

**UNIVERSITY „LUCIAN BLAGA” - SIBIU  
FACULTY OF ORTHODOX THEOLOGY**

**EUNOMIUS AND THE CAPPADOCIANS. THE  
POLITICAL-THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT AND  
DOCTRINAL PRINCIPLES**

**COORDINATION:  
REV. Ph. D. PROF: NICOLAE CHIFĂR**

**CANDIDATE:  
COȘOREAN AXENTE-COSMIN**

**2011**

# CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	6
<b>PART I: THE CHRISTIAN EMPIRE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY IV – THE HISTORICAL-POLITICAL AND DOCTRINAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>CHAPTER I: The “conversion” of Emperor Constantine and the inauguration of christian imperial theocracy.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>CHAPTER II: Heresy versus orthodoxy in the fourth century - doctrinal options and political implications.....</b>	<b>30</b>
II. 1. Terminology and methodological principles.....	30
II. 2. Theological creeds issued following and around theology of Council of Nicaea and the problem of symbols of faith as expressions of official imperial orthodoxy.....	46
II. 2. 1. The arian challenge.....	46
II. 2. 2. The theology of Council of Nicaea and its consequences.....	51
II. 2. 2. 1. The Creed of Nicaea as standard of doctrinal orthodoxy.....	51
II. 2. 2. 2. Theological formulas alternative to the creed of Nicaea and its theology.....	61
II. 3. The position of Emperor Constantine the Great and his successors towards the establishment of doctrinal orthodoxy.....	71
II. 3. 1. <i>From the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325) until the death of Emperor Constantine the Great.....</i>	<i>71</i>
II. 3. 2. <i>Constantine's successors attitude towards christian doctrine.....</i>	<i>74</i>
II. 3. 2. 1. Constantius II and the rise of homoeans.....	74

II. 3. 2. 2. Julian the Apostate - resurgence of paganism and doctrinal relativism.....	76
II. 3. 2. 3. Jovian and Valens - tolerance and homoian excess.....	78
II. 3. 2. 4. Theodosius the Great and the triumph of nicene orthodoxy.....	81
<b>PART II: THE CONTROVERSY EUNOMIUS – CAPPADOCIANS.....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>CHAPTER I: THE EMERGENCE AND THE EVOLUTION OF NEOARIAN DOCTRINAL MOVEMENT.....</b>	<b>93</b>
I. 1. Aetie and the beginning of neoarianism.....	93
I. 2. The formation and consolidation of neoarian party.....	106
<b>CHAPTER II: EUNOMIUS AND HIS DOCTRINAL POSITION.....</b>	<b>127</b>
II. 1. Excursus: Eunomius – historical-theological personage and his ascension.....	127
II. 2. Eunomius <i>Apology</i> : the context of composition and theological significance.....	133
II. 3. Eunomius between glory and decline.....	136
II. 4. Eunomius methodology: theologia ancilla philosophiae (attempt to typologise the heresy).....	162
II. 5. Eunomian gnoseology: the possibility of full and complete knowledge of God being.....	176
II. 6. Eunomius vision about the Persons of the Holy Trinity and the relations between them: Father, Son, Holy Spirit.....	187
II. 7. The incarnation of Logos – Eunomius christology.....	191
II. 8. The christian life.....	195

<b>CHAPTER III: THE FORMULATION OF TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY OF THE CAPPADOCIAN FATHERS ON CONTROVERSY WITH EUNOMIUS.....</b>	<b>198</b>
III. 1. The dispute of St. Basil the Great with Eunomius - theological context and doctrinal principles.....	198
III. 1. 1. St. Basil of Caesarea and the defending of nicene theology.....	198
III. 1. 2. St. Basil's early theology: from homoiousianism to neonicene theology.....	200
III. 1. 3. Against Eunomius.....	204
III. 1. 3. 1. Theological epistemology of St. Basil the Great.....	206
III. 1. 3. 2. Conceptual explanation of orthodox trinitarian doctrine.....	216
III. 2. St. Gregory of Nazianzus: <i>Theological Discourses</i> .....	223
III. 3. St. Gregory of Nyssa and its role in supporting the Nicene cause: <i>Contra Eunomium</i> – opus magnum of eastern trinitarian theology.....	242
III. 3. 1. The background and the argument of composition of the work <i>Contra Eunomium</i> .....	242
III. 3. 2. The defence of his brother, St. Basil of Caesarea.....	248
III. 3. 3. Tradition and doctrinal development in <i>Contra Eunomium</i> .....	250
<b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>281</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>286</b>
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE.....</b>	<b>349</b>
<b>DECLARATION.....</b>	<b>350</b>

**EUNOMIUS AND THE CAPPADOCIANS. THE  
POLITICAL-THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT AND DOCTRINAL  
PRINCIPLES  
(Summary)**

Fourth century of the Christian era is one of the most interesting periods of human history as a whole. In this century started a new civilization for humanity. Following the freedom of expression given to christians by Emperor Constantine the Great, the new religion, founded and revealed by the Son of God Himself, began to make its mark in a human society that accepted it. Christianity entered in legality, but this new situation also had his costs and the Church, as the official institution of Christianity, had to pay these costs. First, now was inaugurated the practice of involvement of earthly political power in church life. If until the fourth century the earthly existence of Church was constantly threatened by persecution ordered by Roman emperors against Christians, since that time political power will interfere in the affairs of the Church in order to lead them, to adapt the church and use it to performance targets that were not enough of a spiritual nature. Of this mismatch between the desires of the Church and the plans of secular leaders were resulted in a series of crises. In order to solve these crises the Church passed through the inner turmoil and unrest for several centuries.

On the other hand, the christian fourth-century represented also an general engagement of the masses in discussing issues of christian doctrine. As St. Gregory of Nyssa ironic remark, the divinity of Jesus Christ became the major topic of discussion not only for those actually engaged with theology, but also for those in the markets, for those on the streets, and even for simple tradesmen, each of them embracing the doctrinal version which he understands better. The doctrinal uncertainty was doubled by a

general lack of concern of the bishops to resolve genuine problems for the Church. Fourth century was one of strong characters who were more concerned with interpersonal disputes and not with good or general interest of the Church.

I dare to say that Christian fourth century is one of the most studied periods in the history of the Christian Church. Probably an explanation for this interest are the significant changes occurring in society at the time. Historical and theological literature on this period is rich and in continuous process of enrichment. In particular the study of arianism as a general theological movement has sparked particular interest among researchers, especially in the last half century. Thus we can say that they have outlined two major ways of approaching this issue: one in which Arianism is seen in principle as a paradigmatic heretical formula and the whole history of his doctrine, with all the moments and their associated characters, was written in this light; and recent trends, trying an absolution of those responsible for creating and promoting Arianism, considering that they were honest in their intentions, but the results of their work were not those expected.

In the works composed on the theme of arianism as general doctrinal phenomenon and theological disputes that it generated we can identify information or even separate chapters and subchapters concerning neoarian or anomean party.<sup>1</sup> But besides these general approaches, theological research dedicated studies to analyzing neoarian doctrinal movement and the reaction of the representatives of nicene theology in front of this theological movement. The first analysis in this direction were

---

<sup>1</sup> Exemplary in this respect and values by the density and systematization of information are the following works: JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN, *Arians of the fourth Century*, fifth edition, Burns & Oates, London, Catholic Publication Society Co., New York, 1871 (prima ediție a apărut în anul 1833); JOSEPH VON HEFELE, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, trad. par Dom. H. Leclercq, tome I, deuxième partie, Letouzey et Ane, Paris, 1907; MANLIO SIMONETTI, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum", Roma, 1975; R. P. C. HANSON, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy, 318–381*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1988.

published by Fr. Diekamp<sup>2</sup>, Martin Albertz<sup>3</sup>, E. Vandenbussche<sup>4</sup>, Jean Danielou<sup>5</sup>. The objective of these studies was the setting the historical context of disputes Eunomius-Cappadocians and to identify influences of Greek philosophy (Aristotelian and Platonic) on theology promoted by Eunomius.

Eighth decade of the twentieth century marked the beginning of a wide series of writings and doctrinal analysis of the theological construction advanced by Eunomius and the Cappadocian Fathers, taken in direct interaction in which they were articulated. E. Cavalcanti published a synthesis-volume about literary work of Eunomius and its implications.<sup>6</sup> On the occasion of the commemoration of the 1600 from Basil's death were published two massive volumes, several studies including the analysis of life, work and doctrine of this great Father of the Church. These were papers from a symposium on St. Basil the Great.<sup>7</sup> Therein we find a critical statement of the content of work *Against Eunomius*.<sup>8</sup>

A similar commemorative approach can be found in Romanian theology<sup>9</sup>, a significant contribution to our theme is obviously a study of the father Dumitru Stăniloae.<sup>10</sup> Also in 1979, was edited and written by

---

<sup>2</sup> Fr. DIEKAMP, "Literargeschichtliches zu der Eunomianischen Kontroverse", în *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 18 (1909), p. 1-13.

<sup>3</sup> MARTIN ALBERTZ, *Untersuchungen über die Schriften des Eunomius*, Wittenberg, 1908.

<sup>4</sup> E. VANDENBUSSCHE, S. J., "La part de la dialectique dans la theologie d'Eunomius le technologue", în *RHE* 40 (1944-1945), p. 47-72.

<sup>5</sup> JEAN DANIELOU, „Eunome l'arien et l'exégèse néo-platonicienne du Cratyle”, *REG* 69 (1956), p. 412-432.

<sup>6</sup> ELENA CAVALCANTI, *Studi eunomiani*, Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma, 1976.

<sup>7</sup> PAUL JONATHAN FEDWICK (editor), *Basil of Caesarea. Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundredth Symposium*, Part One: *Vita, Opera, Doctrina*; part two: *The Tradition*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, 1981, p. XLIV, 436 și VII, 437-715.

<sup>8</sup> MILTON V. ANASTOS, "Basil's *Katà Eūνομίου*, A Critical Analysis", în PAUL JONATHAN FEDWICK (editor), *Basil of Caesarea. Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundredth Symposium*, Part One: *Vita, Opera, Doctrina*; part two: *The Tradition*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, 1981, p. 67-136.

<sup>9</sup> *Sfântul Vasile cel Mare. Închinare la 1600 de ani de la săvârșirea sa*, EIBMBOR, București, 1980.

<sup>10</sup> DUMITRU STĂNILOAE, "Învățătura despre Sfânta Treime în scrierea Sfântului Vasile, "Contra lui Eunomie"", în volumul *Sfântul Vasile cel Mare. Închinare la 1600 de ani de la săvârșirea sa*, EIBMBOR, București, 1980, p. 51-69.

Thomas A. Kopecek a history of neoarianis, which examines in detail the way of this movement from its origin to the end.<sup>11</sup> Otherwise this work has entered in the canon classic of study of the fourth century theological controversies. In the period 1982-1983 was published a bilingual critical edition (Greek-French text) of St. Basil's work, *Against Eunomius*<sup>12</sup>, and at the end of the second volume was printed in the same format *Eunomius Apology*.<sup>13</sup> Both works were preceded by consistent and documented literary and theological introduction. In 1987, Richard Paul Vaggione, a passionate researcher of Eunomius life and theology, published a critical edition (Greek-English text) of his extant works, accompanied by remarkable introduction and relevant analysis.<sup>14</sup> We can observe about this edition the absence of english translation of the fragments preserved from *Apologia Apologiae*, which are presented only in a summary of the content. This lack will be supplied somewhat a few years later by Bernard Pottier. He published the french translation of the fragments of *Eunomius Apologia Apologiae* as an annex to his study on St. Gregory of Nyssa conception about God and Jesus Christ.<sup>15</sup> The same Richard Paul Vaggione wil crown his research with a detailed monography about *Eunomius of Cyzicus*.<sup>16</sup> He suggest a reading of the life and work of *Eunomius of Cyzicus* in terms of all political, cultural, economic, social and religious factors which shaped the fourth century society, beyond the traditional simplifying cliché of demarcation between heretics and orthodox. In the last twenty years were

---

<sup>11</sup> THOMAS A. KOPECEK, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, volumes I-II, Published by The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.

<sup>12</sup> BASILE DE CESAREE, *Contre Eunome*, traduction et notes de Bernard Sesboue, tome I [SC 299], Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1982, p. 140-269 și tome II [SC 305], Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1983, p. 10-175.

<sup>13</sup> EUNOME, *Apologie*, traduction par Bernard Sesboue în volumul BASILE DE CESAREE, *Contre Eunome*, tome II [SC 305], Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1983, 234-299.

<sup>14</sup> EUNOMIUS, *The Extant Works*, text and translation by Richard Paul Vaggione, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987.

<sup>15</sup> BERNARD POTTIER, *Dieu et le Christ selon Gregoire de Nysse. Etude systematique du "Contre Eunome" avec traduction inedite des extraits d'Eunome*, Culture et Verite, Bruxelles, 1994.

<sup>16</sup> RICHARD PAUL VAGGIONE, O.H.C, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford University Press, 2000.

published several valuable monographs dedicated to personality and theology of St. Basil the Great, in which are fully reflected many aspects of eunomian controversy.<sup>17</sup> An important contribution is the recent works dealing with the theme and theology of Council of Nicaea and its reception in the next decades, works in which we find distinct chapters that analyze the theology of the Cappadocian Fathers in dispute with Eunomius.<sup>18</sup>

Also we consider extremely important the work of the two thematic symposiums dedicated to St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius I and II*, published in volume shortly after their deployment.<sup>19</sup> In addition to the english translation of gregorian texts, in these volumes we can find substantial literary, philosophical and theological analysis, wich help us to approach the depth of St. Gregory thought. In this context we note the start of publishing a critical edition of St. Gregory of Nyssa *Contra Eunomium* in the collection *Sources Chretiennes*.<sup>20</sup> The first book was published in Romanian, with parallel Greek text<sup>21</sup>, prefaced by an excellent introductory

---

<sup>17</sup> PHILIP ROUSSEAU, *Basil of Caesarea*, University of California Press, Berkley, Los Angeles, London, 1994; VOLKER HENNING DRECOLL, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea. Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 66, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1996; BERNARD SESBOÛE, *Saint Basile et la Trinité. Un acte théologique au IVe siècle. Le rôle de Basile de Césarée dans l'élaboration de la doctrine et du langage trinitaires*, Desclée, Paris, 1998; STEPHEN M. HILDEBRAND, *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth*, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, DC, 2007; ANDREW RADDE-GALLWITZ, *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity*, Oxford University Press, 2009.

<sup>18</sup> LEWIS AYRES, *Nicaea and Its Legacy. An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*, Oxford University Press, 2004 și JOHN BEHR, *The Formation of Christian Theology*, volume 2, *The Nicene Faith*, part two, *One of the Holy Trinity*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, New York, 2004.

<sup>19</sup> LUCAS F. MATEO-SECO y JUAN L. BASTERO (eds.), *El „Contra Eunomium I” en la produccion literaria de Gregorio de Nisa. VI Coloquio Internacional sobre Gregorio de Nisa*, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, 1988 și *Gregory of Nyssa: Contra Eunomium II. An English Version with Supporting Studies. Proceedings of the 10th International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa (Olomouc, September 15–18, 2004)*, edited by LENKA KARFÍKOVÁ, SCOT DOUGLASS AND JOHANNES ZACHHUBER, Brill, Leiden, Boston, 2007.

<sup>20</sup> GREGOIRE DE NYSSE, *Contre Eunome I* (§ 1-146), tome I, text grec W. Jaeger, introduction, traduction et notes par Raymond Winling [SC 521], Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2009, 240 p. și GREGOIRE DE NYSSE, *Contre Eunome I* (§ 147-691), tome II, text grec W. Jaeger, introduction, traduction et notes par Raymond Winling [SC 524], Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2010, 402 p. Unfortunately, during the writing of the paper I had not available this edition and I have not used it in my research.

<sup>21</sup> GRIGORIE DE NYSSA, *Împotriva lui Eunomie*, I, ediție bilingvă, traducere și note de Ovidiu Sferlea, ediție îngrijită de Adrian Muraru, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2010.

study which highlights all resorts dispute Eunomius-St. Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>22</sup>

The intrinsic value of these studies is undeniable, regardless of the direction of research that follows each of them. However most of these works were published in western theological space. In the romanian theological literature was not published until now a thematic presentation of the theological dispute between Eunomius and Cappadocians, considered within its political and theological implications flowing from it. We considered it necessary and useful research of this doctrinal moment in the church history. For this, I tried to capitalize the traditional historical documents and also mostly important modern theological and literary productions on this topic. I consider that the doctrinal debate that has involved the Eunomius and the three Cappadocian Fathers go beyond, in intensity and importance, than the famous cliché Arius-St. Athanasius the Great. Without minimizing the contribution to shaping the christian doctrine of St. Athanasius, I dare to say that were the theological works of the Cappadocian Fathers who imposed trinitarian orthodoxy in eastern ecclesial space. The challenge to engage in this process have been addressed by Eunomius. Mainly these considerations led me in choosing research-theme in the composition of this work.

The work consists of two parts. The first part tries deciphering and interpreting historical and theological-political context of the dispute between Eunomius and Cappadocian. We considered that the mechanisms and levers of this complex doctrinal debate can not be perceived and understood completely outside the environment has generated. The Cappadocian Fathers have not professed an abstract theology, detached

---

<sup>22</sup> MIHAIL NEAMȚU, “Studiu introductiv. Teologie, metafizică și politică în secolul al IV-lea: Sf. Grigorie de Nyssa *versus* Eunomie al Cyzicului”, în GRIGORIE DE NYSSA, *Împotriva lui Eunomie*, I, ediție bilingvă, traducere și note de Ovidiu Sferlea, ediție îngrijită de Adrian Muraru, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2010, p. 19-81.

from the reality of the times they lived and independent from the tradition of the Church as it was set up at the time.

Chapter I of this first part deals with the "conversion" of Emperor Constantine the Great. It is not a summary of this issue and not even a systematic presentation. I watched only highlight those aspects that are involved in the new ideological status of the Christian Roman emperor, who would become, with Constantine, a crucial figure for what will happen in the life of the Christian Church.

Chapter II proposes an evaluation of the doctrinal concepts of heresy and orthodoxy and corresponding realities as they were perceived in most part of the fourth century, until the time of Theodosius the Great. Even if viewed through the prism of historical epilogue, heresy and orthodoxy have meanings and well-defined areas of coverage, complexity and ambiguity of the fourth century doctrinal constitute serious obstacles in the process of clarifying the normative content of the Christian faith. To the uncertainties inherited from previous centuries, now was added the political component. From Constantine the Great, roman emperors considered themselves entitled and even obliged to intervene directly in theological disputes animating the fourth century, believing that in this way they could achieve religious unity of the empire. Lack of theological training and inconsistency of the emperors, associated with lack of scruples and political opportunism of some bishops, led multiplying complications and instability that troubled church doctrine for nearly six decades. It all happened around theology promoted by the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea in 325 with the conceptual formulation of the symbol of faith and concentrated particularly in the term *ὁμοουσίος* (the same substance). Trinitarian doctrine developments articulated in the fourth century were either in the direction of the Nicene theology rejection, either in the opposite direction of acceptance and explicitness of this theological position. I think that in light

of these coordinates should be approached and understood theological confrontation between Eunomie and Cappadocians.

Part two presents the doctrinal patterns configured in theological dispute between the Cappadocian Fathers and the “technolog” Eunomius.

The first chapter is actually a doctrinal history of the movement which gave the neoarian Eunomius. This movement sought a return to theological postulates of the early extreme arianism, then going to exacerbate them in a theological-philosophical pure syllogistic system, which have little to do with the Christian God. The first leader of this movement was Aetius, a native of Antioch, who will form under his careful supervision the younger Eunomius. Eunomius will become the leader of the movement and its chief theologian. The neoarianism managed to impose in the doctrinal landscape of the fourth century, drawing on his side an important and significant number of bishops (of which most important are, of course, those of Alexandria and of Antioch). Also this doctrinal trend became common enemy of the nicene supporters of the same substance of God-Father and God- Son doctrine and of those who tried tempering the nicene theology by advancing the idea of similarity in substance between God-Father and God-Son. However, following the involvement of imperial power in doctrinal disputes and the polemical-theological assault of Cappadocian Fathers, the neoarianism was gradually pushed to the geographical and theological marginalization, and towards the end of the fourth century almost doomed to extinction.

The second chapter meets formally the first half of the work's title and analyzed the doctrinal position of Eunomius, on the basis of his work and his writings. After I sketched the first years of his life, the following subsections focus on analyzing and defining specific aspects of the doctrine Eunomius: Eunomius syllogistic methodology, an improper approach the central mystery of christian faith; eunomian gnoseology, built on

acceptance of some philosophical confusions dangerous for integrity and completeness of the christian faith; Eunomius vision about the Persons of the Holy Trinity and the relations between them: Father, Son, Holy Spirit, which obviously derives from his methodology and gnoseology; incarnation of the Logos, the synthesis of Christological elements scattered Eunomie in his writings; the transformations and deformations in terms of liturgical practice, made by Eunomius as a reflection of his theological vision, that is changing the traditional practice of committed Christian baptism.

Follows a chapter (III) in which is synthesized the theological replica that Cappadocian Fathers gave to Eunomius boldness to subsume the mystery of Christian faith to data and rational tools of ordinary human knowledge. I entitled this chapter “The formulation of trinitarian theology of the Cappadocian Fathers on controversy with Eunomius”. The text aims to highlight the theological principles that the Cappadocian Fathers advanced as response or replica to Eunomius writings. Although in general many of these principles are common to the three Fathersparents, they were articulated and developed in different argumentative contexts. Cappadocian Fathers doctrinal fight against Eunomius is only one, between literary and theological approaches that they have claimed there are obvious ideational even personal links and notes. However we chose to present in separate sections the cappadocian antieunomian doctrinal positions, in order to remark how orthodoxy has preserved the doctrinal integrity exposed to attack of heresy.

The conclusions summarize in a few points "lesson" that teaches us in an indirect way an epic theological unfolded several centuries ago. The actuality of doctrinal principles structured in a historical dispute not disappears and not dilute, it must be rediscovered and applied.

The Cappadocian Fathers have not professed a theology abstract, detached from the reality of the times they lived and independent from tradition of the Church as it was set up at the time. They interacted with full and fruitful philosophical-theological-political environment of their time, they lived in "history" of their time with everything involving this. So the doctrinal content which they have structured and promoted did not remain confined to the teaching of their existence time and valid only in certain limited circumstances, but was established as normative for what is conceptual extension of the Christian faith.

I think that the doctrinal dispute between Eunomius and Cappadocians, reading in its theological and political context, propose us some permanent reflection points regarding the survival of the Church in this world:

1. The relationship between Church and political power should not be addressed and discussed in an exclusive way, either by blaming, either by exaggerated and unjustified appreciation and valuing. Emperor Constantine the Great gesture, regardless of political and personal reasons were behind him, generated a new political-social-religious reality in which the Church as spiritual community and institution interact with the world. Church exists in the world and for the salvation of the world as it is set in different historical epochs. May be irrelevant counterfactual approaches of the direction and the state of Christian doctrine if there had been no revolution of Constantine or the rise of the emperor Theodosius on the roman imperial throne, but I think that highlighting these issues can help us better understand the depth of changes and of the events that took place in the fourth century, beyond the cliché of formal religious freedom offered by Constantine and Theodosius imposing the Nicene faith. The doctrinal elaborations of Cappadocian Fathers in the line of principles expressed at Nicaea could be valued, standardized and fully received because there was

Theodosius the Great, who helped to impose a political legal framework favorable to theological directions proposed by them. Probably full victory of Nicene faith would not have happened without the passionate commitment and creative labor of the Cappadocian Fathers in the fight that they took against Eunomius in order to preserve untouched the Christian faith, but were not as safe if would have had not on the background Theodosius's commitment for nicene faith. Theodosius was a special case and used constructive the short experience of interdependence of church and empire before it, with all its fluctuations, for developing a legislative framework allowing unequivocal affirmation of Christian truth. On this foundation and legal framework was laid the cappadocian doctrinal construction. In light of these elements can be affirmed and promoted a vision of a fertile collaboration between Church and political power, regardless of historical period, but required no triumphalist character and personal calculations of the actors involved.

2. The dispute between Eunomius and Cappadocian Fathers was in essence a conflict between two completely different views about the fundamental data of the Christian faith. Eunomius not started his activity in the position of enemy of truth, but his intention was sincere search, consideration and full understanding of this truth. The circumstances, the factors and the ways which have resulted in the wrong direction have been discussed throughout the paper. But what is not explicitly recorded by documents is the general spiritual foundation behind its search and his views. Searching and finding the truth beyond the reality of a genuine religious experience is impossible. Eunomius tried to reach the truth by professing an excessive rational exercise and subsumed the fundamental data of Christian faith to it. He did not understand that true theology springs from a genuine religious experience and is premise and an absolute condition of this experience. If in the search and expression of theological

truth we not experts existential the content of the Christian faith, then we are in the wrong direction and our whole approach is compromised, regardless of intellectual resources we have available and to invest in this. A basic principle and common sense tells us that orthodoxy requires orthopraxy or right living and orthopraxy supposed orthodoxy or right faith. In other words between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* should be an indisputable and without blemish correspondence. This axiom has not been fully understood by Eunomius, and the results were obvious. Cappadocian Fathers instead have focused and built their ecclesial destiny around this principle. Their doctrinal productions have been rooted in and supplied from the soil of mystical contemplation and liturgical rhythm of the Church. Conceptual extension of the faith and christian living that imbue their souls is an obvious testimony of naturalness with which they approached this issue. So they could impose and conceptually formulate the “Unknown”. In this sense, the lesson that Cappadocian Fathers offer us is that theology should not be conceived and planned as an intellectualist approach, with pronounced excessively rationalistic and exclusive, but as a result of reflection on the world and society problems and needs that it has at that time. Cappadocian Fathers soteriological dimension of theology is thus extremely relevant. Theology should not be a mental enterprise, rationalist and free, but an approach that we maintain and operate it before God and for God, an openness to knowledge of God as a way to gain salvation. Theology should not be considered an abstract science, but must be directly related to life, to feed on life and at the same time to determine the life.

3. From the foregoing considerations result the exceptional value of doctrinal intuitions of the Cappadocian Fathers. Going beyond that imposed their final victory in the dispute with Eunomius, Cappadocian theological principles made further career in development of doctrinal

issues in church history. We recognize to Cappadocian Fathers the complete and definitive conceptual formulation of trinitarian mystery of christian faith (at least in the Eastern tradition), but also elements of their achievements have been taken in all subsequent trinitarian elaborations and extended and applied in explaining other aspects of corpus of christian doctrine (such as Christology or knowledge of God). We can remember, for example, christological definition from Chalcedon, with the specific revolutionary terminology specific; the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, of St. Maximus the Confessor, St. John of Damascus or St. Gregory Palamas, in order understand the value-paradigm and prolific character of cappadocian writings. Most literary works of the Cappadocian Fathers theological bears the mark of doctrinal dispute with Eunomius and are made in the atmosphere created by this confrontation. Only by discussing and analyzing current and existential problems of the time can reach a positive resolution of their own. It is an impulse regarding the task of theology in its functioning.

4. Heresies of the first centuries of Christian church history were not "consumed" with their official condemnation by the Orthodox ecumenical councils and doctrinal dogmatization. Over time many of these doctrines have reappeared, most often under the guise of authentic christian faith and false pretext to return to the original (these claims belong to all heretics of christian Antiquity). Clearly, the most incisive, aggressive and complete restatement of the principles of (neo)arian theology is represented by the group of "Jehovah's Witnesses." Also elements of neoarian doctrinal construction can be identified in theological conceptions of other neoprotestant groups. We can mention the cultural patterns of the time, imbued with the scourge of secularism, atheism, deism and religious science that systematically reduces the significance and importance for humanity of Jesus Christ Person, denying either His existence (as the Son

of God), either His historical life (the Incarnation). Everything is made on behalf of omniscient and all-encompassing reason. In this context, the actuality and the value of theology formulated by the Cappadocian Fathers in dispute with Eunomie have not need any argument. The paths set by them on the approach and understanding of the mysteries of christian faith are tools that we can value in the tumultuous cultural landscape of our times in order to preserve and enforce the true faith.