

## Apollinaris of Laodicea:

### A Neglected Link of Trinitarian Theology between East and West?<sup>1</sup>

by Peter Gemeinhardt

#### *I. Introduction: A Neglected Trinitarian Theology?*

In a letter of the year 376 or 377, Jerome told Pope Damasus about a debate with followers of bishop Meletius of Antioch<sup>2</sup>. They had discussed the question of naming the triune God adequately. As he reported, they were trying to force him to accept something completely new: “They tried to extort from me, a Roman christian, their unheard-of formula of three hypostases”. In his opinion this notion was neither compatible with the Faith of Nicaea nor with the decree of the Synod of Alexandria in 362, “in which the West had joined”<sup>3</sup>. Assuming three hypostases might only be justified if those were understood as *tria ἐνυπόστατα*, *hoc est ut tres subsistentes personas*<sup>4</sup>. But using “hypostasis” without such an restriction would mean to neglect that “in the whole range of secular learning hypostasis never means anything but essence. And could anyone be so profane as to speak of three essences or substances in the Godhead”<sup>5</sup>?

---

<sup>1</sup> This study is based on a paper presented at the XIV<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Patristic Studies, held in Oxford, August 18<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>th</sup>, 2003. I should like to thank Pastor Anneruth Heinz, Fulda, for some valuable help in improving my English phrasing. I am also indebted to Prof. Markus Vinzent, Birmingham, who suggested to me the possible influence of Apollinaris on latin trinitarian theology and thus encouraged me to undertake the present investigation.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 15 (CSEL 54, 62-67 Hilberg). The translation is taken from: St. Jerome. Letters and Select Works, transl. by W.H. Fremantle, NPNE, second series, vol. VI, repr. Grand Rapids MI 1979, 19. On this epistle see B. Conring, Hieronymus als Briefschreiber. Ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Epistolographie, STAC 8, Tübingen 2001, 198-215.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. 15,3,1 (64,12-15 Hilb.): *Nunc igitur – pro dolor! – post Nicaenam fidem, post Alexandrinum iuncto pariter occidente decretum trium υποστάσεων ab Arrianorum prole, Campensibus, nouellum a me, homine Romano, nomen exigitur.*

<sup>4</sup> Ep. 15,3,2 (65,1f. Hilb.). Cf. A. de Halleux, „Hypostase“ et „personne“ dans la formation du dogme trinitaire (ca. 375-381), RHE 79, 1984, (313-369. 625-670) 335: This translation – which would be appropriate to τρία πρόσωπα ὑφεστώτα – reproduces „la formule anti-sabellien de vieux-nicéens d’Antioche“ while alluding to the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (ibid. 341).

<sup>5</sup> Ep. 15,4,1 (65,9-12 Hilb.): „*Tota saecularium litterarum schola nihil aliud hypostasini nisi usian nouit, et rogo, ore sacrilego tres substantias praedicabit?*“ Cf. Ath., ep. Afr.

But since there is only one nature of the Godhead, the conclusion seems inevitable: “Whosoever in the name of religion declares that there are in the Godhead three elements, three hypostases, that is, or three essences, is striving really to predicate three natures of God”<sup>6</sup>. Jerome was convinced that the notion of hypostasis was leading into dangerous waters and therefore warned the Pope about the Meletians: “There is poison hidden under their honey”<sup>7</sup>!

Only a few years before the Synod of Constantinople in 381 when the Eastern Theology was to define the distinction of one οὐσία of God and three ὑποστάσεις of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the epistle of Jerome testifies that the Latin West was hesitant to share this trinitarian manner of speaking. Western theologians were still aware of the fact that the Nicene Creed had explicitly identified ousia and hypostasis. And though Athanasius on the Synod of Alexandria had reluctantly conceded that speaking of three hypostases may be right, in fact the custom of speaking of only one hypostasis of God had been readily confirmed<sup>8</sup>.

- 
- 4 (CPG 2133; Athanasius Werke II 8,329,1f. Brennecke/Heil/von Stockhausen): ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστὶ καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαίνόμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν, and Epiph., haer. 69,72,1 (GCS Epiphanius III, 220,11 Holl): καὶ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία ταὐτόν ἐστι τῶ λόγῳ. The suspicion that the Greek ὑπόστασις and the Latin *persona* might be incompatible (so that speaking of three hypostases would imply a concept of three divine substances) can be traced until Augustine’s complaint that “we say three persons, not in order to say that precisely, but in order not to be reduced to silence” (trin. V 9,10 [CChr.SL 50, 217,10f. Mountain/Glorie; translated by E. Hill, Augustine: The Trinity, The Works of St. Augustine. A Translation for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, vol. I/5, Brooklyn NY 1991, 196]).
- <sup>6</sup> Ep. 15,4,2-3 (65,12-15; 66,2-5 Hilb.): *Vna est dei sola natura, quae uere est – ad id enim, quod subsistit, non habet aliunde, sed suum est –, cetera, quae creata sunt, etiamsi uidentur esse, non sunt, quia aliquando non fuerunt et potest rursus non esse, quod non fuit ... sed quia illa sola est infecta natura et in tribus personis deitas una subsistit, quae est uere, una natura est: quisque tria esse, hoc est tres ὑποστάσεις, dicit, sub nomine pietatis tres naturas conatur adserere.*
- <sup>7</sup> Ep. 15,4,5 (66,15 Hilb.): *Venenum sub melle latet.* Cf. Conring, Hieronymus (see note 2), 213; A. Fürst, Hieronymus. Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike, Freiburg 2003, 28f.
- <sup>8</sup> Tom. ad Ant. 6,2 (CPG 2134; PG 26, 801C [= Athanasius Werke II 8,345,19–346,5 Brennecke/Heil/von Stockhausen]). In the light of Jerome’s ep. 15 it would be quite interesting to know how Eusebius of Vercelli who subscribed in Latin expressed his agreement περί τῶν ὑποστάσεων (10,3; PG 26, 808C [= Athanasius Werke II 8,350,7 B./H./v.St.]); cf. C. Marksches, Was ist lateinischer Neunizänismus? Ein Vorschlag für eine Antwort, ZAC 1, 1997, 73-95 = id., Alta Trinità Beata. Gesammelte Studien zur altkirchlichen Trinitätstheologie, Tübingen 2000, 238-264, 247. M. Tetz (Ein enzyklisches Schreiben der Synode von Alexandrien [362], ZNW 79, 1988, 262-281 = id., Athanasiana. Zu Leben und Lehre des Athanasius, hg. von W. Geerlings/D. Wyrwa, BZNW 78, Berlin/New York 1995, [207-225] 220f.) points out that the *epistula catholica* of this synod does not contain the specific terms of trihypostatic theology which is nonetheless present, e.g., by the formula ὁμοούσιος ἢ τριάς (§ 7; 217,32f.) which is also found in Ps.-Basil, Eun. V 122 (PG 29, 712A) and in Theodore of Heraclea (= Apollinaris?), fragm. 133,14 in Mt 28,19f. (ed. by J. Reuss, Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche, TU 61, Berlin 1957, 94); cf. Hier., ep. 17,2,2 (CSEL 54, 71,6 Hilb.); c. Lucif. 12 (CChr.SL 79B, 33,457-460 Canellis).

But also Greek nicene theologians were willing to adhere to the  $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \upsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  of God even after 362<sup>9</sup>. Among them was Apollinaris of Laodicea, whom Jerome praised as his former teacher in Antioch, while claiming that Apollinaris' influence upon him did of course cover only exegetical matters, not theological ones<sup>10</sup>. Patristic research has somehow followed this difference between exegetical skills and dogmatic aberrations. Apollinaris has been treated mainly as heretic of christology without paying due attention to his important contribution to the defence of the Nicene Faith, especially within the debate with the neo-arian Eunomius around 360. Moreover, if one tackles the question of the relation of Greek and Latin trinitarian theology in the fourth and fifth centuries – a crucial question which still awaits a comprehensive investigation – the writings of Apollinaris might serve as an hitherto neglected but important link<sup>11</sup>.

I shall thereby refer not only to the sources collected by Hans Lietzmann<sup>12</sup> and to Apollinaris' well-known correspondence with Basil of Caesarea<sup>13</sup>. Recently some pseudepigraphic writings have been attributed to Apollinaris, among them the pseudathanasian treatise against Photin of Sirmium named *Contra Sabellianos* and the pseudo-basilian books IV to V of the *Contra Eunomium*, as Reinhard Hübner and Franz Xaver Risch have argued<sup>14</sup>. The pseudathanasian *Oratio IV contra Arianos* is again

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J.T. Lienhard, *Ousia and Hypostasis: The Cappadocian Settlement and the Theology of 'One Hypostasis'*, in: *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*, ed. by Stephen T. Davis/Daniel Kendall/Gerald O'Collins, Oxford 1999, 99-121; note that the writings of Apollinaris are not dealt with in his paper.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Hier., ep. 84,3,1 (CSEL 55, 122,24-123,3 Hilberg): *Apollinarem Laodicenum audiui Antiochiae frequenter et colui et, cum me in sanctis scriptis erudiret, numquam illius contentiosum super sensu dogma suscepi*. For contemporary esteem of Apollinaris see Epiph., haer. 77,2,1 (416,31 Holl):  $\alpha\epsilon\iota\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ . But note that when Jerome wrote his letter to Damasus, the latter's condemnation of Apollinaris' christology (reported in Thdt., h.e. V 10,2,5 [GCS Theodoret, 295,14-296,1; 297,1-5 Parmentier/Hansen]) was still to come!

<sup>11</sup> I thereby return to my Oxford communication of 1999 (cf. P. Gemeinhardt, „Geboren aus dem Wesen des Vaters...“. Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa und Augustins neunizänische Theologie, *StPatr* 38, 2001, 153-168) and try to identify more exactly in Apollinaris (and Jerome) the missing connection between the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* and the anti-arian trinitarian theology of Augustine.

<sup>12</sup> H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule. Texte und Untersuchungen*, Tübingen 1904.

<sup>13</sup> Bas., epp. 361-364 (quoted from H. de Riedmatten, *La correspondance entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée*, pt. I, *JThS NS* 7, 1956, 199-210). On questions of authenticity see R. Pouchet, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après son correspondance. Une stratégie de communion*, *SEAug* 36, Rome 1992, 109-117, who doubts the attribution to Basil which in turn is attested by B. Sesboué, *Saint Basile et la Trinité. Un acte théologique au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle: Le rôle de Basile de Césarée dans l'élaboration de la doctrine et du langage trinitaire*, Paris 1998, 189-191 and 255f., with whom I am inclined to agree.

<sup>14</sup> R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apollinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea*, *PTS* 30, Berlin/New York 1989; F.X. Risch, *Pseudo-Basilien, Adversus Eunomium IV-V. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kom-*

disputed as apollinarist, too<sup>15</sup>. The debate about these ascriptions has by no means led to safe conclusions yet, and it is not my subject to reassess the discussion in its details<sup>16</sup>. I shall for the time being assume that Hübner and Risch on principle are right in their arguments and try to draw a picture of the trinitarian theology of Apollinaris as it might become visible within such an extended range of sources<sup>17</sup>.

## II. Basic Features of Apollinaris' Trinitarian Theology

Apollinaris' *Κατὰ μέρος πίστις*<sup>18</sup> starts with severe demarcations against "Arianism" and "Sabellianism". Thereby he turns against those who are willing to recognize the Son only as "the First-Born of Creation" or as created out of nothing<sup>19</sup>. "No less alien are those who do not confess the Trinity of three πρόσωπα in accordance with the truth, but who impiously imagine the threefold reality in a monad resulting from synthesis and think that the Son exists as Wisdom in God just as human wisdom, through which humanity is wise, exists in a man, and represents Him as Word in a manner similar to a spoken or mental word and not a single, unique person"<sup>20</sup>. Apollinaris himself concentrates on the unity of God as

---

mentar, SVigChr 16, Leiden 1992; for critical observations to both ascriptions see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea. Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*, FKDG 66, Göttingen 1996, 34-37; 43f.

<sup>15</sup> M. Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV. Eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien*, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ankyra und Photin von Sirmium, SVigChr 36, Leiden 1996. This claim had already been made by A. Stegmann, *Die pseudoathanasianische „Vierte Rede gegen die Arianer“ als κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος ein Apollinarisgut*, Diss. theol. Würzburg 1917.

<sup>16</sup> At least *Contra Sabellianos* (CPG 2243) and *Contra Eunomium* IV-V (CPG 2837) belong to the debate about the Nicene creed from ca. 358 on; see Hübner, Apollinarius (see note 14), 250f. Risch, *Pseudo-Basilii* (see note 14), 17f., dates Eun. IV to 360 and Eun. V to 363; if these are no authentic writings of Apollinaris, they have to be attributed to his theological environment yet. *Contra Arianos* IV (CPG 2230) appears to be two decades older (Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius* [see note 14], 85) and thus might be an early work of Apollinaris which precludes the later trinitarian writings (ibid. 89 note 1).

<sup>17</sup> On Apollinaris' trinitarian theology see G. Voisin, *La doctrine trinitaire d'Apollinaire de Laodicée*, RHE 2, 1901, 33-55; 239-252; E. Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*, FKDG 23, Göttingen 1969, 234-237; Hübner, *Apollinarius* (see note 14), 229-249, and K. McCarthy Spoerl, *Apollinarius on the Holy Spirit*, StPatr 37, 2001, 571-592.

<sup>18</sup> CPG 3645, quoted as ‚KMP‘ from the edition by Lietzmann, *Apollinaris* (see note 12), 167-185. The KMP has been revised by Apollinaris' pupils; cf. G.L. Prestige, *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. by H. Chadwick, London 1956, 60-62. According to Drecoll, *Entwicklung* (see note 14), 33, the KMP should thus not be regarded as source of the theological discussions around 360, while Spoerl, *Apollinarius* [see note 17], 577 note 27, points out that only the christological passages were labored on, not the paragraphs dealing with the Trinity (cf. Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris* [see note 17], 104).

<sup>19</sup> KMP 1 (167,1-4 Lietzmann).

<sup>20</sup> KMP 1 (167,18-168,4 L.): ἀλλότριον δὲ οὐχ ἦν τὸν καὶ οἱ τὴν τριάδα μὴ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐκ τριῶν προσώπων ὁμολογοῦντες, ἀλλ' ἐν μονάδι τὸ τριπλοῦν ἀρεβῶς κατὰ σύνθεσιν φαν-

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in order to confess “one glory, one substance or godhead and one eternity of the Trinity”<sup>21</sup>. The unity of the Trinity is founded nowhere else than in the nature of God: “The divinity is attested as one by nature (φυσικῶς) in the Trinity, whereby the unity of nature is confirmed”<sup>22</sup>. According to I Corinthians 8:6, the godhead is tied to the person of the Father and is called his property (ἴδιον), so that “if one of the three is named the godhead we have to conclude that the property of the Father is found in Son and Spirit, too”<sup>23</sup>.

The reason for the Trinity being in possession of one nature – which obviously differs from the notion of nature we use when speaking about the world of creatures<sup>24</sup> – can be explained by “genetical” relations: “Therefore we confess one true God, one origin, and one Son, true God from true God, who possesses the paternal godhead by nature, that means he is consubstantial with the Father; and one Spirit, holy by virtue of his true nature, the sanctifier and divinizer of all things, who derives his existence from the substance of God”<sup>25</sup>. By deriving their existence from the Father, or more precisely: from the substance of the Father which is at the same time the substance of God<sup>26</sup>, it is possible to distinguish the personal properties of Son and Spirit as well as to maintain their equality of rank with the Father.

---

ταζόμενοι καὶ σοφίαν ἐν θεῷ τὸν υἱὸν ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἠγούμενοι, δι' ἧς ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστὶ σοφός, καὶ λόγον ὁμοίως τῷ κατὰ προφορὰν ἢ διάνοιαν εἰσηγούμενοι οὐδὲ μῖξ ὑποστάσει οὐδὲ μονῆ; the translation is taken from Spoerl, Apollinarius (see note 17), 584 note 64.

<sup>21</sup> KMP 10 (170,26-28 L.).

<sup>22</sup> KMP 14 (172,4-6 L.).

<sup>23</sup> KMP 15 (172,12f. L.); cf. Hübner, Apollinarius (see note 14), 234f. with note 110.

<sup>24</sup> KMP 25 (176,9f. L.).

<sup>25</sup> KMP 27 (176,19-177,1 L.): ὁμολογοῦμεν οὖν ἕνα θεὸν ἀληθινόν, μίαν ἀρχὴν (Leontius [177,2B]: ὡς μονάρχην), καὶ ἕνα υἱόν, ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἐξ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ, φυσικῶς τὴν πατρικὴν θεότητα ἔχοντα, τοῦτέστιν ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ἐν πνεύμα ἁγίῳ φύσει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τῶν πάντων ἁγιαστικὸν καὶ θεοποιὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπάρχον.

<sup>26</sup> This specification can also be found in a christological context; cf. fragm. 143 = adv. Diodor II 12 (241,30 Lietzmann): πῶς σπέρμα τοῦ Δαβὶδ τὸ ἐκ τῆς θεϊκῆς οὐσίας; cf. Ps.-Athanasius, Ar. IV 1.3 (PG 26, 468C; 472B) and the confession of the Apollinarian Jobius (CPG 3730; 286,24-26 Lietzmann): ὁμολογῶ τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν... ὁμοούσιον θεῷ κατὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἀνθρώποις κατὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως ἠνωμένην αὐτῷ σάρκα. R.M. Hübner, Zur Genese der trinitarischen Formel bei Basilius von Caesarea, in: Für euch Bischof – mit euch Christ. Festschrift für Friedrich Kardinal Wetter, hg. von M. Weitlauff/P. Neuner, St. Ottilien 1998, (123-156) 131 note 40, wants to locate the source of the phrase ἐκ μῖς οὐσίας τρεῖς εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις quoted by Mar. Victorin., adv. Ar. III 4 (CPL 95; CSEL 83/1, 198,38f. Henry/Hadot) in Apollinarius. This proposal seems to be quite unlikely when taking into account the latter's unwillingness to speak of three hypostases (see n. 58). A lucid analysis of this puzzling formula is now presented by John Voelker, An Anomalous Trinitarian Formula in Marius Victorinus' *Against Arius* (to appear in: StPatr, forthcoming).

In a quite similar manner, the author of *Contra Sabellianos* describes the Father as “the only fount of the godhead” (μόνος πηγή θεότητος)<sup>27</sup> while pointing out that speaking of “two” as to the godhead does not affect the ontologically preceding unity: Father and Son are “two in respect of the number, but one existing and perfect substance ... God is one, insofar as the perfect godhead is recognized in the Father, while the same perfect and paternal godhead is existing in the Son, too”<sup>28</sup>. Against Photinus, the eternal procession of the Son *from* the Father is given the same stress as his being *with* the Father, without any difference in the mode of being which is again qualified as “perfect” (τελείως)<sup>29</sup>. As this is also true in respect of the Holy Spirit, one is therefore ought to speak of “one ‘pattern’ (εἶδος) of the three who truly exist: originating in the Father, lighting up in the Son, revealing itself in the Holy Spirit”<sup>30</sup>.

This threefold εἶδος is considered a triad of enhypostatic persons, acting together and yet distinguishable. They are definitely not to be degraded in a “sabellianist” manner as ἀνυπόστατα πρόσωπα, i.e. as impersonal faces of the one God<sup>31</sup>. Apollinaris does not employ the notion of ὑπόστασις in order to describe the reality of the threefold godhead but uses πρόσωπον which is to be understood as “the respective mode of Being and Existing”<sup>32</sup>. Only the Father himself is ὑπόστασις, recalling the usage of Hebrews 1:3, the only instance in the New Testament where this word occurs, designating the Son as “reflection of the hypostasis of the Father”<sup>33</sup>. Apollinaris’ trinitarian theology, drawing upon this biblical proof, tries to maintain

<sup>27</sup> Sabell. 2 (PG 28, 97C); cf. Sabell. 11 (116B): ρίζα καὶ πηγή τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος.

<sup>28</sup> Sabell. 5-6 (105B; 108B): δύο μὲν ἀριθμῶ, μία δὲ οὐσα οὐσία τελεία ... εἷς θεός, τελείας μὲν ἐν πατρὶ τῆς θεότητος νοουμένης, τελείας δὲ καὶ ἐν υἱῷ τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος ὑπαρχούσης; cf. Ps.-Bas., Eun. IV 49 (PG 29, 685B).

<sup>29</sup> Sabell. 9 (PG 28, 112B) confirms against Photinus τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αἰδίου πρόδου, καὶ τὴν μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπαρξιν, καὶ τὸ τελείως μὲν ὑφεστάναι πατέρα καθ’ ἑαυτὸν, τελείως δὲ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ὑφεστάναι.

<sup>30</sup> Sabell. 12 (PG 28, 116C): τριῶν γε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὑφεστῶτων, ἐν τῷ εἶδος ἐνοῶμεν, ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἐκ πατρὸς, λάμπας δὲ ἐν υἱῷ, καὶ φανερούμενον διὰ πνεύματος.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. KMP 13 (171,20-23 L.): Δεινὸν δὲ μελέτημά τινες κατὰ τῆς ἀγίας μελετῶσι τριάδος οἱ τρία πρόσωπα οὐκ εἶναι δισχυριζόμενοι, ὥσπερ ἀνυπόστατον εἰσάγοντες πρόσωπον.

<sup>32</sup> KMP 15 (172,10f. L.): πρόσωπον μὲν γὰρ ἐκάστου τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸ καὶ ὑφεστάναι δηλοῖ; cf. Hübner, Apollinaris (see note 14), 230f. Mühlenberg, Apollinaris (see note 17), 187, renders πρόσωπον in German as „Wesensgrund eines für sich Seienden, der nicht vergeht“. On τρία πρόσωπα in KMP 24 (175,19-26 L.) see Spoerl, Apollinaris (see note 17), 575; 584-588.

<sup>33</sup> KMP 17 (173,6 L.). Cf. Sabell. 5 (PG 28, 105B): The Son is χαρακτήρ τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως, οὐ ῥῆμα ἀνυπόστατον; see also Ps.-Bas., Eun. V 131 (PG 29, 713BC): ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ οὐ προφορικὸς λόγος ἐν τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ζῶν καὶ ὑφεστηκῶς, καὶ τῶν ἄλων δραστήριος: οὕτως ἐν τῷ θεῷ οὐ πνεῦμα διαχωρόμενον, οὐ διαλυόμενος ἄηρ, ἀλλὰ δύναμις ἀγιαστική, ἐνούσιος, ἐνυπόστατος, ἐνυπόστατος; for Hebrews 1:3 see Eun. V 179 (PG 29, 753B). The passage in KMP 1 (167,18-168,4 L.; quoted above note 20) where the Son seems to be predicated as ὑπόστασις is highly ambiguous and displays no specific trinitarian terminology (cf. Hübner, Apollinaris [see note 14], 231f.).

the individual properties of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as well as their common origin in the godhead of the Father, i.e. in the Father's substance and in his hypostasis, while both of these terms are understood as identical<sup>34</sup>. They share the divine nature of the Father which is communicated to Son and Spirit by the means of specific τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως<sup>35</sup>. Starting with the unity of God, Apollinaris takes cautious steps in order to find an adequate description of the plurality of persons, carefully avoiding any notion that might make them appear as three independent entities, or more precisely: hypostases.

### III. *The correspondence with Basil of Caesarea concerning the ὁμοούσιος*

During the years after 350 the Nicene ὁμοούσιος was rediscovered as hallmark of orthodoxy. In the case of Apollinaris this is clearly expressed in his correspondence with Basil of Caesarea. The latter had asked if Father and Son, each existing “in a particular determinate substance”, should be spoken about as “precisely and undeviating similar in substance” (ὅμοιος κατ’ οὐσίαν)<sup>36</sup>. Apollinaris regarded this expression as not precise enough, insofar as Father and Son are not only similar to each other but “exactly the same by virtue of substance” (ταυτόν εἶναι κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν)<sup>37</sup>. For the

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Hübner, Apollinarius (see note 14), 238. The identity of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις in connection with the generation of the Son by virtue of nature is already found in Ps.-Ath., Ar. IV 1 (PG 26, 468C; 469A): ὡσπερ δὲ μία ἀρχή· καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο εἰς θεός· οὕτως ἡ τῶ ὄντι καὶ ἀληθῶς καὶ ὄντως οὐσα οὐσία καὶ ὑπόστασις μία ἐστὶν ἢ λέγουσα, „Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὦν“ (Ex 3:14), καὶ οὐ δύο, ἵνα μὴ δύο ἀρχαί. ἐκ δὲ τῆς μιᾶς φύσει καὶ ἀληθῶς υἱός ... ἐξ ὑποστάσεως ὑπόστατος, καὶ ἐξ οὐσίας οὐσιώδης καὶ ἐνουσίος, καὶ ἐξ ὄντος ὦν.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Vinzent, Pseudo-Athanasius (see note 15), 90-104, esp. 97: This elaborated doctrine of τρόποι explains the coexistence of two correlates within an ontologically identical substance, that is, „deren verschiedene Weisen, das eine Sein, die eine Ousia und die eine Hypostase zu sein“. „Das Wesenhafte, der Sohn, ist immer aus dem Wesen, dem Vater. Das Wesen aber ist immer ein solches, das Wesenhafte produziert.“

<sup>36</sup> Bas., ep. 361 (202,25-28 de R.): φῶς γὰρ φωτὶ μηδεμίαν ἐν τῶ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον τὴν διαφορὰν ἔχον, ταυτόν μὲν οὐκ εἶναι, διότι ἐν ἰδίᾳ περιγραφῇ τῆς οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἐκάτερον, ὅμοιον δὲ κατ’ οὐσίαν ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἀπαραλλάκτως, ὀρθῶς ἂν οἶμαι λέγεσθαι. The translations in this paragraph are taken from Prestige, St. Basil (see note 18), 39-43 (slightly altered).

<sup>37</sup> Ep. 362 (CPG 3676; 203,7); cf. the remarks of de Riedmatten, Correspondence (see note 13), pt. II, JThS NS 8, 1957, (53-70) 61-65. Stressing the ταυτόν means to surpass the ὅμοιος in a categorial manner; see H.-J. Vogt, Zum Briefwechsel zwischen Basilius und Apollinaris. Übersetzung der Briefe mit Kommentar, ThQ 175, 1995, (46-60) 49. Ep. 364 (CPG 3677; 205,24f. de R.) enjoins upon this opposition by referring to egyptian bishops carrying a document which agrees with Holy Scripture as well as with the Nicene creed (205,13-15). It is tempting to think of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* written by οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου (2,1; PG 26, 797A [= 321,15 B./H./v.St.]), although the catchword ὅμοιος is not mentioned within. Vogt (see above), 57-59, following Chadwick und de Riedmatten, tries to relate Apollinaris' remark to the confessions of Athanasius and the Meletians directed to the emperor Jovian (CPG 2135; 3415) as well as to the pseudo-athanasian *Refutatio hypocrisis Meletii et Eusebii* which in fact seems to derive from Paulinus of

Son is to be named true God only if he proceeds as the only-begotten offspring from the Father who is the one and only begetting origin. Any notion of an ontologically prior species in God (as Apollinaris suspects in the notion of similarity) is thereby excluded<sup>38</sup>. Only in this way the coexistence of unity and plurality in God can be maintained: “For neither will the otherness by itself secure the reality of the sonship nor again will the identity secure the indivisibility of the new substantive entity; each has mutual relations and singleness of ‘pattern’, and is the same thing in another way and another in the same way”<sup>39</sup>.

It is the concept of τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως again which warrants the balance between the unity of substance and plurality of persons: The Son is consubstantial with the Father “as the one and only offspring from the single stock and ‘pattern’ of the deity, issuing in an inseparable and non-physical manner, in such wise that what begets continues to be its generative self issuing as a begotten self”<sup>40</sup>. This is the only way in which it is possible to claim that the Son is not the paternal prototype himself but its image, notwithstanding the comprehensive consubstantiality, distinguished exactly and sufficiently by the relationship of generation<sup>41</sup>. If not only the *Kata meros pistis* and the epistle to Basil, but also the *Contra Sabellianos* may be taken as a source for Apollinaris’ trinitarian theology, the combined evidence points to a miahypostatic theology based on the Nicene *homoousios*, directed against an overestimation of the notion of

Antioch (CPG 2242; PG 28, 85-88; see esp. 88AB dealing with the generation of the Son ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς). All these documents confirm that Apollinaris insisting upon the ὁμοούσιος while refuting the ὁμοίος can be regarded as a representative of the mainstream of nicene theology around 360, as does Ath., ep. Afr. 4 (PG 26, 1036B [= 328f. B./H./v.St.]); cf. Annette von Stockhausen, Ath. von Alexandrien, epistula ad Afros. Einleitung, Kommentar und Übersetzung, PTS 56, Berlin/New York 2002, 241.

<sup>38</sup> Ep. 362 (203,12-16 de R.): ταυτηγέ τοι καὶ ἐν εἶναι γένος ὑπερκείμενον ἢ μίαν ὕλην ὑποκειμένην ἐπὶ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ περιαιρεθήσεται τῶν ὑπονοιῶν, ὅταν τὴν γεναρχικὴν παραλαβῶμεν ἰδιότητα τῆς ἀνωτάτω ἀρχῆς καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν γενάρχων γένη τὸ ἐκ τῆς μῆς ἀρχῆς μονογενὲς γέννημα.

<sup>39</sup> Ep. 362 (203,29-31 de R.): οὔτε γὰρ ἡ ἑτερότης ἀπλῶς φυλάξει τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῆς υἰότητος, οὔτε ἡ ταυτότης αὐτὸ ἀμέριστον τῆς ὑποστάσεως, ἀλλ’ ἐκάτερον σύμπλοκον καὶ ἐνοειδές ταῦτον ἑτέρως καὶ ἕτερον ὡσαύτως. Cf. Hübner, Apollinarius (see note 14), 236f.

<sup>40</sup> Ep. 362 (204,42-46 de R.): οὗτος ὁμοούσιος, ἐξηρημένως παρὰ πάντα καὶ ἰδιαζόντως, οὐχ ὡς τὰ ὁμογενῆ, οὐχ ὡς τὰ ἀπομεριζόμενα ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς γένους καὶ εἶδους τῆς θεότητος ἐν καὶ μόνον ἀπογέννημα, ἀδιαιρέτω καὶ ἀσωμάτω προόδῳ, καθ’ ἣν μένων τὸ γεννῶν ἐν τῇ γεννητικῇ ἰδιότητι, προῆλθεν εἰς τὴν γεννητικ[ικ]ὴν ἰδιότητα. That consubstantiality is protected by ἀπογέννησις is claimed by Ath., decr. 23,2f. (Athanasius Werke II, 19,21-27 Opitz) and Bas., Eun. II 32 (SC 305, 136,42-48 Sesboüé); cf. R.M. Hübner, Basilius von Caesarea und das Homoousios, in: Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity. Essays in honor of G.Chr. Stead, ed. by L.R. Wickham/C.P. Bammel, SVigChr 19, Leiden 1993, (70-91) 83-87; Drecoll, Entwicklung (see note 14), 26f.

<sup>41</sup> Basil concentrates on the question how Father and Son could be distinguished while presupposing their unity (cf. ep. 361; 202,22f. de R.: φῶς νοητὸν αἰδιον ἀγέννητον – φῶς νοητὸν αἰδιον γεννητὸν); cf. Drecoll, Entwicklung (see note 14), 24f. To what extent *Contra Sabellianos* shows acquaintance with or influence of the philosophy of Plotinus (cf. Hübner, Apollinarius [see note 14], 244-247) should be subject to further investigation.



ὑπόστασις as decribing the individual mode of being of Son and Spirit, while distinguishing them from another and from the Father as source of the godhead by their modes of coming into being eternally.

#### IV. Apollinaris (Pseudo-Basil) against Eunomius

The main contemporary challenge for Nicene trinitarian theology was formed by Neo-Arianism, gaining strength around 360 by the argumentative skills of Aetius and Eunomius. The latter attacked the fundamental premise of the Nicene Creed, namely that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit might be united within the one and only divine substance. Eunomius described the substance of God by the well-known predicate of “unbegotten” (ἀγέννητος); hence his radical aversion against any equality of substance concerning the Son and the Spirit<sup>42</sup>. Tackling this claim, the followers of the Nicene Creed were forced to develop a “neo-nicene” pattern of argumentation and thereby created a remarkable variety of approaches to trinitarian language.

It has long been acknowledged that books IV to V of Basils *Contra Eunomium* were in fact not written by himself. Following Franz Xaver Risch, I shall regard them hypothetically as a treatise of Apollinaris of Laodicea, responding to Eunomius’ “Apology”<sup>43</sup>. The argument runs as in ep. 362: The Son is described as image of the Father, that is, as image of the substance of the latter and therefore as consubstantial (ὁμοούσιος)<sup>44</sup>. Because when Jesus says in John 8:19: “If you had recognized myself, you would have recognized my father, too”, for Pseudo-Basil this is to be understood according to the premise “that nothing incorporeal can be discerned out of an unequal substance”<sup>45</sup>. Thus to discern God is possible only because he makes his true being accessible in Christ, or more exactly: because the notion “God” designates Father and Son not only by virtue of language (θέσει) but by virtue of nature (φύσει): “The substance is the same because the notions are identical!”<sup>46</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. for example apol. 16,1-6; 28,1-14 (CPG 3455; ed. by R.P. Vaggione, Eunomius. The Extant Works, OECT, Oxford 1987, 52; 74). On Eunomius’ theology see now *ibid.*, Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution, Oxford 2000, esp. 161-179 and 246-265; cf. Karl-Heinz Uthemann, *Die Sprache der Theologie nach Eunomius von Cyzicus*, ZKG 194, 1993, 143-175; Sesboüé, *Saint Basile* (see note 13), 27-33.

<sup>43</sup> Risch, *Pseudo-Basiliius* (see note 14), 12. That Apollinaris wrote against Eunomius is attested by Philost., h.e. VIII 12 (GCS Philostorgius, 114,1f. Bidez/Winkelmann), and Hier., *vir. ill.* 120 (ed. by E.C. Richardson, TU 14/1a, Leipzig 1896, 52,29f.).

<sup>44</sup> Eun. IV 13 (PG 29, 676A): εἰ εἰκὼν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀληθῶς πατρὸς, πᾶσα δὲ εἰκὼν ἢ οὐσία, ἢ μορφῆς, ἢ σχήματος, ἢ εἶδους, καὶ χρώματός ἐστιν εἰκὼν, θεὸς δὲ ἐν οὐδενὶ τούτων, ἐν δὲ οὐσίᾳ μόνῃ· ὁ υἱὸς, εἰκὼν ὢν τῆς οὐσίας, ὁμοούσιός ἐστι τῷ πατρί.

<sup>45</sup> Eun. IV 9 (PG 29, 673C): οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀσώματον ἐξ ἀνομοίου οὐσίας γνωρίζεσθαι δύναται.

<sup>46</sup> Eun. IV 1 (PG 29, 673A): ἡ αὐτῆ ἄρα οὐσία, ὡσπερ καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ὀνόματα. On the antithesis φύσει – θέσει see also Eun. V 173 (PG 29, 752A).

The question posed by Eunomius was the following: If the οὐσία of God is his unbegottenness (ἀγεννησία), how then can the begotten Son (γεννητός) be equal to the Father? The notion and the substance of God are thus to be identified. Pseudo-Basil rejects this: Spoken ontologically, the notion of “unbegotten” (ἀγέννητος) only *refers* to the substance of God but is not this οὐσία itself, for our discernment only reaches the designations of substance, not the substances themselves<sup>47</sup>: “A mode of existing (τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως) is the Unbegottenness, not a notion of an Ousia itself”<sup>48</sup>. Now if the notion of γέννημα is not to be identified as the substance of the Son but only referring to it, and if the Son is to be called “begotten of God”, then it has to be concluded that the notion of being begotten refers to the substance of God, that is, to his οὐσία, of which the Son himself is begotten<sup>49</sup>. By this mode of existing the Son is distinguished from the creatures, too: “What is made is not from the substance of the maker, but what is begotten is from the substance of the begetter; so making and begetting are not at all the same”<sup>50</sup>. If now “greater” (μείζον) is predicated within the Trinity according to John 14:28, this does not refer to the οὐσία but to the individual properties (ποιότητες) of the persons of the Trinity, as Apollinaris had already pointed out to Basil<sup>51</sup>.

Eunomius joined the broad strand of theologians claiming that in God there is only one substance and also only one hypostasis: Since God as the Unbegotten is one by nature, he can by no means transfer his substance to the Son by begetting<sup>52</sup>. Eunomius drew the conclusion that therefore the generation of the Son had to be conceived as an act of willing of the Father, as is true for creatures, too, not of his substance<sup>53</sup>. But his opponent insisted on being begotten by the divine paternal nature as τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως

<sup>47</sup> Eun. IV 38 (PG 29, 681C): τὸ ἀγέννητος εἶ ὄνομα, οὐκ οὐσία. τῶν γὰρ οὐσιῶν σημαντικὰ τὰ ὀνόματα, οὐκ αὐτὰ οὐσία. εἰ δὲ αὐτοουσία τὸ ἀγέννητος, λεγέτωσαν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν οὐσιῶν, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν γνωρίζομεν, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ ἀσώματα; cf. Risch, Pseudo-Basilios (see note 14), 27f. Compare to that Eunomius’ frg. II 3f. (CPG 3458; 178 Vagg.): ὁ θεὸς περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίας οὐδὲν πλέον ἡμῶν ἐπίσταται, οὐδὲ ἔστιν αὕτη μᾶλλον μὲν ἐκείνω, ἤττον δὲ ἡμῖν γινωσκομένη.

<sup>48</sup> Eun. IV 32 (PG 29, 681A): ὑπάρξεως οὖν τρόπος τὸ ἀγέννητος, καὶ οὐκ οὐσίας ὄνομα; cf. Hübner, Genese (see note 26), 148f.; against that Eun., apol. 8,1-7 (40-42 Vagg.). Bas., Eun. I 15 (SC 299; 226,33 Sesbouïé), starts with trinitarian terminology by speaking of τρόπος τῆς ὑποστάσεως (!).

<sup>49</sup> Eun. IV 18 (PG 29, 676C).

<sup>50</sup> Eun. IV 4 (PG 29, 673B): τὸ ποιούμενον οὐκ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ποιούντος, τὸ δὲ γεννώμενον ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας τοῦ γεννώντος· οὐ ταῦτόν ἄρα τὸ ποιεῖν καὶ τὸ γεννᾶν.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Eun. IV 25 (PG 29, 677D-680A) with ep. 362 (203,32-204,26 de R.); cf. Vinzent, Pseudo-Athanasius (see note 15), 101f.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. apol. 12,6-10; 28,8 (48; 74 Vagg.): [θεὸν] οὐδὲν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ὑποστάσεως μεταδοῦς τῷ γεννηθέντι. This necessarily implies the disintegration of the Trinity to a „threefold hypostasis“ (cf. the *Confessio fidei* of 383 (§ 2,6f.; CPG 3457; 150 Vagg.): οὐδὲ ἐκ μιάς οὐσίας εἰς ὑπόστασιν τρισσὴν σχιζόμενον.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. apol. 24,1f.; 28,12f. (p. 64; 74 Vagg.); cf. Risch, Pseudo-Basilios (see note 14), 121f.

of the Son: He is “by nature in a substantial manner begotten of him (sc. God)”<sup>54</sup>. Within the Trinity there is no difference of substance and willing<sup>55</sup>; rather it has to be maintained “that what is begotten shares the nature with the begetter, although the begotten has its being in another way”<sup>56</sup>. The boundary within the theological understanding does not separate the non-begotten God from everything that is begotten but the uncreated Trinity from creation. Accordingly the argument in *Contra Eunomium* IV-V is based on the theory of the irreversible τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως. In exactly the same way the orthodox trinitarian doctrine is summed up in the *Kata meros pistis*: “We confess that the Son and the Holy Spirit are consubstantial to the Father, and one substance of the Trinity, that is, one Godhead; the Father is unbegotten by nature, while the Son is begotten of the Father by true generation, not made by virtue of willing; the Holy Spirit is sent forth eternally from the substance of the Father through the Son as the sanctifier of the whole creation”<sup>57</sup>.

The evidence of the pseudo-basilian *Contra Eunomium* IV-V is coherent with the writings analyzed above: Apollinaris holds on to a real Trinity of divine persons but is cautious concerning the notion of τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις<sup>58</sup>. Paradoxically, even while he was already condemned due to his christological teaching, Theodoret of Cyrus confirmed that Apollinaris’ trinitarian theology was safely based upon the Nicene creed: According to him the former bishop of Laodicea “proclaimed the one substance of God and his

<sup>54</sup> Eun. V 173 (PG 29, 752A): ὁ φύσει οὐσιωδῶς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθεῖς.

<sup>55</sup> Eun. IV 19.29 (PG 29, 676C; 680BC).

<sup>56</sup> Eun. IV 26 (PG 29, 680A): τῶν γεννητῶν ἢ αὐτῆ φύσις πρὸς τὸν γεννήσαντα, κὰν ἐτέρως ὁ γεννηθεῖς τὸ εἶναι ἔχη.

<sup>57</sup> KMP 33 (180,12-18 L.): ὁμολογοῦμεν ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ μίαν τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς τριάδος, τουτέστιν μίαν θεότητα, φυσικῶς ἀγεννήτου μὲν ὄντος τοῦ πατρός, γεννηθέντος δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκ πατρός ἀληθινῆ γεννήσει, οὐ ποιήσει τῆ ἐκ βουλήσεως, τοῦ τε πνεύματος ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός δι’ υἱοῦ ἀδιῶς ἐκπεμφθέντος, ἁγιαστικοῦ τῆς ὅλης κτίσεως. A similar reception of the Nicene Creed is found in the memorandum of George of Laodicea written in 358/359 (Epiph., haer. 73,16,4; 289,1-8 Holl); cf. Hübner, Genese (see note 26), 143-145; Spoerl, Apollinarius (see note 17), 580f.

<sup>58</sup> A mention of three hypostases is found only in Theodore of Heraclea, fragm. 134,16-18 in Mt 28,19f. (Reuss, Matthäus-Kommentare [see note 8], 95); according to Hübner, Apollinarius (see note 14), 226 note 71, this fragment can be traced back to Apollinaris himself. A numerically indeterminate plurality of hypostases is displayed in Apollinaris’ frg. 9,1-7 in Mt 3,17 (CPG 3690; Reuss [see above], 3) while Eun. V 140 (PG 29, 724A) indicates the possibility of referring to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as to individual hypostases because the Prophets, Jesus and Paul had gradually introduced the three persons: διήρηται αὐτοῖς ὁ περὶ τῆς ὑποστάσεως λόγος, ἀδιαιρέτου μένοντος ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῦ περὶ ἑνὸς θεοῦ φρονήματος. Spoerl, Apollinarius (see note 17), 585 note 71, refers to the pseudo-apollinarian *quod unus sit deus* 6 (CPG 3737; 296,12f. Lietzmann) according to which “it is wrong to say that there are two ὑποστάσεις in Christ instead of one, thereby introducing a fourth ὑπόστασις into the Trinity” (εἰσαγόντες τῆ τριάδι τετάρτην ὑπόστασιν) – which in fact implies a triad of hypostases. But as long as an explicit proof is lacking, I hesitate to conclude with Spoerl (see above), 585, “that Apollinaris preferred the three ὑποστάσεις formula from early on in his career”.

three hypostases in the same way as we do”<sup>59</sup>. Here Apollinaris’ trinitarian orthodoxy is attested on grounds of Cappadocian neo-niceneism – which he himself deliberately tried to avoid while preferring πρόσωπον as terminus technicus for the threeness of persons.

In doing so, he finally has not joined the road to victory: After two decades of debate within the Nicene party and with neo-arian and homoian theologians and emperors, Basil and his followers succeeded by identifying ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον while distinguishing both from οὐσία<sup>60</sup>. Thus it became possible to maintain the ontological equality of the Trinity and at the same time the derivative relationship of Son and Spirit<sup>61</sup>, while Apollinaris conceived the consubstantiality of the Son, begotten of the substance of the Father, in a slightly subordinatianist manner: ἐν ὑποβάσει τὸ ἴσον ἔχοντα<sup>62</sup>, which led in turn Basil to sharp criticism<sup>63</sup>. Although Apollinaris and Basil fundamentally agreed in drawing the crucial difference between the divine and triune creator and creation instead of the unbegotten Father and everything else, including the begotten Son, the stress on the unity of the godhead made by the miahypostatic theology evolved the suspicion of Sabellianism, especially linked to the identification of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις (which in the meantime had become to be understood as an independent instance of acting while being inseparately tied to the other divine persons)<sup>64</sup>. The battle against Eunomius was eventually fought and won on grounds of the trihypostatic usage of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* while the miahypostatic tradition of Greek theology was set aside because of the fear of sabellianism<sup>65</sup>.

<sup>59</sup> Thdt., haer. IV 8 (PG 83, 425BC).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. the *Tomus synodalis* of Constantinople 382 (COD<sup>3</sup> 28,18-27 = Thdt., h.e. V 9,11; 292,11-16 Parm./H.).

<sup>61</sup> Johannes Zachhuber, Basil and the Three-Hypostases Tradition. Reconsidering the Origins of Cappadocian Theology, ZAC 5, 2001, 65-85, 80.

<sup>62</sup> Ep. 362 (204,34 de R.).

<sup>63</sup> Ep. 263,4 (CUFr III, 124,8-10 Courtonne); cf. also Thdt., h.e. V 3,3 (279,21f. Parm./H.). But at least via negationis the contribution of Apollinaris is of crucial relevance to the development of Cappadocian neo-niceneism; cf. esp. Hübner, Genese (see note 26), 131, and Drecoll, Entwicklung (see note 14), 43.

<sup>64</sup> Bas., ep. 214,3 (CUFr II; 204,21f. C.) identifies “sabellianism” with the formula: ἐνα μὲν εἶναι τῇ ὑποστάσει τὸν θεόν (cf. ep. 125,1; 31,26f. C.) and complains that his former correspondent had fallen back into this heresy (ep. 265,2; 129,10f.29-31 C.; cf. ep. 244,3; 76,3f. C.)

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Jerome’s complaint: *cauterio unionis inurimur* (ep. 15,3,2; 65,6 Hilb.) which refers to sabellianism; cf. Lienhard, Ousia (see note 9), 101f. note 13. That miahypostatic theology did not instantly cease to have supporters even in the East is attested by the confession of the exiled marcellian bishops in Diocaesarea (dating from ca. 376) that illustrates how (while readily stressing the triad of persons) the notion of hypostasis continued to be carefully avoided (Epiph., haer. 72,11,5; 266,3-5 H.): ἀναθεματίζοντες... τοὺς μὴ λέγοντας τὴν ἀγίαν τριάδα τρία πρόσωπα ἀπερίγραφα καὶ ἐνυπόστατα καὶ ὁμοούσια καὶ συναΐδια καὶ αὐτοτελή. Cf. also the marcellian *Expositio fidei* of the deacon Eugenios which mentions the τριάς but refuses to speak of τρεῖς (quoted from Martin Tetz, Markellianer und Athanasios von Alexandrien. Die markellianische Expositio fidei ad Athanasios des Diakons Eugenios von Ankyra, ZNW 64, 1973, [75-121] 79,31f.): οὐ γὰρ ἀνυπόστατον τὴν τριάδα λέγομεν, ἀλλ’ ἐν ὑποστάσει αὐτὴν γινώσκουμεν; cf. Lienhard, Ousia (see note 9), 115-117.

V. Conclusion: A Trinitarian Link between East and West?

Despite the victory of trihypostatic theology in the East, it is tempting to ask if Apollinaris as the probable author of *Contra Eunomium* IV-V continued to figure in the struggle against neo-arianism – in Western trinitarian theology. As I have tried to demonstrate in my Oxford communication four years ago, the defence of the Nicene *ὁμοούσιος* by arguing from the generation of the Son from the substance of the Father is crucial to the anti-arian trinitarian theology of Augustine<sup>66</sup>. It is remarkable that Augustine recurs to the generation of the Son by virtue of nature where he explicitly criticises Eunomius: “He was unable to understand and unwilling to believe that the only-begotten Word of God through whom all things were made is the Son of God by nature, that is, he is begotten of the substance of the Father; and so he said that he is not the Son of the nature or substance or being of God but the Son of his will. He wished of course to assert that the will by which God begot the Son is something accidental to him”<sup>67</sup>. Here we find the same basic anti-arian features as in Apollinaris: the generation of the Son by virtue of substance, explicitly not by virtue of willing, is presented as threshold against arian subordinationism. I am far from neglecting other important factors which helped to shape his trinitarian concept – e.g., the latin pre-nicene theology or the anti-arian contributions of Ambrose of Milan and Hilary of Poitiers<sup>68</sup>. But it should be taken into account that the pattern of argumentation found in Apollinaris lies at the core of Augustine’s late anti-arian writings, too, e.g. the debate with the homoian bishop Maximinus<sup>69</sup>. It is possible that Jerome only echoed the critique on the trinitarian use of *ὑπόστασις* he had heard in Antioch by Apollinaris and perhaps Paulinus. But one should not forget that at the same time Pope Damasus only reluctantly accepted the neo-nicene trihypostatic theology which was presented to him by Basil in

<sup>66</sup> Gemeinhardt, „Geboren ...“ (see note 11), 158-165.

<sup>67</sup> Trin. XV 20,38 (CChr.SL 50A, 515,2-7 M./Gl.): *Qui cum non potuisset intellegere nec credere uoluisset unigenitum dei uerbum per quod facta sunt omnia filium dei esse natura, hoc est de substantia patris genitum, non naturae uel substantiae siue essentiae dixit esse filium sed filium uoluntatis dei, accidentem scilicet deo, uolens asserere uoluntatem qua gigneret filium* (translated by Hill, *The Trinity* [see note 5], 425). The Antithesis “willingly – unwillingly” is also stressed by Gregory of Nazianzus (or. 29,6; SC 250, 186-188 Gal- lay; cf. R.J. de Simone, *The Dialectical Development of Trinitarian Theology: Augustine Versus Eunomius* ‘Technological’ Theology, *Angelicum* 64, 1987, [453-475] 461) but can already be found in Eun. IV 19f. (PG 29, 676C).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. now M.R. Barnes, *Rereading Augustine’s Theology of the Trinity*, in: *The Trinity* (see note 9), 145-176. Another point of convergence to neonicenism can be found in the notion of the *inseparabilis operatio* of the Trinity; concerning Apollinaris cf. Hübner, *Apolinarius* (see note 14), 243 with note 146; for Augustine see recently L. Ayres, “Remember That You Are Catholic” (serm. 52.2): Augustine on the Unity of the Triune God, *J ECS* 8, 2000, 39-82.

<sup>69</sup> See the evidence collected in my previous study: *Lateinischer Neunizänismus bei Augustin*, *ZKG* 110, 1999, 149-169, esp. 162-168.

order to refute the “Arians” in East and West<sup>70</sup>, and the *Tomus Damasi* of 377/378 keeps in line with the Nicene miahypostatic usage when stating: “He who not confesses that the Son is born from the Father, that is, from his divine substance, is a heretic”<sup>71</sup>. Therefore, it might seem that Apollinaris in refuting Eunomianism by underlining the generation of the Son from the substance of the Father indeed met the requirements of western neo-nicene theology *in statu nascendi*.

Of course it may be asked whether Eunomius was adequately understood by both Apollinaris and Augustine – most probably he was not<sup>72</sup>. But the question of interest within the framework of the present study is not if Augustine did Eunomius understand appropriately but if he did rely on an identifiable miahypostatic tradition in developing his „anti-arian“ argument. And in this respect, the parallels of the strategy of defence employed are striking. At least it should be allowed to ask if Augustine reveals an after-effect of Greek anti-Eunomianism based upon the miahypostatic tradition. Certainly this does by no means imply that Augustine was consciously referring to a heretic already condemned by Damasus. But one has to keep in mind that the disciples of Apollinaris continued to draw upon his theological principles not only in questions of christology (thereby exerting an important influence on Cyril of Alexandria) but also in trinitarian theology. Namely the apollinarian *Epistola ad Prosdocium* written by Timothy of Berytos, stressing the Apollinarian theory of the τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως in connection with the generation by virtue of substance, was well-known in the West as a letter of Pope Julius of Rome<sup>73</sup>.

<sup>70</sup> Marksches, Lateinischer Neunizänismus (see note 8), 255-257.

<sup>71</sup> Tomus Damasi, § 11 (DH 163 = EOMIA I/2,1, 288,78-80 Turner): *Si quis non dixerit Filium natum de Patre, id est de substantia diuina ipsius: haereticus est*; see Gemeinhardt, Lateinischer Neunizänismus (see note 69), 161.

<sup>72</sup> M.R. Barnes, The Arians of Book V, and the Genre of *De Trinitate*, JThS NS 44, 1993, (185-195) 186f., is right in denying that those “Arians” are simply to be identified as “Eunomians” (as does de Simone, Dialectical Development [see note 67], 462-469) and also in stressing that Augustine did not know neo-arianism in its details; cf. the sketchy definition in haer. 54 (CPL 314; CChr.SL 46, 324,3-5 vander Plaetse/Beukers): *Eunomius quippe in dialectica praeualens, acutius et celebrius defendit hanc haeresim, dissimilem per omnia patri asserens filium, et filio spiritum sanctum*. On several occasions Augustine simply parallels „Arriani“ und „Eunomiani“; e.g., bapt. III 15,20 (CSEL 51, 211,5 Petschenig); ep. 238,1 (CSEL 57, 535,11 Goldbacher); sermo 71 (ed. by C. Lambot, RBén 75, 1965, 119,70). When debating with Maximinus in 428, Augustine obviously did not meet a skillful eunomian philosopher, as W.A. Sumruld (Augustine and the Arians. The Bishop of Hippo’s Encounter with Ulfilan Arianism, Cranbury NJ 1994, 27-32) believes, but a theologically limited homoian bishop. However, the fact should by no means be classified as “irrelevant” that in Pseudo(!)-Basil and Augustine the same opponent is refuted by an argumentation which runs quite similar (and is clearly distinguished from Cappadocian anti-eunomianism).

<sup>73</sup> Ep. ad Prosdocium 2 (CPG 3726; 284,8-11 Lietzmann): πᾶς οὖν ὅστις χωρίζει τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ μόνου οὐσίας τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς ἐκ βουλῆς ὄντα καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς αὐτῆς ὡς ἐν ὁμοιώματι κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα; for literary transmission see Lietzmann, Apollinaris (see note 12), 156. The latin text is printed as a letter of Julius

If now the pseudonymous *Contra Eunomium* IV-V can be attributed to Apollinaris of Laodicea appropriately, he might be identified as a hitherto neglected trinitarian link between East and West. The indignation of Jerome about being forced to confess three hypostases fifteen years after the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* is a clear indication of the prevailing importance of miahypostatic nicene theology to western writers<sup>74</sup> but implies that also in the East one could adhere to this manner of speaking confidently. While it has long been recognized that the lines of demarcation of trinitarian theology between the synods of 362 and 381 do not simply divide East and West but Rome and Alexandria on one side and the Cappadocians on the other<sup>75</sup>, the observation might be added that also in Antioch miahypostatic trinitarian theology continued to figure as a means to refute the current heresy of neo-arianism. Perhaps in this way the landscape of neo-nicene trinitarian theology in late fourth and early fifth century appears to be open to a description like the conception of trinitarian unity and plurality as Apollinaris pointed out in his epistle to Basil: “the same thing in another way and another in the same way”<sup>76</sup>.

#### ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Die Trinitätslehre des Apollinaris von Laodicea hat in der patristischen Forschung bislang nur wenig Beachtung gefunden. Aufgrund einer verbreiterten Quellenbasis durch die Zuweisung von Ps.-Athanasius, *Contra Sabellianos* und Ps.-Basilus, *Contra Eunomium* IV-V an Apollinaris wird in der vorliegenden Untersuchung dargelegt, daß mit dessen trinitarischer Theologie ein eigenständiger Entwurf in die Diskussionen der 360er Jahre eingebracht wurde. Charakteristisch dafür ist die Identifizierung von Ousia und Hypostasis und die Unterscheidung der Personen durch τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως, die

---

in PL 8, 954-959; see col. 956A: *Quicumque igitur a Dei unici substantia Filium separat et Spiritum, quasi ex uoluntate sint quemadmodum et nos, ac non eadem e substantia, sed ad eiusdem substantiae similitudinem, anathema sit*“; cf. ACO II 2/1 (39,27-40,11 Schwartz) where the stress on the will is lacking.

<sup>74</sup> As late as 401, Jerome could criticise the origenist theology of Pamphilus because the latter wrongly claimed: *Spiritum sanctum non de eadem Patris Filiique substantia* (adv. Rufin. II 15; CChr.SL 79, 49,33f. Lardet).

<sup>75</sup> See M.R. Barnes, *The fourth century as trinitarian canon*, in: *Christian Origins. Theology, Rhetoric and Community*, ed. by L. Ayres/G. Jones, London/New York 1998, (47-67) 60-62; Spoerl, *Apollinarius*, ed. (see note 17), 590 note 87. For example Jerome, accused of Sabellianism, pleaded to both the bishops of Rome and Alexandria (ep. 17,2,2 [71,6-12 Hilb.]): *Hereticus uocor homousiam praedicans trinitatem; Sabellianae impietatis arguor tres subsistentes ueras, integras perfectasque personas in defessa uoce pronuntians. si ab Arrianis, merito; si ab orthodoxis, qui huiusmodi arguunt fidem, esse orthodoxi desiderunt aut, si eis placet, hereticum me cum occidente, hereticum cum Aegypto, hoc est cum Damaso Petroque, condemnent*. The same prelates are named in 380 in Theodosius' famous decree *Cunctos Populos* (Cod. Theod. XVI 1,2); but it is interesting to note that in later imperial decrees directed exclusively to the East (as early as 381, see Cod. Theod. XVI 5,6) the sees of Rome and Alexandria do no longer figure as the guardians of Nicene orthodoxy!

<sup>76</sup> Basilus, ep. 362 (203,31 de R.): ταῦτὸν ἑτέρως καὶ ἕτερον ὡσαύτως.

sowohl eine reale Dreiheit zu behaupten als auch einer „Dreipersönlichkeit“ Gottes zu widersprechen erlauben. Während sich im Osten mit Basilius von Caesarea die Rede von *drei* Hypostasen durchzusetzen begann, könnte Apollinaris' Theologie eine bislang nicht beachtete Nachwirkung im lateinischen Westen entfaltet haben. Es wird damit möglicherweise stringenter zu erklären sein, wie sich innerhalb des nizänischen Grundkonsenses bezüglich der Homousie der trinitarischen Personen in Ost und West unterschiedliche, nicht aufeinander reduzierbare Konzepte etablierten, deren Einheit und Dreiheit begrifflich konsistent zu fassen ist.