

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01861451 1



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



THE INFLUENCE OF PLATO
ON SAINT BASIL

BY

THEODORE LESLIE SHEAR

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BALTIMORE
J. H. FURST COMPANY

1906



NOV 19 1943

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1- 4
1. Influence of Plato on the Fathers.....	1- 3
2. Life of Saint Basil.....	3- 4
II. INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON BASIL IN THEOLOGY AND ETHICS.....	5-21
1. Existence, name and attributes of God.....	5- 7
2. Nature of Man.....	7- 8
3. Superiority of soul over body.....	9-11
4. Immortality of the soul.....	11-12
5. Virtues and vices.....	12-21
6. Scheme of the four virtues.....	18
III. INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON BASIL IN PHILOSOPHY.....	21-37
1. Voluntary and involuntary action.....	21-22
2. Relation of the Hexameron to Plato's Timaeus.....	23-37
a. Existence of creator.....	24
b. Creation of universe.....	25
c. Theory of elements.....	26-28
d. Nature and form of universe.....	28-31
e. Beginning of time.....	31-32
f. Formation of creatures, man, beast, etc.....	33
IV. INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON BASIL IN LANGUAGE.....	37-58
1. Direct quotation.....	37-39
2. Comparison and metaphor.....	39-50
3. Grammatical statements.....	50-51
4. Literary allusions.....	51-55
5. Miscellaneous.....	56-58
V. CONCLUSION.....	59-60

THE INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON SAINT BASIL.

INTRODUCTION.

THE INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON THE CHURCH FATHERS.

The relation of Plato to the Church Fathers is a subject that has received considerable attention in special treatises as well as in general works. A brief survey of some of the results obtained will be given to show how widespread this influence was.

Justin Martyr (c. 100–165 A. D.), the earliest apologist whose works have been preserved even in part, was a Platonist before he was a Christian and Platonic quotations abound in his works. Huber, however, points out, *Die Philosophie der Kirchenväter*, p. 14, the difficulty of harmonizing Justin's pro-Platonic and anti-Platonic views. In *Apol.*, II, 13 (Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, VI, p. 465, B. 11) he states that the teachings of Plato are not foreign to Christ, and then again in many places we find that he attacks the heathen philosophers, Plato, Aristotle, etc.; see *Cohor. ad Graecos*, chap. 5 ff., and declares Plato's inconsistencies in chap 7.¹ But whether as an advocate or an opponent of Plato's doctrines he shows a thorough knowledge of his works, quoting from the Republic, Timaeus, Meno and Phaedrus.

Similar views of the importance of Plato were likewise held by Athenagoras, a contemporary of Justin, and a man who, like Justin, was trained in the Greek philosophy, see Huber, *op. cit.*, p. 24, and Ackermann, *Das Christliche im Plato und in der platonischen Philosophie*, p. 3.

The theological nature of the work of Irenaeus (c. 130–202 A. D.) that has been preserved to us, *Contra Haereses*, does

¹See attack on Justin's authorship of this work by A. Puech in *Mélanges Henri Weil*, 1898, pp. 395–406.

not offer very much opportunity for reference to Plato, but even in Irenaeus two quotations from Plato are cited, from the *Laws* and the *Timaeus*. These quotations are in the same section, *Migne*, VII, 3, 25, 5, and are cited by Irenaeus in praise and defence of Plato.

Tertullian (c. 150–220 A. D.) quotes Plato frequently but condemns him. He says that Plato has become the source of all heresies, that the philosopher serves only for his own glory and, therefore, between him and the Christian a great difference exists.¹

Clement of Alexandria (150–215 A. D.) and his pupil Origen (185–254 A. D.) were both great admirers of Plato. Both quote Plato frequently, though Clement very much more frequently than Origen, and both emphasize the Christian element in his works in their attempt to harmonize Platonism and Christianity.²

Passing over others we may mention further Hippolytus who flourished early in the third century, and who wrote a work against Plato, and Arnobius, c. 200 A. D., who calls Plato the “sublime head and pillar of philosophy,” *Adv. Gent.*, I, 8, and quotes him several times.

We come next to the fourth century and to two authors, contemporaries of St. Basil, whose relation to Plato has been discussed in special dissertations. Gregory of Nyssa, Basil’s brother, is shown to be dependent on Plato for many of his statements on the immortality of the soul by A. M. Akulas, *ἡ περὶ ἀθανασίας τῆς ψυχῆς δόξα τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐν συγκρίσει πρὸς τὴν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Νύσσης*, Athens, 1888.

The second author is Julian, the fellow-student of Basil, and afterwards the Emperor Julian. Prof. Gildersleeve in his essay on the Emperor Julian, *Essays and Studies*, p. 373, remarks that “his prodigious memory seems to have held in solution all Plato.” And further, W. C. France in a dissertation entitled, “The Emperor Julian’s relation to the new sophistic and neo-Platonism, with a study of his style,” Chicago, 1896, makes the statement, p. 71, that Plato is Julian’s favorite prose author. In

¹ See Huber, p. 106, and Ackermann, p. 11.

² Ackermann, pp. 6 and 7.

support of this she cites statistics from Schwarz, *Philologus* 51, 1892, p. 642, which show that in Julian there are fifty-one quotations from Plato, a number that greatly exceeds the quotations of all the other prose authors combined. To this France also adds a list of some thirty-five cases of Platonic reminiscence.

From this brief statement of a few facts bearing on the relation of Plato to the leaders of early Christian thought it is plain that Ackermann's observation is entirely correct when he remarks on p. 8 that it seems very difficult for the Christian Fathers of the first centuries to escape the influence of Plato.

Now the purpose of the present study is to show how far the influence of Plato is manifested in the works of Basil, but before proceeding to the subject proper it is desirable to take a rapid review of Basil's early life and education in order to show the tendency of his preliminary training.

OUTLINE OF LIFE OF ST. BASIL.¹

The period of Basil's life that was devoted mainly to education comes before the time of his decision to consecrate himself to the work of the Church and falls naturally into four divisions: 1, his term of study under his father; 2, his term at Caesarea; 3, at Constantinople, and 4, at Athens.

Basil the elder was a famous teacher of Pontus. The biographers devote much space to eulogy of the two families that were united in this Basil and St. Emmelia, and describe this couple as endowed with the highest attainments and most excellent virtues. If we may judge from the history of their children this record must be true, for the oldest daughter Maerina has been canonized a saint and three sons were bishops in their life-time and were afterwards made saints. If it is a great thing to receive glory

¹The chief authorities consulted for the life of St. Basil are: Böhringer, *Die drei Kappadozier*, p. 1 ff.; Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Oratio in laudem Basilii Magni*, Migne, v. 36, 494, A 1 ff.; Maranus, *Vita Sancti Basilii*, Preface of Migne, v. 29, p. v ff.

from one's ancestors, much greater is it to add glory to them, says Gregory, p. 504.

By this father, then, an *ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία* was given to Basil, see *Greg.* 509, B 14, and of this education Paul Allard says that it consisted of instruction in the art of writing well and speaking well, but the study of this comprehends that of the ancient classics with their immense repertoire of prose and verse.¹ The phrase "ancient classics" here refers only to Greek literature as the Greek Fathers did not "condescend to learn Latin."²

The dates of the events of Basil's early life are all very uncertain, but it seems probable that he did not go to Caesarea until compelled by the death of his father to seek a teacher elsewhere. This is the reasoning of Maranus who estimates the date at about 342 A. D. when Basil was thirteen. At what time he left Caesarea and the extent of his residence in Constantinople it is impossible to determine, but he reached Athens probably in 351 and remained there five years, *Vit. Bas.*, XII. The *Vita* also mentions the teachers of Basil at Athens as Himerius and Prohaereses, Hesychnius and Terence among others, while Gregory, p. 528 A, describes Basil as excelling in his various branches of study, in rhetoric, in Greek literature and in philosophy.

Soon after his return from Athens Basil entered eagerly into church work and was ordained presbyter in 362. He was an assistant to Eusebius, upon whose death he was elected to succeed to the bishopric of Caesarea in 370, an office which he lived to hold for only nine years.

Basil's wide knowledge of Greek is shown in his works by many references to the Greek legends and in many quotations from the Greek authors from Homer down, and we shall now pass to the consideration of the extent of his indebtedness to Plato.

¹ *Revue d. Questions Historiques*, 1898, N. S. 20, p. 10.

² Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, II, p. 3.

INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON BASIL IN THEOLOGY
AND ETHICS.

The question of the resemblance of the theology of Plato to the Christian theology has been discussed by Ackermann on p. 38 ff. of the work already cited. Ackermann shows that this resemblance is very close in regard to the doctrines of the existence, essence, name, attributes and works of God. These topics will be taken up in order here in so far as similarities in Basil lead to their consideration.¹

Basil assumes, naturally, the existence of God since, for example, before the creation of the universe there must have been an existing cause, and that was God, see p. 25 for this statement and its parallel in Plato.

As the unity of the Godhead was one of the fundamental tenets of Christianity it is also assumed everywhere in Basil, for Plato's belief in monotheism Ackermann refers to *Polit.* 270 A and *Tim.* 31 A.

In regard to the compositeness of the divine nature Basil says 4, 105, B 1: *καθαρά συνθέσεως ἢ θεία φύσις*, with which Johnston, edition of Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 48, note, compares Plato's *Republic*, 611 B: *οὐ ῥάδιον ἄδιον εἶναι σύνθετον ἐκ πολλῶν*. To this may be added *Phaedo*, 80 A, *τῷ μὲν θείῳ καὶ ἀθανάτῳ . . . καὶ ἀδιαλύτῳ . . . ὁμοίωτατον εἶναι ψυχῇν, τῷ δὲ ἀνθρωπίνῳ καὶ θνητῷ . . . καὶ διαλυτῷ . . . ὁμοίωτατον εἶναι σῶμα*. Compare also *Rpb.* 381 A f.

Next in regard to the name for God, *θεός*, both make attempts at etymologies, *Bas.* 4, 265, A 5: *παρὰ γὰρ τὸ τεθεικέναι τὰ πάντα ἢ θεᾶσθαι τὰ πάντα ὁ θεὸς ὀνομάζεται*.

Crat. 397 D: *ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ γῆν καὶ ἄστρα καὶ οὐρανόν· ἅτε οὖν αὐτὰ ὀρῶντες πάντα αἰεὶ ἰόντα δρόμῳ καὶ θεόντα, ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς φύσεως τῆς τοῦ θεῖν θεοῦ αὐτοὺς ἐπονομάσαι*.

These explanations are quite far apart and cannot be connected

¹All references are to the Teubner text of Plato, and to Migne's edition of Basil, vols. I-IV (*Patrolog. Græc. cursus*, vols. 29-32), excluding vol. II and other portions considered spurious by Migne.

in any way. Similarly with reference to the titles and attributes of God, though as Ackermann points out Plato's phraseology in various passages is identical with that of the Fathers it would be utterly ridiculous to suggest that in this subject the Fathers, or particularly Basil, were influenced by Plato.

For example *Basil*, 1, 525, B 14, says: ἄφθαρτον γὰρ καὶ ἀγέννητον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὄλων λέγομεν, and 532, C 1: θεὸς . . . οἶον ὁ ἄφθαρτος, ὁ ἀθάνατος, ὁ ἀόρατος.

Such statements as these are paralleled by Plato's description of God in *Tim.* 27 D as τὸ ὄν ἀεὶ, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον, . . . τὸ μὲν δὴ νοήσει μετὰ λόγου περιληπτόν, ἀεὶ κατὰ ταῦτὰ ὄν, but of course there is no connection between the references.

There are also several similar statements in the two authors in regard to God as the creator of the universe, *Bas.* 3, 201, A 12: παρὰ τοῦ τὰ πάντα συστησαμένου θεοῦ.

Ib. 212, B 7: τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα συστησαμένου.

Tim. 29 D: τὸ πᾶν τόδε ὁ ξυριστὰς ξυνέστησεν, and *Ib.* 30 B: ξυριστὰς τὸ πᾶν. Also 41 D, 53 B, etc.

Another parallelism that may be added here has reference to God as the protector of man, *Bas.* 3, 329, C 7: ἀμφίβολοι γίνονται . . . εἰ ἔστι θεὸς ἐπιμελούμενος τῶν τῆδε.

Phaed. 62 D: ὁ νῦν δὴ ἐλέγομεν εὐλόγως ἔχει, τὸ θεόν τε εἶναι τὸν ἐπιμελούμενον ἡμῶν.

These and similar references are interesting as showing the relation between Plato and a Christian writer like Basil, but they are merely the points in which Plato approaches the Christian doctrine of which in the present instance Basil happens to be the expositor, and they might be paralleled easily in any doctrinal Christian writer, ancient or modern.

It is hardly conceivable that St. Basil, the great theologian, the mighty leader of orthodoxy during the fourth century, was dependent on Plato for any part of his theology. It happens that some of Plato's statements approach the Christian ideal and were interpreted from the Christian point of view, but the Christian doctrines were not moulded to the Platonic form. Attempts were made to prove Plato a Christian, but the Church would hardly maintain that Christ was a Platonist, as the impious

Celsus seems to suggest when he declares that Jesus borrowed from Plato perverting his words, see Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VI, 16.

ETHICS.

We pass next to the consideration of man and his relation to his fellow-man, to the study of the connection of Plato and Basil on the ethical side. And first in regard to the nature of man and the reason why he was made to stand upright in contrast to the other creatures, *Bas.* 3, 216, C 4, says: ὀρθιον ἔπλασε μόνου τῶν ζῶων τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἵν' ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ σχήματος εἰδῆς ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἄνωθεν συγγενείας ἐστὶν ἡ ζωὴ σου. τὰ μὲν γὰρ τετράποδα πάντα πρὸς τὴν γῆν βλέπει, καὶ πρὸς τὴν γαστέρα νέενκεν· ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ ἐτοίμη πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἡ ἀνάβλεψις.

Tim. 90 A: τὸ δὲ περὶ τοῦ κυριωτάτου παρ' ἡμῖν ψυχῆς εἶδους διανοεῖσθαι δεῖ τῆδε, ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸ δαίμονα θεὸς ἐκάστω δέδωκε, τοῦτο ὃ δὴ φαμεν οἰκεῖν μὲν ἡμῶν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ σώματι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ ξυγγένειαν ἀπὸ γῆς ἡμᾶς αἶρειν ὡς ὄντας φυτὸν οὐκ ἔγγειον ἀλλὰ οὐράνιον, ὀρθότατα λέγοντες· ἐκείθεν γάρ, ὅθεν ἡ πρώτη τῆς ψυχῆς γένεσις ἔφυ, τὸ θεῖον τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ῥίζαν ἡμῶν ἀνακρεμαννὺν ὀρθοῖ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα.

The essential points in these statements are obviously the same. The Creator made the body of man to stand in an upright position and, therefore, the soul of man should be naturally inclined toward the things of heaven rather than toward the things of earth. To be particularly emphasized is the similar use of *ξυγγένεια* in Basil's phrase ἐκ τῆς ἄνωθεν συγγενείας ἐστὶν ἡ ζωὴ σου and its Platonic parallel πρὸς τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ ξυγγένειαν ἡμᾶς αἶρειν.

It may be mentioned also that the comparison with the beasts is not lacking in the *Timaeus*, but in 91 E appears in a somewhat similar form, see p. 33.

Still further on the nature of man may be cited, *Bas.* 3, 917, A 6: ἡμερον καὶ κοινωνικὸν ζῶων ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐχὶ μοναστικὸν οὐδὲ ἄγριον.

Legg. 766 A: ἄνθρωπος δὲ . . . ἡμερον, . . . παιδείας μὲν

ὀρθῆς τυχὸν καὶ φύσεως εὐτυχούς θειότατον ἡμερώτατόν τε ζῶον γίγνεσθαι φιλεῖ.

And again, *Bas.* 3, 581, C 5: οὐ τὸ ὀρώμενόν ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

Ac. 365 E: τῆς ψυχῆς ἐς τὸν οἰκείον ἰδρυθείσης τόπον τὸ ὑπολειφθὲν σῶμα, γεῶδες ὃν καὶ ἄλογον, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

This reference to the pseudo-Platonic Axiochus is suggested by Padelford, *Essays on the Study and Use of Poetry by Plutarch and Basil the Great*, p. 115, and the similarity in thought is certainly noteworthy. Both maintain that we must not be over-solicitous about the body to the neglect of the soul, because without the soul the body is nothing. E. R. Maloney, in his edition of Basil's homily on Greek literature, note on this passage, p. 56, also says, "this sentence is taken from Plato," but he gives no reference. Other parallel passages cited in this connection are Cicero, *Somm. Scip.* 8, and Lactantius, *Divin. Instit.* 2, 3, 8. The phrase of Lactantius is interesting enough to add, hoc enim quod oculis subiectum est non homo sed hominis receptaculum.

This separation of body and soul is indeed even more distinctly stated, for we are told that man's nature is not simple but two-fold, consisting of a body and a soul, as in *Bas.* 4, 248, D 6: οὐχ ἀπλοῦς τις οὗτός ἐστιν (sc. ὁ ἄνθρωπος), ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστῶς.

Tim. 34 B: ψυχὴν δὲ εἰς τὸ μέσον αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) θεὸς διὰ παντός τε ἔτεινε καὶ ἔτι ἔξωθεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτῇ περιέκάλυψε ταύτη.

And a further subdivision is made into νοῦς, ψυχή and σῶμα in *Bas.* 3, 204, A 9, and *Tim.* 30 A, but on these two statements there is no particular comment to be made except that shortly afterwards Basil seems to draw from the *Timaeus* again as indicated in the next citation. Wandinger, *Edition of Basil's Homily to the Youth on Classical Literature*, p. 44, in a note on this passage of Basil compares *Phaedo* 75 and *Timaeus* 52, but these references seem little to the point.

Another phrase of Basil, which is not far removed from the one just cited, is the echo of the *Timaeus* to which reference is made above. *Bas.* 3, 216, A 15: τῆς ψυχῆς σου τὴν δύναμιν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα συνέδησεν.

Tim. 73 B : τῆς ψυχῆς τῷ σώματι ξυνδουμένης.

The idea of the binding of the soul to the body is so striking that its repetition would at once suggest borrowing.

We next pass to the subject of the difference of the soul from the body and the superiority of the one to the other.

Bas. 3, 644, C 10 : ὅσον γὰρ διαφέρει ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, τοσοῦτον διαφέρει ψυχὴ σώματος.

Legg. 959 A : ψυχὴν σώματος εἶναι τὸ πᾶν διαφέρουσαν.

And the statement of the superiority of the soul also is to be noted in both authors :

Bas. 3, 565, D 1 : καθ' ὅσον σκιὰ καὶ ὄναρ τῶν ἀληθῶν ἀπολείπεται· μᾶλλον δὲ, ἢν' οἰκειοτέρῳ χρήσωμαι παραδείγματι, ὅσφ ψυχὴ τοῖς πᾶσι τιμιωτέρα σώματος.

Tim. 34 C : ὁ δὲ (θεὸς) καὶ γενέσει καὶ ἀρετῇ προτέραν καὶ πρεσβυτέραν ψυχὴν σώματος ὡς δεσπότην καὶ ἄρξουσιν ἀρξομένου ξυνεστήσατο.

Basil uses this fact of the soul's superiority as a familiar comparison to illustrate the difference between life in heaven and life on earth, and he remarks in 565, C 9, that if one should gather together and comprehend into a unit all blessings that have been since the world began, not in the smallest degree would that unit be equal to the good things which he will find in heaven. Padelford, *op. cit.*, p. 103, in a note on this passage refers to Plato's *Republic*, 614 A, where, after reciting the benefits that accrue to the just man in his lifetime, the ἀθλα, μισθοί and δῶρα from gods and men Plato adds that these are nothing either in number or magnitude compared to those which await a man when he is dead.

Since now the soul is superior to the body we must cherish the soul but neglect the body :

Bas. 3, 581, A 1 : τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιμέλειαν ἔχειν, πᾶσαν σχολὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἄγοντας. οὐ δὴ οὖν τῷ σώματι δουλευτέον, ἀλλὰ τῇ ψυχῇ τὰ βέλτιστα ποριστέον.

Phaed. 67 A : ἐγγυτάτω ἐσόμεθα τοῦ εἰδέναι, ἐὰν ὅτι μάλιστα μηδὲν ὀμιλῶμεν τῷ σώματι μηδὲ κοινωνῶμεν, ἀλλὰ καθαρεύομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Also *Tim.* 18 B should be compared here, ἐπιμέλειαν ἔχοντας ἀρετῆς διὰ παντός, τῶν ἄλλων ἐπι-

τηδευμάτων ἄγοντας σχολήν, where the expression in each clause is obviously identical with that of Basil, but from a study of the context it would seem that this whole section of Basil is dependent rather on the discussion in the *Phaedo*, cp. *Bas.* A 5, and *Phaed.* 67 D.

Another parallelism from the same sections may be mentioned in this connection.

Bas. 3, 581, C 9 : κάθαρσις ψυχῆς, . . . τὰς διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἡδονὰς ἀτιμάζειν, μὴ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐστιᾶν, . . . μὴ διὰ τῶν ὠτων . . . μελῳδίαν . . . καταχεῖν.

Phaed. 65 C : (ἡ ψυχῆ) λογίζεται . . . τότε κάλλιστα, ὅταν αὐτὴν τούτων μηδὲν παραλυπῆ, μήτε ἀκοὴ μήτε ὄψις μήτε ἀλγηδῶν μηδέ τις ἡδονή, . . . οὐκοῦν . . . ἡ τοῦ φιλοσόφου ψυχὴ μάλιστα ἀτιμάζει τὸ σῶμα.

The idea expressed in these statements is practically the same, that is, the mortification of the flesh, and the abstract sight and hearing of Plato are simply transferred by Basil to the concrete eyes and ears.

There is also another pair of references to be added, *Bas.* 3, 584, D 3, and *Phaed.* 66 C, where both attack the body as the cause that leads to the acquisition of wealth. All these quotations then are sufficient to show the similarity between these two discussions and to indicate the *Phaedo* as the probable source of Basil.

Bas. 3, 213, C 8 : γινῶθι ὅτι τὸ μὲν λογικόν ἐστι καὶ νοερόν τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸ δὲ παθητικόν τε καὶ ἄλογον.

Tim. Loc. 99 E : τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνας ψυχᾶς τὸ μὲν λογικόν ἐστι καὶ νοερόν, τὸ δ' ἄλογον καὶ ἄφρον.

This reference from the *Loerian* summary is given because of the identity of phraseology. It is plainly an abridgment of the discussion in *Tim.* 69 C ff. of the two parts of the soul, the divine and the mortal, and we find it stated that the mortal part was subject to δεινὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα παθήματα, among others θάρρος καὶ φόβον, ἄφρονε ξυμβούλω, and that these were all mingled αἰσθήσει ἀλόγῳ, a description that justifies the adjectives used by Basil and the Loerian. Whether Basil is borrowing from this summary which was made before the second century A. D.¹ or is abstracting

¹ See Christ, *Gr. Lit.*, 4th ed., p. 461, n. 3.

directly from Plato it is impossible to tell, but in any case the ultimate source is Plato.

Again, in connection with the soul, Basil borrows from this same chapter of the *Timaeus* when he describes the body as the chariot of the soul.

Bas. 3, 549, A 1 : ψυχὴ λεπτή τις οὐσα καὶ νοερά, καὶ σῶμα, τὸ ταύτῃ δοθὲν ὄχημα πρὸς τὸν βίον.

Tim. 69 C : παραλαμβάνοντες ἀρχὴν ψυχῆς ἀθάνατον, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο θνητὸν σῶμα αὐτῇ περιετόρνευσαν ὄχημά τε πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ἔδωσαν. Cf. *Tim.* 44 E.

The next topic to be considered is the immortality of the soul. This subject appears frequently in Basil, though nowhere is it treated as a matter for argument. Various passages might be cited here where there is some similarity of statement between Plato and Basil, as many passages of Plato are quoted attesting his approach to the Christian views on this subject, but it seems useless to accumulate references when there is no evidence that Basil is in any way influenced by Plato. Therefore, only a few passages will be cited.

Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philosophy*, p. 374, points out that Plato teaches that the immortal part of the soul was created or generated by God, and was not always existent. In regard then to the creation of the soul and the body, and the relation of one to the other Basil says, 1, 168, A 12 : μὴ νόμιζε πρεσβυτέραν εἶναι (τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν κτηνῶν) τῆς τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν ὑποστάσεως, μηδὲ ἐπιδιαμένουσαν μετὰ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς διάλυσιν.

While this attests the fact of the creation of the soul it is a clear contradiction of Plato's theory of the priority in creation of the soul, *Tim.* 34 B : τὴν δὲ δὴ ψυχὴν οὐχ ὡς νῦν ὑστέραν ἐπιχειροῦμεν λέγειν, οὕτως ἐμηχανήσατο καὶ ὁ θεὸς νεωτέραν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἀρχεσθαι πρεσβύτερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρου ξυνέρξας εἴασεν ὁ δὲ καὶ γενέσει καὶ ἀρετῇ προτέρα καὶ πρεσβυτέρα ψυχὴν σώματος ὡς δεσπότιν καὶ ἄρξουσιν ἀρξομένου ξυνεστήσατο. See also *Tim.* 69 C, quoted above, and *Legg.* 967 D : ψυχὴ ὡς ἔστι πρεσβύτατον ἀπάντων ὅσα γονῆς μετείληφεν ἀθάνατόν τε.

The emphatic statement of Basil and the way in which he

introduces it by the words *μη νόμιζε* would suggest that he had in mind such arguments on the other side as are given by Plato and wished to belittle them.

Other statements on immortality are, *Bas.* 3, 204, B 12 : *γνώθι σαυτοῦ τὴν φύσιν· ὅτι θνητὸν μὲν σου τὸ σῶμα, ἀθάνατος δὲ ἡ ψυχή.*

Phaedr. 245 C : *ψυχὴ πᾶσα ἀθάνατος· τὸ γὰρ ἀεικίνητον ἀθάνατον,* and *Meno* 81 B and *Phaed.* 70 A.

We may add finally *Bas.* 3, 588, C 7, and *Rpb.* 608 D.

VIRTUE AND VICE.

The next subdivision of this subject deals with the consideration of some vices and virtues in connection with which various parallel references will be cited.

The definition of evil is given by Basil, 3, 341 B 14 : *στέρησις γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ κακόν,* by the side of which is to be placed the statement in the *Axiochus*, 369 E : *τῇ στερήσει τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀντιστάγων κακῶν αἴσθησις.*

Then Basil continuing, in 341 C, draws an illustration from the eye. After the creation of the eye blindness came to exist through the loss of the eyes, so that if the eye had not been of a corruptible nature there could have been no blindness. *οὕτω καὶ τὸ κακὸν οὐκ ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑπάρξει ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς πηρώμασιν ἐπιγίνεται.*

Plato too uses the eye as an illustration, though in a slightly different way and in support of his statement that that which destroys and corrupts is evil, *Rpb.* 608 E. For as ophthalmia to the eyes and disease to the whole body, as mildew to grain, rot to wood and rust to iron, so *τὸ ξύμφυτον κακὸν ἐκάστου καὶ ἡ πονηρία ἕκαστου ἀπόλλυσις.*

Now these two statements are not as far apart as might appear at a glance, and in fact Plato's thesis that the innate evil in each thing destroys it has been followed in the main by Basil. Blindness, he says, destroys the eyes, but surely blindness is the inborn evil of the eyes, for if the eyes had not been of a corruptible

nature there could have been no blindness. Furthermore this passage of the *Republic* has been used several times by Basil, see p. 45, and without doubt he was very familiar with it, it therefore seems probable that we have another echo of it in the present case.

In connection with the subject of evil, reference may be made to a pair of quotations which treat of the origin of diseases, *Bas.* 3, 344 A 9 and *Tim.* 81 E. These passages resemble each other in several respects. In the first place the sum and substance of each statement is that the cause of disease is an abortion of nature. The body is formed with its own proper constitution, says Basil, ἐκτίσθη μὲν τὰ ζῶα μετὰ τῆς πρεπούσης αὐτοῖς κατασκευῆς κατὰ φύσιν, which is merely another form of Plato's statement of the elements that make up the body, τεττάρων γὰρ ὄντων γενῶν ἐξ ὧν συμπέπηγε τὸ σῶμα, γῆς, πυρὸς ὕδατός τε καὶ ἀέρος, while Basil's ἐνόσησε τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν παρατραπέντα is exactly equivalent to the phrase of Plato, ἡ παρὰ φύσιν πλεονεξία καὶ ἔνδεια . . . νόσους παρέχει.

Add to these resemblances the fact that this discussion in the *Timaeus* was a *locus nobilissimus ac celebratissimus* as Stallbaum calls it, note *ad loc.*, and it is very probable that the passages are related.

One of the vices that must be mentioned here as being the subject of some parallel statements in our two authors is anger. It is defined in Basil, 3, 369 A 9: ἔστι γὰρ θυμὸς μὲν οἷον ἔξαψίς τις καὶ ἀναθυμίασις ὀξεία τοῦ πάθους, which is to be compared with *Cratylus*, 419 E: θυμὸς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς θύσεως καὶ ζέσεως τῆς ψυχῆς ἔχει ἂν τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα, where in each case the fiery nature of the quality is recognized. Basil devotes an entire homily to the condemnation of anger, 3, 353 B 1 ff., but in spite of all that can be said against it he acknowledges that it is good and necessary under certain circumstances, as for the purpose of arousing strength and courage in the soul. In 3, 365 B 1 ff. this idea is developed in a way that is remarkably similar to the treatment of the subject in *Repb.* 375 A f., and the resemblances of expression between these two sections may be emphasized. The first sentence in the passage cited from Basil, πρὸς πολλὰ τῶν τῆς

ἀρετῆς ἔργων ἐπιτήδειον τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ θυμοειδές, is almost identical with Plato's τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς (sc. οἶον δεῖ τὸν φύλακα εἶναι, δῆλα), ὅτι γε θυμοειδῆ. Then Basil says, αὐστηρὰν (sc. τὴν ψυχὴν) καὶ ἀνδρείαν ἐποίησεν ὁ θυμός which is parallel to the question of Plato, ἀνδρείος . . . εἶναι . . . ἐθελήσει ὁ μὴ θυμοειδής; also Basil's description of anger, νεῦρόν ἐστι τῆς ψυχῆς ὁ θυμός and χρήσιμος ὁ θυμός are balanced by the characterization in the *Republic*, ἄμαχόν τε καὶ ἀνίκητον θυμός.

But the most notable point of resemblance between the two passages is the use of the same comparison in the same way. This is the figure of the watch-dog which is gentle toward its master and acquaintances, but ferocious toward the stranger. This comparison is considered in its place under the subject of comparison, p. 44, but the similar expressions may be pointed out here.

Basil describes one side of the dog's nature as πρᾶος καὶ χειροήθης τοῖς ὠφελούσι, which is the Platonic πρὸς τοὺς συνήθεις τε καὶ γνωρίμους πραοτάτους, συνήθης being also used by Basil in the same sense in another clause, τοῦ δὲ συνήθους αὐτῷ καὶ φίλου ἐμβοήσαντος ὑποπτήσων. But the dog has another side to his nature as well which is indicated by Basil in the words, πρὸς τὴν ἀλλοτρίαν καὶ φωνὴν καὶ ὄψιν ἔξαγριούμενος, καὶν θεραπείαν ἔχειν δοκῆ, and this corresponds to the sentence of Plato in 376 A, *Rep.*, where he says of the dog, ὃν μὲν ἂν ἴδῃ ἀγνώτα, χαλεπαίνει, οὐδὲν δὲ κακὸν προπεπονθός. Thus then the similarity of phraseology together with the use of the same comparison would tend to prove that one passage is the source of the other.

Another vice that is assailed by Basil is the insatiable desire for wealth and in connection with this topic there are several references to be cited. Basil, 3, 292 C 7, speaking of the dissatisfaction of people with their possessions, says that they are always unhappy because no matter how wealthy they become they continually envy the man who is still wealthier. This same idea is expressed in *Legg.* 918 D. Other references are *Bas.* 3, 293 A 8 and *Legg.* 870 A. But there is no particular comment to be made on these passages, for while the thought is similar there is no resemblance in the phraseology.

Now one excuse that the avaricious give for their practice of accumulating wealth is the necessity of making provision for their children and this idea, therefore, is the subject of attack by both our authors, see *Bas.* 3, 284 B 11 and 297 C 8, with which compare *Legg.* 729 A.

Another topic in this connection deals with the relation of wealth to war. Basil maintains that wealth is conducive of war, as by it the sinews of war are supplied, 3, 297 B 11: ἕως πότε πλοῦτος, ἢ τοῦ πολέμου ὑπόθεσις, δι' ὃν χαλκεύεται ὄπλα, δι' ὃν ἀκουᾶται ξίφη. So in the *Republic*, 422 A, the same point is recognized, πῶς ἡμῖν ἢ πόλις οἷα τ' ἔσται πολεμεῖν, ἐπειδὴν χρήματα μὴ κεκτημένη ἦ, ἄλλως τε καὶ πρὸς μεγάλην τε καὶ πλουσίαν ἀναγκασθῆ πολεμεῖν.

In reply to this Socrates, from a different point of view, argues that wealth is a hindrance to war as it introduces into a state luxury and effeminacy, and this also is the view stated in the *Laws* 831 E.

Envy is another vice that is considered by St. Basil in a separate sermon, and some of his statements are not far removed from passages of the *Philebus*, though the resemblances seem due to the nature of the subject as in the case of the stock definition of envy given in *Bas.* 3, 373 A 2: ὁ φθόνος τὴν ἔχουσαν αὐτὸν ψυχὴν ἐξαναλίσκει, and A 6 λύπη γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς τοῦ πλησίον εὐπραγίας ὁ φθόνος, to be compared with *Phil.* 50 A: τὸν γὰρ φθόνου ὁμολογήσθαι λύπην τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῖν πάλαι, and *Ib.*, ἡδονὴν δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς τῶν φίλων κακοῖς . . . τὸν φθόνου. See also *Bas.* 3, 373 C 8 and *Phil.* 48 B.

Next we have to consider attempts to place the responsibility for the infliction of misfortune. People blame the gods for their troubles, a practice that is reprehended by both authors, *Bas.* 3, 332 B 10 and *Ib.* C 15, and *Rpb.* 619 C. For God is not the cause of evils. Basil makes this thought the subject of a special homily, 3, 329 A 1 ff., and it is treated at some length in the *Republic*, 379 B f. *Bas.* 3, 341 B 10: ὅπως δὲ μήτε θεὸν αἴτιον ἡγοῦ τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ κακοῦ, μήτε ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ κακοῦ εἶναι φαντάζου. Compare also 332 A 15. This same idea is expressed in the *Republic*, 380 B: κακῶν δὲ

αἴτιον φάναι θεόν τιμι γίγνεσθαι ἀγαθὸν ὄντα, διαμαχετέον παντὶ τρόπῳ, and C: μὴ πάντων αἴτιον τὸν θεὸν ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν. Compare also *Rpb.* 379 C and *Tim.* 42 D.

While the section of the *Republic*, from which these quotations have been taken, was used freely by Basil (see p. 52), and while he may have had this section in mind here, it is impossible to make any definite assertion of this as the subject is so purely theological, and the most we can do is to point out the similarity in the statements, where the same explanation is given, God is good, and therefore He cannot be the cause of evil.

If then God is not the cause of evil, but man brings it upon himself, the question arises as to the extent of the freedom of the will. Basil in 3, 337 D 9 holds that sin waits on our choice, and that it is in our power to be evil or to abstain from it. Further on, 345 A 1, he draws an illustration from the history of Adam, who on account of sin was excluded from Paradise and διὰ τοῦτο ἄναρτε μὲν διὰ μοχθηρὰν προαίρεσιν. Basil is thus plain and unequivocal in his statement of the absoluteness of the freedom of the will, and this is in harmony with Plato's teaching in the *Republic*, 617 E, that our lot does not choose us but we choose our lot, ἀρετὴ δὲ ἀδέσποτον, ἣν τιμῶν καὶ ἀτιμάζων πλέον καὶ ἔλαττον αὐτῆς ἕκαστος ἕξει, αἰτία ἐλομένου· θεὸς ἀναίτιος. But on the other hand he makes a contrary statement in *Tim.* 86 D when he remarks that no one is voluntarily evil, but that the evil man becomes so διὰ πονηρὰν ἕξιν τιὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἀπαίδευτον τροφήν, see p. 32. On this confusion in Plato about necessity and free-will comment is made by Jowett, *Translation of Plato*, 3d ed., vol. III, *Int. to Timaeus*, pp. 408 and 425. See also Gomperz, *Griechische Denker*, II, pp. 237 ff.

Virtue is the next topic to be considered on the basis of treatment by our two authors. Several parallel passages that show a decided resemblance are from Basil's sermon to young men on education, and the second and third books of the *Republic*, which Basil has used frequently in this homily. First, then, in regard to the impressionability of the young *Bas.* 3, 572 A 4, says: οὐ μικρὸν γὰρ τὸ ὄφελος οἰκειότητά τινα καὶ συνήθειαν ταῖς τῶν νέων

ψυχαῖς τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐγγενέσθαι, ἐπεὶπερ ἀμετάστατα πέφυκεν εἶναι τὰ τῶν τοιούτων μαθήματα.

Rpb. 378 D : ὁ γὰρ νέος οὐχ οἶός τε κρίνειν ὃ τί τε ὑπόνοια καὶ ὃ μῆ, ἀλλ' ἂ ἂν τηλικούτος ὦν λάβῃ ἐν ταῖς δόξαις, δυσέκνιπτά τε καὶ ἀμετάστατα φιλεῖ γίγνεσθαι.

It is shown on p. 55 that this passage of Basil is probably an echo of the *Republic*, 377 A. The section immediately following in Basil is parallel to *Rpb.* 364 A, and the citations before us simply furnish more evidence that Basil is drawing from this part of the *Republic*. So Jahn supports Hess who alters the *τοιούτων* of Basil to *τηλικούτων* after the analogy of the text of Plato, *Neue Jahrbücher*, 49, 1847, p. 389. Another pair of passages bearing on this subject may be cited from about the same sections in both works, *Bas.* 3, 573 D 1 and *Rpb.* 360 D. But in still another case there is even a greater similarity, *Bas.* 3, 572 C 3 : τοσοῦτου δεῖν αἰσχύνῃν ὀφλήσαι γυμνὸν ὀφθέντα, ἐπειδὴ περ αὐτὸν (sc. Ὀδυσσεά) ἀρετὴ ἀντὶ ἱματίων κεκοσμημένη ἐποίησε. *Rpb.* 457 A : ἀποδυτέον δὲ ταῖς τῶν φυλάκων γυμνῶν, ἐπεὶπερ ἀρετὴν ἀντὶ ἱματίων ἀμφιέσονται, καὶ κοινωνητέον πολέμου.

The resemblance here is between the women exercising nude in order to receive the greatest benefit, and the naked Odysseus appealing to Nausicaa for help. Practically the same phrase is used in each case, 'virtue covered him instead of clothes,' and equally well in regard to Odysseus might be used the summary of this matter in the *Republic*, 457 B : τὸ μὲν ὠφέλιμον καλόν, τὸ δὲ βλαβερὸν αἰσχρόν. This quotation, as has been shown, is found in Basil in connection with many reminiscences from the *Republic*, and there is no doubt of the relation in the present instance.

Again, on the subject of virtue, Basil says, 3, 572 D 5 : μόνη δὲ κτημάτων ἢ ἀρετὴ ἀναφαίρετον καὶ ζῶντι καὶ τελευτήσαντι παραμένουσα. This is quite similar to the statement of the *Rpb.* 618 E in connection with the story of Er. The choice of lots should be made in the line of virtue which leads to that which is more just, ἐωράκαμεν γάρ, ὅτι ζῶντί τε καὶ τελευτήσαντι αὕτη κρατίστη αἴρεσις. There may be compared here too *Bas.* 4, 69 C 6 and *Legg.* 730 B.

Basil further, in 1, 316 C 2, makes a summarized statement in regard to the four great virtues, *φρόνησις*, *σωφροσύνη*, *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἀνδρεία*, which he defines in terms quite similar to those used in the elaborate discussion of these virtues found in the *Republic*, 427 E ff. Plato in 430 B gives the definition of *ἀνδρεία* as *δύναμις δόξης ὀρθῆς δεινῶν πέρι καὶ μῆ*, which is followed closely by Basil, who calls it the principle *περὶ δεινῶν καὶ οὐ δεινῶν*. Another close parallelism may be indicated in the definition of *δικαιοσύνη* as the allotment of good and evil to each according to his due, *Bas.* 3, 401 B 9: *δικαιοσύνη ἐστὶν ἕξις ἀπονεμητικὴ τοῦ κατ' ἀξίαν*, and Plato, *Rpb.* 332 D: *ἡ οὖν δὴ τίσιν τί ἀποδιδούσα τέχνη δικαιοσύνη ἂν καλοῖτο; . . . ἡ τοῖς φίλοις τε καὶ ἐχθροῖς ὠφελείας τε καὶ βλάβας ἀποδιδούσα.*

These examples cited show the greatest resemblances, but on the whole there is no great difference between the two sets of definitions. It is true that the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues was enunciated for the first time in the *Republic*, but it must be remembered that this doctrine gained great popularity and was used much by the church writers, so the question of connection in the present instance is a very doubtful one. This is also true when Basil again seems to have reference to this scheme of the four virtues in 3, 381 B 3, with which Wyttenbach¹ compares *Republic*, 560 D, for the resemblance here is in form of expression only and is very slight, while there is no similarity of context.

Finally in this connection there are two parallel references which relate the misfortunes of a virtuous man who holds a public office. Basil in 4, 1041 D 3 tells how it is an old story that those who aspire to virtue refrain from accepting public office, whereas the venal man considers office as the greatest good since it will enable him to benefit his friends, take vengeance on his foes and acquire great possessions. Plato in the same line of thought says, *Rpb.* 343 E, that if a just man takes office he neglects his own business, can get nothing from the public treasury, and has trouble with his family and friends because he

¹ Note on Plutarch's *de discern. adul. ab amico*, 56 B.

will not assist them unjustly; but in the case of the unjust man the opposite is true. While these descriptions are given from different points of view, the first from the point of view of the rascal and the second from that of the honest man, there is considerable similarity in the general tone and arrangement. Both emphasize the fact that a magistracy held by a dishonest man is used by him to advance his own interests and to benefit his friends. The resemblance is worth noting and is sufficient to suggest the possibility that Basil had in mind the passage of Plato.

We now pass to the presentation of some miscellaneous parallelisms connected with the general subject of ethics. A similar statement in regard to friendship, namely, that it is produced by association is given by both authors, *Bas.* 3, 348 C 3, and *Phaedr.* 240 C.

Another similarity in the line of definition is found in *Bas.* 3, 217 C 12: *τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἀρετή, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν διαχύσει ψυχῆς φαιδρὸν καὶ γεγανωμένον διάγειν.*

Crat. 419 C: *χαρὰ δὲ τῇ διαχύσει καὶ εὐπορίᾳ τῆς ῥοῆς τῆς ψυχῆς ἔοικε κεκλημένη.*

It is to be noted here that the same phrase, *διάχυσις τῆς ψυχῆς*, is used by Basil in the same connection in which it is found in Plato, that is, in definition or explanation of *χαρά*. In fact, shortly before the sentence quoted above he asks, *τί μὲν οὖν τὸ χαίρειν αὐτό;* which he then proceeds to explain. It is, therefore, not unlikely that there is a connection between these two passages.

There is a more striking resemblance in the next pair of citations, *Bas.* 3, 588 A 2: *οὐκ ἔστιν ὃ μᾶλλον φευκτέον τῷ σωφρονούντι τοῦ πρὸς δόξαν ζῆν καὶ τὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς δοκοῦντα προσκοπεῖν.*

Rpb. 362 A: *φήσουσι τὸν ἄδικον, ἅτε . . . οὐ πρὸς δόξαν ζῶντα, οὐ δοκεῖν ἄδικον ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐθέλειν.*

Plato devotes considerable space in the *Republic*, 362 ff., to the discussion of this matter of appearances, making Adimantus argue in opposition to Socrates for the necessity of employing such a veil before one's real self. There is no doubt that Basil had this

treatment in mind when he wrote the present passage. In 365 C Adimantus says: 'Since appearance overwhelms actuality and is master of happiness, to this I must turn my whole attention, before me and around me I must trace out the sketch of virtue, but behind I must drag the cunning and crafty fox of Archilochus.' So Basil, in the sentence immediately preceding the one quoted above, uses this metaphor of the fox of Archilochus repeating even the words of Plato, and again, shortly afterwards, in 588 B 4 he gives the phrase 'to trace out the sketch of virtue.' For the identification of these phrases see p. 49. The passage under discussion then is simply a further reference to the same section of the *Republic*.

Further on the subject of justice each author maintains that it is worse to do wrong than to suffer it, *Bas.* 3, 364 D 1 and *Gorg.* 473 A. But he who does the evil is in danger of future punishment. Basil, 3, 580 C 14, urges us not to waste our time lest we be called to account οὐ τι παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς, εἴτε ὑπὸ γῆν, εἴτε καὶ ὅπου δὴ τοῦ παντὸς ὄντα τυγχάνει δικαιοτηρίοις, with which is to be compared *Phaedr.* 249 A : (αἱ ψυχὰι) κριθεῖσαι δὲ αἱ μὲν εἰς τὰ ὑπὸ γῆς δικαιοτήρια ἐλθοῦσαι δίκην ἐκτίνουσιν.

Basil seems to have borrowed *verbatim* Plato's phrase τὰ ὑπὸ γῆς δικαιοτήρια, and then to have thought it wise to add some modification in regard to the statement of the location of the δικαιοτήρια. This parallelism is noted by Jahn, *Neue Jahrb.*, Suppl. Band 13, 1847, p. 461.

But those who are so deeply dyed in wickedness as to be themselves beyond the hope of cure must not be destroyed, but are to be left as examples to others. This thought is presented by Basil, 3, 340 C 9, in a way that is similar to that of the *Gorgias*, 525 C. In fact with variations in the line of phraseology and vocabulary excepted the passages are practically identical. The meaning and context are the same in each case and it seems certain that the first is an imitation of the second. See also Wytttenbach's note on Plutarch's *de ser. num. vind.* 564 E.

Finally, under this heading we may refer to a pair of statements on the duties of children to parents, *Bas.* 3, 912 B 6, and

Legg. 717 B, in which there is not sufficient similarity to require any discussion.

INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON BASIL IN PHILOSOPHY.

The writings of St. Basil are divided into three groups by Böhringer, *Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen*, 2d ed., VII, *Die drei Kappadozier*, p. 60. These divisions are, (1) the dogmatical works such as that against Eunomius and the Book on the Holy Spirit; (2) the Homilies; and (3) the Epistles. There is then no work that could be classed distinctively under the head of philosophy. So further Huber says, *op. cit.*, p. 212, that we find no original ideas in Basil, for, although at Athens he studied philosophy as well as other branches, no lasting impression was made on him because shortly afterwards he devoted himself to theology and the study of the doctrines of the church. Moreover, his life in the church is characterized by the activity of his work, which left him no time for philosophy. As Böhringer, *loc. cit.*, says: Basil ist mehr ein Mann des Handelns und der That als der Wissenschaft, das praktische Element ist in ihm weit überwiegend.

Under this caption, however, it seemed best to group various statements of Basil on voluntary and involuntary action, and to treat the question of the relation of his *Hexaemeron* to Plato's discussion of the creation of the universe in the *Timaeus*. As Basil handles it the subject is rather theological than philosophical, but it will be shown that in his attempt to harmonize philosophy and theology Basil has retained many of Plato's philosophical theories.

The subject of voluntary and involuntary action, which is another phase of the question of the freedom of the will, see p. 16, is mentioned or discussed in several places by Basil. In 3, 404 A 12 he asserts that some sins are involuntary, others voluntary, and in 580 D 5 that for the involuntary wrong there may be pardon, but for the voluntary severe punishment is certain. Similarly Plato, *Legg.* 860 E, determines greater punishment for the voluntary than for the involuntary sin. Compare

also *Hipp. Min.* 375 D. Basil further illustrates his statement in 404 B 1 f. by a comparison of two prostitutes, one of whom is sold to a *πορνοβοσκόσ* and so is compelled to sin, while the second voluntarily gives herself up to that form of life. Then in 404 B 6 he declares that punishment varies as early training tended to virtue or vice. So in the *Protagoras*, 323 D ff., Plato maintains that no man is held responsible for what occurs by nature or by chance.

But the most important passage on this subject in Basil is 4, 676 A 11 ff. which shows some similarities to *Legg.* 865 f. Basil begins with the sentence *ὁ ἀξίνη παρὰ τὸν θυμὸν κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γαμετῆς χρησάμενος φονεύς ἐστι*, and further on, in 676 C 2 f., he takes up the discussion of homicide done under the impulse of anger and decides that if the instrument is a club or a stone it is involuntary, as there is a chance that the assailant intended only to injure and not to kill, but if a sword or axe is used the murder is voluntary. Plato devotes considerable space to this same question of homicide arising from passion, *Legg.* 866 E f. He describes two kinds of such homicide, one when the act is done in the moment of rage and is followed by immediate repentance, which is involuntary; and the other when the anger is restrained for the moment and the murder is the result of a premeditated plan of revenge, in which case the deed is voluntary. In 868 D, among the involuntary crimes which are to receive a comparatively light punishment, he mentions the following which recalls the opening sentence of Basil's discussion, cited above, *γυναῖκα δὲ γαμετὴν ἐὰν ἀνὴρ δι' ὀργὴν κτείνῃ τινά τις, ἢ γυνὴ ἑαυτῆς ἄνδρα*. Basil also gives other illustrations of involuntary homicide, as, for example, when a stone is hurled at a dog and hits a man, when a man dies under blows administered in chastisement, etc., which are not the same as those given in the *Laws*, 865 A f., but are similarly used. Finally then the treatment in the *Laws* is very elaborate, while that of Basil is quite brief, but the general similarity is worth noting.

RELATION OF PLATO'S TIMAEUS TO BASIL'S HEXAEMERON.

The nine homilies of Saint Basil on the *Hexaemeron*, a treatise on the creation of the world, constitute one of his most important pieces of work and one that received much praise from the Fathers. Gregory of Nazianzus says of this work :¹ 'When I take up and consider his *Hexaemeron* I walk with the Creator and I learn to know the theory of creation, and I admire the Creator more than before when I used my sight alone as my instructor.' The praise of Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, verges on the extravagant when he connects the name of Basil with that of Moses in regard to their descriptions of the creation. In his treatise on the *Hexaemeron* he writes to his brother Peter as follows :² 'You have directed me to present in order the theory of the creation of the universe elaborated by the great Moses with divine inspiration, and to point out how Holy Scripture is consistent with itself, and that too though you have before you the divinely inspired treatise of our Father (*i. e.* Basil), which all who know admire no less than the work of Moses himself, and rightly in my opinion.' Gregory writes at considerable length in this eulogistic way and points out that Basil has completely elucidated by his reflections the difficult work on the creation of the world so that there is no one who can not easily understand it.³

This treatise of Basil was afterwards used freely and worked over by Ambrosius (d. 399 A. D.), and was translated into Latin by Eustathius.

It is not necessary here to make any preliminary statement on the line of argument of Basil in the presentation of his views on the creation. In the main he takes his outline from Genesis and for much of his matter he is dependent on his training in the scriptures. But in part again he seems to be indebted to Aristotle.⁴ We shall proceed at once to the question of his relation to

¹ *Orat.* 43, p. 585 A 9 (Migne).

² P. 61, A 6 (Migne).

³ See Tillemont, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, IX, p. 288.

⁴ See Müllenhoff, *Hermes*, II, 252 f.

Plato and in this case from the nature of the subject chiefly the *Timaeus* of Plato.

At the very beginning the statement of the subject even seems to recall the *Timaeus*. It is to be a treatise *περὶ φύσεως* (*Bas.* 1. 8 A 1), as the subject of the *Timaeus* is also declared to be *περὶ φύσεως* in *Tim.* 27 A where the company decide that *Timaeus* should be first speaker as he had taken the most pains to gain knowledge *περὶ φύσεως τοῦ παντός*. So it is very probable that Basil had Plato in mind when he said (*loc. cit.*), *πολλὰ περὶ φύσεως ἐπραγματεύσαντο οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων σοφοί*, and the statement immediately following on the difficulty of the subject and the variety of views is clearly a reflection from the *Timaeus*. Basil says that among the wise men no theory remains immovable but one always displaces another, though there is no similarity in expression the same thought is found in *Tim.* 29 C.

Now in beginning a treatise on the creation of the universe it must necessarily be assumed that the universe was not ever-existent but at some time had to be brought into being. Basil then sounds this note of warning in 1. 9 A 8: *μη οὖν ἀναρχα φαντάζου τὰ ὀρώμενα*, and this is also one of the first points of the *Timaeus*, given in 28 B, *ὁ κόσμος γέγονεν, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τινὸς ἀρξάμενος*.

On the other hand we are informed of that which is ever-existent, without beginning and without end, *Bas.* 1. 12 A 10: . . . *θεὸν ἀναρχόν τε καὶ ἀτελεύτητον* and *Tim.* 34 A: *οὗτος δὴ πᾶς ὄντος ἀεὶ λογισμὸς θεοῦ*.

If then the universe is a thing created there arises at once the question as to what was previous to the creation. Basil 1. 13 A 4 says that there was a certain *κατάστασις πρεσβυτέρα τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως*, which was *ὑπέρχρονος, αἰωνία, αἰδῖος*. This view seems to be significant as showing the influence of philosophy in opposition to the statement of Genesis, *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν*, which offers no suggestion of any possibility antecedent to the beginning. The *Timaeus* makes several statements on this point. First it gives the view of *primaevial* chaos and asserts that the chief reason for the creation of the universe was the desire of God to bring order out of that chaos, in 30 A, and then in 52 D is specified what was before the universe, *ὄν*

τε καὶ χώραν καὶ γένεσιν εἶναι τρία τριχῆ καὶ πρὶν οὐρανὸν γενέσθαι. See also 48 B, 53 A and 69 B.

Now proceeding with the development of the theory, before there can be any creation there must be a cause and this accordingly is also one of the early questions discussed. Basil, 1. 4 A 6, asserts that the creation of the heaven and earth did not take place automatically but there was a moving cause which was God, and then he adds: 'what sense of hearing is worthy of the magnitude of these words, what soul prepared for the reception of such tidings.' The necessity of a cause preceding is similarly stated in the Timaeus which also adds the suggestion of the immensity and greatness of that cause, which is the father God, *Tim.* 28 A and C. τὸν . . . ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὐρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντα ἀδύνατον λέγειν.

After the statement that God is the cause of existence the important point here is of course this remark on the nature of God, that He is difficult to find and when found can not be appreciated by all. This is clearly followed by Basil in the sentence quoted above, and in regard to its importance in general there is a note by Ackermann, *op. cit.*, p. 40, n. 1: 'No passage was so frequently cited by the church Fathers, now with praise and now with blame, according as they understood.'

From this the next step in the theory comes naturally in the expansion of the idea of God as creator of the universe. In *Bas.* 1. 9 A 1 it is the highly-honored name of God, ἡ μακαρία φύσις, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν ὄντων etc., and this idea is expressed or inferred several times in the Timaeus and is summarized conveniently in 30 B. It may deserve mention here in passing that of the attributes of God given in the list, which has partly been quoted in the passage of Basil just cited, one is ἡ ἀφθονος ἀγαθότης which may be a reminiscence from *Tim.* 29 E: ἀγαθὸς ἦν (sc. ὁ θεός), ἀγαθῷ δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίγνεται φθόνος.

After the statement of the creation some characteristics are noted specifying the grade of the thing created. It was the product of the wisdom of God says Basil 1. 17 B 9, while the Timaeus 30 B asserts that it was formed διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν. Other statements of the perfection of the creation are *Bas.* 1. 17 C 8 and *Tim.*

28 C, in which there is particularly noticeable the similarity in the two remarks on the relation of the creator to his work, each affirming the beauty of the creature as a consequence of the excellency of the creator. In this connection compare also *Bas.* 1. 13 B 3 and *Tim.* 29 E.

The next question that presents itself concerns the nature of the substance of the creation. Plato bases his theory absolutely on the Empedoclean doctrine of the four elements and the discussion of the matter in the *Timaeus* is clearly the source of Basil. In commenting on the thesis of Genesis that God created the heavens and the earth Basil, 1. 20 A 9 shows how the theory of the elements lies implicit in this statement and is necessarily assumed. If the existence of the earth be granted the other elements, fire, water and air are easily found, for fire leaps from stone and iron which are of the earth, the well-diggers have proved the presence of water in the earth and finally the winds from the south are sufficient proof of the air. Thus it is apparent that Basil is trying to harmonize the statement of Genesis with the theory of the *Timaeus*, expressed in 31 B and 32 B, that the created body consisted first of fire and earth and that later between these constituents the god added water and air, binding all together into a whole. Basil then accepts the doctrine of the elements and insists that this doctrine is inherent in the Old Testament teaching, for though earth alone is mentioned common sense only is needed to show that earth comprehends all the other elements and therefore the statement of the existence of earth is no less than the statement of the existence of the elements.

As a proof of the importance that Basil attaches to this point he reverts to it again in 33 C 5 and selecting the element, water, for particular emphasis explains that, while nothing is said about God creating the water, we are told that the earth was invisible and therefore must assume that water as a veil covered the face of the earth.

In still another passage of Basil the reference to the *Timaeus* is even more plain and the language is practically repeated, *Bas.* 1. 25 A 14: *καὶ οἱ μὲν σύνθετον αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν κόσμον) ἐκ τῶν πεσσάρων στοιχείων εἰρήκασιν, ὡς ἀπτὸν ὄντα καὶ ὀρατὸν, καὶ*

μετέχοντα γῆς μὲν διὰ τὴν ἀντιτυπίαν, πυρὸς δὲ διὰ τὸ καθοράσθαι, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν διὰ τὴν μίξιν. Compare also *Bas.* 4. 248 D 2.

Tim. 31 B: σωματοειδὲς δὲ δὴ καὶ ὄρατὸν ἀπτὸν τε δεῖ τὸ γενόμενον εἶναι · χωρισθὲν δὲ πυρὸς οὐδὲν ἄν ποτε ὄρατὸν γένοιτο, οὐδὲ ἀπτὸν ἄνευ τινὸς στερεοῦ, στερεὸν δὲ οὐκ ἄνευ γῆς.

The similarity here is so obvious that it is hardly necessary to emphasize it. Both statements agree that the universe is visible and tangible, ὄρατὸς καὶ ἀπτός, and both explain these terms in the identical manner but with different words, asserting that the visibility is due to fire, the tangibility to the hardness of the earth.

Since thus the theory of the elements has been established the next step in advance is the notice of the harmony among these constituents, which is set forth in *Bas.* 1. 33 A 9 and *Tim.* 32 C, where there is a striking similarity in the repetition of the idea of the bond of friendship as that which yokes the elements together, a bond unbreakable, that can not be unloosed save by him that bound, Basil's phrase, ὅλον δὲ τὸν κόσμον ἀνομοιομερῆ τυγχάνοντα ἀρρήκτω τινὶ φιλίας δεσμῶ εἰς μίαν κοινωνίαν καὶ ἁρμονίαν συνεδησεν, corresponding to the following sentence of Plato: τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σῶμα ἐγεννήθη δι' ἀναλογίας, φιλίαν τε ἔσχεν ἐκ τούτων, ὥστ' εἰς ταῦτ' αὐτῷ ξυνελθὸν ἄλλου ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄλλου πλὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ξυνδῆσαντος γενέσθαι. Further at this same point in each work there is discussed the subject of the completeness of the creation, the complete employment of the elements, *Bas.* 1. 33 B 5 and *Tim.* 32 C.

Finally before leaving the matter of the elements a question arises in regard to their relations to each other and the passage of one to another. This is mentioned by Basil, 1. 61 B 13 and elaborated shortly afterwards in 89 C 4; it is discussed by Plato, *Tim.* 49 C. The idea presented here of the close interrelation of the elements is the same in each case and in fact the passage of Basil might be viewed as a commentary on that of the Timaeus, giving a fuller explanation. Plato states that water when congealed becomes earth, Basil unites water and earth by the quality of coldness. Water melted, says Plato, passes into air, water and air are connected in Basil by the quality of moistness. Finally beside Plato's statement that air when inflamed becomes fire, stands Basil's

union of fire and air in the quality of heat. Thus both sections are seen to be very similar and both are concluded by a similar sentence in summary, Basil's *καὶ οὕτω γίνεται κύκλος καὶ χορὸς ἐναρμόνιος* corresponding to *κύκλον τε οὕτω διαδιδόντα εἰς ἀλληλα τὴν γένεσιν* of the *Timaeus*.

But in the course of transition as one element is dissolved into another, it loses its characteristic form and therefore is practically destroyed, *Bas.* 1. 64 C 14 and *Tim.* 56 D.

Next in both authors the power of fire is emphasized as surpassing that of all the other elements, *Bas.* 1. 65 C 1 and *Tim.* 58 A; and further the nature of fire is characterized as a nature that is double, on the one hand being the flame that burns, on the other the flame that provides light to the eyes, *Bas.* 1. 121 C 14; 297 B 14. and *Tim.* 58 C. We also find parallel notes in regard to the condensation and precipitation of water in *Bas.* 1. 69 A 13 and *Tim.* 49 C.

From the substance of the universe, the elements, we pass to the nature and form of the universe which is the next point that is developed similarly in each work, *Bas.* 1. 33 A 2 and *Tim.* 32 D, where to be particularly noted is the emphasis that both authors lay on *τὸ πρέπον*, which brings these two passages into close relationship. Compare for example the phrase of Basil, *οὐρανῶ μὲν ἀφώρισε τὴν οὐρανῶ πρέπουσαν φύσιν* with the words *σχῆμα δὲ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὸ πρέπον* of the *Timaeus*. Basil thus declares that God determined for the heaven the nature that was proper for the heaven, and for the earth too its own proper nature, which is identical with the statement of Plato that God gave to the universe the form that was proper and natural.

The expression is also notably similar in the following extracts, *Bas.* 1. 60 B 12: *οὐκ . . . τοῦτο ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν ἕξωθεν ἐπιφάνειαν σφαιρικῶς ἀπηρτίσθαι, καὶ ὄλον ἀκριβῶς ἔντορνον εἶναι καὶ λείως περιηγημένον.*

Tim. 33 B: *διὸ καὶ σφαιροειδές, . . . κυκλοτερές αὐτὸ ἔτορνεύσατο . . . λείον δὲ δὴ κύκλῳ πᾶν ἕξωθεν αὐτὸ ἀπηκριβοῦτο πολλῶν χάριν.*

Of course the subject here discussed is the same in each case and in this sentence of his description Basil has apparently borrowed

his vocabulary directly from Plato, while altering the phraseology and the forms of the words. So σφαιρικῶς corresponds to σφαιροειδές, ἀκριβῶς to ἀπηκριβοῦτο, ἔντονον εἶναι to ἔτορνεύσατο, and λείως περιηγμένον to λείον κύκλω. Add to this also the parallel phrases for the 'outer surface', τὴν ἔξωθεν ἐπιφάνειαν and πᾶν ἔξωθεν, and it is plain that the resemblances are too close to be accidental.

In connection with the subject of the form of the universe there is considerable discussion relative to the question of the possibility of the existence of more than one οὐρανός or κόσμος. Plato is distinct and emphatic in his statement on the negative side, there is and there will ever be but one οὐρανός for it comprehends all creatures and therefore could not be second to another, *Tim.* 31 A. Reference should also be made here again to *Tim.* 32 C where Plato states that all the elements are completely used in the formation of the universe and therefore there can be but one universe, since nothing is left from which a second might be formed. Now it seems probable that Basil had in mind Plato and this presentation of the subject in the *Timaeus* when he wrote in 1. 56 D 4 ff': 'They assume that there is a single οὐρανός, the nature of which can not be double or triple or manifold, on the ground that all universe-matter has been expended on the one leaving nothing for a second or third.' But Basil refuses to subscribe to this view and in support of his opposition cites the fact that learned men of the Hellenes are arrayed on either side. He therefore espouses that theory for which he finds scriptural warrant, 1. 57 B 9, referring to the third heaven of Paul, II Cor. 12. 2, and the heavens of heavens of the psalmist, Ps. 148. 4.

An additional point in favor of the belief that in this treatment Basil has reference to the *Timaeus* is presented in the fact that immediately after the preceding statement Basil remarks that this theory of the numerous οὐρανοί is no more marvelous than is the theory of the seven orbits of the stars. Now this description of the arrangement of the stars, which will be considered later, follows in the *Timaeus* very shortly after the question of the single οὐρανός is discussed and therefore the appositeness of this comparison by Basil is made apparent.

Basil further does not fail to touch on the etymology of the word *οὐρανός* which is mentioned several times in Plato, *Bas.* 1, 72 B 7; 180 C 2 and *Tim.* 32 B; *Rpb.* 509 D; *Crat.* 396 B, in all of which there is the same underlying thought of its derivation from the verb *ὀράω*. Compare *Bas.* 1. 180 C 2: *οὐρανοῦ ἐνταῦθα παρὰ τὸ ὀρᾶσθαι τοῦ ἀέρος προσειρημένον* and *Crat.* 396 B: *οὐρανία, ὀρώσα τὰ ἄνω*.

The *Timaeus* however does not discuss *οὐρανός* in the sense in which it is often used by Basil, that is the heaven of Genesis as contrasted with the earth. In Plato it is primarily the universe and therefore Basil resorts to the Old Testament for his description of the nature and form of the vault of heaven, referring in 1. 20 C 14 to the verses of Isaiah, 51. 6 for its nature and 40. 22 for its form.

But the earth receives attention in both works particularly in regard to the question of its immobility or rotation. There has been much discussion of the passage of the *Timaeus*, 40 B, bearing on this point, *γῆν . . . εἰλλομένην δὲ περὶ τὸν διὰ παντὸς πῶλον τεταμένον . . . ἐμηχανήσατο*. The difficulty lies in the consideration of *εἰλλομένην* and whether this word should be interpreted as conveying the idea of rest or motion. But Boeckh, Stallbaum, Jowett and others, in spite of opposition principally on the part of Grote, stoutly maintain their belief that Plato here had no intention of asserting the theory of the rotation of the earth. In a passage in the *Phaedo* indeed he clearly states its immobility, 108 E: *εἰ ἡ γῆ ἐστὶν ἐν μέσῳ τῷ οὐρανῷ περιφερῆς οὔσα, μηδὲν αὐτῇ δεῖν μήτ' ἀέρος πρὸς τὸ μὴ πεσεῖν μήτ' ἄλλης ἀνάγκης μηδεμίᾳς τοιαύτης, . . . ἰσόρροπον γὰρ πρᾶγμα ὁμοίου τινὸς ἐν μέσῳ τεθεῖν οὐχ ἕξει μᾶλλον οὐδ' ἦττον οὐδαμῶσε κλιθῆναι, ὁμοίως δ' ἔχον ἀκλινὲς μενεῖ*.

The statements of Basil differ little from those of Plato, see 1. 24 A 12 and particularly B 10 ff. where Basil seems to have some particular treatment in mind for he says that certain of the *φυσικοί* declare the earth to be immovable on the following grounds, which are quite the same as those given in the *Phaedo*, *ὡς ἄρα διὰ τὸ τὴν μέσσην τοῦ παντὸς εἰληφέναι χώραν, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἴσην πάντοθεν πρὸς τὸ ἄκρον ἀπόστασιν, οὐκ ἔχουσαν ὅπου*

μᾶλλον ἀποκλιθῆ, ἀναγκαίως μένειν ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς. Attention is especially directed to the relation to each other of the final phrase in each quotation, but the similarity is marked throughout. The idea expressed, that motion of the earth is impossible because it would destroy the condition of the equipoise and equality in space, is practically the same although the form of expression is somewhat different, except that Plato's phrase οὐχ ἔξει μᾶλλον οὐδ' ἦττον οὐδαμῶσε κλιθῆναι has been followed by Basil almost *verbatim* in his οὐκ ἔχουσαν ὅπου μᾶλλον ἀποκλιθῆ.

Thus the immobility of the earth is declared, but that the universe as a whole has a circular movement is the assertion of *Bas.* 1. 9 A 9 and *Tim.* 34 B.

The next point that comes up for consideration is the question of the beginning of time and the distinction between day and night as presented by *Bas.* 1. 13 B 7 and *Tim.* 37 E. Each of these passages consists of two sentences which are respectively similar, the first sentence in each case stating that time was not existent before the creation of the universe but began instantly with the universe, while the second sentence describes time as that which is divisible into the past, the present and the future. The general thought and arrangement are the same, the details of vocabulary and phraseology are quite different. Perhaps Basil again has in mind this passage of the *Timaeus* when he says emphatically in 1. 560 B 8 that a child would know that the days, months and years were μέτρα τοῦ χρόνου, οὐχὶ μέρη, whereas the *Timaeus* in the passage cited calls them μέρη χρόνου.

Further resemblances of expression are found in other statements on this subject, particularly *Bas.* 1. 121 B 5 and *Tim.* 39 B, where there is a similar expression of the idea that God kindled the sun and made it of sufficient brightness to shine on the whole universe. To be also compared with this same passage of the *Timaeus* and the *Locrian* summary 97 B, are *Bas.* 1. 16 B 3, 48 B 11, and 49 B 12.

Immediately subsequent to the question of the division of night and day comes the theory regarding the arrangement of month and year, in the statement of which there is a general resemblance to be noted between *Bas.* 1. 137 B 7 and *Tim.* 39 B.

Further in connection with this same subject of time comes the discussion of the stars and their orbits. Basil is clearly quoting some authority for he says 1. 57 B 13, that it is granted by all that seven stars are borne in the seven orbits, which they say are in harmony one with another. It seems probable that Basil has reference to the elaborate presentation of this matter in the *Timaeus* 36 C. The fundamental points are the same, but Basil's treatment is much simpler than that of Plato, and his statements might easily be deduced from the *Timaeus*. Moreover, it has been shown on p. 29 above, that Basil may have introduced this matter in order to support his theory of the *ὄψαροι* in opposition to Plato.

Finally, in regard to the stars both works have notes on their wide distribution, *Bas.* 1. 141 A 6 and *Tim.* 40 A.

From this consideration of the universe and its creation we now pass to a few parallel statements in regard to the creatures. First, concerning the ethical nature of the creature it is agreed by both authors that sin did not come from the creator, for evil by the law of opposites can not have its source in the good, *Bas.* 1. 37 C 4 and *Tim.* 29 E. But on the other hand, that sin is a growth within the man himself is asserted by *Bas.* 1. 37 D 1 and *Tim.* 86 D.

There is also some space devoted to the consideration of the subject of the sensations in the *Timaeus*, 61 D ff. Cold and heat are discussed in 61 D, the heavy and light in 62 C, the hard and soft in 62 C, taste in 65 C, color in 67 C, etc, and this treatment would be an admirable source for such a summarized note as that of Basil 1. 21 A 12, to the effect that if the world were deprived of the sensations of the black, the cold, the heavy, the thick, and of taste, nothing would remain. Compare here also *Bas.* 3. 216 C 13, and *Legg.* 961 D.

Further there are several notes on voice and hearing given by both authors, as *Bas.* 1. 56 B 12 and *Tim.* 47 B, but in form of expression and content the passages show very little similarity. There is however some parallelism in the treatment of the phenomenon of color, as both declare that color exists as far as our perception is concerned only through the sight, *Bas.* 1. 81 A 1, and *Tim.* 67 C.

Again, Basil's statement in regard to the formation of flesh seems to be repeated from Plato, *Bas.* 1. 168 A 4: αἷμα δὲ παγὲν εἰς σάρκα πέφυκε μεταβάλλειν. *Tim.* 82 C: κατὰ φύσιν γὰρ σάρκες μὲν καὶ νεῦρα ἐξ αἵματος γίγνεται, . . . σάρκες δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ παγέντος, ὃ πῆγνυται χωριζόμενον ἰνῶν.

Now the *Timaeus* says very little about the creatures other than man but even the few statements made are found also in part in Basil. In regard to the beast, *Bas.* 1. 192 A 4 repeats in almost the same words the description given in 3. 216 C 4 ff. which is quoted above on p. 7. Both of these references then give the idea of the Platonic passages, *Tim.* 90 A and 91 E, that the degradation of beasts is shown in the fact that their heads are brought low and their looks are toward the earth.

The fish also receive some attention in both works as *Bas.* 1. 149 B 5 and *Tim.* 92 A, where however the resemblance is limited to similar notes on their peculiar nature which allows breathing in water but not in air. And finally there are similar notes declaring that trees, plants, etc., were created to be food for men, *Bas.* 1. 96 C 1 and *Tim.* 76 E, 77 C.

In conclusion now it must be clear that in his treatment of the creation Basil has followed very closely the outline and reasoning of the *Timaeus*. From the very statement of the subject not only are the main doctrines of Plato repeated but even at times there appear notable parallelisms in expression which compel one to the belief that in the preparation of these sermons Saint Basil made free use of the *Timaeus* as one of his books of reference.

This dependence is shown chiefly in the first four sermons which deal more particularly with the creation of the universe in contrast to the formation of the creatures. In these are found the parallel references which we have discussed, developing logically the theory of the creation from the matter preëxisting through a preceding cause to the fact of the creation, followed by the discussion of the nature of its substance and the theory of the elements. The nature and form of the universe are then considered, presently leading to the question of the divisions of time, and finally is stated the theory of the formation of the creatures.

The last three homilies of Basil discuss respectively the creeping

things, the creatures of the air and creatures of the waters, the creatures of the land. Since it has been pointed out that the *Timæus* devotes very slight attention to these subjects, it is not surprising that we find hardly a single Platonic parallel in this section. Basil was compelled to look to other sources and Müllenhoff has shown in *Hermes*, II, p. 252 f., that for these matters he has drawn largely on Aristotle.

There is on the other hand one subject that occupies a large section of the *Timæus* about which Basil has practically nothing to say. This is the subject of the formation of man, the presentation of his characteristics and his attributes. It is evident that Basil did not intend to neglect this subject, for at the conclusion of the ninth homily, the last one in this series of which we have any knowledge, he says, 1. 208 A 13: "In what then man has the characteristics of the image of God and how he partakes of His likeness will be told in the succeeding books by the grace of God." That he wrote no more than nine homilies on the *Hexaëmeron* is attested by the Fathers, for example Cassiodorus, *de instit. divin. lit.*, I.¹ And Socrates, IV, 26², affirms that the work of Basil was finished by his brother Gregory, who also in his turn asserts, *de hom. opif.*, p. 125 C 1 (Migne), that the reason for his work on the formation of man was not to convict Basil of error because he had neglected this subject in his sermons on the creation, but rather to communicate to others the great light that he had received from him. He completed this work immediately after the death of Basil, see Tillemont, *op. cit.*, IX, p. 289 f., and *Vita Basili* of the Garnier ed.³

The sermons *περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευῆς*, (2, p. 9, Migne), attributed by some to Basil, are considered by Tillemont, *l. c.*, as the work of some ancient writer who possessed something of the style and genius of Basil, and who wrote merely for exercise and not to impose on others or to deceive the church.

So we observe that without doubt it was the intention of Basil

¹ Migne, *Patrolog. Lat.*, v. 70, p. 1110.

² Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, v. 67, p. 536 A 2.

³ Reprinted in *Migne, St. Bas.*, I Preface, Chap. XLI, p. clxiii.

to discuss also this subject which is so extensively treated in the *Timaeus*, but for some reason he was prevented from completing his plans. The main subject of the *Timaeus* then was not of purpose neglected and so the lack of the presentation of this matter in Basil can not be considered as a serious break in the parallelism between the two works.

In his *History of Classical Scholarship*, p. 343, Sandys makes the statement that "Basil in his *Hexaëmeron* imitates Philo Judaeus and in his turn is imitated by Ambrose." Now, in so far as it would suggest that the degree of imitation is the same, this note is rather inaccurate, as will be briefly indicated. The dependence of Ambrose on Basil in this work is pointed out by all the editors. For example Migne, *Pref. to Hex.*, *Bas.* 1. p. 1, says: "No one, I fancy, who has read both works will deny that Ambrose in those sermons of his has performed the office of translator and not that of originator. I grant to be sure that Ambrose added something of his own, and altered and transposed, but he did it as a free translator would." Also in the preface to the homily on the Psalms, p. 210, he declares how "every one knows that Ambrose, when he wrote his books on the *Hexaëmeron*, took many things *verbatim* from Basil."

The second quotation is from the preface of the Ballerini edition of Ambrosius, (*Med.* 1875), where the author maintains that both Ambrose and Basil probably drew from the lost *Hexaëmeron* of Origen, a deduction made from a statement of Hieronymus the accuracy of which can not be verified. This preface also cites the Maurini Patres as giving the opinion that while Ambrose took very much from Basil he did not borrow servilely nor in the manner of a translator, but frequently altered and sometimes severely criticised the earlier work. This seems on the whole a very fair statement of the matter, although it is obvious that on almost every page Ambrose does play the part of mere translator. A single reference showing the word for word borrowing mentioned above may be selected from many that are readily found, *Ambros.* 21 and *Bas.* 20 C 14, where the imitation of Ambrose takes the form of a literal translation, and the closest parallelism to Basil is marked throughout the entire work, as is shown by Schenkl, ed. of

St. Ambrose, *Corp. Scrip. Eccles. Lat.*, v. 32, 1897, who in his footnotes to the *Exameron* refers to Basil no less than 353 times.

Matters are quite different however when we come to the consideration of the relation of Basil to Philo. Siegfried, in his *Philo von Alexandria*, (Jena, 1875), devotes a chapter to the subject of Philo's influence on the Greek church Fathers but mentions Basil only once incidentally on page 369. Cohn, in the proleg. to the Cohn-Wendland ed. of Philo, p. LX f., discusses the authors who have borrowed from Philo, referring to Eusebius, Ambrosius and others, but not even suggesting the name of Basil. In his notes, however, to Philo's *de opificio mundi*, he cites a single parallelism where the same phrase appears in both works, Philo, *de op. mun.* 149, and Bas. *Hex.* IV, p. 80 B I. Philo in his treatise draws freely from the *Timaeus*, in fact Philo is saturated with Plato as the ancients testify, ἡ Πλάτων φιλονίζει ἡ Φίλων πλατωνίζει, a phrase which the later writers seem not to tire of repeating.¹ Now, as Basil uses the same source it is natural to expect similarity in some cases, but the differences are more marked than the resemblances. So, for the sake of example, Basil following Plato, enlarges on the theory of the elements which is not discussed by Philo in this treatise. Philo again gives an elaborate treatment of the significations of various numbers, devoting fourteen chapters to the number 7, XXX–XLIII, a subject which is not mentioned by Basil. And further Basil does not enter into the question why man was created last, Philo, XXV–XXIX, etc. Also in some cases Basil's statements seem to correct those of Philo, as where Philo remarks, ch. XXIV and XXIX, that the earth was called invisible because it was a model perceptible only by the intellect, and incorporeal; but Basil, 29 B 8, says that it was invisible either because there was no man to see it or because it was covered by water.

Although these instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely, enough has been presented perhaps to prove that while Basil was without doubt acquainted with Philo, his reference in *Epis.*

¹ See *Testimonia de Philone* in Proleg. of Cohn-Wendland ed.

190¹ attesting that, his Hexaemeron can by no means be called an imitation in the sense that Ambrose is an imitator of Basil. Basil plainly went back to the source of Philo and abstracted material for his sermons at first hand.

INFLUENCE OF PLATO ON BASIL IN LANGUAGE.

This chapter will treat of those notable similarities in expression which point to a direct borrowing from Plato. Much allowance has been made for commonplace words and for such combinations in expression as might suggest themselves to any writer. The attempt will be made to present here only those phrases that show by use of a particular word or an unusual combination signs of immediate Platonic influence.

Direct Quotation.

The first section of this chapter will deal with those cases in which Basil quotes Plato directly or makes reference to him by name.

Bas. 3. 576 A 9 : οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἔσχατος τῆς ἀδικίας ὄρος, εἴ τι δέι Πλάτῳ πείθεσθαι, τὸ δοκεῖν δίκαιον εἶναι μὴ ὄντα.

Rpb. 361 A : ἐσχάτη γὰρ ἀδικία δοκεῖν δίκαιον εἶναι μὴ ὄντα.

This same idea is also expressed in *Gorg.* 527 B.

The second reference is *Bas.* 3. 584 B 3 : τοσοῦτον ἀνθεκτέον αὐτοῦ ὅσον, φησὶ Πλάτων, ὑπηρεσίαν φιλοσοφία κτωμένον.

Rpb. 498 B : τῶν σωμάτων . . . εὖ μάλα ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, ὑπηρεσίαν φιλοσοφία κτωμένους.

These two quotations are from the oration to youths on the study of Greek and both are surrounded by quotations and reminiscences from Plato. Indeed it is not easy to understand why in these places Plato is mentioned by name while further on in the same work, p. 585 D 5 (cited on page 49), another extract is taken *verbatim* from the Republic but no mention is made of

¹ Migne 4. 700 C 1. cited by Cohn, proleg. CIV.

Plato and no hint is given that a quotation is being presented. This manner of giving a quotation, however, or presenting a reminiscence without indicating the source, is quite characteristic of Basil, and France, *op. cit.*, p. 71, points out that this is also the rule in Julian.

The third and last direct quotation from Plato is found in Basil's Epistles, 4. 236 A 3: *καὶ τῆς περὶ λόγους σπουδῆς οὐδὲν ὑφίεσαι · ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος, ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ ζάλη πραγμάτων, οἶον ὑπὸ τείχει τιμὴ κρατερῶ ἀποστάς, οὐδενὸς θορύβου τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναπίμπλασαι.*

Epist. 496 D: *ταῦτα πάντα λογισμῶ λαβὼν ἡσυχίαν ἔχων καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττων, οἶον ἐν χειμῶνι κοινοροτοῦ καὶ ζάλης ὑπὸ πνεύματος φερομένου ὑπὸ τειχίου ἀποστάς, ὁρῶν τοὺς ἄλλους καταπιμπλαμένους ἀνομίας ἀγαπᾶ.*

This is a good example of the way in which Basil borrows from Plato, not giving the passage exactly, but as if quoting from memory he interweaves his own words with those of Plato. In the other cases then when the name of Plato is not mentioned we should not require an absolute identity of phraseology before accepting a passage as a quotation or reminiscence.

Now these three are the only direct assigned quotations from Plato in the 1543 pages of Basil (Migne). This is a remarkably small proportion compared with the practice of the other Fathers, Justin Martyr for instance shows 37 direct quotations in 286 Migne pages; Julian, Basil's contemporary, gives 51 in 612 Teubner pages,¹ and with very few exceptions the Fathers all cite Plato frequently.

In addition to these direct quotations Plato is referred to by name several times in Basil. Once in the same homily on education, 3. 584 C 7, reference is made to Plato's selection of an unhealthy spot for the Academy in order to mortify the flesh. Then in the Epistles there are two passages that have to do with the style of Plato, 4. 1092 C 10: *ταύτην ἔχει τὴν σημασίαν ἡ λέξις, ἣν ἐκ τῶν Πλάτωνος ἀδύτων ἡ σοφιστικὴ σου ἡμῖν προεχειρισάτο,* and most important of all as definitely stating Basil's

¹ See Schwarz, *Philol.* 51, 1892, p. 642 f.

admiration for Plato is a section from 4. 572 C 8, where he says that Aristotle and Theophrastus when they had something to discuss went straight at the subject matter, as they were aware how far they fell short of the grace of Plato. "But Plato through the power of his language both discussed philosophy and at the same time satirized his characters as in comedy, attacking the boldness and impudence of Thrasymachus, the fickleness and vanity of Hippias, and the boastfulness and pompousness of Protagoras." Basil continues with a reference to the arrangement in the Laws, and so, besides attesting his high regard for Plato, this passage shows too his thorough knowledge of Plato's works and from this point of view its importance can not be too much emphasized.

Comparison and Metaphor.

Saint Basil, like all writers of sermons, continually has need of illustrations to clarify, explain and enlarge topics presented and therefore his works abound in comparison and metaphor. There is hardly a page but can show more than one, and many phases of life and varied spheres of knowledge are drawn upon for their composition. It is beyond question that Basil must have taken many of these from the classical works that he read, from Plato as well as from others, but there is no doubt also that many were suggested to him from his own knowledge and experience of life. The line of demarcation is often impossible to draw. For instance in the case of the figures bearing on the subject of physicians or medicine which Basil uses so frequently, it is impossible to imagine that he has in mind Plato's numerous figures on the same subject. They are commonplace figures that would occur to any writer in any language. But often the use of a word or phrase, or the similarity of context enables us to assert with considerable certainty an instance of borrowing, and this is the method that we shall aim to pursue in the examples to be presented in this section.

In the small number of examples no classification has been possible and they will be cited as a rule in the order in which they occur in the works of Basil.

Bas. 1. 116 D 1 : ὡς γὰρ οἱ στρόβιλοι ἐκ τῆς πρώτης αὐτοῖς ἐνδοθείσης πληγῆς τὰς ἐφεξῆς ποιοῦνται περιστροφάς, ὅταν πῆξαντες τὸ κέντρον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς περιφέρωνται.

Rep. 436 D : ὡς οἷ γε στρόβιλοι ὅλοι ἐστᾶσί τε ἅμα καὶ κινουῦνται, ὅταν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πῆξαντες τὸ κέντρον περιφέρωνται.

The context in these two passages is quite different. Basil uses the comparison of the top to illustrate the statement that everything in nature succeeds in order from the first beginning, while Socrates suggests his comparison in support of the thesis that the same thing can stand still and be in motion at the same time. In each quotation the clause immediately following the word *στρόβιλοι* infers the purpose of the comparison.

The word *στρόβιλος* in the meaning 'top' is very rare. In addition to these examples in the Republic and Basil but one other is cited in the Thesaurus, Plutarch *Lysand.* 12, where the use is quite different. Aristophanes uses the word *βέμβιξ*, *Aves* 1461; Homer gives *στρόμβος*, *Il.* 14. 413, as does Lucian also, *As.* 42 : *παίουσιν ἀθρόα τῇ χειρί, ὥστε με ὑπὸ τῆς πληγῆς ὡσπερ στρόμβον ἐξαπίνης στρέφεισθαι.* While the word for 'top' in any form is not one that we should expect to find very often in the literature, the fact that Basil uses the same word as Plato is significant. Moreover the word *στρέφεισθαι* as used by Lucian seems very much more natural in connection with tops than *περιφέρεσθαι*, and the use of the latter by Basil is an additional sign that the phrase is borrowed. But the last clause beyond any question of doubt puts the Platonic stamp on Basil's phrase. In the words *ὅταν πῆξαντες τὸ κέντρον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς περιφέρωνται* Basil has repeated with really no change the language of Plato.

The next references use for comparison the brightness of the sun, of which Basil says, 1. 516 A 14, . . . *φανότατον εἶναι τῶν κατ' οὐρανὸν ἀστέρων τὸν ἥλιον*, which has its parallel in Theaet. 208 D, *ἥλιος. . . ὅτι τὸ λαμπρότατόν ἐστι τῶν κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἰόντων περὶ γῆν.* Basil employs the comparison of that which is perfectly plain and obvious to all, while in the Theaetetus it is introduced as an illustration of a kind of definition that defines by giving a peculiar characteristic of an object which distinguishes it from all others. The description of the sun however is so similar

in each case as to suggest the possibility of the phrase being borrowed.

Bas. 3. 164 B 1 : οὐδείς ἀθυμῶν στεφανοῦται · οὐδείς στυγνάζων τρόπαιον ἴστησι. Compare also 440 B 8.

Critias 108 C : ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀθυμοῦντες ἄνδρες οὐπω τρόπαιον ἔστησαν.

This is a proverbial expression cited in Leutsch and Schneide-
win, *Paroem. Gr.* I 382 as given by Suidas from the *Critias*. Basil is plainly repeating the identical phrase, and though it is possible that the proverb may have been well-known, from the fact that it is not cited elsewhere for the literature in this exact form, it would seem probable that Basil is consciously borrowing from Plato.

Basil refers several times to the legend of the punishment of the Danaids, in 3. 184 A 2 and again in 545 C 2, and finally in 581 A 13 : τῶν ἐν Ἄιδου κολαζομένων οὐδὲν πάσχοντες ἀνεκτότερον, ἀτεχνῶς εἰς πῦρ ξαίνοντες, καὶ κοσκίνῳ φέροντες ὕδωρ καὶ εἰς τετρημένον ἀντλοῦντες πίθον.

Gorg. 493 B : τῶν ἐν Ἄιδου . . . οὔτοι ἀθλιώτατοι ἂν εἶεν οἱ ἀμήνητοι, καὶ φοροῖεν εἰς τὸν τετρημένον πίθον ὕδωρ ἐτέρῳ τοιοῦτῳ τετρημένῳ κοσκίνῳ. Cp. also *Rpb.* 363 D.

From these repetitions it would seem that Basil was much impressed by this story of the fate of the daughters of Danaus. With his third reference beside the quotation from the *Gorgias* the parallelisms in language indicate beyond doubt his indebtedness to Plato. Both, it is to be observed, first refer to the severity of the punishment, after which they mention the carrying of the water in a sieve and the cask with holes that is to receive it. There are many references to this legend in the literature but in all the phraseology is quite different. One that is most similar may be cited for the purpose of comparison, *Lucian, Tim.* 18 : ὥστε ἐς τὸν τῶν Δαναΐδων πίθον ὑδροφορήσειν μοι δοκῶ καὶ μάτην ἐπαντλήσειν, but here the mention of the daughters by name and the omission of the circumstances of the sieve and of the description of the jar as *τετρημένος* present an independent phrase that could not be associated with that of Plato. On the other hand

the language and arrangement of Basil are so similar as to forbid the thought that the resemblance is the result of chance.

Bas. 3. 212 B 12: τῶν ὄντων τὴν φύσιν λογισμῶ καθορᾶς. σοφίας δρέπη καρπὸν ἡδιστον.

Ib. 4 72 A 7: εἰ δέ τις γελᾷ, βλέπων τὴν περὶ τὰς συλλαβὰς ἡμῶν ἀδολεσχίαν, αὐτὸς μὲν ἴστω ἀνωφελῆ καρπὸν τοῦ γέλωτος δρεπόμενος.

Rpb. 457 B: ὁ δὲ γελῶν ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ γυμναῖς γυναιξὶ τοῦ βελτίστου ἔνεκα γυμναζομέναις ἀτελῆ τοῦ γελοίου [σοφίας] δρέπων καρπὸν οὐδὲν οἶδεν.

Stobaeus, *Flor.* III, p. 103 (Teub.), cites the phrase ἀτελῆ σοφίας καρπὸν δρέπειν as a quotation from Pindar, and it is given by Boeckh in *Frag.* 227, and among the Pindaric ἀποφθέγματα with the note, eoque alludit Plato *Rep.* p. 457 B ubi delendum esse σοφίας scite notat Schneiderus.¹ Adam, in his Edition of the Republic, note *ad locum* follows Schneider in regarding σοφίας in this passage as a gloss and excluding it from the text. He points out that Pindar refers to the σοφία of the physiologists as ἀτελής, *i. e.* "no real σοφία at all. *More suo* Plato adapts the Pindaric fragment to his own purpose. He attacks comedy and replaces Pindar's σοφίας by the words τοῦ γελοίου. The humour of his adversary is ἀτελής—no real humour at all." See also Adam, *Rpb.* appendix III to book V.

Basil shows in the first passage quoted that he knows the original form of the sentence, but later when he comes to adapt it we find it changed even as Plato changed it. Indeed, the use of the phrase in the second passage cited is identical with that of Plato except that the humor of the mocker is ἀνωφελές. The parallelism of the two passages is perfect and the phraseology of Basil, that is the omission of σοφίας and the substitution of τοῦ γέλωτος therefor, supports the reading and interpretation of Adam for the reference in the Republic and helps to confute the view of Stallbaum that the τοῦ γελοίου is the gloss that crept into the text.

Bas. 3. 220 D 5: οἱ μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι τῆς μεγαλοῖας τοῦ

¹ This view, however, retracted by S. in ed. Plat. note *ad loc.* (Leip. 1831).

νομοθέτου, περὶ γῆν καὶ σάρκας, ὡς περὶ τέλμα σκώληκες, ἰλυσπόμενοι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ σώματος πάθεισι.

Phaed. 109 B: ἡμᾶς . . ὥσπερ περὶ τέλμα μύρμηκας ἢ βατράχους περὶ τὴν θάλατταν οἰκοῦντας.

This passage of the *Phaedo* is the sole place cited in the literature where this comparison is found. The thought and expression in Basil are very similar. What differences there are seem to strengthen the view that Basil is borrowing. In fact this sentence when placed beside that of the *Phaedo* shows rather a crude connection between assertion and comparison which makes the comparison appear not entirely natural. In Plato the antithetical relations are obvious. We in our insignificance live round the sea, the Mediterranean, as ants and frogs round a marsh. This permits also a proportionate arrangement, as we are in proportion to the ants or frogs so is the sea to a marsh. The quotation from Basil compares passionate men crawling round the earth to worms crawling round a marsh. The relations plainly are not as fit as is the case in the Platonic passage. It is easy to assume that Basil has worked over a borrowed phrase to suit the exigencies of a slightly different connection. The changes are not difficult. Basil was an inlander preaching to inlanders, the phrase *περὶ τὴν θάλατταν* was too restricted, hence the *περὶ γῆν*. The verb must then of necessity be altered and *ἰλυσπᾶσθαι* was selected perhaps to increase the obloquy. *σκώληξ* is the crawling creature required by the new verb, and *σκώληξ* is not a far call from *μύρμηξ*.

While this analysis may be rather fanciful, for the general reasons stated it seems not unjustifiable to count the phrase of Basil as an echo of the comparison of the *Phaedo*.

Next there are a number of comparisons which have to do with the eyes, among which particularly to be noted are *Bas.* 4. 128 A 2 and *Rpb.* 516 A which show the greatest resemblances. Here the first clause of Basil corresponds to the first clause of the passage from the *Republic*, each stating that eyes accustomed to darkness when brought suddenly to the light are blinded and can not see actualities. Therefore, to note the parallelism in the second clauses, they must look first at the shadows of objects, then at the reflections in water, and finally at the objects themselves.

Both this citation and *Bas.* 3. 236 B 3 clearly suggest that Basil is drawing from the famous cave simile of the Republic.

Basil frequently makes use of the figure of the steersman in comparison and metaphor, as in 3. 256 C 12, and 421 C 1, which particularly show Platonic influence when placed beside Republic 488 C, and D. The first passage in each case refers to the steersman's neglect of his duties and the second details some of those duties. Both of the sections of Plato are from the famous comparison at the beginning of the sixth book of the Republic, to which as Jowett points out, in note to 488 A, Plato returns as to a familiar image in *Polit.* 297 E. In this latter place it is to be noted that Plato couples in his comparison the steersman and the physician, τὸν γενναῖον κυβερνήτην καὶ τὸν . . . ἰατρόν . . . So it may be an additional sign of reminiscence from Plato when Basil in the first passage cited, 3. 256 C 10, says, οὔτε γὰρ ἰατρόν ἐπαινῶ, . . . οὔτε κυβερνήτην . . .

We next come to a pair of comparisons which centre round the dog. The first one, which is used in *Bas.* 3. 365 C 1 and *Rpb.* 375 E, has already been discussed on p. 14. This comparison introduces the dog mild to its friend and fierce toward its foe in each case as an illustration of the benefit of anger under certain circumstances. Plato's statement is, ἄμαχόν τε καὶ ἀνίκητον θυμός, *Ib.* B, and therefore it should be an attribute of the character of the φύλαξ. Basil, *Ib.* B. 3, compares proper anger to the soldier who bears aid always at the necessary points, and then summing up with the words μάλιστα χρήσιμος ὁ θυμός he introduces the comparison of the dog. This similarity of the setting, added to the resemblances of expression indicated before on the page cited, is strong proof that this section of the Republic has here been Basil's model.

The dog again figures in *Bas.* 3. 369 A 1 : καὶ ποιεῖς τὸ τῶν κυνῶν, οἱ τοὺς λίθους δάκνουσι, τοῦ βάλλοντος οὐ προσαπτόμενοι.

Rpb. 469 D : οἶε τι διάφορον δρᾶν τοὺς τοῦτο ποιοῦντας τῶν κυνῶν, αἱ τοῖς λίθοις οἷς ἂν βληθῶσι χαλεπαίνουσι, τοῦ βάλλοντος οὐχ ἀπτόμεναι ;

This is another example where a comparison has been borrowed by Basil and poorly fitted to his context. The comparison itself

in each case is obviously identical. Plato compares those who rob the corpses of their enemies to dogs who attack the stones with which they are struck instead of those throwing the stones. The comparison is perfectly fit, the dead thing is assaulted after its power has gone from it. Basil, however, makes use of the comparison to illustrate the folly of getting angry at a different person from him who has provoked you. The whole point of the comparison is thus lost, all that remains being the fact that the anger is directed toward the wrong object.

The form *βάλλοντος* in this passage of the Republic is the reading of Adam, who selects it in opposition to the second aorist, *βαλόντος*, of the other editors, because the latter is found in one MS. only (A), because Aristotle uses *βάλλοντος* and not *βαλόντος* when he quotes the sentence in *Rhet.* 3. 4 as a typical example of simile, and because the "present is more picturesque and true to nature." We observe then that the form of the expression in Basil again supports the reading and interpretation of Adam in refutation of the commonly accepted view.

There are several references in Basil which illustrate the thesis that the inborn evil in each thing destroys it, so in 3. 373 A 1 envy destroys the soul as rust does iron, and shortly afterward in 380 A 13 it is declared that envy is the disease of friendship as mildew is of wheat. This again is repeated in 4. 1005 C 3, *ὥσπερ ἡ ἐρυσίβη τοῦ σίτου ἐστὶ φθορὰ ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένη τῷ σίτῳ, οὕτω καὶ ἡ κολακεία τὴν φιλίαν ὑποδνομένη, λύμη ἐστὶ τῆς φιλίας.*

All of these are to be considered in connection with *Rpb.* 608 E where Plato states that each thing has its own proper disease as *σίτῳ ἐρυσίβην, σηπεδόνα τε ξύλοις, χαλκῷ δὲ καὶ σιδήρῳ ἰόν.*

The first two passages of Basil occurring one immediately after the other in the same general sense with each other and with the Platonic usage, suggest that Basil must have had the phraseology of this reference of the Republic vividly in mind when he wrote this homily, and thought this sentence of Plato capable of being split so as to provide him not with one only but with two comparisons. The third quotation from Basil again shows the simile *ἡ ἐρυσίβη τοῦ σίτου.* Now this simile is not so common in the

language that we should expect it to appear in Basil even thus much. The *Thesaurus*, s. v. ἐρυσίβη, gives but one reference to where it is found, the passage of the Republic cited above. In addition to this the similar connection in thought helps to convince us that Basil is using a borrowed phrase. Plato states that everything has its natural disease, wheat has mildew, iron has rust, etc. Similarly in Basil envy is the proper disease of friendship as mildew is of wheat, and again even as mildew of wheat so fawning is the disease, destruction of friendship.

There are several comparisons now that have to do with the ship and the sea. *Bas.* 3. 421 B 13: ὥσπερ τι πλοῖον ἀνερμάτιστον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀεὶ προσπιπτόντων περιφερόμενος. Compare also *Ib.* 577 C 8.

Theæt. 144 A: καὶ ἄττοντες φέρονται ὥσπερ τὰ ἀνερμάτιστα πλοῖα.

In addition to the identity of phrase in the reference from Basil and that from the Theaetetus there is also a marked similarity of context. Both employ the comparison as an illustration of those who are under the influence of passion. Basil, immediately preceding the quotation given above, exhorts his hearer not to permit the storm of wrath to overthrow him, and the comparison in Plato is made directly with those clever men of retentive memory who for the most part are prone to anger. This then seems to be another example of a borrowed simile.

In the same sphere of the sea may be cited *Bas.* 3. 436 A 8: ἡδονὴ ἀγκιστρὸν ἐστὶ τοῦ διαβόλου.

Ib. 964 B 5: ἡδονὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ μέγα τοῦ κακοῦ δέλεαρ.

Tim. 69 D: . . . ἡδονήν, μέγιστον κακοῦ δέλεαρ.

The first of these fish metaphors, where pleasure is the hook, suggests that Basil here may have had the Platonic statement in mind. The second reference from Basil is merely a repetition of the phrase of the Timaeus, which is the only example of this metaphor cited in the *Thesaurus*. As is pointed out in the commentaries Plato is praised for it by Cicero, *Cato Mai.* 13, divine enim Plato escam malorum appellat voluptatem, quod ea videlicet homines capiantur ut pisces.

We return again to the thought of the boat and note that Basil

in 3. 565 A 14 urges us not to be led of others ὡσπερ πλοίου τὰ πηδάλια τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν παραδόντας, beside which is to be mentioned *Clit.* 408 A : . . . δούλω ἄμεινον ἢ ἐλευθέρῳ διάγειν τῷ τοιούτῳ τὸν βίον ἐστὶν ἄρα, καθάπερ πλοίου παραδόντι τὰ πηδάλια τῆς διανοίας ἄλλω.

But two occurrences of this simile are cited, the reference given from Plato and the same phrase borrowed by Themistius, *Orat.* 321 B, who quotes the entire sentence from the Clitopho beginning with the word δούλω. Though Basil has abstracted in phraseology no more than the simile itself, the connection is similar in that it is used as an illustration of one who is under the guidance of another. The resemblance in the context then, the identity of phrase, and if that is not sufficient the repetition of the figurative use of πηδάλια, all combine to afford unquestionable proof of the relationship of the two passages.

We pass now to an elaborate simile of dyers and dyeing which is introduced in each case for the purpose of illustrating the importance of preliminary education, *Bas.* 3. 568 A 9 ff. and *Rpb.* 429 D f. Basil declares in exhorting the Christian youths that all that we do is in preparation for the future life and this end we must prosecute with might and main. The scriptures are our guide thither but often we are unable to understand them on account of immaturity, and therefore we must acquire preliminary training by study of the poets, historians and orators, just as dyers prepare the cloth before they dye.

The context of the Republic here is concerned with the discussion of courage which Plato defines as the salvation of the opinion concerning the things to be feared and their character, begotten by law through education. As therefore cloth must be prepared to take a good dye, so the soldier to attain to courage must receive a thorough preliminary education.

In form of expression the simile itself in each case is practically the same if allowance is made for a certain interchange of words, which makes it appear indeed as if Basil were deliberately altering a borrowed passage to make it more his own. So Basil says, οἱ δευσοποιοὶ παρασκευάσαντες πρότερον θεραπείαις τισὶν, ὃ τι ποτ' ἂν ᾖ τὸ δεξόμενον τὴν βαφήν, οὕτω τὸ ἄνθος ἐπάγουσιν, beside

the Platonic phrase, οἱ βαφεῖς προπαρασκευάζουσιν θεραπεύσαντες, ὅπως δέξεται ὁ τι μάλιστα τὸ ἄνθος, καὶ οὕτω δὴ βάπτουσι. δευσοποιός in the meaning of βαφεύς is cited by Suidas and Hesychius, but no example of such use from the literature is given in the lexicons. Blümner, *Techn. u. Term.* 1. 217, 6, says: "das eigentlich von der Farbe gebrauchte Wort δευσοποιός findet sich für Färber gebraucht." In support of this statement he cites only three lexical notes, from Moeris, Suidas and Harpocration's lexicon of the Attic Orators. Harpocration's note does not seem to bear on the point, however, and the others simply mention the fact. Plato in this passage cited above uses the word twice, first in 429 E 1 with the meaning 'deeply-dyed' and hence 'indelible;' but on its second appearance the word shows a metaphorical use of this meaning in 430 A 4, δευσοποιὸς αὐτῶν ἢ δόξα γίγνεται καὶ περὶ δεινῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων, which has its parallel in the similar metaphorical use by Basil of ἀνέκπλυτος in the clause (*loc. cit.*), μέλλει ἀνέκπλυτος ἡμῖν ἢ τοῦ καλοῦ παραμένειν δόξα. ἀνέκπλυτος too is simply the negative of the Platonic ἔκπλυτος in 429 E 6.

It is almost unnecessary to add a note on the identity of Basil's παρασκευάσαντες πρότερον θεραπείαις τισὶν with the Platonic προπαρασκευάζουσιν θεραπεύσαντες, of δέξεσθαι τὴν βαφήν with δέξεσθαι τὸ ἄνθος. Plato also says δέξεσθαι ὡσπερ βαφήν in 430 A 3. Attention is finally called to the interchange in Basil's δέξεσθαι τὴν βαφήν, οὕτω τὸ ἄνθος ἐπάγουσιν and Plato's δέξεσθαι τὸ ἄνθος, καὶ οὕτω δὴ βάπτουσι.

From these various considerations then, from the similarity in form and expression of the comparisons and from their similar relations to their respective contexts it seems without doubt that this is another instance where Basil has drawn extensively from Plato. A. Jahn, *Neue Jahrb.* 49, p. 397, agrees to this identification and mentions several editors who accept and make comment on it.

Bas. 3. 581 C 13: μὴ διὰ τῶν ὧτων διεφθαρμένην μελωδίαν τῶν ψυχῶν καταχεῖν.

Rpb. 411 A: καταχεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς διὰ τῶν ὧτων, ὡσπερ διὰ χῶνης, . . . τὰς ἀρμονίας.

Hiller in the *Neue Jahrb.* 109, p. 174, maintains that this passage of Plato and particularly the comparison of the ears to a funnel must have had a common source with Aristoph., *Thesm.* 18, ἀκοῇ δὲ χράνῃ ὄτα διετετρήνατο. This source he suggests was an early philosopher, and consequently the phrase in Plato is a simple reminiscence. Now, although Basil does not mention the funnel the rest of the clause is so similar as to convince us that in its turn this is a reminiscence from Plato. In fact there can be little doubt about the identification since Basil uses this metaphor in the midst of a section where he draws largely from this identical portion of the Republic, see below.

Bas. 3. 584 C 1: ὡσπερ ἡνίοχον ὑπὸ δυσηνίων ἵππων ὑβρεὶ φερομένων παρασυρόμενον ἄγεσθαι.

Phaedr. 254 E: ὁ δ' ἡνίοχος . . . τοῦ ὑβριστοῦ ἵππου ἐκ τῶν ὀδόντων . . . σπάσας τὸν χαλινόν, τὴν κακηγόρου γλῶτταν . . . καθήμαξε.

In Basil the connection of thought is that as the charioteer is disregarded by his frenzied steeds so is the mind disregarded in the ascendancy of the passions. This is the exact point in the elaborate comparison of the Phaedrus, 253 D ff., of the charioteer and his two horses, on which Thompson, ed. of *Phaedrus*, p. 45 (note to 246 A), remarks: "All commentators, ancient and modern, have recognized in the charioteer and his pair of steeds the well-known triple division of the soul into the reasoning, the passionate, and the appetent principles (λογιστικόν, θυμικόν, ἐπιθυμητικόν) which lies at the root of Plato's ethical doctrine."

The brief simile of Basil then with the warning against allowing the rational principle to be overcome by the other two seems to have been taken from the Phaedrus, and Wandinger here, *op. cit.*, p. 46, n., refers very properly to that comparison.

The last example to be presented in this chapter has to do with the fox of Archilochus to which reference has already been made on p. 20. Basil says in 3. 585 D 6: τῆς Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκος τὸ κερδαλέον τε καὶ ποικίλον ζηλώσομεν—and again in 588 B 4: σκιαγραφίαν τινα τῆς ἀρετῆς . . . περιγραφώμεθα.

Erb. 365 C: πρόθυρα μὲν καὶ σχῆμα κύκλω περὶ ἑμαυτὸν

σκιαγραφίαν ἀρετῆς περιγραφτέον, τὴν δὲ τοῦ σοφωτάτου Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκα ἐλκτέον ἐξόπισθεν κερδαλέαν καὶ ποικίλην.

Obviously Basil is giving a quotation word for word from Plato and it is interesting to note how he divides the passage of Plato into two phrases which are separated in his work by several pages. He probably had read the whole general section of the Republic bearing on this subject in preparation for his own treatment, as is shown above on the page cited. Such a striking comparison would remain vividly in his mind and he simply uses it again as he sees fit.

There are many other comparisons and metaphors which show more or less resemblance between Basil and Plato, but those cited here have been selected as among the most important and they are sufficient to prove the contention of this chapter that in this department also Basil is heavily indebted to Plato.

GRAMMATICAL STATEMENTS.

In this section will be presented a small number of passages relating to the grammatical structure of the sentence, in which the language of Basil bears a close resemblance to that of Plato. First, both authors similarly emphasize the importance of mastering the elements before proceeding to anything more advanced. The letters must be learned before the syllables can be understood and the syllables lead up to the λόγος, *Bas.* 4. 69 C 3 and *Theact.* 203 A. Then comes the definition of the λόγος as that which is composed of συλλαβαὶ καὶ λέξεις, *Bas.* 4. 69 B 10, and this is practically the same as that given in *Crat.* 424 E, for though it is true that the Cratylus gives the complete course, letters, syllables, words and sentence, while Basil mentions only syllables and words, λέξεις in this usage apparently including ὄνομα and ῥῆμα, as parts of the sentence, yet immediately afterwards as cited above in 69 C 3 he points out the necessity of the letters preceding the syllables and so they too must be assumed in their place in his analysis of the sentence.

Next there is to be noted a similarity in the definition of ὄνομα which Basil gives in 1. 681 C 10: τῶν γὰρ οὐσιῶν σημαντικὰ τὰ

ὀνόματα, οὐκ αὐτὰ οὐσία, which is to be placed beside the *Crat.* 388 C : ὄνομα ἄρα διδασκαλικόν τί ἐστὶν ὄργανον καὶ διακριτικὸν τῆς οὐσίας. Now the fact that in Basil at the beginning of the second page following there appears a further parallelism to this section of the *Cratylus* is additional proof of borrowing, *Bas.* 1. 685 A 7 and *Crat.* 385 E, where the similarity of expression and context is noticeable. The passage of the *Cratylus* is an elaborate treatise on names and their relations to objects, things, and it is the πράγματα that have βέβαιον οὐσίαν. So Basil in discussing the Trinity says in the place cited, τὰ πράγματα τῶν ὀνομάτων ἰσχυρότερα, κτλ. Thus throughout this section Basil seems clearly to be indebted to Plato.

Finally there is given in each work a division of λόγος into three forms, *Bas.* 3. 477 A 2 f. and *Theaet.* 206 C f. The first division of Basil is exactly the same as the first division of the *Theaetetus*, that is the description of λόγος as the expression of thought in speech. The second division of Plato has to do with analysis or as it is expressed, the passage to the whole through the elements. Basil's statement of his second category is quite different from this but in his elaboration of the subject he has considerable to say about the λόγος representing complete thought, *Bas.* 477 B 15 f. There is no resemblance between the two works in the statements on the third division of λόγος, but this circumstance does not destroy the general parallelism of the two passages which has been indicated.

LITERARY ALLUSIONS.

There are to be considered under this heading a few quotations and literary allusions given both by Basil and Plato, preceded by the citation of some parallel notes concerning the poets.

Basil, in his address to Christian youths on education, devotes one of his early chapters to the consideration of the merits and demerits of the poets, basing his remarks on the discussion of the matter by Plato in the *Republic* 376 E ff. as is noted by Padelford, *op. cit.*, p. 104, n. 5. Some of these parallelisms will be indicated.

In the first place there are preliminary statements, *Bas.* 3. 568

C 10 and *Rpb.* 377 C, in regard to the different kinds of poets and the decision on what of their works are to be accepted and what rejected, which are very similar, and especially to be noted is the description of the poet as παντοδαπός in Basil which is to be compared with *Rpb.* 398 A where it is stated that the poet has the power of becoming παντοδαπός ὑπὸ σοφίας. Further on in 569 A 4 Basil says that we should not commend the poets who represent the gods as scoffers or railers, or in love or intoxicated, nor yet when they define happiness as coincident with the loaded table and with ribald song. This is a condensation of a large section of the Republic in the closing chapters of the second and the opening chapters of the third book, where many illustrations, chiefly from Homer, are presented. Some particularly significant passages may be mentioned. *Rpb.* 379 E shows the same form of expression as that used by Basil, 'we shall not commend the breaking of oaths,' etc. And in regard to the railing and scoffing mentioned by Basil reference should be made to *Rpb.* 389 E. f. where Plato cites among other examples *Il.* 1. 225, οἰνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων, κραδίην δ' ἐλάφοιο, and to *Rpb.* 388 E f. with the quotation from *Il.* 1. 599, ἄσβεστος δ' ἄρ' ἐνώρτο γέλωσ μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν, | ὡς ἴδον Ἥφαιστον διὰ δώματα ποιπνύοντα.

Finally the last part of Basil's statement about happiness and its connection with the loaded table seems to have its source in *Rpb.* 390 A which criticises the remark of the wisest man, Odysseus, when he says that it seems to him most beautiful when tables are full to overflowing with flesh, *Od.* 9. 8.

Basil passes next to the family quarrels of the gods, 3. 569 A 11, "among them brother fights against brother, the parent against his children and the children against their parents." On this subject too there is an extensive treatment in the same section of the *Republic* 377 E ff, where many concrete examples are given.

The last count of Basil's indictment against the poets has reference to those who describe the loves and adulteries of the gods, especially of Zeus the chief of the gods. This bears a close relationship to *Rpb.* 390 B f. where it is agreed that it is not proper to listen to a poet describing, for example, Zeus who forgets

all things in his passion for Hera, *Il.* 14. 312 ff., or the illicit love of Ares and Aphrodite, *Od.* 8. 266 ff.

Thus in this whole discussion then, although the treatment of Basil is very much condensed and all citation of examples from the poets has been omitted, it is clear that his source is the elaborate presentation of Plato.

Bas. 3. 292 A 10: καὶ τῇ μὲν γλώσση ἐξόμνυσαι, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς χειρὸς διελέγχει. Also 501 D 6, and particularly 576 A 7: ἀλλ' ἡ γλώττα μὲν ὁμώμοκεν, ἡ δὲ φρῆν ἀνώμοτος, κατ' Εὐριπίδην ἐρεῖ.

Theaet. 154 D, and particularly *Conv.* 199 A: ἡ γλώττα οὖν ὑπέσχετο, ἡ δὲ φρῆν οὐ.

All these quotations are clearly variations of Euripides, *Hippol.* 612, ἡ γλώττ' ὁμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρῆν ἀνώμοτος. Hug, commentary on *Conviv. l. c.*, points out how this verse was seized by the writers of comedy as the text for many attacks on Euripides, of which he cites Aristoph. *Thesm.* 275, *Ran.* 101, 1471. It thus passed into conversational language and became proverbial in use. It is impossible to say that Basil was in any way impelled to its use by its appearance in Plato, but on the contrary the fact that Basil in the third passage cited above gives the original more exactly than Plato would suggest that he was taking it at first hand, or at least following some other source. In his note on the use of this verse by Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. 39, Prof. Gildersleeve calls it "one of the most notorious and best-abused verses in Greek scenic poetry."

Now the chief reason for citing these passages in this connection is to illustrate the difficulty of proving a relation between such allusions. It is generally an impossible thing to do unless great assistance is rendered by the context. It must therefore not be imagined that the few examples in this chapter represent the sum total of all such allusions or quotations common to Plato and Basil. In the other cases where there is no more proof of relationship than in the present the references have been omitted.

Next there are parallel passages on Odysseus and the Sirens in *Bas.* 3. 568 D 3 and *Conv.* 216 A; and then we come to an elaborate discussion as to whether Homer and Hesiod are friends

or foes of virtue. Basil in 3. 572 B 13 declares distinctly that all the poetry of Homer is a praise of virtue and all things in his poetry lead up to this end, on the other hand Plato is quite as definite in *Rpb.* 600 E when he says that the poets from Homer on are imitators merely of the image of virtue. Plato indeed in this whole section of the *Republic*, 598 D ff., attacks the poets and particularly Homer because though they are considered masters of virtue, in fact they are only imitators of virtue and have no real knowledge of it.

“It is clear,” as Adam remarks, note on *Rpb.* 598 D, “that Plato is refuting a view of poetry which found enthusiastic advocates in his own time,” but Plato also in his turn is severely criticised. Gräfenhan, *Gesch. d. klass. Phil.* III, p. 239, writing of the period from the time of Augustus to the end of the fourth century, states that in this period we find frequently an ethical view of the Homeric poems both in secular and Christian works. He continues, “so nennt Dion Chrysostomus in seiner zweiten Rede *περὶ βασιλείας* den Homer einen ‘Verkünder der Tugend,’ und Basilios der Grosse nahm gleichfalls an, dass Homer mit seinen Gedichten ein ‘Lob der Tugend’ habe geben wollen.” He refers here to the passage of Basil cited above where considerable space is devoted to this discussion. Basil particularly mentions verses of Hesiod, a poet who is included with Homer in Plato’s criticism 600 D, as written to guide men to virtue, as will be shown below. In general then it seems probable that Basil in this treatise on the education of Christian youths is distinctly refuting the Platonic theories in his advocacy of the study of the Homeric poems.

The passage of Hesiod quoted and discussed by both authors, *Bas.* 3. 572 A 8 and *Rpb.* 364 A ff., is from the *Op. et Dies*, 287 f. *τὴν μὲν τοι κακότητα καὶ Ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἐλῆσθαι | ῥηϊδίως · ὀλίγη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ’ ἐγγύθι ναίει. | τῆς δ’ ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν, κτλ.*

Plato maintains that such passages of the poets as this from Hesiod impel the youths to vice; on the contrary says Basil, what other meaning could Hesiod have had except to incite them to virtue. Again after giving the quotation Basil repeats that in his opinion Hesiod had no other meaning than to incite us to virtue,

plainly emphasizing his view of the matter in opposition to that of some one else, and without doubt criticising the statement in the Republic.

Various circumstances help to support this theory. Both authors are dealing with the subject of the education of youths and Basil immediately before has discussed the degrading influence in education of the poets with their descriptions of the quarrels and debauches of the gods, etc., a section which, as has been shown on p. 52 finds its source in several chapters of the Republic shortly following the reference quoted in this connection. Now again Plato in this same passage, 365 C, introduces the comparison of the fox of Archilochus, which is used by Basil also near the end of this same treatise, see page 49. These facts then prove that Basil borrowed freely from this part of the Republic, abstracting and condensing as he pleased, and therefore, with the similarity of quotation and with the tone of Basil's language added, there is little doubt that he had in mind this particular interpretation of Hesiod's words given here by Plato. This view however is not accepted by Jahn, *N. Jahrb.* 49, p. 414, who opposes Hess and Nüsslin in regard to it. But Jahn's objection, that the use of Hesiod's quotation in the two places is so entirely different that Basil could not have had this passage of Plato in mind, has already been answered.

Another parallelism may be mentioned here taken from the same section of each work, which gives further evidence in support of this theory of relationship, *Bas.* 3. 572 A 4 and *Rpb.* 377 A. In these sections we have a very similar pair of phrases which relate to the education of the young. The idea stated in each case is that particular care must be taken with their training because in the young the character is most impressionable. Basil also repeats various words from Plato and there is no doubt of the relation of the two passages. See Jahn, *N. Jahrb.* 49, p. 407.

In conclusion of this chapter several other references may be mentioned. *Bas.* 3. 588 B 9 and *Crat.* 428 A quote and treat similarly another verse of Hesiod, *O. et D.* 361. Again *Bas.* 3. 580 C 8 and *Prot.* 339 C quote the saying of Pittacus, χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι.

MISCELLANEOUS PARALLELISMS.

There still remain several parallel passages which could not be included in any of the foregoing chapters and so may be grouped together here. Only the most important examples will be cited.

Bas. 3, 241 A 1, 624 D 1 and *Rpb.* 455 D consider the question of the equality of women with men. Basil says that women engage in warfare for Christ and do not plead the weakness of their bodies as excuse for abstaining therefrom and, he adds, many women have far excelled men. So Plato begins his statement with the remark that women frequently are better than men, etc. Plato's advocacy of the equality of women "is part of a well-reasoned and deliberate attempt by the Socratic school to improve the position of women in Greece," says Adam, *Rpb.* note to 451 C. The movement seems to have been quite widespread and finally to have reached considerable magnitude, as it was savagely attacked by Aristophanes in his *Ecclesiazusae*. See Adam, *Rpb.* App. I to bk. V, on the relation of the fifth book of the Republic to Aristophanes' *Eccles.*, and Ivo Bruns, *Frauenemancipation in Athen.*

This view of woman is of course fundamental in the Christian teaching, so we must not emphasize too much the similarity here, but it may be noted that Basil's assignment of woman to warfare, in spite of the weakness of her body, is paralleled by Plato's decision that she must take her position beside man, whether performing guard duty or engaged in active military expeditions. See *Rpb.* 466 C f.

We come next to cite a pair of references on the subject of envy, *Bas.* 3. 252 C 11 and *Theaet.* 174 E. Basil is giving a description of envy, which causes each man to desire the sphere of life above his own, the slave desires to be free, the free man to be well-born, etc., and in this list of positions desired is placed the nobility which attends the ability to trace one's ancestors for seven generations. In the *Theaetetus* too this is placed beside great accumulation of wealth as one of the desirable things of life which is scorned by the student of philosophy there described. It is

this tone of scorn and general parallelism of treatment together with the similarity of phrase that would suggest the dependence of one passage on the other. Stallbaum in his note on this reference of the Theaetetus refers to Welcker, *Theognis, Proleg.* p. LI, who gives a brief discussion of this subject of genealogy as a claim to nobility. He cites but one parallel passage from the literature that bears particularly on our citation, and that is from Menander, *Mein.* IV, p. 229, which is not likely to have affected here the relation of Basil to Plato.

Both our authors make declarations against the pampering of the body which show considerable parallelism, *Bas.* 3. 584 C 11 and *Rpb.* 407 B. The contexts are somewhat similar. Plato cites various examples, as Phocylides and his maxim, *δεῖ, ὅταν τῷ ἤδη βίος ᾖ, ἀρετὴν ἀσκέειν*, 407 A, and Asclepius who either cured or killed but did not meddle with dietetics, 408 A. So Basil also introduces some illustrations, referring to Pythagoras who rebuked one of his scholars for growing fat, and to Plato who fearing the ascendancy of the body selected an unhealthy spot for the site of the Academy.

Next both treat the subject from the point of view of the man of wealth. Plato maintains that in order to be able to devote such excessive care to his body a man must be wealthy, but that even though wealthy such a man would be an undesirable member of society, and the sons of Asclepius would not attend him were he richer than Midas. Similarly Basil argues that if a man disregards this attention to his body he has no need of riches, and this is the man who makes the good citizen. As an illustration to match the reference to Asclepius in Plato is mentioned the example of Diogenes, who in his scorn for the body and its pleasures showed himself richer than the Persian king. But additional evidence that Basil in this section is dependent on the Republic is furnished by the fact of the mention of Plato here twice by name, once as indicated above in connection with the selection of the site of the Academy, and again in 584 B 3 where a quotation is given. This quotation, which is to the effect that we must pay only sufficient attention to the body in order to keep it for the service of philosophy, is taken from the Republic 498 B, see p.

37, and proves at least that Basil had the Republic in mind in his treatment of this question.

These various considerations then, taken together with similarity of phraseology, the phrase ἡ ἄγαν αὐτῆ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιμέλεια of Basil balancing the ἡ περιττῆ αὐτῆ ἐπιμέλεια τοῦ σώματος of Plato, the πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν ἐμπόδιον of the one corresponding to the πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐμπόδιος of the other, give considerable warrant for the belief that the earlier passage was the source of the later.

Basil in this same discussion borrows still further from Plato and from the same book of the Republic. This time it is in connection with the subject of the good and bad modes of music and the influence which they exert. So the effect of the Phrygian mode is described in 3. 580 A 4 ff. where it is said of Timotheus that his skill in playing was so great that he could arouse passion by the harsh mode and soothe it again by playing the gentle mode. Thus once by the Phrygian mode he caused Alexander to leap to arms in the midst of the feast. Further in 581 D 6 the Dorian mode is approved because by it the player once caused a band of drunken revelers to cast away their crowns and to flee home ashamed. Likewise in the Republic the Dorian and Phrygian are commended and are the only modes to be allowed in the state, *Rpb.* 398 E ff., where Socrates proceeds to describe these two modes in explanation of their selection. The one, the Dorian, is fitted for time of war and gives calmness and endurance in misfortune; the other, the Phrygian, is the mode for the time of peace, which gives moderation and wisdom. The one is the strain of courage, the other the strain of temperance. Obviously this is slightly different from the account of Basil but the fact that Basil has introduced this discussion in this section of his treatise on the education of youths, in connection with borrowings from the same passage of the Republic and with approval of the same modes praised by Socrates, is sufficient evidence of his indebtedness to Plato.

Finally reference may be made to *Bas.* 3. 928 C 7 and *Rpb.* 369 B; as well as to the passages *Bas.* 4. 752 A 4 and *Rpb.* 370 B, where there is a certain degree of similarity to be noted.

CONCLUSION.

This study has not pretended or attempted to give the total influence of Plato on St. Basil, for such a task would be well-nigh impossible. We have observed that Basil was brought up in the Schools and traditions of Greece, he was trained under Greek influence and was taught by Greek instructors and without doubt Plato was his model from his earliest days and therefore influenced the whole formation of his style. Further the secondary influence of Plato can not be disregarded. It has been shown that he was the most popular of the classical authors with the early Church writers on account of his many statements that could be interpreted as bearing on Christianity, and Basil, by his acquaintance with the works of his predecessors, was still more imbued with this Platonic atmosphere.

We have, however, attempted to show the more immediate and the more conscious imitation of Plato with the result that whereas Basil does not exhibit the extent of imitation to be seen in various of the other Fathers who have been mentioned, the reason for this is not far to seek. Justin Martyr in the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (cp. p. 1) abounds in Platonic quotation, in Platonic reference and in Platonic imitation, but consider his Dialogue with Trypho on the doctrines of the Christian and the Jew, and the Platonic references are practically nil. So in Basil too the subject with which he is dealing is the determining factor and it is no surprise that his theological discussion on the Trinity seems to borrow little from the Greek philosophy. In our chapter then on the theology of Basil there is little said of the influence of Plato, for while some similarities are noted nothing of relationship can be proved. But in his statements on the subject of ethics there is more opportunity for Basil to borrow from Plato and more of such borrowings have been indicated, though Basil is still most practical in his teachings and serious in his aim to reach the people and has therefore nothing to do with theories of ethics.

We have already stated that Basil was no philosopher and so he gives no space to purely philosophical discussions. But in

general throughout his works, here and there, a Platonic reminiscence or imitation appears, especially in the form of a comparison or metaphor, which proves that even in his busy and practical life he did not forget his Plato.

In the corpus of Basil, however, there are two works and two of the most famous works, in which the nature of the subject gives him a good opportunity to use Plato and where indeed we find that Plato is used to the full. The first of these is the *Hexaemeron*, which has been discussed thoroughly and on which the conclusions are stated on pages 33 ff., and the second is the *Essay to youths on the study of classical literature*, *λόγος πρὸς τοὺς νέους*, *Migne* 3. 564 C-589 B. In this short work are found two of the three direct quotations from Plato given by Basil, and on almost every page there is some more or less obvious reminiscence. These cases have been presented and discussed in their proper sections throughout this paper and we need only mention here that the collection of so many into such a small compass is proof of the observation just made, that when the nature of the subject permitted, Basil drew liberally from his distinguished source.

Finally, then, the influence of Plato on St. Basil is exhibited in reminiscence, imitation and rarely quotation, sporadically through most of his works, and while in some there is little sign of it, in at least two it is most marked and noticeable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following were the chief works used :

- Ackermann, G. Das Christliche im Plato u. in der platonischen Philosophie. Hamburg, 1835.
- Adam, J. The Republic of Plato. Cambridge, 1902.
- Ast, F. Lexicon Platonicum. Leip., 1835-38.
- Böhringer, F. and P. Die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen VII. Die drei Kappadozier. Stuttgart, 1875.
- Cocker, B. F. Christianity and Greek Philosophy. New York, 1870.
- Farrar, F. W. Lives of the Fathers, St. Basil, II. New York, 1889.
- Hermann, C. F. Platonis Dialogi. Leipzig, 1856-70.
- Huber, J. Die Philosophie der Kirchenväter. München, 1859.
- Jahn, A. Neue Jahrb. 49 (1847), p. 371 f. Supp. Band 13, p. 455 ; Zeits. f. Alterthumsw. 10 (1843), p. 1012.
- Johnston, C. F. H. The Book of St. Basil on the Holy Spirit. Oxford, 1892.
- Jowett, B. The Dialogues of Plato trans. into Eng. 3d Ed. Oxford, 1892.
- Lothholz, G. Bas. d. Gr. Rede an christliche Jünglinge. Jena, 1857.
- Migne. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series Graeca. Basilii opera omnia, v. 29-32. Paris, 1857.
- Gregorii Naz., Orat in laudem Bas. Mag., v. 35, p. 494.
- Müllenhoff, K. Hermes, II, p. 252. Aristoteles und Basil.
- Padelford, F. M. Essays on the study and the use of Poetry by Plutarch and Basil the Great. New York, 1902.
- Stallbaum, G. Platonis opera omnia. Gotha, 1836-85.
- Tillemont, L. S. Histoire Ecclesiastique, IX. Saint Basile. Paris, 1714.

LIFE.

Theodore Leslie Shear was born in New London, New Hampshire, August 11, 1880. He received his preparatory education at the Halsey Collegiate School, New York City, and in the Fall of 1896 entered New York University where he graduated with the class of 1900. The year 1900-01 he devoted to graduate study in New York University under the supervision of Professor Sihler. In 1901 he entered Johns Hopkins University where he has since studied, pursuing work under Professors Gildersleeve, Bloomfield, K. F. Smith, and Associate Professors Miller and Wilson, to all of whom he desires to express his deep-felt gratitude, and especially to Professor Gildersleeve for the inspiration of his teaching.

May, 1904.

BQ
1170
.P7S5

