

OXFORD

THE THEOLOGICAL  
ANTHROPOLOGY OF  
EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH

*Sophie Cartwright*

OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES

OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES

*General Editors*

Gillian Clark   Andrew Louth

THE OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES series includes scholarly volumes on the thought and history of the early Christian centuries. Covering a wide range of Greek, Latin, and Oriental sources, the books are of interest to theologians, ancient historians, and specialists in the classical and Jewish worlds.

Titles in the series include:

**Ascetic Pneumatology from John Cassian to Gregory the Great**  
Thomas L. Humphries, Jr. (2013)

**Contemplation and Classical Christianity**  
*A Study in Augustine*  
John Peter Kenney (2013)

**Cyril of Alexandria's Trinitarian Theology of Scripture**  
Matthew R. Crawford (2014)

**The Canons of Our Fathers**  
*Monastic Rules of Shenoute*  
Bentley Layton (2014)

**Gregory of Nyssa's Tabernacle Imagery  
in its Jewish and Christian Contexts**  
Ann Conway-Jones (2014)

**John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy**  
*The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*  
David Rylaarsdam (2014)

**The Practical Christology of Philoxenos of Mabbug**  
David A. Michelson (2014)

**Law and Legality in the Greek East**  
*The Byzantine Canonical Tradition, 381–883*  
David Wagschal (2014)

**Debates over the Resurrection of the Dead**  
*Constructing Early Christian Identity*  
Outi Lehtipuu (2015)

**The Role of Death in the *Ladder of Divine Ascent*  
and the Greek Ascetic Tradition**  
Jonathan L. Zecher (2015)

**Theophilus of Alexandria and the First Origenist Controversy**  
*Rhetoric and Power*  
Krastu Banev (2015)

**The *Consolation* of Boethius as Poetic Liturgy**  
Stephen Blackwood (2015)

# The Theological Anthropology of Eustathius of Antioch

SOPHIE CARTWRIGHT

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Sophie Cartwright 2015

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015931548

ISBN 978-0-19-874455-9

Printed and bound by

CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

## *Preface*

This monograph grew out of my doctoral thesis of the same title, completed at the University of Edinburgh under the supervision of Sara Parvis.

The theology, politics, and philosophy of early fourth-century Christianity are marked by great upheaval. As the Constantinian revolution transformed the way that the church understood the world and itself, a matrix of issues around the doctrine of God—Christology, cosmology, and soteriology—exploded in the ‘Arian’ controversy. I first explored the ‘Arian’ controversy by focusing on Marcellus of Ancyra. I became interested in how anthropology stood at the heart of ‘Arian’ controversy, and was persuaded that Irenaeus was important to how anthropology was negotiated within it. Origen’s legacy, of course, pervades the controversy. So, I sought to understand how these two traditions were interacting in this context.

Eustathius of Antioch appears as a possible key to many questions—about the relationship between Christology and anthropology, for example. With the publication of Declerck’s new edition of his work came a remarkable opportunity to explore the ‘Arian’ controversy, placed in the context of Constantinian politics, from a fresh angle. I offer here an exploration and analysis of Eustathius’ thought, through the lens of his theological anthropology, set in the context of the ‘Arian’ controversy, the Constantinian revolution, and the philosophical commentary tradition. My hope is that it may encourage further conversation and scholarship on a thinker both fascinating in his own right and important in the history of Christian doctrine.

Space will not permit me to mention everyone to whom I owe a debt of gratitude for helping me to complete this book. In particular, I would like to thank Sara Parvis, without whose encouragement and many invaluable insights it would not have been possible; Paul Parvis, whose formidable knowledge of Greek helped me to detangle Eustathius’ fragments; my examiners, Lewis Ayres and Oliver O’Donovan, for their very helpful comments on the thesis and subsequently, Kelley Spoerl, whose own work on Eustathius has informed my own, and with whom I have had detailed discussions about Eustathius’ Christology; Michel Barnes, Inna Kupreeva, and Michael Slusser, all of whom have commented on aspects of this project at different stages; Emily Cartwright; Nancy Cartwright; Maegan Gilliland; and Rachel Manners, to whose support this project owes its completion.



# *Contents*

Introduction	1
1. Eustathius' Life	11
2. The Evidence, Content, and Context of Eustathius' Writings	33
3. Body and Soul	75
4. The Image of God	141
5. Soteriology: The Tragedy and Potential of Human History	165
6. Eschatology: The Human Kingdom	213
Conclusion	239
<i>Bibliography</i>	245
<i>Index</i>	279



## Introduction

In the 320s, the Christian church stood at a crossroads, with regards to both its theology and its position within the Roman Empire. The increasingly controversial legacy of Origen was rapidly becoming a battleground for contested theological, Christological, and anthropological issues. However, a defining aspect of Origen's theological system—the eternity, in some sense or other, of the intelligible world—was rejected by everyone partaking in these discussions, raising the question on which the 'Arian' controversy turned: was the Son eternal, or did he have a beginning?<sup>1</sup>

At the same time the church, having experienced particularly bad persecution recently, found itself in unprecedented favour with the Roman State. This not only raised questions of self-understanding and political and ecclesial theology; it also shaped the context in which the discussion of Origen's legacy would be carried out—in ways that would be difficult to predict.

Eustathius is vital to understanding how these problems were negotiated. In the 320s, he was Bishop of Beroea and then Antioch, one of the largest and most influential cities in the eastern part of the Empire.<sup>2</sup> As a self-declared anti-Origenist, who nonetheless shared Origen's unusual belief in Christ's human soul, he is important to the history of Origenism in the fourth century. Despite this, until very recently, he has eluded in-depth analysis.

That there is remarkably little scholarship on Eustathius is explained partly by the fact that the sources have been understood to be extremely sparse. Other than one anti-Origenist treatise, *Engastrimytho Contra Origenem* [*Engastrimytho*], there were only a handful of fragments preserved by later writers. However, this has changed with the discovery that Eustathius is the author of *Contra Ariomanitas et de anima* [*Ariomanitas*], previously ascribed

<sup>1</sup> See Rebecca Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Mediation in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 15–17.

<sup>2</sup> For the dates of his accession to both sees, see 'Life before Antioch' and 'Accession to Antioch' in Chapter 1.

to Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>3</sup> Though this is preserved as an epitome, the epitomizer is trying to convey Eustathius' own arguments, and aims at completeness. This gives us invaluable new insight into Eustathius' thought.

Eustathius is known primarily for a highly unified conception of the Father–Son relationship, and a highly divisive, proto-Nestorian Christology, often called 'Antiochene'. Older Germanic scholarship, which was partly responsible for this depiction of Eustathius, coupled it with the theology of Irenaeus and an 'Asia Minor' (*kleinasiatisch* or *vorderasiatisch*) tradition, to which he was central. This tradition, which was championed first by Theodor Zahn, ostensibly focused on the historical Christ and took an economic approach to the Trinity, in contrast to the philosophizing approach of the 'Alexandrian' school. Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, and Marcellus of Ancyra were key figures in Zahn's reconstruction.<sup>4</sup> Friedrich Loofs reworked Zahn's thesis, focusing the tradition more specifically on Antioch. He ultimately concluded that the tradition was better labelled 'Antiochene', and added Eustathius.<sup>5</sup> Eustathius, then, has long been associated both with the Christologically divisive theology of Antioch and with a flesh-affirming theological tradition indebted to Irenaeus, which, in older scholarship, was thought to be closely related to it, and thus to 'Antiochene' theology as it later appeared in Nestorius.

More recent scholars have often rejected the idea of an 'Asia Minor' tradition. However, some more recent work, focusing, in particular, on Marcellus and Eustathius, has sought to revive the idea, in various guises.<sup>6</sup> It must be noted that Irenaeus' extant writings were produced in the West, and were probably marked by his time in Rome.<sup>7</sup> However, I believe that there is good evidence for the existence of a flesh-affirming theological tradition, especially influenced by the theology of Irenaeus and persisting into the fourth century,

<sup>3</sup> See José Declerck, ed., *Eustathii Antiocheni, patris Nicaeni, opera quae supersunt Omnia* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002) and 'Contra Ariomanitas et de anima' in Chapter 2.

<sup>4</sup> Theodor Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1867).

<sup>5</sup> Loofs first addressed the idea of the 'Asia Minor' tradition in 'Die Trinitätslehre Marcell's von Ancyra und ihr Verhältnis zur älteren Tradition' in *Patristica*, edited by Hans Brennecke and Jörg Ulrich (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), pp. 123–42 (originally published 1902). His fullest treatment of Eustathius appears with his *Paulus von Samosata. Eine Untersuchung zur altkirchlichen Literatur—und Dogmengeschichte* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924). Eventually, as he drafted Eustathius into the tradition, Loofs decided that Marcellus, after all, echoed Origen as much as he did the Antiochene tradition.

<sup>6</sup> Sara Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy, 325–45* (Oxford: OUP, 2006), pp. 57–60; Patricio de Navascués, '“Cuerpo” en la tradición antioquena', *Augustinianum*, 51, no. 1 (2011), 21–45; Sophie Cartwright, 'The Image of God in Irenaeus, Marcellus of Ancyra and Eustathius of Antioch' in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*, edited by Paul Foster and Sara Parvis (Augsburg: Fortress Press, 2012), pp. 173–81.

<sup>7</sup> For Irenaeus' time in Rome, see Eric Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), pp. 3–5.

strong in Asia Minor. Its influence can be seen especially in the thought of Methodius of Olympus, Marcellus, and Eustathius.

‘Asia Minor’ theology, like the sometimes related ‘Antiochene’ school, was held in contradistinction to Origenism in scholarship of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>8</sup> Eustathius has, correspondingly, been understood as staunchly opposed to Origen and his legacy. In an article published in 1923, Friedrich Zoepfl suggested that the picture might be a bit more complicated than this—Eustathius clearly held to Irenaeus’ doctrine of recapitulation, but his doctrine of Christ’s human soul had strong Origenist influences.<sup>9</sup> The connection between Eustathius and Irenaeus has been reaffirmed in recent scholarship, but not considered in light of the more Origenist aspects of Eustathius’ Christology.<sup>10</sup>

I will suggest that Eustathius’ theology is best understood in light of the interplay between Origenism and the legacy of Irenaeus. This is an interplay that was of fundamental importance to the theology of Eustathius’ hero, Methodius of Olympus, as Lloyd Patterson has ably demonstrated.<sup>11</sup> Some recent scholarship has sought to question the opposition between the theology of Irenaeus and the theology of Origen.<sup>12</sup> There are good reasons for doing this: Origen is heavily indebted to Irenaeus for his Adam–Christ typology, particularly in his famous *Commentaria in Epistulam ad Romanos* [*Commentaria in Romanos*]. Relatedly, Origen’s doctrine of ἀποκατάστασις—‘final restoration’—has the same sense of progression-in-restoration that defines Irenaeus’ doctrine of ἀνακεφαλαίωσις—‘recapitulation’. So, the immediate differences between these two thinkers appear to have obscured important continuities. We should not, however, conclude that the immediate differences are, in the end, superficial differences. Especially in *De Principiis*, Origen took Irenaeus’ soteriology and placed it within a radically different cosmological structure, in which the corporeal aspects of creation are of subsidiary and teleological importance. He also abandoned Irenaeus’ optimism, seeing the fall as a catastrophe. The effect was to give a completely different account of both embodiment and human history in relation to God—that is, a completely different account of anthropology.

<sup>8</sup> See Loofs, *Paulus*.

<sup>9</sup> Friedrich Zoepfl, ‘Die trinitarischen und christologischen Anschauungen des Bischofs Eustathius von Antiochien’, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 104 (1923), 170–201.

<sup>10</sup> See Cartwright, ‘The Image of God’.

<sup>11</sup> Lloyd Patterson, *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom and Life in Christ* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1997).

<sup>12</sup> See Karl Shuve, ‘Irenaeus’s Contribution to Early Christian Interpretation of the Song of Songs’ in *Irenaeus*, edited by Foster and Parvis, 81–8, pp. 86–8; Peter Widdicombe, ‘Irenaeus and the Knowledge of God as Father’ in *Irenaeus*, edited by Foster and Parvis, 141–9, pp. 146–9; Mark Edwards, *Origen against Plato* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), p. 102.

Correspondingly, Eustathius also shows a keen interest in anthropology. In *Ariomanitas*, he lays out an anti-Arian Christology on an anthropological basis. The extant sources for Eustathius are both most interesting and most informative for the rest of his theology if approached, in the first instance, from the perspective of understanding his anthropology. As we shall see, this in turn gives important further shape to the fourth-century theological landscape.

We can best appreciate the importance of grappling with fourth-century anthropology if we appreciate how the changing cosmological landscape impacts on anthropology. For Origen, embodiment is often a problematic arena, qualifying, rather than complementing, the soul as it intrinsically *is*. Correspondingly, in Origen's cosmology, the relationship between the soul and the body is important to the relationship between God and creation. This is clearest in Origen's Christology: as the Word mediates between the Father and the soul, the soul mediates between the Word and the flesh. The God-creation relationship is connected to the body-soul relationship. The partial rejection of Origen's cosmology that gave rise to the 'Arian' controversy therefore also casts pre-existing disagreements about the relationship between the soul and the body before God in a new light.

Many ways of understanding the 'Arian' controversy have been proposed. Often, they have been framed in terms of an attempt to find *the* lynchpin of the controversy. This is pointedly true of the work of Robert Gregg and Denis Groh, in which the authors argued that the 'Arian' view of Christ was driven by soteriological concerns.<sup>13</sup> Rowan Williams depicts the key issues in cosmological terms, and Sara Parvis has followed him here, though she sees the participants in the controversy as divided firmly into two camps, while Williams sees more ambiguity.<sup>14</sup> Lewis Ayres has focused primarily on the doctrine of God itself, and has identified four theological trajectories within the early 'Arian' controversy: 'theologians of the true wisdom' who emphasize the 'eternal correlative status of Father and Son'; 'The "Eusebian" theologians of the "One Unbegotten"'; 'Theologians of the undivided Monad'; and 'Western anti-adoptionism: a Son born without division'.<sup>15</sup> These provide a useful hermeneutical key that acknowledges the initially clear dividing line between supporters and opponents of Arius whilst allowing for the complexity and variety of theological positions within the early 'Arian' controversy.

In my opinion, a cosmological emphasis has much to recommend it as far as understanding the immediate question of dispute at Nicaea is concerned, but

<sup>13</sup> Robert Gregg and Denis Groh, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (London: SCM, 1981).

<sup>14</sup> Rowan Williams, *Arius, Heresy and Tradition*, 2nd edn (London: SCM, 2001); Parvis, *Marcellus*, p. 54.

<sup>15</sup> Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), pp. 43–70.

Gregg and Groh, among others, have identified important strands in the wider theological context surrounding Nicaea, and this context should not be ignored. The question of the Son's eternity arose out of particular cosmological suppositions, but immediately gave rise to a host of Christological, soteriological, and anthropological questions.

What is evident in so many reconstructions of the 'Arian' controversy is that anthropology considerably elucidates the question; soteriology is intrinsically anthropocentric, focusing on the gap between human possibility and its current actualization. Cosmology often starts from the point of trying to understand the place of human beings in the universe. Christology, the concept of God becoming human, or taking on humanity is, again, entwined with anthropology. I am not proposing that anthropology is the, or even a, defining theological issue in the question of the doctrine of God as played out at the Council of Nicaea. At least, I do not propose this in the sense that I do not think that anthropology is 'what the opposing parties at Nicaea were arguing over'. However, I believe that anthropology is a thread running through the various ways in which both pro-Arians and anti-Arians thought about and articulated the doctrine of God; the question of the Son's nature, as it was framed in the early fourth century, was partly cosmological and partly Christological. How does the Son stand in relation to the world on the one hand and the Father on the other? Both aspects of this question raise the further quandaries of how humankind stands in relation to God, and how Christ affects this relation.

Eustathius' controversial and genuinely problematic, almost Nestorian, Christology gives a unique insight into the anthropological issues of the early fourth century. Unlike Athanasius, Eustathius does not primarily seek to bridge the gap between humankind and God of which early fourth-century theologians are so especially aware. Instead, he tries to work out what the human being looks like on the other side of this gap. In Christological terms, this means that he must describe Christ's human experiences in such a way that they are not, also, divine experiences. The consequence is an anthropology that focuses on the interrelation of body and soul. Eustathius agrees with Irenaeus that the body is integral to human nature and strongly reacts against what he sees as Origenist and Platonist tendencies to locate human essence in the soul. He nonetheless utilizes Origenist Christology to develop Irenaeus' Adam-Christ typology. The soul is key to Christ's humanity for Eustathius because he places a great deal of emphasis on the emotional and psychological aspects of Christ's embodied experiences.

In the 'Arian' controversy, Eustathius' primary antagonist is Eusebius of Caesarea, whom, I will argue, he engages in *Contra Ariomanitas*. Eustathius already shared Origen's belief in Christ's human soul prior to the 'Arian' controversy. During the controversy, Eustathius deploys his Origenist Christology in opposition to an anthropology that he attributes to Plato, that he

associates, in different ways, with Eusebius and Origen, and that underlies a pro-Arian Christology in which the Word of God was united simply with a human body.

Another respect in which Origen departs from Irenaeus is in seeing human history as fundamentally a result of tragedy. Here he has kept many of the structures that enable Irenaeus to speak positively about history in the face of tragedy—history is an aid to improvement, and will result in a glorious progression beyond the original created state—but holds this together with a sense of catastrophe. For Origen, this idea is bound up with his speculations about the fall of souls and related theology of embodiment, but it was in fact to have a much more widespread legacy. Rejecting Origen's theology of embodiment but accepting his belief that the fall was catastrophic requires a renegotiation of our understanding of the relationship between history and eschatology. In Origen, eschatology is often depicted as the negation of history. Eustathius, along with most of his contemporaries, shares Origen's sense that history began with a tragedy. However, because he rejects Origen's cosmology—and especially the place of embodiment in that cosmology—he both has a stronger sense that *history itself* is tragic, and feels that this is a tragedy to be redeemed, rather than negated.<sup>16</sup> The Constantinian Revolution had thrown these questions into a new light by apparently opening up new possibilities for human society within the current world order. However, for Eustathius, Constantine's involvement in the church ended up proving less of a blessing than expected when the emperor intervened in the 'Arian' controversy, derailing the anti-Arian attempt to exclude the pro-Arian sympathizers. As he considers a future existence that will do justice both to his picture of embodiment and to his picture of restoration of human freedom and power, Eustathius depicts the kingship of Christ in such a way as to raise a question over the authority of the emperor.

A word needs to be said about the manner of categorizing various theological and ecclesial groups in the 'Arian' controversy. The term 'Arian' has been widely criticized as a descriptor of subordinationist theology within the fourth-century disputes about the doctrine of God, often because it seems to exaggerate the significance of both the person and the theology of Arius within these disputes.<sup>17</sup> These criticisms have much to recommend them and I have here opted instead for the term 'pro-Arian'. It could be argued that this fails to address the problem of the undue centralization of Arius himself, and this might indeed be the case if some of Eustathius' anti-subordinationist writings

<sup>16</sup> Origen tends to suggest that history helps to undo the primeval tragedy, and is then itself discarded, so it is better to speak of history *resulting from tragedy* than *being tragic* in Origen's thought. See 'Suffering and the Tragedy of History' in Chapter 5.

<sup>17</sup> For example, this view is expressed by Richard Hanson who dubs the term 'the Arian controversy' 'a serious misnomer' in *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1988), pp. xvii–xviii, quote p. xvii.

hailed from the later fourth century. However, (as I will argue) all of Eustathius' anti-subordinationist polemic can be dated to the 320s and was almost certainly written between 323 and the end of 327. In this context, Arius is neither the main protagonist nor, in real terms, the main issue. However, the participants at Nicaea itself and in the discourse immediately surrounding it can meaningfully be placed in two camps: 'for' and 'against' Arius. One's position on Arius is, for this brief period, a focus of group unity. The subordinationist theologians justifiably identified by Ayres as 'Eusebian' are, at this point, also specifically pro-Arian. 'Pro-Arian' is as meaningful a term as we are likely to find for subordinationist theology immediately surrounding Nicaea. 'Anti-Arian' expresses, similarly, the position of Alexander and his allies around the time of Nicaea. Neither term should be taken to designate theological homogeneity within these groups.

I use the term 'Origenist' to refer to readings and echoes of Origen in later thinkers, despite its connotations of heresiological categories constructed in the later fourth-century controversy.<sup>18</sup> This is determined by my focus on Origen's legacy and no value-judgement is intended; it has proved otherwise impossible to convey how ideas justifiably and unjustifiably attributed to Origen contributed to one discussion and could be bound together in new or reworked systems and doctrines.

Chapter 1 sets Eustathius in historical context, focusing especially on his time at Antioch, and the controversial events surrounding his accession to and deposition from the See of Antioch, and bringing together the many scholarly discussions on this subject. Drawing on recent scholarship, it demonstrates that he was dissatisfied with Constantine's involvement at Nicaea and suggests that he may well have been deposed as a consequence of a conspiracy by the pro-Arian faction.

Chapter 2 reviews the sources for Eustathius, including those that have emerged from Declerck's recent work, and sets Eustathius' writings in context. It examines the evidence, nature, and context of his writings, in light of Declerck's work.

Chapter 3 examines the relationship between the body and the soul in Eustathius. There we see that he promotes an anthropology heavily indebted to Irenaeus, in opposition to what he perceives as the Origenist and Platonist anthropology of Eusebius of Caesarea, and on the basis of an Origenist Christology. Eustathius gives an account of human identity and experience that is psychophysical, in a strict sense, whilst giving an account of the soul's existence apart from the body that owes much to Origen. Held together, this suggests a body-soul dualism in which the soul actualizes the body. Such a view resembles certain strands of eclectic Platonism, but underlying

<sup>18</sup> See Elizabeth Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Eustathius' particular emphasis on the interrelation of body and soul are also some Peripatetic sources. Eustathius' psychophysical account of the body–soul relationship also falls within a specifically Christian tradition of deploying Aristotelian strands within Hellenic discourse to find a positive space for embodiment. This tradition can be found frequently in Irenaeus and Methodius and occasionally in Origen. Eustathius emphasizes the passibility of the soul, explaining human emotional experience in terms of his integrated anthropological ontology, and depicting sorrow as a proper aspect of human experience.

Chapter 4 examines the image of God in Eustathius' thought, and identifies three main strands. First, echoing Origen, Eustathius clearly distinguishes between humanity, including Christ's humanity, *qua* image and the eternal Son *qua* image, maintaining a sharp disjunction between God and humanity within the cosmological framework of the 'Arian' controversy. Second, Eustathius' image theology has an important soteriological dimension that invokes a parallel between Adam and Christ, and sees eschatological humanity as conformed to Christ—this is indebted to Irenaeus and Origen, in different ways. Third, in locating the image of God at least partly in the human body, Eustathius emphasizes the physical nature of human beings. There is also a suggestion that the image is visible, but incomplete, without the soul, echoing the idea that the soul actualizes the body, identified in the previous chapter.

Chapter 5 examines Eustathius' soteriology, partly drawing on the discussion about Adam–Christ typology in Chapter 4. Eustathius retells a common soteriological narrative that centralizes the devil's power over humankind and Christ's defeat of him, again drawing heavily on both Irenaeus and Origen. In Eustathius' retelling of this narrative, there is a particularly strong tension between human guilt and human victimhood that has important implications for the nature of human freedom and power. This chapter explores the way that Eustathius' account of the devil's power, and the freedom that Christ brings in overthrowing the devil, operate on both a micro-level—in the individual—and a macro-level—in the human race. Eustathius' emphasis on Christ's humanity allows his Christology to operate as a model of how God fulfils human agency.

Chapter 6 examines Eustathius' eschatology, drawing together various strands from previous chapters. It demonstrates that Eustathius believed that Christ would reign in a world order that is in important respects commensurable to the current one, over a kingdom that is vastly superior. This locates ultimate human identity in current identity and emphasizes the importance of the current life. It also acts as a challenge and a foil to the current life, and reveals present manifestations of human society and government to be deficient. This chapter further posits that, in his anti-Arian writings, Eustathius depicted Christ's authority as human authority, and as incommensurable to any human authority in the lapsed world order. It suggests that this

may be intended to place a question mark over the nature of Constantine's authority.

Eustathius of Antioch's theological anthropology draws on eclectic sources in seeking to offer a vision of humankind in history that does justice to the tragedy of history whilst rooting human nature and identity in its current, historical, manifestation. In doing so, it provides a window into the tumultuous theological, philosophical, and political environment of the early fourth-century Roman Empire and gives new shape to the theological context of the 'Arian' controversy.



---

## Eustathius' Life

### LIFE BEFORE ANTIOCH

Eustathius' life prior to the outbreak of the 'Arian' controversy is shrouded in mystery. A handful of facts can be pieced together from various ancient sources, chief among which are the writings of Athanasius, Jerome, and Theodoret of Cyrus.<sup>1</sup> Eustathius was from Side, a harbour town in Pamphylia, and his parents' religious affiliation is unknown.<sup>2</sup> He was evidently highly educated; he shows the signs of a classical education, including rhetorical training and significant familiarity with Greek philosophy and medicine.<sup>3</sup>

The church's status within the Roman Empire underwent huge fluctuations during Eustathius' lifetime. Following the legalization of Christianity in the third quarter of the third century, the opening decades of the fourth century saw peculiarly bad persecution of the church, particularly in the East, under Galerius, Maximinus, and Diocletian.<sup>4</sup> The church of Eustathius' youth had enjoyed a new freedom, but had probably remained wary of the state. Then, at the beginning of the fourth century, the fragile truce between the church and the empire had come crashing down. However, following the persecution under Diocletian and his successors, the church under Constantine enjoyed not only regained freedom, but also,

<sup>1</sup> See Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.*, 4 and *Apologia de fuga sua* [*Apologia*], 3; Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, [*De Viris*]. Theodoret, who preserves many fragments from Eustathius, often refers to him in his *Eranistes* and includes a section on him in his *H.E.*, 1.22.

<sup>2</sup> Jerome, *De Viris*, 85.

<sup>3</sup> Margaret Mitchell, 'Rhetorical Handbooks in Service of Biblical Exegesis: Eustathius of Antioch Takes Origen Back to School' in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context*, edited by John Fotopoulos (Brill: Leiden, 2006), pp. 349–67 has demonstrated Eustathius' Greek education.

<sup>4</sup> Timothy Barnes and David Potter both argue, persuasively, that Christianity was legalized by the emperor Gallienus in 260: Barnes, *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman History* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), p. 97 and Potter, *The Roman Empire at Bay AD 180–395* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 85–172 and pp. 217–62. See Stephen Mitchell, *A History of the Later Roman Empire, AD 284–261: The Transformation of the Ancient World* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007) for a recent alternative perspective.

increasingly, unprecedented favour. This was a church torn between giddy excitement and considerable trepidation, but also, quite simply, unsure of how to handle its new role and influence.

Eustathius himself was probably a confessor under either Diocletian or his successors, or, at any rate, was at some point arrested—Athanasius and Theodoret both label him a ‘confessor’.<sup>5</sup> Admittedly, Theodoret’s source may have been Athanasius; when introducing fragments from Eustathius, he writes that they are *ὁμολογητοῦ*, but he never discusses the status he accords to Eustathius, so there is little from which to address his sources. Jerome never writes that Eustathius is a confessor, which seems an odd omission given that he writes relatively extensively, and always positively, of Eustathius. However, Athanasius’ testimony is in this case relatively reliable, despite his wanting to present Eustathius positively. Well into the fourth century, the Christian community remained keenly conscious of the persecutions, and less than exemplary behaviour during the persecutions was often dredged up to discredit one’s opponents.<sup>6</sup> Even in a work as late as *Historia Arianorum*, it would be a high-risk strategy to refer to Eustathius as a confessor if there were no truth in it. In any case, as we shall see, the concept of persecution was important to Eustathius.

In either 321 or 322, Alexander of Alexandria wrote *He Philarchos*, a letter about Arius sent to a number of prominent bishops.<sup>7</sup> Eustathius received this

<sup>5</sup> Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.*, 4 and *Apologia*, 3, and Theodoret, e.g. *Eranistes*, 1.33, respectively.

<sup>6</sup> For example, in *De Decretis Nicaeanae Synodi* in *Athanasius Werke* II.2, edited by Hans-Georg Opitz (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935) [*De Decretis*], 8, Athanasius rather cruelly refers to ‘Asterius the sacrificer’, because Asterius sacrificed to the pagan gods during the persecution.

<sup>7</sup> There has been much disagreement about the date of *He Philarchos*, which is closely connected to the debate about exactly when the ‘Arian’ controversy broke out, and a corresponding disagreement about its nature. Parvis, *Marcellus*, pp. 68–75, provides the most recent summary of the historiography of the outbreak, and the relevant evidence: Hans-Georg Opitz claimed that the argument began in 318, and started suddenly but developed slowly [‘Die Zeitfolge des arianischen Streits von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 328’, *ZNW*, 33 (1934), 131–59]. Schwartz subsequently argued that the outbreak, which took some building up to, did not take place until 324 and that the disagreement then progressed very quickly [‘Die Dokumente des arianischen Streites bis 325’, pp. 296–9, reprinted in *GS*, III, pp. 165–8]. Schwartz’s argument relies on his belief that Constantine defeated Licinius in 323; he thought that the entire controversy must have occurred after Licinius’ ban on the meeting of synods had been lifted. In placing Licinius’ defeat in 323, he allowed the maximum time for the necessary events predating Nicaea to have occurred within these parameters. Later, Schwartz decided that Licinius must have been defeated in 324, after all [‘Von Nicaea bis zu Konstantins Tod’, p. 370 reprinted in *GS*, III, p. 191, note 1]. The year 323, in any case, does not allow enough time for all the relevant letters to be circulated, as Parvis has argued. Rowan Williams has posited 321 [*Arius*, pp. 48–61]. Parvis, whilst acknowledging that Williams’ suggestion is reasonable, argues for 322, following Schwartz’s assumption that one must allot the shortest time possible to the events between the outbreak of the controversy and the Council of Nicaea. She then argues that *He Philarchos* and Alexander’s other letter to all bishops, *Henos Somatos*, were written and dispatched simultaneously, and were versions of the same letter (one need not, in that case, allow time for both of them). It seems to me that Schwartz, Williams, and Parvis are right to suppose

letter whilst Bishop of Beroea, so his accession to Beroea must predate 321–2.<sup>8</sup> His career was apparently soaring when he was bishop there. Joseph Trigg has described him as a 'rising star' in the decade after the end of the 'Great Persecution', and the little available evidence commends this picture.<sup>9</sup> Eustathius received *He Philarchos* despite Alexander's very different theological leanings, and Alexander also requested that he write to him on the subject of Melchizedek. We shall see that this had a lot to do with the fact that Alexander was forming an alliance to deal with Arius and his supporters; Eustathius was a natural ally in this context, and clearly a man he wanted onside.

Eustathius' theological context prior to the outbreak of the 'Arian' controversy bears the marks of Asia Minor and Antioch, and declared anti-Origenism (though, as we shall see, this does not involve a straightforward rejection of Origen's theology). Eustathius was evidently a great admirer of the sometime critic of Origen, Methodius of Olympus, to whom he refers in glowing terms in *Engastrimytho*.<sup>10</sup> This indicates a pre-existing disagreement with Eusebius of Caesarea, who wrote warmly of Origen, omitted any mention of Methodius from his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and was to be one of Eustathius' particular antagonists during the 'Arian' controversy.<sup>11</sup>

A prior connection with key members of what was to become the anti-Arian alliance at Nicaea is also evident. Eustathius was clearly on good terms, and in anti-Origenist cahoots, with Eutropius of Adrianople, at whose request he wrote *Engastrimytho*. Eutropius had complained that he found Origen's interpretation of the witch of Endor narrative inadequate.<sup>12</sup> Athanasius writes that Eutropius was deposed because he disagreed with Eusebius of Nicomedia.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, in his attachment to theologians from Asia Minor, Eustathius apparently follows earlier bishops of Antioch. For example, Vitalis, Philogonius' predecessor at Antioch, attended the Council of Ancyra in 314, and was the only bishop outside of Asia Minor to do so.<sup>14</sup>

that things must have moved fairly quickly, at least once *He Philarchos* was written, and that, therefore, it must have been written in either 321 or 322, though there is evidence that the anti- and pro-Arian alliances have a prehistory within which certain theological disagreements had begun to fester earlier.

<sup>8</sup> Theodoret, *H.E.*, 1.3.

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Trigg, 'Eustathius of Antioch's Attack on Origen: What is at Issue In an Ancient Controversy?', *The Journal of Religion*, 75, no. 2 (1995), 219–38, p. 220, <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1205319>>.

<sup>10</sup> *Engastrimytho*, 22.5.

<sup>11</sup> See 'The Nature and Context of Eustathius' Works: *Engastrimytho*' in Chapter 2.

<sup>12</sup> See *Engastrimytho*, 1:1–2.

<sup>13</sup> Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.*, 5.      <sup>14</sup> Parvis, *Marcellus*, pp. 13–14.

## ACCESSION TO ANTIOCH

It has become conventional to date Eustathius' accession to the See of Antioch to the Council of Antioch in 324/5.<sup>15</sup> However, Paul Parvis has recently questioned this thesis, arguing that Eustathius was one of two rival bishops of Antioch from the death of Philogonius in 323.<sup>16</sup> Parvis' claim is persuasive.

Paul Parvis' argument is closely connected to a wider uncertainty surrounding the episcopal succession in Antioch. The chronology of the bishops of Antioch in the 320s has long been confused, principally because the ancient sources disagree as to whether Paulinus of Tyre was Eustathius' predecessor or his successor:<sup>17</sup> Jerome, Theophanes, and Nicetas name Paulinus as Eustathius' predecessor.<sup>18</sup> However, Philostorgius writes that Paulinus was the predecessor of Eulalius, who was bishop *after* Eustathius, thereby suggesting that Paulinus succeeded Eustathius.<sup>19</sup> Theodoret and Eusebius also order the bishops of Antioch Eustathius–Paulinus–Eulalius.<sup>20</sup>

It is known that Philogonius Antioch—the predecessor of either Eustathius or Paulinus—died on 20 December, because this is his feast day. Much scholarship has assumed that this was December 324. However, Burgess places Philogonius' death on 20 December 323, a year earlier than the conventional date.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, whilst most scholars see Philogonius as Eustathius' immediate predecessor, Burgess argues that Paulinus was bishop in between Philogonius and Eustathius. He has argued this partly because he believes that there would not have been time for Paulinus' episcopate if he had succeeded

<sup>15</sup> See Williams, *Arius*, p. 58. For the conciliar letter, see Schwartz, 'Zur Geschichte des Athanasius, VI: Die Dokumente des arianischen Streites bis 325', *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1905), 257–99 reprinted in GS, III, pp. 117–68. All the extant documents for the Council of Antioch are listed at CPG, 8509–10.

<sup>16</sup> Paul Parvis, 'Constantine's Letter to Arius and Alexander?', *SP*, 39 (2006), 89–95.

<sup>17</sup> Richard Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and post-Eusebian Chronography* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), pp. 184–91, discusses the evidence in detail and I draw here on his analysis.

<sup>18</sup> Jerome, *Chronicon* [Eusebius of Caesarea–Jerome, *Chronicon*, edited by Rudolph Helm (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956)], p. 232, entry c; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, edited by Carl de Boor, vol. 1 (Hildesheim: Olms, 1963), 11.30, 13.27, 15.17; Nicetas, *Thesaurus Orthodoxae Fidei*, 5.6. A few of the sources placing Paulinus directly before Eustathius are somewhat confused about Paulinus' name because of transcriptional error. For example, *Chronicle 724* refers to 'Flavianus', but this clearly leads us back to Paulinus when one considers the similarity of the names 'Paulinus' and 'Flavianus' in Syriac.

<sup>19</sup> Philostorgius, *H.E.*, 2.7b, 3.15, and 15b. Jacob of Edessa also says that Paulinus succeeded Eustathius, but sees him as a rival 'orthodox' bishop to the pro-Arian Eulalius. Burgess, *Studies*, pp. 184–91, convincingly argues that Jacob has confused Paulinus I with Paulinus II, who was Bishop of Antioch from 362 to 380 and whose title, according to Socrates (*H.E.*, 5.5.4.), was contested by Meletius.

<sup>20</sup> Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum*, 1.4.2; Theodoret, *H.E.*, 1.22.

<sup>21</sup> Burgess, *Studies*, pp. 186–7. Robert Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: CUP, 1928), pp. 21–2, had earlier suggested this reconstruction.

Eustathius. I believe that Burgess is right to date Philogonius' death to 323, rather than 324, but that his proposed chronology of the bishops of Antioch is, nonetheless, incorrect. Paul Parvis has offered a more persuasive alternative in arguing that Eustathius and Paulinus were simultaneous, rival bishops.

Parvis' argument is based on Constantine's so-called letter to Arius and Alexander, in which the emperor appeals for reconciliation in the church. Parvis thinks that this letter suggests that there were two rival bishops of Antioch at the time of writing, and that this remained the case;<sup>22</sup> this is why Constantine cancelled his tour of the East, and later sent his mother instead. So, in Parvis' view, Eustathius was *a* bishop of Antioch from the death of Philogonius in 323, and the (strongly anti-Arian) Council of Antioch asserted his legitimacy over that of Paulinus. Paulinus was later recognized as Bishop of Antioch by the emperor, in Eustathius' place, after Eustathius' deposition.

Parvis' argument has three main strands. First, he follows Stuart Hall in arguing that Constantine's letter was written to the Antiochene Synod of 324/5, not to Arius and Alexander personally.<sup>23</sup> To this end, he notes that Eusebius says that Constantine ἐπιτίθησι the letter to Alexander and Arius, and that Eusebius only uses this term when he is introducing excerpts in the *Vita Constantini*, and that here it means that Constantine 'presented' the letter in question.<sup>24</sup> Eusebius does not say, therefore, that the letter was 'written' to Alexander and Arius.

Second, Parvis argues that the text of Constantine's letter refers to a disputed succession. Σύνοδος, he claims, should be read as 'corporate body' when singular.<sup>25</sup> He further suggests that Constantine's lament that 'the honour of the synod be removed by impious dissension' should be rendered as continuing 'from the congregations', i.e., δῆμων, rather than either δι' ὑμῶν—'through you', after Hans-Georg Opitz—or δι' ἡμῶν—'through us', after Ivar Heikel and Friedrich Winkelmann.<sup>26</sup> Third, he argues that Constantine's admonition to his readers to 'open to me the road to the east'

<sup>22</sup> Loofs, *Paulus*, pp. 186–7, had earlier suggested that the confusion over episcopal succession at Antioch lay in the existence of simultaneous, rival bishops, arguing that there had been a long-standing schism at Antioch since the time of Paul of Samosata. He suggested that Paulinus was a 'Paulianische' bishop of Antioch, following Paul of Samosata's tradition, whilst Philogonius was the 'katholischen' bishop, and that Eustathius was sole bishop, being intended to unite the two factions.

<sup>23</sup> Stuart Hall, 'Some Constantinian Documents in the *Vita Constantini*' in *Constantine: History, Historiography and Legend*, edited by Samuel Lieu and Dominic Montserrat (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 86–103, esp. p. 87.

<sup>24</sup> Parvis, 'Constantine's Letter', pp. 91–2; Eusebius, *V.C.*, 2.63, and 4.34, respectively.

<sup>25</sup> Parvis, 'Constantine's Letter', p. 93, refers us to a discussion about property belonging to Christians in the so-called Edict of Milan. Eusebius renders this by writing that it belonged to the Christians, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῷ σώματι καὶ συνόδῳ.

<sup>26</sup> Parvis, 'Constantine's Letter', p. 93. See Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, edited by Ivar Heikel (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902), p. 70, line 6; Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, edited by Friedrich Winkelmann (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975), p. 77, line 11; and *Epistula ad Alexandrum et*

indicates that he was prevented from making an imperial visit east because ‘an emperor could not be received by rival bishops. His *adventus* could not be marred by tumult’.<sup>27</sup> Parvis notes the importance of the fact that Licinius’ ban on synods would only just have been lifted in 324—while the ban was in place, it would be difficult to consecrate a new bishop. So, following the death of Philogonius, there would have been only an acting bishop. Among the earliest petitions Constantine would have received as sole emperor would have been requests for permission to appoint a new bishop of Antioch.<sup>28</sup>

Paul Parvis’ argument about episcopal succession at Antioch is persuasive, as it accounts for the chronological confusion of the bishops, explaining why Paulinus is sometimes listed as Eustathius’ successor, sometimes as his predecessor. In the eyes of the pro-Arian faction at Antioch, Paulinus had been bishop there since Philogonius’ death, but, in the eyes of the anti-Arian faction and the imperial administration, he was not Bishop of Antioch until Eustathius’ deposition. The See of Antioch was clearly already pitted against the pro-Arian cause prior to Eustathius’ accession, as Arius names Philogonius of Antioch as one of his opponents, despite claiming widespread support from Eastern bishops.<sup>29</sup> However, the city of Antioch evidently hosted theological diversity on this point; Eustathius acceded to Antioch as the intended champion of anti-Arian theology.

### THE COUNCIL OF ANTIOCH 324

The creed produced at Antioch was strongly anti-subordinationist and, as Sara Parvis has argued, is in many ways closer to *He Philarchos* than the Creed of Nicaea 325.<sup>30</sup> Some features that distinguish both it and *He Philarchos* from the Creed of Nicaea can be found in Eustathius’ anti-Arian writings; for example, the appeal to the idea that the Son is the image of the Father to establish continuity between Father and Son, and the use of Hebrews 1.3 in this context.<sup>31</sup> It also anathematizes those who declare the Son to be immutable by his will, rather than by his nature. Karl-Heinz Uthemann has picked up on this as important to Eustathius’ *Contra Ariomanitas*, and we shall see that

*Arium*, in *Athanasius Werke*, III: *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites*, edited by Hans-Georg Opitz (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1934), 17.10, p. 34, line 16.

<sup>27</sup> Parvis, ‘Constantine’s Letter’, p. 94.

<sup>28</sup> On Licinius’ ban on synods, see Williams, *Arius*, pp. 49–50.

<sup>29</sup> In a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, for which, see Theodoret, *H.E.*, 1.4.

<sup>30</sup> Parvis, *Marcellus*, p. 78.

<sup>31</sup> Alexander of Alexandria, *He Philarchos*, in *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites*, edited by Hans-Georg Opitz (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1934), 14, document 17.

this is true.<sup>32</sup> All the evidence suggests that the Council of Antioch is important to understanding Eustathius' engagement with pro-Arian theology.

Eustathius' involvement in this Council shows him to have been highly important on the anti-Arian side of the controversy from a relatively early stage. Antioch also marks an important moment in the relationship between Eustathius and Eusebius of Caesarea, whose theology was condemned at this Council, and who was placed under a provisional ban of the empire, pending a larger council, to be held in Ancyra.<sup>33</sup> This Council of Ancyra 325, however, never took place. In its stead was the Council of Nicaea.

### THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA

At Nicaea, Eustathius was a crucial figure in Alexander's anti-Arian alliance and, although there is little evidence that Eustathius was the source for the Nicene Formula's key theological terms, he was evidently very happy to support them. However, from Eustathius' point of view, the Council of Nicaea failed, and this was Constantine's fault; its intention had been to exclude the pro-Arians, but Constantine had hijacked the Council and pressed for compromise.

Sara Parvis identifies a Eustathian fragment as containing a description of Nicaea. The fragment in question is from Eustathius' *In Proverbia* 8.22 and is preserved in Theodoret's *Historia Ecclesiastica* [D79]. It is, unfortunately, extremely ambiguous, and Hanson has read it as referring to anti-Nicene intrigue several years after Nicaea. Here is the Greek text:

[Ἦ]ς δὲ ἐζητεῖτο τῆς πίστεως ὁ τρόπος, ἐναργῆς μὲν ἔλεγχος τὸ γράμμα τῆς Εὐσεβίου προῦβάλλετο βλασφημίας. Ἐπὶ πάντων δὲ ἀναγνωσθέν, αὐτίκα συμφορὰν μὲν ἀσάθμητον τῆς ἐκτροπῆς ἔνεκα τοῖς αὐτηκόοις προῦξένοι, αἰσχύνῃ δ' ἀνήκεστον τῷ γράψαντι παρέιχεν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ ἐργαστήριον τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Εὐσέβιον σαφῶς ἔάλω, τοῦ παρανόμου γράμματος διαρραγέντος ὑπ' ὄψει πάντων, ὁμοῦ τινὲς ἐκ συσκευῆς, τούνομα προβαλλόμενοι τῆς εἰρήνης, κατεσίγασαν μὲν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἄριστα λέγειν εἰωθότας. Οἱ δ' Ἀρειομανῖται, δείσαντες μὴ πῃ ἄρα τοσαύτης ἐν ταυτῷ συνόδου συγκεκροτημένης ἐξοστρακισθεῖεν, ἀναθεματίζουσι μὲν προπηδήσαντες τὸ ἀπηγορευμένον δόγμα, συμφώνοις γράμμασιν ὑπογράφαντες αὐτοχειρί, τῶν δὲ προεδριῶν διὰ πλείστης ὄσης περιδρομῆς κρατήσαντες, δέον αὐτοὺς ὑπόπτωσι λαμβάνειν, τότε μὲν λεληθότως, τότε δὲ προφανῶς τὰς ἀποψηφισθείσας πρεσβεύουσι δόξας, διαφόροις ἐπιβουλεύοντες

<sup>32</sup> Karl-Heinz Uthemann, 'Eustathios von Antiochien wider den seelenlosen Christus der Arianer. Zu neu entdeckten Fragmenten eines Traktats des Eustathios', *ZAC*, 10, no. 3 (2007), 472–521, see esp. pp. 479, 493, doi: 10.1515/ZAC.2006.036.

<sup>33</sup> On the original intention of holding the Council in Ancyra, see Parvis, *Marcellus*, p. 50.

τοῖς ἐλέγχοις. Βουλόμενοι δὲ δὴ παγιῶσαι τὰ ζιζανιώδη φυτουργήματα, δεδοίκασι τοὺς ἐπιγνώμονας, ἐκκλίνουσι τοὺς ἐφόρους, καὶ ταύτη τοὺς τῆς εὐσεβείας κήρυκας ἐκπολεμοῦσιν.<sup>34</sup>

I translate this passage as follows, though this is, we shall see, only one of several possible renderings:

As the manner of the faith was sought, the writing, a manifest proof of Eusebius' blasphemy, was brought forward. And, when it had been read aloud to everyone, immediately it gave ever-growing grief to those who had heard it because of its heresy, and it inflicted irredeemable shame on the writer. After the gang of those around Eusebius was clearly convicted, the heretical writing having been torn asunder before everyone's eyes, some men from the plot, putting forward the name of peace, silenced those who used to speak best. But those stirring up war around Arius feared lest they should be banished, given that so great a council had come together. On one hand, they rush forward to anathematize the condemned doctrine, subscribing with their own hands to a common written statement. On the other, once they had held onto their seats through the greatest possible deviousness, when they should have fallen, sometimes covertly and sometimes openly, they are ambassadors for the rejected opinions, plotting against diverse refutations of them. And, being determined to establish the tares they have planted, they fear the learned, pervert the authorities and in this way attack the preachers of godliness.

Hanson argues that Eustathius wrote this after the start of the 'Arian purge' but whilst he was still in his see. This reading relies on rendering the phrase *προεδριῶν . . . κρατήσαντες* as 'now that they have *gained control* of the *leading position*'.<sup>35</sup> Sara Parvis, however, reads it as referring back to Nicaea: 'having held onto their seats'. She sees this as evidence that Eustathius was disappointed with the outcome of Nicaea.<sup>36</sup>

Parvis' reading of this fragment is more probable than Hanson's, though a great number of phrases in the fragment could plausibly be rendered in very different ways. Although Hanson's translation of *κρατέω* as 'to gain control' is perfectly plausible, *κρατέω* can also mean 'hold onto' in the sense of 'retain'. Whilst *προεδρία* can refer to a privileged position, it can also refer to a leading ecclesiastical office. Given that the context in this fragment is an ecclesiastical council, the latter does seem somewhat more likely. It is therefore equally possible to translate the phrase as Parvis does.<sup>37</sup> That Eustathius was less than

<sup>34</sup> D79:6–24.      <sup>35</sup> Hanson, 'Fate', pp. 171–4.

<sup>36</sup> Parvis, *Marcellus*, pp. 81–2.

<sup>37</sup> Parvis, *Marcellus*, p. 82. It would also be possible to translate the phrase as 'having held onto the leading position', which would suggest an even greater degree of frustration with Nicaea than Parvis argues for. However, given that Arius was exiled at Nicaea and Eusebius of Nicomedia shortly afterwards, and Eusebius of Caesarea was, at least, forced to sign up to Nicaea, this is not as plausible. Timothy Barnes opts for the translation 'having gained their position as bishops' whilst noting as possible the rendering which Parvis was later to choose in

happy about Constantine's new role in the church at the time of writing D79 is further implied by the claim that his opponents ἐκκλίνουσι τοὺς ἐφόρους. Timothy Barnes renders this phrase 'they corrupt the secular rulers', arguing that ἐκκλίνουσι cannot plausibly mean 'to avoid'.<sup>38</sup> This seems to me most probably correct; otherwise, the text suggests that the secular rulers are trying to get the bishops, and failing, and it is not clear how this could be the case. I also follow this reading in part because I believe that Eustathius' deposition must be seen as a trigger for Constantine's change of mind, rather than a consequence of it, as I argue shortly.

Furthermore, Eustathius elsewhere expresses frustration at what he perceives as his opponents' duplicity in signing up to Nicaea and then teaching against its theology: in *Ariomanitas*, he writes that '[i]f [they say that the Word] . . . is susceptible to passions, they anathematize themselves, because they have denied his immutability in writing, in public and also in private, after having agreed to it in the assembly'.<sup>39</sup> In this passage, Eustathius seems to have the impression that Nicaea failed to bring the pro-Arians in line, very much cohering with a sense that they kept hold of their seats when they should have lost them. The evidence suggests that Eustathius was frustrated with the pro-Arians' continued place in the church, and that he blamed the attempt to compromise at Nicaea for this.

Eustathius' contribution to the formulation of the Nicene Creed is uncertain, but there is no good evidence that he suggested the key terms. Hanson argues that Eustathius was responsible for the inclusion of the term ὁμοούσιος in the creed, and that he pressured the reluctant Alexander on this point.<sup>40</sup> Parvis notes the absence of the term ὁμοούσιος in the creed produced at the Council of Antioch, and argues that this undermines Hanson's suggestion.<sup>41</sup> It remains possible that Eustathius conceived of the usefulness of the term ὁμοούσιος between Antioch and Nicaea. However, there is no mention of it in his anti-Arian writings, which would be surprising if he were its champion, particularly because he *does* refer to his opponents' failure to adhere to Nicaea.<sup>42</sup> It is therefore unlikely that ὁμοούσιος was Eustathius' idea.

his article, 'Emperor and Bishops: A.D. 324–344: Some Problems', *American Journal of Ancient History* 3 (1978), 53–75 reprinted in *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire* (London: Variorum, 1984), Paper XVIII, p. 58.

<sup>38</sup> Barnes, 'Emperor and Bishops', p. 58, text and note 40. <sup>39</sup> D6:3–5 [*Ariomanitas*].

<sup>40</sup> Hanson, *The Search*, pp. 171–2. <sup>41</sup> Parvis, *Marcellus*, p. 80.

<sup>42</sup> D6:3–5 [*Ariomanitas*]. Notoriously, ὁμοούσιος is not mentioned in the extant sources between the Council of Nicaea and Athanasius' writing of the *Orationes Contra Arianos* (see *C. Ar.*, I.3.9).

## EUSTATHIUS' DEPOSITION

Eustathius was one of the bishops deposed from his see when Constantine came to favour the pro-Arian faction.<sup>43</sup> The last sixty years have seen significant discussion of Eustathius' deposition. Estimates of the date range from 326 to 331.<sup>44</sup> Pro-Arian conspiracies, Eustathius' involvement in sex scandals, his political or social ineptitude, and his apparent Sabellianism all appear, in various combinations, as reasons for his deposition in the ancient literature. I am going to argue that Eustathius was deposed in 327 as a consequence of the machinations of Eusebius of Caesarea and his allies, who took advantage of his failure to properly receive the Empress Helena on her journey east. It is first necessary to survey recent discussions.

**Eustathius' Deposition: the Scholarship and Evidence**

The discussions about Eustathius' accession have tended to feed into discussions about his deposition, largely because of the close interrelation of the evidence.

*Asclepas of Gaza and the Evidence of Serdica*

A central consideration in dating Eustathius' deposition is the deposition of Asclepas of Gaza, Eustathius' ally. The conciliar letter of the Eastern Council of Serdica declares that Asclepas was deposed seventeen years beforehand.<sup>45</sup> The Western Council of Serdica says that he was deposed at Antioch '*praesentibus adversariis et Eusebio ex Caesarea*'.<sup>46</sup> It is widely, and correctly, thought that Asclepas would not have been deposed at Antioch under Eustathius, and that therefore, seventeen years prior to Serdica is the latest possible date for Eustathius' deposition. Henry Chadwick assumed that this phrase implied Eusebius' presidency at the synod that deposed Asclepas, whilst Hanson noted that it could refer simply to Eusebius' presence there.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>43</sup> See Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.*, 1.4.

<sup>44</sup> Henry Chadwick, 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS*, old system 49, (1948), 27–35, doi: 10.1093/jts/os-XLIX.193–194.27, and Hanson, *The Search*, p. 210, respectively.

<sup>45</sup> Hilary, *Fragmenta Historica*, Series A, IV 1, 11, edited by Alfred Feder (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1916), p. 56, lines 19–20.

<sup>46</sup> Hilary, *Fragmenta Historica*, Series B, II 1.6, edited by Feder, p. 118, lines 3–5.

<sup>47</sup> Chadwick, 'Fall', p. 31, Hanson, 'The Fate of Eustathius of Antioch', *ZKG*, 95 (1984), 171–9, p. 176. Schwartz assumes that Eusebius took a leading role, but regards it as uncertain that he was the chief presiding figure. He argues, however, that the See of Antioch must at this time have been vacant in his 'Geschichte des Athanasius: Von Nicaea bis zu Konstantins Tod', pp. 395–6 = GS, III, p. 224.

Burgess allows Hanson's point, but thinks that the phrase probably did imply presidency.<sup>48</sup>

Socrates' 347 used to be the most reliable date for Serdica, so Eustathius' deposition was placed in 330–331.<sup>49</sup> However, since the discovery of the Festal Index in 1848, it has become clear that the Council of Serdica took place in either 342 or 343.<sup>50</sup> Counting inclusively, this places Eustathius' deposition at the latest between 326 and 327. Chadwick's 326 date for Eustathius' deposition is partly dependent on his dating Serdica to 342. Hanson conversely argued that Asclepas may have been deposed on non-theological grounds and, therefore, under Eustathius.<sup>51</sup> Thus, he placed Eustathius' deposition later, initially in 328–329 and then in 330–331. Burgess, arguing for 328, suggests that those at Serdica miscounted, but Parvis argues that this is unlikely, especially as they were probably using a fifteen-year cycle.<sup>52</sup>

Chadwick and Timothy Barnes have both argued that Eustathius and Asclepas were deposed simultaneously.<sup>53</sup> Burgess conversely suggests that there were two separate councils at Antioch quite close together, and that the first deposed Eustathius and the second deposed Asclepas.<sup>54</sup>

### *Eusebius of Caesarea's Chronici Canones*

Several documents potentially connected to Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronici Canones* make references that point to 328 as the date of Eustathius' deposition. Burgess correspondingly favours 328, largely because of a particular understanding of the interrelation and reliability of these documents.

First, the accession of Eulalius is entered in the *Chronicon miscellaneum ad annum Domini 724 pertinens* (*Chron. 724*) in the Syriac epitome of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronici Canones*. Eusebius of Caesarea, Philostorgius, and Theodoret, writing that Paulinus of Tyre succeeded Eustathius and was himself succeeded by Eulalius, give Paulinus a six-month episcopate. In *Chron. 724*, Eulalius' accession is the first entry after Athanasius' 328 ordination as bishop and the second before the Dedication of Constantinople, May 330.<sup>55</sup> Burgess argues that this suggests that it occurred between the two, allowing for another, interceding event, and therefore probably during 328 or possibly 329. Jerome's Latin translation and continuation of *Chronici Canones* says that Eustathius was deposed in the year 22–23 'Constantine', which would, again, be 328–329.

<sup>48</sup> Richard Burgess, 'The Date of the Deposition of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS*, 51, no. 1 (2000), 150–60, p. 157, doi: 10.1093/jts/51.1.150.

<sup>49</sup> Socrates, *H.E.*, 2.19.

<sup>50</sup> Parvis examines the evidence extensively, and argues for 343, in her *Marcellus*, pp. 210–17.

<sup>51</sup> Hanson, 'Fate', pp. 176–7. <sup>52</sup> Burgess, 'Date', p. 159, Parvis, *Marcellus*, p. 102.

<sup>53</sup> Barnes, 'Emperor and Bishops', p. 60, Chadwick, 'Fall', p. 35.

<sup>54</sup> Burgess, 'Date', p. 158. <sup>55</sup> Burgess, 'Date', p. 154.