all scholarship on the relationship between these two men has focused on the 380s, even though by then both Gregory and Apollinarius had been players on the orthodox theology scene for several decades. The reason for this scholarly concentration is easy to parse. Gregory of Nazianzus wrote his letters to Cleodion and Nectarius, in which he named Apollinarius directly, in the mid 380s. By that time, Apollinarius and his teachings had come under intense scrutiny and he had in effect been made to cross the border separating orthodoxy from heresy.² I will return briefly to this phase in the second part of my paper, to note only that Gregory was in retreat in Seleucia between 375 and 379, when Apollinarius surged into the spotlight in both East and West thanks to the *mêlée* following his ordination of Vitalis in Antioch.³ That ordination would, however, prove to

¹ Peter Gemeinhardt, 'Apollinaris of Laodicea: A Neglected Link of Trinitarian Theology between East and West?', *ZAC/JAC*, 10 (2006), 286–301. I thank Silke-Petra Bergjan and Martin Heimgartner for the invitation to the wonderful conference that forced me to focus on Apollinarius, something I ought to have done much earlier.

² Gr. Naz. ep. 101–2, 202 (SC 208, Gallay/Jourjon); See now Christopher A. Beeley, 'The Early Christological Controversy: Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory Nazianzen', *VigChr*, 65 (2011), 1–32; Silke-Petra Bergjan, 'Anti-Arianische Argumente gegen Apollinarios. Gregor von Nyssa in der Auseinandersetzung mit Apollinarios in *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarium*', in V. H. Drecoll/M. Berghaus (eds.), *Gregory of Nyssa: the Minor Treatises on Trinitarian Theology and Apollinarism, Proceedings of the 11th International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa (Tübingen, 17–20 September 2008)*, SVigChr 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 481–98; John Behr (ed.), *The Case against Diodore and Theodore: Texts and Their Contexts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 9–11; Christian Lange, *Mia Energeia. Untersuchungen zur Einigungspolitik des Kaisers Heraclius und des Patriarchen Sergius von Constantinopel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 25–32; Neil McLynn, 'The Voice of Conscience. Gregory Nazianzen in Retirement', in *Vescovi e pastori in epoca Teodosiana. In occasione del XVI centenario della consacrazione episcopale di S. Agostino, 396–1996. XXV Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana 2* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1997), 299–30; John McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus. An Intellectual Biography* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 379–95.

³ Epiph. haer. 77.20–24; Alessandro Capone, 'La polemica Apollinarista alla fine del IV secolo: La lettera di Gregorio di Nissa a Teofilo di Alessandria', in *Gregory of Nyssa: The Minor Treatises* (op. cit. fn. 2), 499–517; Kelley McCarthy Spoerl, *Study of the Κατὰ Μέρος Πίστις by Apollinarius of Laodicea*, PhD Thesis (University of Toronto, 1991), 39–66; Ekkehard Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 45–63.

be rather consequential for both, Gregory and Apollinarius, and the positions in which they found themselves in the mid 380s: moved from the center to the margins, one as a retired bishop of Constantinople, the other as a heretic.

1. Phase I

1.1. *The Early 360's*

Twenty years earlier, Apollinarius and Gregory of Nazianzus had occupied an entirely different landscape of theological debate. In 360, most Eastern bishops had signed the formula agreed upon by the council of Constantinople under the aegis of emperor Constantius, a formula that declared the relation between Father and Son to be similar. It was a compromise solution and resulted in the marginalization of those who held opinions considered too radical, such as the an-homoian (or heterousian) Aetius on the one hand and the homoiousian Eustathius of Sebaste on the other. The council of Constantinople also resulted, directly and indirectly, in a flurry of new ordinations and appointments to bishops' seats, for example that of Meletius, made bishop of Antioch in late 360. Apollinarius, as Kelley McCarthy Spoerl argues convincingly in this volume, was also consecrated as bishop of Laodicea at this critical time, not least because he had established his theological credentials in the preceding decade such that he stood in prominent opposition to the prevailing homoian stance.

Evidently embattled, the newly consecrated bishop Apollinarius produced, in 360 or 361, a manifesto stating his theological view-points: the Detailed Confession of Faith (*Kata Meros Pistis*).⁴ Here, Apollinarius voiced inter alia his doubts regarding the prohibition of the terms *ousia* and *hypostasis* when discussing the relation between Father and Son (though he exercised restraint in actually using them), his concerns regarding the position of Aetius and his followers, especially those protected by leading homoians, and he affirmed the eternity of the Trinity and all its members.⁵

Apollinarius was not the only newly ordained Christian leader under pressure at that time to produce a manifesto proclaiming his views.⁶ Eunomius, previously a close adviser of Aetius, parted sides with his mentor in 360, a move that earned him the bishop's see of Cyzikus. Eunomius had announced his shift in a speech at the council of Constantinople and published a version soon thereafter, in 360 or 361, as his manifesto, the Apology. In

⁴ Kelley McCarthy Spoerl, 'The Circumstances of Apollinarius's Election in Laodicea', see below 19; ead., 'Apollinarius on the Holy Spirit', *StPatr*, 37 (2001), 588; Joseph T. Lienhardt, 'Two Friends of Athanasius: Marcellus of Ancyra and Apollinaris of Laodicea', *ZAC*, 10 (2006), 63, suggests 363 as the KMP's date, following Hubertus R. Drobner, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 221; Mark DelCogliano, 'The Death of George of Laodicea', *JThS*, 60 (2009), 181–90; id., 'George of Laodicea: A Historical Reassessment', *JEH* 62 (2011), 667–92, especially 683–92. For Meletius's appointment see now Thomas R. Karmann, *Meletius von Antiochien: Studien zur Geschichte des trinitätstheologischen Streits in den Jahren 360–364 n. Chr.* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009), 60.

⁵ KMP 32 (180 L.). The KMP will be cited henceforth according to the edition of Hans Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1970).

⁶ For the practice of publishing such manifestos upon episcopal election see Susanna Elm, 'Autobiography as Apology', in J. Stenger (ed.), *Literature in Late Antiquity*, forthcoming.

fact, he wrote this apology while “at home” in Cappadocia on the emperor’s orders, who had sent him there to rusticate because of intense opposition to his ordination.⁷ According to Philostorgius (and before him Jerome) Apollinarius had written *his* manifesto in direct response to Eunomius’s Apology.⁸

Not long thereafter, in 362 or 363, another embattled young man who likewise no longer saw eye to eye with his elder and better who had recently ordained him as priest also wrote a manifesto: Gregory of Nazianzus. Oration 2 On the Priesthood, also known as *Apologia de fuga sua*, is Gregory’s inaugural speech, representing his definition of appropriate, orthodox Christian leadership. Thus, the theme of leadership, or to use Christopher Beeley’s words, “pastoral ministry,” both correct and incorrect, occupies the lion’s share of this oration.⁹ Scholars have consequently paid little attention to its theological themes. Admittedly, like most of Gregory’s orations, Oration 2 is not a systematic theological treatise. Scholars have paid even less attention to the theological implications of yet another of Gregory’s orations he wrote shortly thereafter, in late 363 and early 364, namely his first invective against the emperor Julian, Oration 4.¹⁰

Indeed, the relatively scant scholarly engagement with the theological views Gregory expressed in his early orations forms part of an overall trend. Because Gregory formulated his theological positions most systematically in the five so-called Theological Orations he delivered in Constantinople in 380, these orations form the basis of scholarly scrutiny of his theology.¹¹ And since he expressed his views on Apollinarius most concretely then as well, namely in 379 in his Oration 22 On Peace, and then later in the so-called Christological Letters 101–102 and 202, scholars likewise focus almost exclusively on the 380s to reconstruct the relation between these two men.¹²

⁷ For details and bibliography Susanna Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 46–50.235–39.

⁸ Hier., vir. ill. 120; Philost., h. e. 8.12.

⁹ Gr. Naz., or. 1–3 (SC 278 Bernardi); Christopher Beeley, *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 235.

¹⁰ For a discussion of the dates see Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (op. cit. fn. 7), 147–54.340–44.

¹¹ Numerous excellent studies discuss Gregory’s theology. I relied especially on Hanns-Christof Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 107–14.134–5; Volker H. Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 17–111; Richard P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Beeley, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 9); Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea And Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Richard P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 639–53.676–737; Thomas Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 299–440; Frederick W. Norris, *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 12–71; Jean Plagnieux, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze théologien* (Paris: Editions franciscaines, 1952); Michel R. Barnes, ‘The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon’, in L. Ayres/G. Jones (eds.), *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998), 47–67; Pier F. Beatrice, ‘The Word ‘Homoousios’ from Hellenism to Christianity’, *ChHist*, 71 (2002), 243–72; Winrich A. Löhr, ‘A Sense of Tradition: the Homoiousian Church Party’, in M. Barnes/D. H. Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 81–100; Johannes Zachhuber, ‘Basil and the Three-Hypostases Tradition. Reconsidering the Origins of Cappadocian Theology’, *ZAC/JAC*, 5 (2001), 65–85.

¹² Gr. Naz., or. 20–23 (SC 270 Mossay); Beeley, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 9), IX and 116, is the most trenchant critic of such a focus on the Theological Orations and the so-called Christological epistles, even

Such focus on Gregory's late years could be justified by a further argument that applies to Gregory's entire oeuvre and thus also to an analysis of his Constantinopolitan writings. Prompted by the fact that Gregory edited all of his orations, letters, and poems while in retirement at Nazianzus or at Arianzus in the late 380s and the early 390s, Caroline Macé has suggested that Gregory published his orations only after these revisions, in one batch, and not, as most scholars argue, in smaller groups earlier on. This would imply that we can only talk with any certainty about Gregory's theological positions as he formulated them in these very same late 380s and early 390s.¹³ Though I fully appreciate the merits of Macé's suggestion, I cannot, as a historian, find the courage to abandon all contextualization. Thus, I follow all other scholars of Gregory in trying to relate his orations to an actual period of composition, which is to say that I take his Orations 2 and 4 to express the views he held between 362 and 364.¹⁴

What then did Gregory say about theology in his inaugural manifesto and in his first repudiation of the recently deceased emperor Julian? When Gregory wrote Oration 2, in 362 and 363, and Oration 4, in 363 and 364, he was, as ordained priest, a close advisor to his father, Gregory the Elder, bishop of Nazianzus. The Elder had signed the homoian document of 360, a signature that had caused disarray among his followers to the degree that the leaders of those who opposed him had been ordained as counter-bishops, probably by Lucifer of Calaris, travelling back from Antioch where he had just ordained Paulinus. Nazianzus was, so it seems, in schism (with some of the schismatics potentially homoiousian, that is, holding positions close to the Younger), a schism not yet mended when Gregory wrote Oration 4 in 364. Gregory the Younger had left Nazianzus after his ordination and before he wrote Oration 2 to spent time with Basil in Annesi. Basil had gone to Annesi, because, like Gregory, he was not at ease with his own bishop Dianius's signature of the homoian document. Gregory's Oration 2 was thus his inaugural speech in the sense that it signaled his return to his father's side to accept and carry out the duties of a priest of Nazianzus under his father's leadership.¹⁵

As such, Oration 2 had three aims. First, aside from explaining Gregory's defection to Annesi, the oration was in effect Gregory's defense of his father. Second, it presented a theological platform intended to integrate those in opposition back into the fold on Gregory the Younger's terms. These terms modified his father's views (as expressed in his signature under the homoian document), but not so much that they simply accepted those of the local opposition; that is, these terms represented Gregory's own theological views. Third, however, Gregory framed these views in no small part in direct contrast to three enemies "outside" Nazianzus, Photinus, the successor of Marcellus of Ancyra, Eunomius, the disciple of Aetius, and the emperor Julian, who counted Gregory's brother Caesarius among his personal physicians.

though his excellent analysis of Gregory's doctrine of the Trinity also relies in the main on these works; id., 'Early Christological Controversy' (op. cit. fn. 2).

¹³ Caroline Macé, 'À propos d'une édition récente de Grégoire de Nazianze', *AC*, 77 (2008), 243–56.

¹⁴ *Pace* Jean Bernardi, John McGuckin, and Christopher Beeley, I do not to single out particular phrases and passages of these early orations as representative of his later views and hence as the result of his editing hand. The manuscripts offer no clues as to where editing occurred so that the identification of specific passages as later insertions relies on presumptions regarding Gregory's earlier views that cannot be independently verified.

¹⁵ Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (op. cit. fn. 7), 147–214 for details and bibliography.

At Oration 2.37, Gregory names his adversaries thus: “There are now three theological maladies: atheism and Judaism and polytheism. The Libyan Sabellius has led the first, Arius the Alexandrian the second, and the third is led by some among us who are too orthodox.” In response to such aberrations, that is, those of Photinus and Eunomius on either end, Gregory advocates avoidance of all excess, “to flee what is noxious” and to remain “within the strict limits set by piety (*en hōrois menein tēs eusebeias*).”¹⁶ Sabellius and his followers’ excess led them to atheism because their love of the Son made them consider him the same as the Father, a “new analysis and synthesis,” which defines all as one (*hen ta panta*). Such innovation had the consequence of erasing what is essential in each being, “making each being nothing,” because, Gregory continues, a being that changes its essential nature ceases to be what it is.¹⁷ To love the Son so much as to make him indistinct from the Father robs him of his distinctiveness as son (and thus reduces all three to one). But one must not “paint¹⁸ and fabricate in one’s mind a composite and absurd god similar to those mythic animals” of old, either (or. 2.36).¹⁹

The followers of the “madness (*mania*) of Arius,” in contrast, revert to “the poverty of Judaism.” By arguing that only the unbegotten (*agennētos*) Father is fully divine, they deprive both Father and Son, since they seem “afraid that God, by being Father of a true God of equal dignity in his nature (*homotimou tēn physin*), might be lost to us.” Yet others, presumably those affected by the third malady, polytheism, set the three persons or powers of the divinity against each other like rivals and thus reintroduce “the multiple [divine] powers of the Greeks that we have left behind” (or. 2.37). These were persons, I assume, who gave too much power to each hypostasis without respecting what Gregory considered essential, namely the proper internal hierarchy of Father, Son, and Spirit in the one Trinity.

Because the central aspect of Gregory’s ideal form of Christian leadership was the correct comprehension of the Trinity, Oration 2 contains in fact a substantial amount of Trinitarian teaching, including Gregory’s understanding of the nature of Christ.²⁰ True Christian leaders had to comprehend the Trinity fully or else they could not administer the greatest *pharmakon*, the Trinity, correctly to all in their care. To administer this *pharmakon* incorrectly was fatal so that Gregory clarified in detail the Trinity’s true mixture. Those he calls (sarcastically) “father-lovers” (*philopatores*) extend their love for the Father

¹⁶ Gregory’s labeling of two of the “three theological maladies” of his day with the names of two historic “heresiarchs,” the “Libyan Sabellius” and the “Alexandrian Arius,” is reminiscent of Diogenes Laertius’s association of philosophical ideas with (mythic) founders of schools. Sabellius stands for teachings privileging the supremacy of the Father, including those of Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus. Gregory’s accusation of Christ-loving is ironic/sarcastic: these men love the Son to the degree that they assimilate him so much to the Father as to be absorbed by him, so that the Father rules supreme. Alain Le Boulluec, *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque*, vol. 1 (Paris: , 1985), 79–91; Wolfgang A. Bienert, ‘Sabellius und Sabellianismus als historisches Problem’, in H. C. Brennecke/E. L. Grasmück/C. Marksches (eds.), *Logos*. Fs. L. Abramowski (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993), 124–39; Rebecca Lyman, ‘Arians and Manichees on Christ’, *JThS*, 40 (1989), 493–503.

¹⁷ Arist., *Cat.* 5.3.33–7.

¹⁸ Gregory uses *skiagraphon*, “written in shadows,” a classic Platonic term.

¹⁹ Pl., *Phdr.* 229c–e considered the chimera and similar mythic animals examples of wrong forms of myth.

²⁰ For a full explication of Gregory’s teachings see Beeley, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 9), 122–43.187–233.

such that they deprive him of fatherhood by denying him a true son. “Of whom, in fact, could he be the Father, if the nature of the Son were to be separated from his and linked together with creation (in fact, what is estranged (*allogrios*) cannot be his Son); or if [the father] were united and absorbed by him, or, what results in the same thing, if were to absorb [the son]?” In contrast, to love Christ too much, to be *philochristos*, reduces the power of the Father and threatens to deprive the Son of his essence as son: “Of whom would he in effect be the son if he would not refer to his Father as his cause (*archē*), nor grant the Father the dignity of being the cause that is his [due], both as father and as beggetter (*gennētōr*)?” (or. 2.38).

Gregory avoids these excesses to set out a middle course, the “Royal Road” that deviates neither to left nor right.²¹ To align the Son with creation and to separate him from the Father diminishes him and denies the Father his true role, and so Gregory emphasizes the full humanity and divinity of Christ.²² Only as fully divine being who has become fully human could Christ fulfill his role, to guide all toward the divine in a process Gregory calls *oikeiosis pros theon*, affiliation with the divine.²³ Gregory also insists on the difference distinguishing Father and Son. As Son, Christ is a different entity. Though of equal dignity, his relation to the father is nevertheless one of a hierarchical ordering, in which the Son is below the Father. The *Logos* has assumed human form (or. 2.23), so that in Christ human and divine attributes are mixed or mingled, both before and after the incarnation. Only in such a fully mixed or compounded form can Christ be worshipped as one with the Father, while the distinction between Father and Son must be maintained to guarantee the former’s (monarchic) role as Father. Christ is deeply united with the Father and has only one nature; he is not God and in addition a human being. “This new mixture (*mixis*) of God and man [is] one out of two and through one both . . . two disparate elements [are] tied together by the relationship of familiarity that the mediator entertains toward both of them . . . all is oriented toward the one”²⁴, yet the members of the Trinity also remain distinct.²⁵ This is so because “The Father is the cause of the divinity and goodness that is contemplated in the Son and the Spirit, in the one as Son and Word (*Logos*), and in the other as procession and undiluted Spirit. Because of that the God who is one must be preserved and three *hypostaseis* professed, each with its own specific properties” (or. 2.38).²⁶

In Oration 4 Gregory revisits and deepens his discussion of one of the main reasons why, in Oration 2, he considered the Son’s divinity so essential: his notion of *oikeiosis pros theon*, or affiliation with the divine. Indeed, it is in Oration 4 that Gregory coins a new term, *theosis*, that crystallizes his teachings on *oikeiosis pros theon* already so central

²¹ Or. 2.34; or. 3.8.

²² Gregory continues at or. 2.38 that to reduce the divinity of the Son makes the Father either into a “small and insignificant” first cause, or into the cause of small and insignificant things, both unacceptable options.

²³ See KMP 1.6–12 (167–185 L.).

²⁴ Or. 2.23; see also 26.19, 33.16.

²⁵ For a more detailed Christological statement see Gr. Naz., or. 29.19.

²⁶ Gr. Naz., or. 2.38: . . . θεότητος ὡν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἀγαθότητος, τῆς ἐν Υἱῷ καὶ Πνεύματι θεωρουμένης, τῷ μὲν ὡς Υἱῷ καὶ Λόγῳ, τῷ δὲ ὡς προόδῳ καὶ οὐ διαλύτῳ Πνεύματι· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν τηρεῖν καὶ τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ὁμολογεῖν, καὶ ἐκάστην μετὰ τῆς ἰδιότητος. Gr. Naz., or. 20.6 and or. 31.9 are nearly identical formulations.

for Oration 2.²⁷ *Theosis* is crucial for Gregory's Christology. Ascent, illumination, and union with the divine are how we come to know the Trinity to the extent humanly possible, which in turn grants salvation, "the *telos* of divinization, for which we are born and toward which we are propelled, those of us at any rate who are advanced in our way of thinking and expect something worthy of God's magnanimity" – a process for which Gregory uses a form of the verb *theōō*, that was avoided by all contemporary Christian authors except Apollinarius (or. 4.124).²⁸ The saving power of this process, affiliation with the divine, is predicated on the divine having assumed flesh, on the great, mysterious *paradoxon* of the incarnation. In an act of voluntary submission and humility intrinsic also to the Stoic concept of *oikeiosis*, the *Logos* has assumed humanity so that man (in soul and body) may become divine: "Let us become like Christ, since Christ has become like us . . . He descended so that we may be exalted" (or. 1.5; see or. 2.17)." This is why the *Logos*, by choice and out of free will, has assumed suffering and the cross. For us "who had ignored the great mystery of the union," "the Savior and Master of all, the creator and ruler of this entire world, the Son of the highest Father, the *Logos*, mediator and high priest and participant in the Father's throne" "assumed the form of a slave" and ascended the cross, "taking my sin with him so that it would be annihilated".²⁹

Oration 4 is a masterly display of Gregory's classical training, intended to show how superior Gregory's learning was compared to that of the emperor Julian, a self-proclaimed Platonic philosopher and priest on the throne. Thus, not surprisingly, Gregory juxtaposes the moment when he first introduces his term *theosis* with a thorough denigration of Julian's philosophical models and heroes. Julian's ideal philosophers, *anthropoi entheoi* such as Empedocles, only pretend to have been divinized and are soon found out to have been frauds. Consequently, Julian, the *anthropos entheos* who rejected the sole being that could provide true affiliation with God because of his divinity, the *Logos*, in favor of his own fraudulent charlatans (such as Empedocles), also proved to have been a mere charlatan on the throne. Had Julian realized God's, the *Logos*'s, full divinity and humanity, he would not have so recklessly deserted him.

The same argument holds against Eunomius. By reducing the *Logos*'s full divinity, he too undermined the true power of *theosis*. Julian was led astray by emphasizing the *Logos*'s humanity to the exclusion of his divinity; Eunomius pushed subordination too far; and yet others (Photinus) overlooked the crucial importance of the *Logos*'s mixture of both full humanity and full divinity in their efforts to shore up the Father. What is at stake for Gregory in the early 360s, arguing for his father and against Photinus, Eunomius, and Julian, is the Son's full divinity and full humanity, and not how exactly such a mixture of a full divinity and humanity should be conceived.³⁰ This was so because it was essential to express in the best manner possible the notion of three equal yet distinct, fully realized, fully divine persons in the Trinity.

²⁷ For a fuller discussion of *oikeiosis* see Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (op. cit. fn. 7), 176–182.215–17.413–22.

²⁸ See also see Gr. Naz., or. 2. 22: 21.1–2; 38.11; ep. 212.2; Apoll., frg. 147 (246 L.).

²⁹ Or. 4.78, 2.54; 30.3–6.

³⁰ See also Gr. Naz., or. 7.32, or. 1.5; see also or. 2.38 and 20.6–7. Gregory develops these themes more fully later.

1.2. Julian and Diodore of Tarsus

After all, the emperor Julian had made it clear on numerous occasions that he did not deny Christ's humanity. For him, Jesus had been all too human. What he denied was his divinity, that he was indeed the *Logos*. In fact, in 363, the emperor, then resident in Antioch, wrote a letter to Photinus praising his position that, so Julian, diminished the divinity of the *Logos* (by differentiating between a human and a divine one) in contrast to the nefarious views of a certain ascetic presbyter who had been ordained by Meletius and was then active in Antioch called Diodore.³¹ In Julian's opinion, Diodore, later bishop of Tarsus, had gone too far in considering Christ divine even though he had died a despicable death on the cross, in particular when Diodore argued that this so-called god had been born from a human uterus. Julian resumed his attack against Diodore and his (muted) praise of Photinus soon thereafter in his *Against the Galileans*, which he wrote almost at the same time as Letter 90.³² Presenting his exegesis of John 1:1, 1:3, 1:18 and 3:16, Colossians 1:5 and Is 7:14, the emperor ridiculed Diodore's position (and that of other Christians) as an absurdity. Why is there the need to have Mary give birth, even to claim that she was *theotokos*, if one wants to argue that Christ was born of God, the Father, and is hence one with the Father?³³ In the end, however, all the differences between Diodore and Photinus are moot, because, according to Julian, Jesus died as he did, on the cross, so that he cannot have been divine, and, needless to say, Mary was not *theotokos*.

Indeed, Julian addressed matters of exegesis in several imperial writings published between 362 and 363, in addition to the *Against the Galileans*. For Julian, incorrect exegesis of myth had been a pervasive problem leading to the Christian desertion of true myths, those of the gods of the Greeks and the Romans, and as a consequence the emperor had sought to express upon his subjects the correct understanding of literal and allegorical reading of such myths.³⁴

Correspondingly, Gregory devoted a significant portion of Oration 4 to establishing his ground rules for appropriate exegesis. In contrast to Julian's allegorical readings (*allegoria*) of his false myths of the gods, Gregory stressed that *theoria*, Christian interpretative reading, must adhere as close as possible to the literal (*lexis*) and the historical, because the *lexis* of Scripture is always decorous and beautiful. Julian, so Gregory, was forced into allegory, in contrast, by the amorality of the literal myths he defended. Yet, Gregory continued, in specific instances certain Christians, those properly purified like him, should engage in a certain measure of allegorical reading (*theoria*), because otherwise the deeper

³¹ Jul., ep. 90 (147 Bidez/Cumont). English translation: *The works of the emperor Julian*, transl. W. C. F. Wright, vol. 3 (London: Heinemann/New York: Macmillan: 1923), 55; excerpted in Latin by Facundus of Hermiane. For Diodore's career Behr, *The Case* (op. cit. fn. 2), 49. For Photinus's hard to reconstruct views see Markus Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius Contra Arianos IV. Eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ancyra und Photin von Sirmium* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 313–26.

³² For details see Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (op. cit. fn. 7), 300–21.

³³ Jul., Gal. 253a–262c; 262c–277a. Felix Thome, *Historia contra mythos. Die Schriftauslegung Diodors von Tarsus und Theodors von Mopsuestia im Widerstreit zu Kaiser Julians und Salustius' allegorischem Mythenverständnis* (Bonn: Borengässer, 2004), 20–24.

³⁴ Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (op. cit. fn. 7), 111–39.

meaning of some Scriptural passages would remain incomprehensible. Indeed, the meaning of words and their signifying value, adumbrated in the context of exegesis, are yet another crucial element of Oration 4, especially in Gregory's attacks of Julian's mistaken use of homonyms and synonyms. Here, Gregory used arguments against Julian he later reprised in his Theological Orations against Eunomius.

To summarize, between 362 and 364, Gregory had to argue a position that mitigated his father's signature under a homoian document, sponsored by Constantius, and began to trace a trajectory that differed from the homoiousians and others leaning toward their side then opposing his father at Nazianzus. Gregory's emerging trajectory rejected the views of Eunomius, proclaimed in 360 and written down shortly thereafter in the Apology, and those of Photinus. By 362 and 363, Photinus, Eunomius, and some homoiousians were in ascendancy because Julian, the new emperor, had recalled those who had fared badly under Constantius and the homoians. For Gregory, however, Julian posed perhaps the greatest threat, especially after it became clear, in 362, that Julian had deserted his Christian faith in favor of the gods of the Greeks and the Romans (though Gregory maintained in or. 2.87 and 4.109 that the internal enemies were worse than the beast on the outside).

The emperor made his views known as early as the spring of 362. By the fall of 362 Julian had arrived in Antioch and as his letter to Photinus shows, he was *au courant* with the Christian debates in the city. Thus, his attacks against Diodore, though concise, focus on Diodore's "pagan" education that he had misused to concoct wrong readings of Christ's divinity, arguing that a human woman bore a so-called god, when it was clear to all of any sense, and above all to Julian, that Jesus had been a mere human. By 363, Diodore was well-known for his earlier stance against Aetius, a stance that presumably emphasized the *Logos's* divinity (and hence caused Julian's ire). In addition, Diodore (eventually) proposed a form of exegetical reading that privileged "*to historikon* to *to allegorikon*."³⁵

Diodore's pithy statement sounds remarkably like Gregory's stance on allegorical versus literal exegesis against Julian, though Gregory does allow for some to read some passages allegorically. Gregory, of course, placed great emphasis on the *Logos's* full divinity and full humanity in a context very similar to that in which Diodore proposed his views. So, how did Gregory, in the early 360s, manage to keep so many balls in the air? Granted that he polished his orations in the 380s and 390s, Gregory's Orations 2 and 4 as now extant attest to an impressive dexterity. Did all of this spring fully formed from Gregory's forehead?

1.3. Apollinarius and Gregory

Most scholars agree that both Meletius of Antioch and, even more so, Basil of Caesarea, were essential in aiding Gregory's formulation of his theological positions at that time. But what about Apollinarius? In the early 360s, Apollinarius was a well-known figure in Antiochene Christian circles (Laodicea was located just south of Antioch). Following Kelley McCarthy Spoerl's dating, by 362, Apollinarius had just published his *Kata Meros Pistis*. Already known as a "pro-Nicene," he now delineated, inter alia, his anti-Eunomian or heterousian position *and* his opposition to those on the other end of the spectrum:

³⁵ Cited in Behr, *The Case* (op. cit. fn. 2), 35; Elm, *Sons of Hellenism* (op. cit. fn. 7), 401–03.

he opens the KMP with an attack against the followers of Arius and Sabellius.³⁶ Central to Apollinarius's repudiation of both was his insistence on the unity of Christ. Thus he declared that "if the Son of man is from heaven and the Son of God is [born] from a woman, is not the same one both God and man?"³⁷

Though difficult to date, it seems probable that Apollinarius had, also by 360, already published much of what made him such a widely praised exemplar of literary erudition. Among his works is said to have been a repudiation of Porphyry (whose critique of Christians was surpassed only by Julian's *Against the Galileans*, at least according to Libanius). After Julian's open condemnation of Christian teachers of rhetoric in 362, Apollinarius rewrote the classic canon in Christian form – incidentally the same description used for Gregory of Nazianzus entire oeuvre. Finally, Apollinarius was a well-known exegete, perhaps also as early as the 360s, with an emphasis on the literal and historical (even though the fragmentary nature of what must have been an immense exegetical oeuvre makes certainty as to his methods difficult).³⁸

Would such a man not have been a welcome role-model for someone like Gregory, a highly trained rhetorician with "pro-Nicene" leanings, caught between Julian, Eunomius, Photinus, a homoian bishop as father, and homoiousian opponents to the latter? Much suggests that Apollinarius may well be the "neglected link" for Gregory of Nazianzus's early Trinitarian formulations as well.³⁹ Rather than offering proof positive, difficult to achieve, I will instead embark on a brief perambulation of possible links that could have connected Gregory and Apollinarius in the early 360s, intended merely to round out the picture and perhaps to spark further investigation.

When he returned to Nazianzus in mid 363, Oration 2 in hand and preparations for Oration 4 well on their way, Gregory had just spent considerable time with Basil of Caesarea at Annesi. At that time, Basil was engaged in preparing and composing his *Contra Eunomium*, probably intended for the synod of Lampsacus.⁴⁰ While thus engaged, Basil also corresponded with Apollinarius, who knew that Gregory was then present at Annesi and adds greetings.⁴¹ The correspondence addresses the use of the term *homoousios*. Basil

³⁶ Apoll., KMP 1 (167–68 L.); Kelley McCarthy Spoerl, 'Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcian Tradition', *JThS*, 45 (1994), 545–68; ead., 'Study' (op. cit. fn. 3), 96–105; Lienhardt, 'Two Friends' (op. cit. fn. 4), 62; Anette von Stockhausen, 'Athanasius in Antiochien', *ZAC/JAC*, 10 (2006), 86–102; Johannes Zachhuber, 'The Antiochene Synod of A. D. 363 and the Beginnings of Neo-Niceneism', *ZAC/JAC*, 4 (2000), 81–101.

³⁷ Apoll., frg. 9 (206 L.).

³⁸ Hier., vir. ill., 86, 104, and 120; Socr., h. e. 3.16.1–8; Soz., h. e. 5.18.3–4; Lib., or. 18.178; Spoerl, 'Study' (op. cit. fn. 3), 12–14; Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, 'Die Christen und die heidnische Bildung: Das Beispiel des Sokrates Scholasticus (Hist. Eccl. 3,16)', in J. Dummer/M. Vielberg (eds.), *Leitbilder der Spätantike – Eliten und Leitbilder* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999), 79–100; Paul Speck, 'Sokrates Scholasticus über die beiden Apollinarios?', *Philologus*, 141 (1997), 362–69, does not think such works by Apollinarius existed. For a discussion of scholarly literature on Apollinarius exegesis see Reinhart Ceulemans, 'Apollinarius of Laodicea in the Catenae as a Source of Hexaplaric Readings', *ZAC/JAC*, 15 (2011), 431–49.

³⁹ Gemeinhardt, 'Apollinarius' (op. cit. fn. 1), 292–94.

⁴⁰ Bas., Eun. 1 (SC 299, 40–45 Sesboüé).

⁴¹ According to the first letter (ep. 362) Gregory was with his parents, and ep. 364 adds greetings to Gregory. Drecoll, *Entwicklung* (op. cit. fn. 11), 23 dates the correspondence between 362 and 363; Henri de Riedmatten, 'La correspondance entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée', *JThS*, 7 (1956), 199–210; *JThS*, 8 (1957), 53–70. Though doubts persist, the majority of scholars accepts the exchange

voiced concerns that the term was not sufficiently precise to express the essential unity of the Trinity and also the separate identity of its members, concepts that Apollinarius implies as given (ep. 362.14). In his response, Apollinarius also stressed the hierarchical nature of the Trinity, that is, the monarchic position of the Father (ep. 362.23–26).⁴² As Basil's correspondence implies, Apollinarius was, in 362 and 363, among the most important figures in Antioch when requesting clarification in pro-Nicene formulations of the Trinity that were then being drawn with new nuances.⁴³ Gregory and Basil were at Annesi together, both engaged in formulating their views in part against Eunomius. It is hard to imagine that Gregory was unaware of Basil's exchange with Apollinarius, and, thus, of Apollinarius's views and as his status as a leading light.

Further, Gregory's Oration 2, more than Oration 4, argues explicitly against those he calls Sabellians, that is, Marcellus of Ancyra and his successor Photinus, by 363 a recipient of Julian's imperial letter. In Oration 2, Gregory insists on the fully realized identity of the Son. Apollinarius had declared his anti-Sabellian stance already in the opening passage of his KMP. In KMP 3, he determined that "if . . . certain persons falsify the holy faith, either by attributing the human characteristics of Christ (such as his progress and sufferings and supervening glory) to the divinity or by separating the progressing and suffering body from the divinity as if it existed independently, these persons are also outside the Church's saving confession." In the same text, he further stressed that "the Son of God has become the Son of Man, not in name but in truth, having taken flesh from the Virgin Mary. And we confess that the same is perfect Son of God and the same Son of Man," and that "the one without flesh, who was manifested in flesh, is true God, perfect by virtue of the true and divine perfection, and is neither two *prosopa* nor two natures." In KMP 13, Apollinarius rejects in particular Sabellians' teaching that Father and Son are the same divine entity without distinct persons.⁴⁴

Kelley McCarthy Spoerl has long since pointed to the anti-Marcellan and thus also anti-Photinian stance of Apollinarius's KMP. Earlier, Reinhard Hübner suggested that the author of the so-called *Contra Sabellianos*, a treatise he dates to 360, was in fact Apollinarius, and that Apollinarius may have sent this treatise to Basil when both corresponded on the meaning of *homoousios*.⁴⁵ This suggestion has not been unanimously accepted, but it is clear that by 362 and 363 Apollinarius was a known anti-Sabellian as well as anti-Eunomian. In fact, scholars have attributed several other treatises against Photinus and Eunomius, preserved under the names of "orthodox" authors, to Apollinarius or at least to his circles.⁴⁶ Even if, again, these attributions have not convinced all, there are good

as genuine. Even those who doubt grant, however, that both men must have been in conversation; thus Kelley McCarthy Spoerl, also in conversation.

⁴² Drecoll, *Entwicklung* (op. cit. fn. 11), 25–28.

⁴³ Bas., ep. 92; Apollinarius appears to have sent emissaries to Alexandria to influence the Tome to the Antiochenes. See Zachhuber, *Basil'* (op. cit. fn. 11), 65–85.

⁴⁴ Apoll., KMP 3, 13, 28, 31 (168.16–21, 171.22–23, 177.7–9, 179.1–4 L.); Spoerl, 'Apollinarian Christology' (op. cit. fn. 36), 545–68, quote 547–8.

⁴⁵ Reinhard Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apollinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 250.255; critical Drecoll, *Entwicklung* (op. cit. fn. 11), 34–37.43; but see Gemeinhardt, 'Apollinarius' (op. cit. fn. 1), 288.

⁴⁶ See Franz Xaver Risch, *Pseudo-Basilii Adversus Eunomium IV–V* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 12.18–46; Vinzent, *Ps. Athanasius* (op. cit. fn. 31), 57–88.135–67.

reasons for suggesting Apollinarius and to highlight his influence. Apollinarius was an undisputed authority on the Trinity, a bishop, a figure to be reckoned with in Antiochene circles, and a man consulted on questions of *homoousios*, as shown by his correspondence with Basil at Annesi in 362 and 363, where Gregory, too, was then in residence.

There is always the temptation to attribute an outsized degree of influence to authors whose work is so fragmentary that detailed analysis is very difficult. It is clear that many persons in the early 360s opposed Eunomius, Photinus, and Julian, and were engaged in formulating a new path between *homoiousios*, *homoios*, and *homoousios* without being defenders of a strict *homoousios* position (as Gregory was not between 362 and 364, indeed ever). But not that many. Granted, Gregory had older models for his emphasis if on Arian Judaizers, Hellens, and Sabellians for his definition in Oration 2 of the greatest theological maladies of his time.⁴⁷ However, Apollinarius' presence, both in Antioch and as a correspondent at Annesi when Gregory was formulating his inaugural manifesto, invites closer comparison between Apollinarius and Gregory's early works. There are positive convergences, even verbal echoes that may well reflect more than the need to redress common adversaries. Apollinarius (KMP 10) and Gregory stress the unity of the Trinity, that Christ is divine, and that his saving power emanates from the paradox that he, as Son of God, has assumed human form in full (KMP 1; 6; 12). Both stress the unifying nature of the incarnation, resulting in a mixing or blending of humanity and divinity, so that out of two distinct entities emerges one: Christ is one and the same, before and after incarnation (KMP 3).⁴⁸ Therefore, Christ has one nature (KMP 9; 31). While Apollinarius in the KMP insists on three distinct *prosopa*, proceeding out of one *hypostasis*, he also emphasizes that each must have its own *hypostasis* (and cannot be *anhypostatotom*; KMP 12; 13). These three hypostatic *prosopa* form one *theotes* (or *mia hypostasis*): this is language akin to the formulations Gregory employs in Oration 2.⁴⁹

In addition, as Ekkehard Mühlberg has shown, the concept of the *anthropos entheos*, so relevant for Gregory's arguments against Julian in Oration 4, was highly significant for Apollinarius.⁵⁰ Considering further Apollinarius's extensive writings against Julian in the early 360s, reacting, like Gregory, to Julian's school-law linking Hellenism and religion, it is not too far-fetched to assume more than common preoccupations and rather a real engagement on Gregory's part with the writings of Apollinarius.

In sum, Gregory had been, early on, his own man, but he, too, looked for models and exemplars. Many have posited Athanasius as an influence on Gregory, but one may look closer to home, to Antioch and hence both Meletius and Apollinarius.⁵¹ In particular,

⁴⁷ Already Eusebius of Caesarea had labeled Marcellus the new Sabellius (GCS Eusebius IV 1972, Klostermann/Hansen 224).

⁴⁸ See also Apoll., frg. 10 (207 L.); Id., corp. et div. 11 (190 L.).

⁴⁹ So also with regard to the image language both apply to the relation between Father and Son; Apoll., KMP 14; 15 (172 L.); see Gr. Naz., or. 31.30; 37.22; 42.16; Gemeinhardt, 'Apollinarius' (op. cit. fn. 1), 289–92; Beeley, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 9), 285–92; Lienhardt 'Two Friends' (op. cit. fn. 4), 61–6.

⁵⁰ Mühlberg, *Apollinarius* (op. cit. fn. 3), 130–40. Likewise suggestive is Gregory's engagement in Oration 4 and in the Pseudo-Athanasius and Pseudo-Basil with the use of homonyms and synonyms.

⁵¹ Further supporting Beeley's suggestion, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 9), 277–92, and 'Early Christological Controversy' (op. cit. fn. 2), 4–10, that much of Gregory's unifying language, often attributed to Athanasius, reflects instead that of Apollinarius, though Gregory subsequently corrected and modified that language.

then, the relation between Apollinarius's extant writings and Gregory's early orations, Oration 2 and 4, merits a second glance.⁵² Such a second glance may also illuminate further the complex situation in Antioch in the early 360s. Julian had been in residence there between late summer 362 and early summer 363. Apollinarius was a presence in Antioch at that time, and appears to have sent, as bishop of Laodicea, envoys to Alexandria to a council in preparation for Athanasius's *Tomus ad Antiochenos*.⁵³ By 363, Meletius had also returned to Antioch, while Diodore had remained there throughout. As my brief discussion of Diodore above has indicated, he and Gregory developed their exegetical method initially against a common foe, and thus along comparable lines. Indeed, it appears to me as that those who were not homoian, who were opposed to Eunomius (whose followers were also present at Antioch), to Photinus, and to Julian, shared far more around 363 than divided them.⁵⁴ That is to say, Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory, all on opposing sides of each other by the 380s, may well have been quite close in their positions, faced with common enemies, twenty years prior.

2. Phase II: 379–384, Gregory's Oration 22 and the Christological Letters 101, 102, 202 to Cledonius and Nectarius

By the 370s and early 380s, much had changed. Valens' reign, though theologically not to everyone's liking, had nevertheless lasted long enough for many players to discover the consequences of what they had posited in the 360s, only to find that friendships need not last forever and former allies could well become new enemies.⁵⁵ Valens's catastrophic death at Adrianople on August 9 378, Theodosius's ascent, and the subsequent inevitable reshuffle of the leading personnel brought such ruptures into sharp relief. When Meletius returned to Antioch in 378, thus ending his third exile begun in 371, the city's bishops included, in addition to Paulinus, Euzoius and then Dorotheus, and Flavianus, also a certain Vitalis. Originally ordained presbyter by Meletius, Vitalis had been part of the group following Meletius in Antioch, a group that also included Diodore.⁵⁶ After Meletius's exile in 371, Flavianus and Diodore emerged as the care-takers of that group. At some point prior to 376, however, Vitalis shifted his allegiance to Apollinarius, who was then teaching in the city.⁵⁷ By 376, Vitalis had been ordained as bishop in Antioch by Apollinarius.

⁵² Beeley, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 9), 24–28.292–303.

⁵³ Ath., tom. (AW II/1, Die Apologien, 8. Lieferung, hg. H.C. Brennecke/U. Heil/A. von Stockhausen, Berlin/New York 2006, 349.13 f; Behr, *The Case* (op. cit. fn. 2), 50–51. For the contentious nature of Apollinarius's episcopal status see Spoerl in this volume.

⁵⁴ Jerome's claim (Hier., vir. ill., 91) that Diodore learned his exegetical method from Eusebius of Emesa does not detract from Julian's potential impact, which no one then would have liked to acknowledge in any positive sense. Interestingly, exegesis of John 1:1 and 3 played a particular role in Julian's attack of Diodore, as mentioned above. That passage was also significant in debating Photinus, see e.g. Ps.-Ath., c. Sab. 2. Diodore had participated in these debates with his own now lost treatise. See also Thome, *Historia* (op. cit. fn. 33), 20–24.

⁵⁵ Spoerl, 'Study' (op. cit. fn. 3), 28–39.

⁵⁶ Behr, *The Case* (op. cit. fn. 2), 52.

⁵⁷ Where he counted Jerome among his audience, Hier., ep. 84; Lietzmann, *Apollinarius* (op. cit. fn. 5) 15–16.

This caused sufficient concerns to call for the expert testimony of a celebrity such as Epiphanius of Salamis to come and examine Vitalis's orthodox credentials.⁵⁸ Indeed, by 373 Apollinarius's orthodoxy, until then above doubt, had come under increasing scrutiny, in part as a by-product of a fight in the early 370s between Basil, by the bishop of Caesarea and actively engaged in shoring up Meletius's position, and Eustathius of Sebaste, a time that also saw a distinct cooling of relations between Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus.⁵⁹ Apollinarius for his part was by then (though it is unclear since when) a sharp opponent of Diodore, in particular of the latter's Christological views.⁶⁰

When Meletius returned to Antioch in 378, the city had three "pro-Nicene" bishops, himself, Paulinus, and Vitalis. Gregory, meanwhile, after his father's death in 374, had withdrawn in 375 to a "house of virgins" dedicated to Thecla in Seleucia, in Isauria, where he remained until 379.⁶¹ Seleucia was, however, significantly closer to Antioch than Nazianzus had been, and closer still to Tarsus, where Diodore had become bishop in 378. Thus, Gregory's retreat did not prevent him from noticing what went on in Antioch, probably to the contrary, nor did those in the city lose sight of him. In 379, Meletius convened a synod in Antioch at which Diodore of Tarsus and Gregory of Nyssa were also present.⁶² According to Gregory of Nazianzus's later account in his *De vita sua* of 382, this synod, that is, Meletius and Diodore, appointed him as bishop of Constantinople with the brief of countering the effects of Apollinarius.⁶³

By then, the Christological differences between Apollinarius and Diodore had become more than evident. Both had sharpened their Christological language in debating each other, and it is this development Gregory evidently noted while in Seleucia. That at least is the impression of one of Gregory's first Constantinopolitan orations after Meletius and the synod of 379 had sent him to the capital.⁶⁴ In the fall of 379 Gregory delivered his so-called Oration 22 On Peace, in which he presented his view of the causes of the empire-wide dissention threatening to render the unity of the church, while Oration 23, more or less contemporaneous, addressed problems affecting his own group in Constantinople.⁶⁵

⁵⁸ Epiph., haer. 77.20 (GCS Epiphanius III 1985, 434 Holl/Dummer); Mühlenberg, *Apollinarius* (op. cit. fn. 3), 45–56.

⁵⁹ Bas., ep. 129; Gregory voiced discontent following Basil's ordination of him as bishop of Sasima in 372; McGuckin, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 2), 180–205.

⁶⁰ Apoll., frg. 121–46 (235–42 L.). For the fight between Basil and Eustathius see Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 149.233–69; Capone, 'La polemica' (op. cit. fn. 3), 500–1. It is clear that Apollinarius eventually disagreed with Diodore, but it is unclear when that break occurred. Spoerl, 'Apollinarian Christology', (op. cit. fn. 36), 546, fn. 4, follows earlier scholarship in suggesting that the two became adversaries only in the 370s. Pace Beeley, 'Early Christological Controversy' (op. cit. fn. 2), 4, this does not mean that Apollinarius had not been acquainted with Diodore earlier. In defense of Diodore, given Julian's attack against the divinity of Christ and Mary's nature as *theotokos*, it is not surprising that he would respond by arguing that the *Logos* was from the Father, and though he assumed human form and died on the cross, he was divine and divinely born by Mary while differentiating sharply between the divine and human aspects of that *Logos*.

⁶¹ Norris, *Faith* (op. cit. fn. 11), 8, fn. 43, points out that Seleucia Pieria near Antioch was also a possibility.

⁶² Beeley, 'The Early Christological Controversy', (op. cit. fn. 2), 21; Capone, 'La polemica' (op. cit. fn. 3), 503–4.

⁶³ Gr. Naz., *De vita sua*, 607–31; McGuckin, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 2), 231–9.

⁶⁴ I follow McGuckin's revised dating, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 2), 248–51.

⁶⁵ Gr. Naz., or. 20–23 (SC 270 M.), also known as *ta eirenika*.

Antioch plays a prominent role in Oration 22. Gregory praises an agreement seeking to resolve the schism between Meletius and Paulinus, according to which Paulinus should succeed Meletius in case of the latter's demise and vice-versa. Now, after Adrianople, the realm needed peace and unity, because the long-drawn internal divisions have wrought greater harm than the barbarian invasions, threatening Christianity's ability to be "a great people and a great nation" (or. 22.2). Gregory's "golden mean" between "Sabellianism" and "Arianism," his comprehensive version of the Trinity, provides a suitable platform to achieve just such a peace and hence a means to re-assert that greatness (or. 22.12 and 14). At this point, in the context of presenting his royal road, Gregory at or. 22.13 harshly condemned the recent fraternal rift (*zygomachia adelphikae*) at Antioch regarding the nature of Christ. In an (until recently) little noted passage Gregory attacked Diodore and Apollinarius with equal vigor. It is irrational to posit that the Word of God took on human flesh without a human mind, that the Word takes the place of the human mind, and also mistaken to argue that Christ had two distinct natures, divine and human, "cut, or combined, into two sons" (or. 22.13). Both, Diodore and Apollinarius, were wrong – a nuance that did not escape later readers such as Severus of Antioch, who used this passage to argue that Gregory considered Diodore a heretic, only to be refuted later on by the east-Syrian Patriarch Timothy I., who argued that in this passage Gregory had instead chastised later followers of Apollinarius.⁶⁶

As Beeley has noted, it is clear that in Oration 22.13 Gregory is more averse to Diodore's Christological position than to that of Apollinarius. Subsequent events served to sharpen Gregory's dislike of Diodore's politics; it is possible, as Beeley has recently argued, that Gregory's anti-Diodore stance in fact predates the events of the 380s.⁶⁷ After the death of Meletius, his followers, Diodore prominent among them, ignored the agreement Gregory had praised in Oration 22 and instead supported Flavian as bishop, an act Gregory perceived as betrayal.⁶⁸ Further, Diodore seems the most likely sponsor of Nectarius, Gregory's successor, a move that could easily have sealed Diodore's status as Gregory's *bête noire*, despite, or probably because, of their shared close relationship to their common sponsor Meletius.

By 382 or 383, while Gregory was enjoying the health-giving properties of the spa at Xanxaris, his presbyter Cleonius informed him that followers of Apollinarius had sought to install one of their own as bishop of Nazianzus. Following Valens's death, Apollinarius and his followers, like everyone else in the East, sought to promote their position under the new emperor Theodosius, even more so, perhaps, because they had been under mounting pressure since the mid-370s. According to Theodore of Mopsuestia, at any rate, they swarmed about like "a large cloud of testifiers," and the seemingly vacant see at Nazianzus had not escaped their notice.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Severus of Antioch, *Against the Grammarian John*, 3.8; 3.28 (CSCO 93/94, 140/97 f. Lebon; CSCO 101/02, 78/56 f. Lebon). I thank Martin Heimgartner (ed. and transl.) for allowing me to cite his manuscript, 'Die Briefe 42–58 des ostsyrischen Patriarchen Timotheos I.', XXVIII–XXX.5.12–44.17–22.

⁶⁷ Beeley, 'Early Christological Controversy', (op. cit. fn. 2), 22.

⁶⁸ McLynn, 'The Voice' (op. cit. fn. 2); McGuckin, *Gregory* (op. cit. fn. 2), 379–95; Kelley McCarthy Spoerl, 'The Schism at Antioch since Cavallera', in M. Barnes/D. H. Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (T&T Clark, 1993), 101–26.

⁶⁹ Thdr. Mops., frg. inc. 15 (Till Jansen [ed.], *Theodor von Mopsuestia: de Incarnatione*, Patristische Texte und Studien 65 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009], 154–159).